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The focus of this dissertation is on transformational leadership at publicly supported institutions of higher education in urban and metropolitan settings. A quantitative analysis was performed to study the perception of the transformational leadership skills of presidents of such universities.

Overall, this dissertation will explore three subgroups of the university community -- faculty, staff and administrators -- and their perceptions of the transformational leadership qualities of their current university president. Transformational leaders tend to serve as guiding, mentoring coaches. They possess vision and charisma and they inspire employees to perform beyond expectations for the good of the organization. Bass and Avolio list four factors that define transformational leadership: idealized influence (charisma); inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; and individualized consideration (Bass and Avolio, 1993) (Table 1).

Transformational leadership, when properly enacted, can result in greater organizational effectiveness, greater employee commitment to the mission and organization, employee willingness to exert extra effort, higher moral and motivational levels and emotional responses such as inspiration to excel and
attachment to the leader (Stoner-Zemel, 1991). The intellectual offspring of Burns' transformational theory place emphasis on vision, values, empowerment, trust, culture and leader-follower relationships that comprise coaching, teaching and counseling.

As leaders and managers confront the dynamic demands of the twenty-first century, it is believed that the twentieth century hierarchical, bureaucratic, managerial, controlling model will decrease in its effectiveness and its ability to energize and help to coordinate knowledge workers (Cleveland, 1985). An emerging conceptualization of leadership that includes the attributes of being transformational, visionary, values-based, developing, inspiring and empowering offers a viable approach to contemporary organizational coordination (Fairholm, 1991).

This research focused on faculty, staff and administrators at 20 public urban colleges and universities in the U.S. (Appendix A), and detailed their perceptions of the transformational leadership skills of their presidents.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the 1800s, Abraham Lincoln and Justin Morrill proposed a concept that became one of America’s most enduring contributions to education – establishing governmentally supported universities based on grants of land to be used for their campuses. It was acknowledged that these institutions of higher learning would provide service to the communities they served, not only in production of educated graduates to work and live in these communities but also in serving the population by discovering new knowledge, promoting teaching and disseminating knowledge through partnerships. Today, the leaders of modern public urban universities are at the forefront of this ideal.

Exceptional leaders today often are transformational leaders. They are motivational coaches. They thrive on helping others to succeed and, in turn, succeed themselves. As Lynch (1993) puts it, “When leaders focus on the growth of their people instead of on absolute success or failure, they are less frustrated by imperfect performance because they can get satisfaction from the followers’ improvement” (p. 170).

The need for transformational leadership has never been greater than it is now, although the concept was first introduced more than 30 years ago. Dowton
was the first to name this style of leadership “transformational leadership” in 1973, and his work was expanded upon by Burns in 1978 and later extended by Bernard Bass and others. Neither Burns nor Bass studied presidents of institutions of higher education, basing their work on political leaders, military officers or business executives, instead.

J. M. Burns first introduced the defining characteristics of transformational leadership theory in his 1978 Pulitzer Prize winning book, *Leadership*. Other authors have developed the theory with more comprehensive emphasis on organizational settings, including Bass (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Sashkin and Fulmer (1987), Kouzes and Posner (1989), and Tichy and Devanna (1990).

Komives talks about a “relational process” (Komives, 1998, p. 31) that occurs when people work together for a common good. Good leaders learn to focus and to treat their teams as a community. They realize that groups go through stages of growth, including “forming, storming, norming and performing” (p. 34). We need to learn that organizations should resemble a web. The exact shape and pattern may vary over time but the common purpose resides at the center (Komives, 1998).

According to Bass (1995), transformational leadership is comprised of four components: charisma or idealized influence (attributed or behavioral); inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; and individualized consideration. Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) and Conger and Kanungo (1998) defined similar components in the category of charismatic leadership.
The primary approach for coordinating organizations has been the bureaucratic model. In part, this method encompasses a formal organizational structure, a clear vertical chain of command, detailed procedures for every task an organization faces and effective accountability to management (Weber, 1946). Waldo (1955) predicts that organizations of the future will be less bureaucratic and authoritarian. Knowledge workers cannot be supervised efficiently using highly bureaucratic and authoritarian systems that were devised more than a century ago (Fairholm, 1994).

Changes in the way we work, many fostered by the increasing role of technology, have made the bureaucratic organizational model too costly and counter-productive. New approaches to leadership are needed. This new leadership must focus on developing shared values, assisting in personal and professional advancement for a wide range of constituents and fashioning and communicating a sense of transcendental purpose for the institution.

This dissertation will focus on transformational leadership qualities among university presidents at public urban universities in the United States. Urban colleges and universities have played, and continue to play key roles in moving our society forward. Metropolitan universities educate large numbers of citizens, and forge critical partnerships in several key areas: business and industry; government and human services; and public education, including primary, secondary, adult and post-graduate education.

Johnson and Bell (1995) emphasize that “The metropolitan university’s regional orientation and strong commitment to serve the intellectual needs of its
surrounding communities and constituencies, the resulting diversity of the student body, the focus on the education of practitioners, and the emphasis on outreach through applied research and technical assistance add up to an institutional model very different from that of the traditional research university” (p. xiii).

This study considers the urban and metropolitan university important, and they were chosen as the subject for this research for three reasons:

- Because of the added complexity of their missions in the communities where they exist, and the additional demands this places on their leaders
- Because of their comparable size and the diversity of their geographical locations in comparison to those of private or more rural institutions.
- Because of the growing demand for education in urban areas.

The urban environment and its changing nature increases the demands on urban university leaders. At the very least, today’s leaders must be far more flexible than was necessary in the past, which is far more easily accomplished with a transformational leadership style than a more traditional, bureaucratic model. Segal (1977) states that the urban environment is very important to our society. Segal says, “The urban movement was stronger than the westward migration, and its effect on the American character has been equally important” (Segal, 1977, p. 3). This is further evidenced by the following census data: “In 1890, the
U.S. population was 65% rural and 35% urban. Today, over 75% of the population is urban and 25% is rural" (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Number of Inhabitants, Part 1, United States Summary, Series PC80-1, A1: 1-35). These facts show the role urban life plays in our society.

The Bureau of the Census defines an urbanized area as “consisting of at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more and the surrounding, closely settled area that meets certain census criteria of population density or land use” (Segal, 1977, p. 6). Alan Evans (1985) discussed urban areas operating as single or interconnected labor markets. Evans writes, “An urban area operates as a single labor market with people traveling between homes in one part and jobs in another.” He also writes, “An urban area is a set of separate, although interconnected labor markets” (Evans, 1985, p. 116). Evans goes on to define an urban area in “administrative terms, by using legal boundaries of the local government area” (p. 117). Evans also points out, “Up to 1951, the urban area as an economic entity rather than as an administrative unit could be defined in terms of the contiguous build-up area” (p. 118).

The urban society is a significant part of our culture. The urban setting is where the majority of our citizens live and work, it is where most of our laws and decisions are made and, as data shows, its role in our society is getting larger.

As mentioned earlier, the population of the United States shifted dramatically from rural to urban locations over the last 100 years. In pointing out the need to educate urban citizens, Elliott (1994) notes government’s interests and role: “Enacting the Morrill and Hatch Acts, Congress laid the groundwork for
a national network of low-cost public colleges, thus bringing higher education to people who had generally not had the opportunity to further their education” (p. 2).

Roles of a university president

Job description

The president serves as the chief executive officer of the university and reports to the Board of Trustees and to the Board of Regents. The president is expected to exhibit a commitment to excellence in teaching, research, extension and public service and to exhibit an understanding of the university’s land-grant mission and a commitment to land-grant principles, and to possess the ability to communicate the University’s mission to its various constituents. The president will have leadership and administrative skills and experience required to effectively manage the personnel, finances and facilities of a complex multi-campus university in a multicultural environment.

A number of metropolitan universities (The University of Akron, The University of Cincinnati, Youngstown State University, Cleveland State University, Toledo University) were studied in a research project that sought to find the various job descriptions for their president. The following is a list of common characteristics:

- An earned doctorate or terminal degree with demonstrated excellence in teaching, research and scholarly activities
• Distinguished executive-level experience in the public or private sector

• A demonstrated ability to communicate effectively with students, faculty, staff, alumni, governing boards, legislators and the public both on an individual and group basis

• Strong personal integrity and enthusiasm required to meet the vigorous demands placed on a university president

• An understanding of the land-grant mission and a commitment to land-grant principles

• A demonstrated record of successful fundraising

• The ability to relate to people of many backgrounds and educational levels in an effective manner, with a demonstrated commitment to cultural diversity

• Recognition of the needs of all students, and a strong commitment to student experiences, i.e., student services, athletics and the arts

• The vision to continue leading the institution to national and international prominence

• An understanding and appreciation for the role of community colleges in meeting the needs of the region and state

• A commitment to shared governance.
Engaged universities and service learning

Engaged universities have redesigned their teaching, research and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities (The Engaged Institution, 1999, p. vii). These institutions go further than current perceptions of public service. There is a commitment to sharing and reciprocity, true partnerships and mutual respect. The modern engaged university brings the community and university together at the same table, each as an equal member of the family.

There is little room for the old, bureaucratic management style in an institution that must interact with the community it serves on so many fronts. Managing these engaged institutions -- and their complex, multi-faceted missions -- requires modern thinking about leadership, especially at the top.

Engaged learning, or its predecessor, service learning, has a rich historical tradition, strong theoretical frameworks and principals of good practice and exemplary programs. However, the following quote bears significance to its future: "If schools are to become laboratories of democracy and entrepreneurship, and if students are to become engaged as partners in renewal of their communities, a research case must be made for service-learning" (Service-Learning, 1998, p. ix). Less prevalent in the literature is research about the impact of service learning on the university community and the metropolitan area where the university is located.

Community service in college used to mean stuffing envelopes, cleaning up trash in vacant lots or writing a check to an organization after a car wash. For
today’s students, community service also can include spending time each week with a patient dying of AIDS, defending children’s right as a court-appointed advocate or counseling children whose mothers or brothers have died of cancer. College students teach reading and writing at local community houses, lead Girl Scout Troops when no other adults are available, and help build houses for people who otherwise would not be able to own a home.

Service learning connects students to a rich tradition. After he visited the United States in the 1830’s, the French author Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in *Democracy in America* that our habit of forming associations for political, charitable, religious and intellectual purposes was a key to the success of our democracy. Modern evidence suggests that communities with strong civic association are more successful in dealing with social issues like crime, education, unemployment and poverty. Service learning almost always engages students with civic associations in their communities.

Service is this generation’s form of student activism. In the past, activism took the form of public events like rallies and demonstrations directed against broad topics like segregation, the Vietnam War or the "Establishment." Today’s student activism is rooted in the desire to make a difference in very specific areas about which students are passionate.

Service is connected to all aspects of students’ lives. Some will come to service just because it looks good on a resume. Some will undertake service for guidance in making a career choice or to develop job-related skills. Most students come to service because they realize that this community will be their
home during their college years, and they want to make a difference. Regardless of their initial reason for serving, most students will remain active throughout their lives because they find service personally rewarding. All of them will have their previous knowledge or belief systems challenged by their interaction with the community. They also will gain firsthand experience in civic engagement.

Without the nourishment of active service, citizenship may easily wither into apathy, cynicism and personal withdrawal. Therefore, service becomes an energizing force in education and an antidote to the boring routine of the daily classroom grind. Gallup (1996) writes in *Growing Up Scared in America*, "The Gallup Youth Surveys also underscore the compelling qualities of youth--their idealism, optimism, spontaneity and exuberance. Young people tell us they are enthusiastic about helping others, willing to work for world peace and a healthy world and that they feel positive about their schools and even more positive about their teachers" (p. 34).

Without service learning and the engaged university, our social capital will be depleted. Social capital is the valuable fund of interaction that results when groups of citizens and neighbors come together with higher education to tackle the tough problems of our communities. Where social capital exists, people come together to understand what needs to be done and work together to accomplish the tasks at hand. Where it does not exist, the people on all sides will stay home and let the TV explain what is wrong with their neighborhoods.

Definitions of engaged universities and service learning vary considerably among those who embrace it. In 1999, *The Engaged University* postulated that
an engaged university must accomplish at least three things: respond to the students of today and tomorrow; bring research and engagement into the curriculum; and offer practical opportunities. The book goes on to point out that engaged institutions are guided by seven characteristics—responsiveness, respect for partners, academic neutrality, accessibility, integrating engagement into institutional mission, coordination and resource adequacy. Common themes on these campuses include: a clear commitment to engagement; strong support for infusing engagement into the curriculum and teaching mission; diversity in approaches and efforts; defining their own community; leadership; funding; and accountability (The Engaged Institution, 1999).

In 1998, Tapscott pointed out that engaged learning is an instructional strategy involving a shift from the traditional teacher-centered "broadcast" instructional model to a more "interactive" student-centered environment. Engaged leaning is a collaborative learning process in which the teacher and the student are partners in constructing knowledge and answering essential questions (Tapscott, 1998).

From The University of Colorado at Boulder, we learn that at its heart, service learning is a form of experiential learning that employs service at is modus operandi. Service-learning pedagogies are used by teachers in college and universities as well at in K-12 schools to enhance traditional modes of learning, actively engage students in their own educations through experiential learning in course-relevant contexts and foster lifelong connections between
students, their communities and the world outside the classroom (University of Colarado at Boulder Service-Learning Handbook, 1995, p. 1).

We see a different definition from *Service Learning in the Disciplines* (1996). In this work, service-learning means a method under which students learn and develop through thoughtfully organized service that:

- Is conducted in and meets the needs of a community and is coordinated with an institution of higher education and the community;
- Helps foster civic responsibility;
- Is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students enrolled, and;
- Includes structured time for students to reflect on the service experience (*Service Learning in the Disciplines*, 1996, p. 1).

The book *Power* provides a detailed definition:

"At their best, service-learning experiences are reciprocally beneficial for both the community and students. For many community organizations, students augment service delivery, meet crucial human needs and provide a basis for future citizen support. For the student, community service is an opportunity to enrich and apply classroom knowledge, explore careers or majors, develop civic and cultural literacy, improve citizenship, develop occupational skills, enhance personal growth and self-image, establish job links and foster a
concern for social problems which leads to a sense of social responsibility and commitment to public/human service" (The Power, 1994, p. 3).

_Service-learning in Higher Education_ defines the issue this way: "Service learning is the various pedagogies that link community service and an academic study so that each strengthens the other. The basic theory of service-learning is Dewey's: the interaction of knowledge and skills with experience is key to learning. Students learn best not by reading the great books in a closed room but opening the doors and windows of experience. Learning starts with a problem and continues with the application of increasingly complex ideas and increasing sophisticated skill to increasingly complicated problems" (Service-learning in Higher Education: 1996: Forward). Finally, we close with the Corporation on National and Community Service, who clarifies that "Service-learning is a method through which citizenship, academic subjects, skills, and values are taught. It involves active learning--drawing lessons from the experience of performing service work (Corporation on National and Community Service, 1997, p. vi).

These are all very well written and comprehensive definitions. However, the true question is this: how can the inclusion of a service project enhance education? Learning occurs through the active behavior of the student. It is about what the student learns, not what the teacher does. Incorporating service into the curriculum emphasizes civic responsibility. "Service is often segregated
from civil responsibility, and is instead associated with altruism or charity—a supererogatory activity of good men and women rather than obligatory activity of responsible citizens" (Barber, 1993, p. 235).

Cyber education is also a major player in the world of engagement. This new form of education is virtually transforming America’s universities. The term "engaged learning" comes from a landmark research report, Plugged In!, published by the Council for Educational Development and Research in 1995. Evidence of this new type of education coming together with engagement is shown in the following quote, "We believe that technology that does not advance students' learning has little value in the classroom. Technology use in conjunction with the most recent research and development findings on learning, however, can help students achieve in school" (Plugged In, 1995).

There are a number of public service centers on campuses across the nation, The Swearer Center in Providence, RI, and the Boulder Colorado Center to name just two. They have tracked down information that demonstrates the importance of service learning to our nation. Some facts from 1998 include: 29 million hours of service contributed by undergraduate students; 294,000 students involved in community service projects; 316,000 students involved in one-time service projects; 10,800 faculty involved in service learning, and; 11,800 courses available to undergraduates (1998 Service Matters). These figures show the depth of the impact of service learning.

Students should see service learning as a true learning tool rather than merely as a gesture of charity to the disadvantaged. Educators need to strive to
help students learn from their service experiences by providing opportunities for them to talk with each other, to tie their experiences to academic learning and to write about their service encounters.

Institutions of higher learning have a responsibility to a population greater than their own campus. Service learning can help higher education to realize that role. This will help change the situation so that college and universities will function as genuinely civic institutions, improving the quality of life in their communities. The new engaged universities can be the crossroads where theory in the classroom meets the practice of living in the world, connecting community-based work to education and relationship building. These tasks are best accomplished with a university workforce that is being led by a transformational leader.

Campus planning

This section focuses on planning, the university’s relationship to the city and how planning for a metropolitan university relates to goals of the city and the university. Additionally, the work will look at the planning process for a metropolitan campus with an evaluation of a specific area of concentration.

Campus plans may be categorized in a number of ways, but the typical version includes long-term development plans and short-term project plans. Development plans typically encompass the entire campus, or at least a large portion of it. They include capital improvements and typically cover a longer span of time than project plans. Project plans are commitments to action on specific
program requirements that cover short periods of time and usually deal with a small part of campus.

Dober describes different types of plans in the following ways: “Campus planning is the premeditated guidance of the amount, quality, and location of facilities for higher education so as to achieve a predetermined objective” (Dober, 1963, p. 53). “The plan can be illustrated as a physical form. Depending on the type of plan, the form could range from a classroom addition to the entire campus and its surroundings. Plans can be distinguished by the time period they cover, the area they encompass, the precision of their program and the characteristics of their design. Plans can be grouped together as projects or treated individually” (Dober, 1963, p. 54).

Campus styles are as diverse as the students who populate them, and the styles must change as the needs and requirements of those students, as well as the university’s faculty and environment, dictates. “The first realized campus plan in the United States was prepared in 1813 by Joseph Jacques Ramee for Union College, Schenectady, New York. Thomas Jefferson, however, stands as the most extraordinary master planner in American education. Jefferson devised the curriculum for the University of Virginia, selected the campus site, designed the buildings, wrote the specifications, supervised the construction, hired the first teachers, served as Rector and, in his last days, was still a member of their Board of Overseers” (Dober, 1963, p. 21).

Surges in population and increased diversity of the population have caused universities to expand. As a result of the increase in enrollments,
campus planners have tried to keep up with the demand for “bigger and better” while attempting to maintain universities’ core objectives. Goals and objectives also can be modified to adapt to change. It is anticipated that many colleges and universities will continue to grow and as they do, the need for campus planning will increase as well.

In this excerpt from Kaiser, we see a good description of the overall planning process for universities:

“The five principle products of an integrated academic, fiscal and facility planning process are an academic plan, a physical development plan, institutional priorities, a capital budget plan and an operating budget plan. The academic plan is the foundation of the entire process. The physical development plan is far more specific than a landscape or building site plan. It needs to access the spatial needs of academic and support programs. Institutional priorities should be thought of as the institution’s strategic plan. Capital and operating budget plans are derived from the institutional priorities” (Kaiser, 1989, p. 13-15).

One of the most important steps in the planning process is the preparation of a statement of institutional priorities. Such a statement links academic program planning with fiscal planning, thus improving the chances for full integration of the planning process (p. 13-15). Kaiser identifies nine criteria as essential for the successful integration of academic, fiscal and facility planning: a comprehensive planning process, a team-oriented organizational structure, a
skilled technical staff, an information base, the use of external consultants, a controlled, participatory involvement, decisive leadership, the involvement of the institution’s governing board and fixed responsibility for implementation of the plan (p. 13-18).

Dober describes the members of the institution sharing power in the planning process. “Decision makers are the people who are legally responsible for choosing between alternatives, establishing policy, and seeing that policy is carried out once it is made. Advisors review and recommend but have limited decision-making. Staff serves both the advisors and decision makers, but does not sit in judgment” (p. 177).

The following excerpt from Dober describes the steps in the campus planning process:

“Establish a steering committee for planning; staffing the development plan study; setting up a work program; and forming a campus development committee. The steering committee will determine general objectives, resources, budget limits, time schedule, and appoint the appropriate staff. Staffing the planning study involves selecting specialists in the areas of architecture, community planning, engineering, real estate, and traffic. Under the work plan the consultant will: evaluate the planning and development problems; suggest surveys and studies necessary to resolve problems; establish the institutions responsibility for providing data, information, a liaison, and related items; outline documents, drawings, plans, studies and services the institution may expect during the
planning study; set up appropriate due dates; and establish budgets and fees. Finally, a campus development committee is formed with the at least one member from each of the following groups: administration; business office; building and grounds; dean of students; dean of faculty; faculty; and library” (p. 179).

Green describes the planning process as follows: “Beginning with the notion that an institution should own and operate only well-maintained facilities required for its program and enrollments in the near future, university officials have developed a novel planning process. First, proposals have been made to reassign the use of space where departments and functions have been inadequately housed, inappropriately located or have occupied too much space. In addition, all facilities have been analyzed in terms of program appropriateness, quality, cost of operation and level of maintenance” (Green, 1980, p. 13).

In Green’s vision of planning, campus buildings should be designed to one of three standards: to remain in their original form into the foreseeable future; to be expandable in the future; or to be removed when they reach the end of their useful life through, razing, sale or leasing to outside parties (p. 13).

Green believes the dollars saved by building to specific standards ahead of time will in turn finance improvements for the remaining facilities and the overall operating and maintenance cost burden for the institution will be reduced.

Bareither and Schillinger outline the following steps in the campus planning process (Bareither and Schillinger, 1968, p. 4):
• Learn the language
• Become familiar with terms and definitions
• Know your university
• Become familiar with the role and scope of your institution
• Know the policies and procedures
• Know what you have
• Obtain and maintain a physical facilities inventory compatible with the demands for the date
• Establish a data collection system
• Gather the necessary data relating to staff and students that are required for analysis, and projection of physical facilities
• Establish space standards
• Determine workable physical facility standards for the educational program
• Summarize the data
• Present the data of facilities available, those in process of construction, and those required
• Translate data into building projections
• Prepare a building program giving functional relationship of rooms, space requirements by building blocks, and equipment requirements.
One final note with regard to the constant problem of parking on campus: Weinstock says: “Every large urban enterprise has had to become involved in the garage business, like it or not. The automobile is as much a part of its operation as are text books and teachers” (Weinstock, 1961, p. 26).

As tastes and styles continue to develop over time, planning for the development of a metropolitan university must have the benefit of the continuity of the plan throughout and within change, helping to maintain stability for a university during transitions. Such plans allow universities to inherit and to pass on a viable campus design.

**Policy**

When policy issues arise, it must be remembered that metropolitan universities often face economic challenges because they are closely allied to the communities that surround them. In designing policy for the metropolitan institution of higher education, the university’s role in the community cannot be overlooked. Metropolitan universities play an important role within urban societies, which often face vast arrays of problems and issues. Addressing these problems and issues requires the best our institutions of higher learning have to offer.

Because faculty, staff and administration live in the city, the institution must be prepared and willing to help to improve it. Schneider and Ingram show how democracy works to make good decisions for the general public or, in this instance, for the university “family” (Schneider and Ingram, 1997). For a
university to make good decisions that provide benefits for a wide number of constituents and for its complete campus and urban communities, it needs to incorporate the democratic principle of involving as many people as possible in the decision making process.

Fischer and Forester describe how planning and policy is made up of language, arguments and politics (Fischer and Forester, 1993). Their descriptions are appropriate in considering the atmosphere on campus that comes from good dialogue including many voices. Faculty, staff and administration all contend for their respective areas, wants, needs and desires, and each group sees their intentions and wishes as helping to make the university a better place. Fischer and Forester (1993) also point out how the concept of “framing” issues in the correct context for the greatest good is used, and how framing an issue correctly is important when new issues are brought to a campus. Framing an issue is an important communications skill that transformational leaders must have.


1. Ambiguity of purpose.

   In what terms can action be justified? What are the goals of the organization? (Cohen and March, p. 385)

2. Ambiguity of power. How powerful is the president? What can he or she accomplish? (p. 385).
3. Ambiguity of experience. What is to be learned from the events of the presidency? (p. 385).


The president of a university is the person to whom everyone looks for leadership and policy design but, in reality, the president is not the ultimate authority at the university. The president has to answer to the board of trustees who, in turn, answer to a statewide governing authority, who answer to the state governor or legislators, who ultimately answer to voters. The president is the leading decision maker for a university, but not the highest authority.

Cohen and March (1974) point out that there is no way to put into effect a long-term plan or process to run a university. They point out that universities are too large for any one system of governance and often become an agglomeration of governance systems that seem to run on their own. So universities seem to be nothing more than “organized anarchies” with everybody appearing to “do their own thing,” and administrators who are along for the ride, acting as facilitators more than leaders.

Notable persons and community leaders often are in power at most universities. Members of the board of trustees usually are appointed by the state’s governor and as such, tend to be elite members of the community. Despite the best efforts of all parties involved, the policy decision processes are decentralized. Lindblom discusses relationships on a university campus between all the constituents it serves: students and community, faculty and staff, alumni,
Lindblom also discusses how these relationships help to shape society.

Finally, Lindblom discusses the issue of needing more information and analysis to further illuminate these relationships (Lindblom, 1990). Lindblom acknowledges that executives try to accumulate a great deal of knowledge prior to making policy decisions, but he notes that leaders of universities and colleges need to do a better job of knowledge accumulation for their institutions to become more effective.

Weimer and Vining say policy analysis should be more “client” oriented (Weimer and Vining, 1999) and, if the term “client” is applied to a university campus, it can be inferred that their theory on policy analysis is applicable to universities and that all universities should learn more about this issue. These authors also discuss methods of accumulating practical advice on policy analysis (Weimer and Vining, 1999). The implication drawn from their work is that universities should have a full-time policy analyst who would be used to analyze all important decisions for the university and advise the institution’s administration. Such an analyst would be a valuable asset to the institution.

The physical development plan is far more specific than a landscape or building site plan. It needs to take into account the spatial needs of academic and support programs. Institutional priorities should be thought of as the institution’s strategic plan. Capital and operating budget plans are derived from the institutional priorities (Kaiser, 1989, p. 13-15).
In this statement we see some of the factors involved in the planning process for a university. All of these factors impact the direction of the university and its future policy decisions. Dober describes how the members of the institution share power:

“Decision makers are the people who are legally responsible for choosing between alternatives, establishing policy, and seeing that policy is carried out once it is made. Advisors review and recommend but have limited decision-making. Staff serves both the advisors and decision makers, but does not sit in judgment” (Dober, 1968).

In discussing the design of public policy issues, the works of Bobrow and Dryzek (1987) seem to have the most appropriate application to higher education. They note there is no one, true, final strategy for public policy. These authors show how an effective public policy analyst should acquire the tools, methods and techniques necessary for such analysis. Then, a method can be devised to couple these skills with the needs of an urban university to analyze, design and develop a strategy for public policy that would be beneficial for the institution’s administration, faculty, staff, students and alumni and for the local and state communities it serves.(Bobrow and Dryzek, 1987).

Another point that Bobrow and Dryzek (1987) discuss is their “frames of reference,” which is analogous to Fischer and Forester’s (1993) comments on the “framing issues” for university communities. According to Bobrow and Dryzek, arguments have been framed that say publicly supported university
systems have their bases in “welfare economics” (Bobrow and Dryzek, 1987, p. 27). While framing the discussion in this way ignores the reality of the land-grant basis on which public universities were founded in the United States, universities do have to address this contention as a part of the continuous reporting to taxpayers that they already do to justify their costs and expenses. Bobrow and Dryzek say, “Economic analysis is simply an extension of financial appraisal, in which a governmental agency seeks to maximize profit--or net benefit--on behalf of society as a whole, rather than just to stockholders (p. 31).

However, the authors also say this theme has limitations. The political environment in which the university is housed may not be completely in harmony with this theme. Bobrow and Dryzek state that, “While the welfare economics approach has many shortcomings, the only ineluctable limit to its onward march is politics. The approach is uncomfortable with and it does not fit well within political reality, or with the values embedded in a democratic order” (p. 43). As politics play such an important role in policy issues, every board and faculty member must select the best options for the taxpayers and for students and the institution, while often restraining their personal opinions and their own political preferences.

Several articles on higher education policy discuss the political climates and the involvement of business in higher education. The political climate refers to the major investment of millions of dollars in the higher educational system and concerns about “getting our moneys worth” (Ewell: 1997). There are calls for much more in-depth systems of policy to determine if the investment is
worthwhile. The second issue is whether there is too much involvement of private business in our higher educational system (Slaughter, 1990). Both of these issues also include concerns about politics and private business having too much influence on our public tax dollars. Policy decision-making at a public university is a significant problem on a contemporary basis because of the conflict it engenders. Waste (1989) writes in his book *The Ecology of City Policymaking* that, "City policy is not caused or determined but is greatly influenced by ten identifiable ecological factors (age, locale, growth process, rate of growth, local political culture, personality of policy makers, presence or absence of political scandals or reforms, types of conflict and types of policy enacted) that affect the policy life cycle in differing degrees in all American cities" (p. 3).

Some factors can be better controlled by universities' public affairs departments, including working with the administration to advise it of a beneficial growth rate, addressing rumors that might put the university in a bad light, addressing types of public conflicts that may arise, helping to ensure that beneficial legislation is considered and enacted at the state level, ensuring that regulatory agencies’ requirements are met and coordination of governmental relations.

These departments of public affairs focus on enhancing the positive impact and minimizing the negative impact a particular policy has on internal and external parties involved with the university. Although departments of public affairs at individual institutions may have separate focuses, collectively they
desire the same end result -- enabling all influencing factors on the university and the resultant policy making to work together for the betterment of the university.

Understanding that policy decisions are based on several factors, listing these factors and understanding the potential for their effects on decisions permits administrators to better predict and understand what policies will be made. Once the policy is determined, the "educated" can work with controllable factors to enhance the ramifications of the decisions.

Policy designers and analysts must find their own solutions for their respective university. It must be realized that good policy design does not stop with the completion of the design. Institutions are always changing and the plans for any given institution must be adjusted to change with the institution.

Over time, urban and metropolitan universities and colleges changed dramatically in response to changing urban economics, migration from rural areas to the city and new academic trends. In the future they will continue to change. Overall, metropolitan university policy design will help to keep these institutions together during transitions. Such policy design also contributes to the university’s ability to enhance the assets handed down from previous administrations and to maintain and build those assets into a viable institution with a promising future.
Statement of problem

Johnson and Bell (1995) point out that “Today, America’s major challenges are no longer in agriculture and the nation’s rural areas but in its urban and metropolitan regions” (p. 343). The 21st century will be a time of great challenge for institutions of higher education, especially for institutions located in metropolitan settings. Those institutions have already navigated through rough waters caused by reduced numbers of high school graduates, increased competition for college candidates, increasing costs for higher education and reduced support from federal and state governments. As Johnson and Bell (1995) point out “The multidimensional task undertaken by metropolitan universities is not only of great societal importance, it also constitutes a challenge which may be greater than that faced by any other category of academic institutions” (p. xiv). While such issues will continue to be challenging for higher education, the next century will offer new and greater challenges. These growing challenges bring a greater demand for effective university leadership.

The task for today’s public university leaders is to effectively communicate this complex message to legislatures, members of Congress, foundations, corporations, alumni, friends and others who can provide resources to assist in overcoming these challenges. Communication, interaction, collaboration, shared responsibility and team leadership appear to offer the greatest promise for addressing the multidimensional problems of the metropolitan campus of the 21st century.
We live in a diverse, fast-paced, global, high technology environment. A new approach to leadership is needed, given the changing nature of the workplace and the increased diversity of the work force. This leadership must be focused on shared values, follower development and transcendental purpose. If we want true leaders for our metropolitan and urban universities, a quantitative research study on current leadership of public urban universities should be conducted to benchmark where we are in terms of modern, transformational leadership on campuses today.

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine whether evidence suggests that urban university presidents exhibit characteristics of transformational leadership.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

In the first chapter, we learned about transformational leadership and the role it can play in a modern urban university. The urban environment presents special challenges and complexities that suggest the need for new approaches in leadership. The growing complexity of the role of a university president coupled with urban changes, including a squeezed middle class and reduced support for education from government, create additional demands for modern approaches for leadership.

Much research has been done on the topics of leadership and transformational leadership. In this chapter, we will review that research.

Leadership

Today’s leaders often are the first to be dismissed when an organization fails to achieve its objectives. Leaders are on the front lines and put themselves at risk for the organization. In today’s society, leaders can be chastised, hated or overwhelmingly disliked. It is no wonder that leaders need to have occasional renewals of the mind, body and spirit (Komives, 1998).
Rosenbach and Taylor (1998) point out, “We must recognize that one of the root causes of our divisions and social unrest is an absence of creative, dynamic leaders” (Rosenbach and Taylor, 1998, p. 169). The authors also point out ways to overcome this cultural deficiency. The primary objective is to conquer fear and mistrust through knowledge of what leadership is and the methods used to achieve its purposes.

What Rosenbach and Taylor suggest is that the traditional role of captain is not a true portrait of today’s leader. They suggest we need to delegate work and decisions back to those in the organization who are most able to provide leadership or who have specific expertise in the area in question. Komives discusses this point of individualized knowledge, showing us how each person’s unique experiences have shaped their views of leadership and how those experiences can be called upon to help to solve important issues. Kotter (1996) also makes this point when he states, “masses of people help (to) provide the leadership process.” (Kotter, 1996, p. 176) Kotter also points out that there are leaders throughout an organization, not just at the top. In its purest form, leadership should not separate leaders but should bring leaders and their constituents closer together (Koyzes, 1993).

We learn from Vaill that leaders have to “work smarter.” We no longer have simple problems with right and wrong answers, but are faced with complex dilemmas and paradoxes (Vaill, 1996, p. 6). Overall, we need to work smarter, not harder, to solve the complex problems facing society.
Reasons for wanting to lead include the feeling of self-satisfaction gained by seeing the organization grow and prosper, the feeling of accomplishment when a job is well done and the feeling of importance when helping the organization meet its goals and objectives. A leader also enjoys helping fellow employees succeed beyond their expectations. Covey (1989) acknowledges this last point by telling his readers to “seek first to understand, then to be understood” (p. 38).

Unfortunately, there also are poor leaders who thrive on power and submission of employees. This type of leader is counter-productive in the long run, and shows no caring or respect for individual persons. Even though they may be ineffective leaders, they too find some self-satisfaction in the process. The power of leadership becomes a drug-like stimulus that fuels the poor leader’s ambitions and ego. Biggs (1993) notes that such poor leaders use the negative influences of coercion, intimidation and manipulation to attain their personal and organizational goals. As Biggs mentions, these tactics usually lead to high employee turnover, resentful employees, distrust and suspicion.

Rosenbach points out that leaders must know the true art of developing an organizational vision (Rosenbach, 1998). Vision provides direction, aligns people so they move together and forces management to come to grips with its strategic obligation (Rosenbach, 1998). Having vision requires strategic planning, industry analysis, risk-taking and decision-making, imagination and commitment (Rosenbach, 1998). Then, leaders must be taught to have the courage to paint that vivid description inside and outside the organization.
Leadership involves empowering others to achieve ultimate goals. No leader can accomplish great things alone. So, to accomplish tasks, first and foremost, today’s leaders must learn to delegate responsibilities to their subordinates. Delegation involves finding, knowing and entrusting the right ambassador with the appropriate responsibilities at the right time. Lynch makes this point, telling us that leaders must create work situations to build competence and self-esteem in the persons with whom they are associated. This will result in the improved performance of work. (Lynch, 1993)

To facilitate such achievement, leaders need to be able to turn over responsibilities smoothly and foster a working environment in which progress can be made with ease, not tension. Leaders need to learn to assist, aid and expedite the processes that lead to progress effortlessly.

In delegating responsibilities, leaders also need to train their associates on the values of stewardship. Kass (1995) speaks of the importance of this trait in public administration, stating that, “image must be built on the concept of stewardship if it is to be accepted as legitimate by the American public” (p. 113). Our organizations are only as good as the agents that represent us. They are responsible for earning the public trust. Using the values of stewardship, a leader can build an effective, ethical organization.

Finally, leaders must provide motivation, the key to all forms of leadership. The leader who can inspire their associates to greatness is a gift to all. Such a person can stimulate hearts, souls and minds to accomplish the impossible.
When discussing change, we learn from Bennis (1999) that changes should be viewed from a solid conceptual basis. This author says we need to have a clear understanding of what to change as well as how to change.

Leaders cannot direct their organization by following fads; they must lead with genuine, gradual change based on considered strategies.

Johnson and Bell (1995) suggest several leadership approaches and typologies that could be effective for metropolitan universities. The first is the “strong leader/weak leader model” (p. 331). This model is seen as necessary to accomplish the various tasks required of a president. The strong leader is demanding and acts as a drill sergeant to push employees to accomplish tasks. The weak leader allows employees to define their own tasks and then empowers them to accomplish goals they set.

Another typology is the instrumental leader/expressive leader model. Instrumental leaders typically issue directives and discipline to employees. They use authoritarian management styles and are not concerned about their personal likeability. Expressive leaders in contrast, emphasize collective well being by providing emotional support to employees and by minimizing tension between group members.

An additional model, team leadership, believes the increasingly complex and rapidly changing world requires diverse perspectives and multiple talents. This approach considers the “solo leader” approach (Johnson and Bell 1995 p. 333) to be unrealistic. Disadvantages of the team leadership approach include its complexity, the necessity for compromise and the time it requires to do well.
Overall, to meet the complex challenges faced by modern urban universities, Johnson and Bell (1995) feel university leaders must make use of all of these individual, collective and institutional forms of leadership. Modern university leaders must assume multidimensional roles for their institutions to thrive, and the complexities of changing and growing challenges will make their leadership skills more important in the future.

With regard to addressing distinguishable leadership tasks and challenges, Johnson and Bell (1995) start with a leader’s task of establishing public confidence. To obtain this goal, a leader first must develop multidirectional communication so that both the leader’s associates and the larger community are assured the organization serves and will continue to serve their interests. Some managers learn leadership skills through intuition or, as Rowan states, from knowledge gained without rational thought (Rowan, 1986). This intuition allows leaders to think on their feet and to make decisions effectively and efficiently. Such intuition combined with Fisher and Ury’s citation of negotiating tactics could produce a true professional in the field of leadership (Fisher and Ury, 1991). Fisher and Ury (1991) explain how to separate the people from problems, focus on the interests -- not positions -- in an argument, invent options for mutual gain and most importantly insist on using objective criteria when measuring gains derived from situations in which negotiations are used. These points provide ways for all parties to be involved in a win-win situation.

Leaders also need to become lifelong learners, as Komives (1998) relates. “Leadership in this new world requires embracing rapid change and constant
learning” (p. 63). Leaders who develop these skills and abilities can more easily overcome their fear of being the captain and can focus on leading the ship.

Among the things such leadership can accomplish are overcoming cynicism to rebuild trust in the organization and building cultures that hold all associates accountable for high performance and ethical practices. When a leader is forced to negotiate to accomplish these tasks, they must use principled negotiation tactics and strategies that are hard on merits and soft on people (Fisher & Ury: 1991). In other words, the leaders must work to become transformational leaders.

Transformational leadership

Dowton (1973) and later Burns (1978) opened a new chapter in leadership research when they introduced the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership involves "exchanging one thing for another" (Burns, 1978), by which Zaleznik explained that Burns meant "managing" (Zaleznik, 1977). Transformational leadership is considered more powerful and complex than transactional leadership (Burns, 1978) and "occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Burns, 1978, p. 67). Burns (1978) notes the importance of the leader in both imparting compelling causes and in leveraging his or her charismatic personal qualities to support the organizational vision.
Burns’ (1978) work was expanded by Bass (1985), who wrote that transformational leadership is comprised of: charismatic leadership, which consists of developing an organizational vision and inspiring others to follow it; individualized consideration, which addresses how the leader develops the skills of his associates; and intellectual stimulation, which is the ability to develop new ways of looking at and solving problems. Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) note that effective transformational leaders influence followers through their charismatic personalities and the ideals for which they stand.

Many who study transformational leadership have identified the importance of establishing a vision, promoting shared values, shaping the culture of an organization, being a role model and offering knowledge, trust and empowerment to associates in the organization. These practices inspire followers to exert extra effort, to become self-led and to enhance commitment to the common purpose, the group and the leader (Bass, 1985).

Burns defines leadership as "inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations - the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations - of both leaders and followers" (Burns, 1978, p. 89). Burns sees leadership in terms of the relationship between leaders and followers, each of whom respond interactively to attain some goal. The nature of that interaction can be either transactional or transformational (Burns, 1978).

J. M. Burns points out that transformational leadership is distinguished by its elevation of leaders and followers to higher levels of needs, motivations and values. Burns sees transformational leadership, in its teaching role, as concerned
with shaping the values of leaders and followers and moving followers and leaders to a higher moral level (Burns, 1978). "At [the] highest stage of moral development persons are guided by near-universal ethical principles of justice such as equality of human rights and respect for individual dignity" (Burns, p. 42).

For Burns, transformational leadership is moral in nature. In contrast, Bass (1985) does not believe transformational leadership is inherently moral. Bass argues that Adolph Hitler's leadership of Germany in the 1930s and 1940s was transformational, and is universally considered as having an evil rather than a morally elevating purpose.

Avolio and Bass (1991) hypothesizes that transformational leaders may be at a higher stage of moral development as a result of life experiences. The higher stage of moral development allows the leader to put personal interest aside in favor of satisfying follower needs. Transformational leadership has, as one of its underlying aspirations, the purpose of making "conscious what lies unconscious among followers" (Burns, 1978, p. 40). The leader attenuates the hidden conflicts between different values, or between values and actual behavior.

The role of the leader is to move both self and follower to higher, more essential values that provide an advanced purpose for all members of an organization (Burns, 1978). Such a realignment of values helps to transform the motives and needs of both the leader and his associates and, as Burns (1978) says, leads to the moral elevation of values with a transcendental common purpose for the organization.
Bass’ transformational theory augments the theory of transactional leadership. With Seltzer, Bass (1990) conducted research on 138 subordinates of 55 managers. Their research suggests that transformational leadership helps to explain followers’ views of satisfaction with a leader and followers’ perception of leader effectiveness by placing it above other theories of leadership.

In transformational leadership, the leader focuses on reordering the needs of the follower, not merely meeting the existing needs of the organization. Such reordering helps to reveal within the leader’s associates needs of a higher order than simple, personal needs (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership uses transcendental, inspiring vision to energize self-reward, understanding, and development among followers (Avolio and Bass, 1987).

Bass and Avolio (1993) prescribe four transformational factors leaders employ -- charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Bass and Avolio, 1993). Charisma concerns the follower’s respect and trust for the visionary leader. Charisma, as earlier defined by Avolio and Bass (1987), includes an articulated vision with a sense of importance. Inspirational motivation involves using symbols or emotional appeals to win support for the vision. Intellectual stimulation essentially deals with follower development and empowerment. Individualized consideration reflects the degree of personal concern the leader demonstrates for followers needs, especially their developmental needs (Bass and Avolio, 1993). Bass says, "It is the transformational leader who has a developmental orientation toward his subordinates" (Bass, 1985, p. 85). The works of Bennis and Nanus (1985),
Bradford and Cohen (1984) and Fairholm (1991) also emphasize and strongly confirm the need for follower development.

Transformational leadership asks for higher levels of judgment, sacrifices and effort from followers in contribution toward important common aims and values (Burns, 1978). Bass (1985) depicted transformational leadership as resulting in motivation to contribute more effort than was originally anticipated. This benefit is characterized as energizing the discretionary effort of organizational members (Ackerman, 1986). Discretionary effort is the extra effort people are capable of giving to some activity above the level required (Daniels, 2000).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) conceptualize transformational leadership as a process that changes the organization by focusing action, and by converting followers to be leaders and leaders to be agents of change. Followers become leaders when they are committed to a cause and are self-managing (Sergiovanni, 1990). The transformational leader communicates values and expectations to support an articulated vision, establishes trust by announcing and adhering to specific positions on issues and provides a model of self-confidence by taking considered risks (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) concluded a study of ninety top leaders in both the private and governmental sectors, and reported that all of the leaders were concerned "with the organizations' basic purposes" and all were "vision oriented." The leader's articulation of vision, grounded in shared meaning and purpose, focuses and energizes the organization's efforts. Meanwhile, shared meaning
and purpose are essential for coordinating action in an effective manner (Smircich, 1992). "In short, an essential factor in leadership is the capacity to influence and organize meaning for the members of the organization" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 39).

In the last decade, the focus of leadership research has shifted from traditional or transactional models of leadership to a new genre of leadership theories, many having charisma as their central concept. This may be because these concepts hold promise for extraordinary individual and organizational outcomes or because of the inherent "romance of charisma" (Shamir, House and Arthur, 1993; Steers, Porter and Bigley, 1990). This new type of leadership sees the captain focusing on the voyage, not just the destination.

In regards to transactional leadership, Bass (1985) states that transactional leaders clarify for their followers the followers' responsibilities, the expectations they have as leaders, the tasks that must be accomplished and the benefits of compliance to the self-interests of the followers. Thus, transactional leadership is based on an exchange process in which the leader provides rewards in return for the subordinate's effort and performance. The primary factors of the Bass and Avolio (1993) transactional leadership model include contingent reward (followers and leaders have a positively reinforcing interaction), management-by-exception (the leader intervenes only when things go wrong), and laissez-faire (leadership is absent).

Transformational leaders, on the other hand, motivate their followers to perform beyond expectations by activating followers' higher order needs,
fostering a climate of trust and inducing followers to transcend self-interest for the sake of the organization. The primary factors of the transformational leadership model conceptualized by Bass and Avolio (1993) include charisma or idealized influence (followers trust in and emotionally identify with the leader), inspirational motivation (followers are provided with symbols and emotional appeals directed at goal achievement), intellectual stimulation (followers are encouraged to question their own way of doing things or to break with the past), and individualized consideration (assignments are delegated to followers to provide learning opportunities) (Table 1).

In organizations, management is distinguished from leadership (Waldman, Bass and Yammarino, 1990). Management is concerned with using resources within the formal organization in the most effective ways. Leadership focuses on the development of the individual member, the importance of a transcendental purpose, the singleness of purpose and the dominance of an idea that inspires followers to enthusiastically shape their contributions to the whole.

Transformational leadership differs from management in terms of goals, skills, values, and competencies (Fairholm, 1991). Leadership focuses on the basic purposes and values of the organization (Locke, 1960). It encourages commitment, shapes meaning, uses symbols, promotes shared values and takes advantage of opportunities for change (Deal, 1980). Leadership uses the vision it is charged with developing to mobilize and direct energy (Kotter, 1990). "The unique and essential function of leadership is the manipulation of culture," Schein
says, adding it is essential to help organizations to adapt to changing environments (Schein, 1991, p. 317).

Leadership operates on the emotional, qualitative level, while management operates on the physical, quantitative level (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Management is concerned with controlling activities and quantitatively measuring results (Fairholm, 1991). Tasks that can be measured are relegated to management. In contrast, leadership is concerned with values that inspire independent follower action, a qualitative phenomenon. The results of leadership tasks cannot be quantified (Fairholm, 1991).

However, management and transformational leadership are complementary functions. Transformational leadership serves change, while management serves stability (Flanagan and Thompson, 1993). Leadership and management both are necessary functions (Bradford and Cohen, 1984). Management works to maintain a focus on production and goal attainment, while leadership excites the organization and unleashes discretionary energies (Berlew, 1974). Being a good manager involves leadership, and effective organizational leadership requires a proper managerial foundation (Jaques and Clement, 1991). As Fairholm says, to be effective, managers have to be both leaders and managers (Fairholm, 1991).

Kouzes and Posner (1989) stress the importance that organizational leaders make their followers feel their work and contributions are larger than life. They help their followers to embrace an almost immortal ideal, similar to that of a stonemason building a cathedral. In addressing their most rooted values and
desires, the follower and leader become psychologically grateful that their efforts for the organization have a synergistic and higher significance.

Sashkin and Fulmer (1987, p. 67) converted the leadership strategies identified by Bennis and Nanus into five specific behaviors: "Focusing attention, Taking risks, Communicating skillfully, Demonstrating consistency and trustworthiness, and Expressing active concern." Tichy and Devanna (1990) investigated transformational leadership in terms of the necessity for contemporary organizations to change and be innovative. As a result of their interest, they focused on the role of transformational leadership at the macro-level; that is, at the transformation of the organization. Schien synthesized their research to say that the creative, imaginative, empathetic and risk-taking leader is the center of the transformation process that fosters organizational viability (Schein, 1991).

In a complementary analysis, Fairholm (1991) asserts that the task of the leader is to develop and define a vision of the organization and its interactions based upon a set of values. The leader influences subordinates and other stakeholders to accept consistent values so that everyone in the organization works together to mutually advance toward the vision. The thrust of Fairholm's (1991) work is on attaining excellence in organizations through a conception of leadership that is values-driven, change-oriented, developmental and based on a few unifying, founding values that help to achieve the organization's goals while celebrating the individuals who comprise the organization (Fairholm, 1991). The
vision helps to provide organization members with values that become the basis for their commitment and foster a unique culture of excellence (Fairholm, 1991).

So, we see that transformational leadership brings about desired outcomes for the organization at the macro (culture) level and at the micro (individual) level (Boal and Bryson, 1987). Some researchers place emphasis on changing overall culture, while others emphasize changing individual members. Burns (1978) notes the differing levels of leadership in society. His primary focus was on the macro (political) level, and he is concerned with the collective purpose, based on the elevating, moral relationship between leaders and followers.

Bass (1985) concentrated on leadership's effect on individuals. As a result of the leader's influence, individuals can transcend their lower level values and replace them with values at a higher level that are beneficial to the organization's collective effort and to themselves. Bennis and Nanus (1985) similarly were concerned with changes made to the organization through the elevation of each individual to positions of self-leadership in which they were empowered to help to achieve the common purpose. They studied ninety distinct leaders to determine what factors helped them to attain organizational success. Kouzes and Posner (1989), meanwhile, concentrated on the organizational level, with a primary emphasis on how effective leaders initiate change and adapt to the influences of external environments. Tichy and Devanna (1990) also focus on changes to the organization by means of transformational leadership.
Ultimately, however, transformational leadership is concerned with influencing the follower's values and attitudes. The effect of this influence is to empower individuals to assist in organizational transformation as a whole (Yukl, 1989). "It is the cumulative result of individuals who change in conformance to a shared vision and shared values that changes the organization for the better," Fairholm concluded (Fairholm, 1994, p. 132).

The effects authentic transformational leadership and the credit given to transformational leadership on a moral basis also must be considered. The presence or absence of such moral foundations provide the distinction between authentic versus pseudo transformational leadership. An analogy for this distinction is the difference between the captain of a merchant vessel (an authentic leader) and the captain of a pirate ship (a pseudo transformational leader).

Burns (1978), Bass (1985) and Howell and Avolio (1993), among others, examined the morality of transformational leadership. For Burns (1978), to be transformational, a leader must to be morally uplifting although, as we have seen, transformational leaders could be virtuous or villainous depending on their values. Howell and Avolio (1993) say only socialized leaders concerned for the common good can be true transformational leaders. Therefore, egotistical leaders, who are primarily concerned with their own self-interests, cannot be truly transformational leaders.

Authentic and pseudo transformational leadership characteristics can be considered in terms of the four attributes previously mentioned: idealized
influence (or charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. The inspirational influences of the authentic transformational leader tend to focus on the best in people — on harmony, charity and good works. However, the inspirational influences of the pseudo transformational leader tend to focus on the worst in people—on unsavory plots, conspiracies, unreal dangers, excuses and insecurities.

While true and pseudo transformational leaders both may fail to exhibit any one of the four idealized attributes, the component that typically is missing in the egocentric leadership of the pseudo transformational leader is individualized consideration. Bass (1985) finds moral fault with transformational leadership when it motivates followers to go beyond their self-interests for the good of the group or organization.

In dealing with such conflicting values, the transformational leader directs individuals toward pursuing organizational efficiency instead of their personal needs for income, security, affiliation, or career development (McKendall, 1993). To such critics, transformational leadership is seen as immoral in that it moves individuals to sacrifice their personal goals for the sake the organization’s needs. These critics say there is no moral justification for the organizational vision of the leader to become the future that is desired and sought by the individual members of the organization.

Transformational leadership is value-centered. Leader and followers share vision and values, mutual trust and respect, and unity in diversity (Fairholm, 1991). But the moral question remains: Are the followers coerced or
unknowingly seduced into adopting the values of the leadership or are the shared values of the leader and the led the result of their mutual influences? Combining the values of the leader and followers can be viewed as morally acceptable only if it is derived from participative decision-making.

Whether a leader’s style is participative or directive is not a matter of morality. It is a matter of many contextual considerations including the naiveté and experience of the followers (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Bass says that, in many cases, directive leadership is more appropriate and acceptable to everyone in an organization (Bass, 1990). Ethically, values may be imparted directly to followers by authorities who they respect and trust, and from whom they want and seek guidance: priests, physicians, parents and teachers. In this context, receiving ethical values from organizational leaders, or authorities, could be considered similar given the followers’ respect for the organizational leader.

There is no one best way to lead in all situations. Few leaders of organizations and movements give orders and direction without reasons. Many give orders with persuasive reasons. Often, leaders consult with followers before they make decisions for the organization. Less frequently, leaders empower followers through the delegation of responsibilities, or they participate with followers in shared decisions. Ordinarily, followers are more satisfied with consultative or participative decision-making but the effectiveness of decisions made in such circumstances depends on how knowledge, wisdom and expertise are distributed between the leaders and followers (Bass, Valenzi, et al, 1975).
Many hierarchical organizations and such hierarchical organizational models as assembly lines are being modified or replaced by teams that work together to address changing requirements necessitated by new technologies, global markets and work forces. In these modern organizations, greater participation is needed for agreement on objectives, methods and values. Nevertheless, some direction from higher authority remains necessary, but it does not have to be arbitrary nor without reason or explanation. Members of such teams rise above self-interests to seek the objectives of these adaptable organizations, and they come to appreciate that benefits accrued by the organization provide advantages to their own lives and situations (Burns, 1978).

Hollander (1995) argues that transformational leadership is unethical and that it appeals to emotions rather than to reason. He says it lacks the checks and balances of democratic discourse and power distribution, or that it violates the principles on which the theory of organization development is based. Further, he says it manipulates followers into ignoring their own best interests. However, he fails to consider the positive bases on which transformational leadership was developed. His arguments fail to consider that democratic processes and organizational development have shortcomings, and they fail to distinguish between transformational and pseudo transformational leadership. Hickman (1998) points out that, rather than being unethical, true transformational leaders identify the core values and unifying purposes of the organization and its members, liberate their human potential and foster pluralistic leadership and effective, satisfied followers.
Self-aggrandizing, pseudo transformational leaders could be branded as immoral, but truly transformational leaders who engage in the moral uplifting of their followers, who move them to share in the mutually rewarding visions of success and who enable and empower them to convert the visions into realities, are requisite for an organization based upon teamwork and for the enrichment of the diverse individuals that comprise it.

Burns (1978) distinguishes between transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership is based on the concept of exchange and is equated with management and, as we have discussed, management is a complementary function that works with transformational leadership (Hollander, 1995). Transformational leadership uses an inspirational, shared vision and unifying values to elevate both follower and leader to a higher level of judgment, motivation and morality. Leadership inspires people to expend discretionary effort toward a common purpose. It is qualitative and emotional in nature (Fairholm, 1991).

Bass (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Fairholm (1991, 1995), Kouzes and Posner (1989), Sashkin and Fulmer (1987), Tichy and Devanna (1990), and numerous others cited in this work have built upon of Dowton’s and Burns’ early formulation of the theory of transformational leadership. The intellectual offspring of transformational theory place emphasis on vision, values, empowerment, trust, culture and leader-follower relationships that comprise coaching, teaching and counseling.
Most leaders have a profile of the full range of leadership that includes aspects of both transformational and transactional theories of leadership. However, those whom we call “true transformational leaders” do rely much more on transformational aspects than on transactional aspects. In their defining moments, these leaders are transformational.

Those whom we label as transactional leaders display many more aspects of transactional leadership. They are more likely to hold attitudes, beliefs and values consistent with transactional leadership but still they may use transformational tactics in some of their dealings.

The best leadership combines transformational and transactional. Transformational leadership traits augment the effectiveness of transactional leadership traits (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990).

Summary

In the previous pages, the discussion has focused on leadership, transformational leadership, engagement and service learning and the role of a university president. The literature review has shown how transformational leadership has an effect on all of these areas. With that in mind, transformational leadership has been defined by the following authors with four main principles:

- Charisma/idealized influence (attributed or behavioral)
- Inspirational motivation
- Intellectual stimulation
- Individualized consideration.
Each one of these characteristics has been defined in depth by a multitude of authors cited in the previous pages: Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985, 1998; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Kouzes and Posner, 1989; Sashkin and Fulmer, 1987; Tichy and Devanna, 1990; Shamir, House and Arthur, 1993; Conger and Kanungo, 1998; Zeleznik, 1977; Avolio, 1994; Avolio and Bass, 1987; Seltzer and Bass, 1990; Bass and Avolio, 1993; Bradford and Cohen, 1984; Fairholm, 1991; Akerman, 1986; Daniels, 2000; Smith and Peterson, 1988; Sergiovanni, 1990; Smircich, 1992; Steers, Porter and Bigley, 1990; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990; Deal, 1980; Kotter, 1990; Flanagan and Thompson, 1993; Boal and Bryson, 1987; Howell and Avolio, 1993; Yukl, 1989; McKendall, 1993. These definitions have been categorized in the following table (Table 1).
Table 1: Transformational leadership definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARISMA/IDEALIZED INFLUENCE (ATTRIBUTED OR BEHAVIORAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared vision and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated vision with sense of importance to energize organizations efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision grounded in shared meaning and purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring others to follow that vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and trust for the leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the organization by focusing on action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate values/norms supporting an articulated vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets high standards for emulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can followers emotionally identify with the leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative and imaginative leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture shaping/value shaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exert extra effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance/elevate commitment to common purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert the follower in regards to values/motives/needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using symbols or emotional appeals to win support for the vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level of judgment, sacrifice, and effort for the common purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides followers with challenges and meaning for engaging in shared goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the leader excite the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the leader inspire the follower to excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there harmony and charity and are good works being done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High moral/ethical standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New ways of problem finding/solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves both self and follower to higher more fundamental values that provide transcendent purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the follower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert followers to leaders and leaders to change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps followers to question assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate more creative solutions to problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break from the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster a climate for trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become self-leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reward, understanding, development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of personal concern the leader demonstrates for the followers needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to a cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-managing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats each follower as an individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides coaching, mentoring, and growth opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcends self-interest for the sake of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments are delegated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrates the individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust/respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity in diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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These definitions were used to create a survey project in which the separate definitions could be compared and contrasted by key stakeholders in a public, metropolitan university setting. For research purposes the definition of idealized influence will be broken down into attributes and behaviors. This project is outlined specifically in the next chapter.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this research are:

H1: Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics.

H2: Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics.

H3: Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics.

H4: There will not be differences in how faculty, staff and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president’s transformational characteristics.

H5: Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributed).
H6: Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributed).

H7: Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributed).

H8: There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributed).

H9: Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).

H10: Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).

H11: Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).

H12: There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).
H13: Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

H14: Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

H15: Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

H16: There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

H17: Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.

H18: Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.

H19: Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.
H20: There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.

H21: Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of individualized consideration.

H22: Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of individualized consideration.

H23: Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of individualized consideration.

H24: There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of individualized consideration.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Because this dissertation is focused on the perceptions of transformational leadership qualities among urban university presidents, it was necessary to determine those groups whose opinions are most valuable with regard to the leader and to acquire those opinions in a non-biased manner. While students are key stakeholders in the university community, they are a transient population who have little interaction with the university’s leader. Accordingly, it was determined that three specific groups in the university community with different roles – faculty, staff and administration – should be polled with a proven survey instrument.

Assessment survey

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Rater Form (5x) Short

This study used a purchased Likert scale survey (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – Rater Form (5X) Short from Mind Garden, Inc. Bruce J. Avolio and Bernard M. Bass have been principle authors in the study of transformational leadership for more than 20 years and are the authors of this survey.
This survey was deemed most appropriate as it is specific to addressing transformational leadership by individual characteristics and is suitable for use with varying populations. Select quotes from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Manual (2004) include:

- “The MLQ and MLQ Report have evolved over the last 25 years based on numerous investigations of leaders in public and private organizations, from CEO's of major corporations to non-supervisory project leaders” (p. 3).

- “The MLQ is more suitable for administration at all levels of organizations and across different types of production, service, and military organizations” (p. 4).

- “One of the principle advantages is its 360 degree capabilities. It can be used to assess perceptions of leadership, effectiveness of team leaders, supervisors, managers, and executives from many different levels of an organization” (p. 4).

- “Another principle advantage of the MLQ over other leadership surveys is its emphasis on development. The survey includes items that measure a leader’s effect on both the personal and intellectual development of self and others” (p. 4).
• “Finally, the MLQ is based on a model that is easy to understand. The model points to a leader’s performance on a range of leadership styles and to the directions he or she may pursue to be a more effective leader” (p. 5).

• “The MLQ (5X-Short) is available in a validated form of 45 items for organizational survey and research purposes and for preparation of individual leader reports. The factor structure of the MLQ (5X) has been validated by both the discriminatory and confirmatory factor analysis described later. Additional correlated items of behavior are provided in the MLQ Report for counseling and development purposes” (p. 5).

• “Various forms of the MLQ have been used in over 30 countries and in numerous languages, business and industrial firms, hospitals, religious institutions, military organizations, government agencies, colleges, primary schools and secondary schools. The MLQ has been shown to be equally effective when supervisors, colleagues, peers or direct reports rate the leader” (p. 13).

• “Since the questionnaire is self explanatory, the primary issue in its administration is the maintenance of privacy and anonymity” (p. 15).
Data collection procedures

The study procedure will consist of two phases: a survey research phase, followed by a detailed quantitative analysis of the data. The procedure of collecting the survey data will involve randomly selecting subjects from a list of select universities (Appendix C) and e-mailing a questionnaire packet. The packet will include a cover letter explaining the survey, questionnaire, and assurance of confidentiality (Appendix D). The letter will state that completion and return of the questionnaire constitutes the subject's willingness to participate in the study. The names of the subjects will be separated from the coded documents and placed in a secure data area. Any hard copies will be locked in a secured filing cabinet. Data will be entered into SPSS 13.0 for analysis.

The research will be a quantitative study of 20 public, urban institutions in the U.S. These universities will be members of The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU) (Appendix B). CUMU was formed in 2002 and its By-Laws state, “The Coalition is an international affiliate organization of universities in large metropolitan areas that share common understandings of their institutional missions and values” (Bylaws: The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities: 2002). CUMU Universities were deemed most appropriate because they were the largest coalition and most diverse group of urban universities in the United States. While there are 66 members of CUMU, the list was pared to twenty for the following reasons:

1. Six members are private universities and will be removed from consideration.
2. To allow survey respondents to more accurately respond, 27 CUMU member universities with presidents who had served less than three years in their jobs will be eliminated from consideration.

3. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval will be requested from the remaining 33 universities. 20 IRB approvals were received. Thus, 20 universities were surveyed. (Appendices E and A)

To insure that an adequate number of surveys will be returned from each group of stakeholders, the survey packet will be e-mailed to 1,800 possible respondents, with 90 surveys distributed to each of the 20 select universities. Each university that is a member of CUMU, has a president or chancellor (Appendix F) who has served for more than three years and has given full IRB approval will receive 30 surveys for each subgroup (faculty, staff and administration). To assess the ease of responding and time burden of the designed survey, a pilot survey will be distributed to five members of each group at The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio. The pilot survey proved to be successful and therefore the full survey was instituted. The validity and reliability of this instrument is discussed later.

These groups (faculty, staff and administration) have been identified as the key stakeholders in the university community. As such, a sample from each subgroup gave a more comprehensive picture of the current president’s perceived transformational leadership characteristics.
The survey subjects were e-mailed a cover letter (Appendix D). The Institutional Review Board at the University of Akron approved both the cover letter and the survey (Appendix E). The cover letter will describe the purpose of the research, explain the measures to be taken to ensure confidentiality and notified the subject that by completing the survey and returning it to the secured e-mail address, they have provided informed consent. Participants will be told they are under no obligation whatsoever to participate in the project and, if they chose not to participate, there would be no negative consequences.

A scoring scheme was developed to determine the levels of perception of transformational leadership characteristics. Higher scores indicated greater levels of a transformational leadership style. A mean score of three or greater will indicate that transformation leadership is perceived. This will be fully described later in this section and in research results.

Operational definitions

There were a number of items that needed further clarification regarding this specific research. Therefore, the following operational terms were defined as follows:

- **Faculty**: Currently teaching at least one class; may be full or part time
- **Staff**: Any university employee not falling into the faculty or administration category
- **Administration**: Dean, director, department head, or vice president
• Urban or metropolitan public university: Public university in the United States and a dues paying member of the CUMU (Appendix C).

Transformational leadership has been defined in the following paper with four main principles; charisma/idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Table 1). Each one of these characteristics can be defined in depth by a multitude of authors cited in the previous pages: This study used these definitions as a basis for a survey that was given to a random sample of faculty, staff and administrators at the twenty identified universities.

Documented evidence from the MLQ Third Edition, 2004

External validity

“The latest version of the MLQ, Form 5X, has been used in nearly 300 research programs, doctoral dissertations and masters theses around the globe in the nearly ten years between 1995 and 2004” (p. 35). “In terms of performance, four meta-analyses of the military and broader organizational psychology literature have confirmed that the relationships between transformational leadership and rated and objectively measured performance were stronger and more positive than the transactional styles of leadership and the less active laissez-faire leadership” (p. 35). Thirty-three independent empirical studies using the MLQ concluded there were strong positive
correlations between all components of transformational leadership, and both objective and subjective measures of performance” (p. 35).

Factor structure, norms and descriptive statistics

“There were high inter-correlations among MLQ 5X factor scores for the overall 2004 sample” (p. 71). “There were high, positive correlations among the five transformational leadership scales, similar to the inter-correlations reported for the MLQ 5R survey, and previous analysis with the 1999 nominative sample” (p. 71). “There were also positive and significant correlations between the contingent reward scale and each of the five scales comprising transformational leadership” (p. 71). “Item loadings were also recorded as very high” (p. 71).

“We have set out over the last 20 years to provide the very best validation evidence for the MLQ” (p. 80). “We have learned over time which items work and which don't” (p. 80). “We have seen very high consistency across raters, regions and cultures in terms of support for the nine-factor full range model” (p. 80). “The current manual provides ample support for using the nine-factor model as the basis for research, assessment and development” (p. 80).

Sample size and power analysis

To assure a random sample of relevant stakeholders, every tenth person was selected from alphabetical lists of faculty, staff and administrators at each university. These lists were obtained from each universities web site or faculty staff directory. While this method worked well in generating lists of faculty and
staff members to be surveyed, the overall number of administrators at each university was considerably fewer, so every third name was chosen from the lists of administrators. The power analysis for this study was determined by using work from Cohen (1988). The power analysis requires a minimum sample size of 50 per group or 100 total for a 80% confidence +/-5% with a power of .8 and a medium effect size of .25.

For the survey research, each group consisted of 600 subjects (30 for each group - faculty, staff and administrators X 20 universities). An 8.5% response rate would have achieved the minimum sample size (50) for each subgroup. Overall, the survey was distributed to 1,800 potential subjects. A total projected response rate of 8.5% would have generated 144 total responses. The research results section will show how a 9.6% overall return was achieved.

The same questions were asked of all groups. Optional questions seeking demographic information were also asked. The optional questions included:

1. Age
2. Gender – Male or Female
3. Race – African American, Caucasian, other
4. Type of employee – Full Time or Part Time
5. Are you tenured – Yes or No
6. Name of University

Individual surveys were collected and tabulated by this researcher only and were not shared. Additionally, all results are reported in the aggregate, thus further protecting the confidentiality of the respondents. Finally, in order to
continue to protect the confidentiality of the respondent, information such as Social Security numbers and employee identification numbers that identify the respondent were not collected.

Statistical analysis

All demographic data and survey responses were entered into SPSS 13.0. Descriptive statistics were provided for each category represented in the survey for the overall sample. This research project was based on exploratory research. The intent was not to compare differences in perceptions between the universities, but rather to assess the perceptions of each subgroup and the aggregate sample. Differences between the subgroups were assessed as well.

Twenty questions in the 45-question survey reflected the true meaning and definitions of transformational leadership discussed earlier. A further breakdown describes each characteristic of transformational leadership. These final twenty questions were tallied by separate characteristics to determine the individual level of transformational leadership perceived by the respondents (Table 2).
Table 2: Survey questions broken down by transformational characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEALIZED INFLUENCE (ATTRIBUTED)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts in ways that build my respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays a sense of power and confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEALIZED INFLUENCE (BEHAVIORAL)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talks about their most important values and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulates a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets me to look at problems from many different angles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spends time teaching and coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me to develop my strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who participated in the survey were directed to a website created with Modern Mind Interactive Software (Appendix D). This web designed survey allowed each individual to select bullets to each question based on the following Likert scale responses: $4 = \text{Frequently, if not always}$, $3 = \text{Fairly often}$, $2 = \text{Sometimes}$, $1 = \text{Once in a while}$ and $0 = \text{Not at all}$.

Decision rules were created to determine the level of perception of each respondent, with individual mean scores ranging from 0-4 for each person. Adding the scores for the 20 specific questions and dividing that number by the number of questions answered gave a mean score for each individual. Higher scores indicated a greater level of perceived transformational leadership. It was determined that mean scores greater than 3 were indicative of transformational leadership as the score of 3 represented a university leader who completed each task “fairly often”. Scores of less than 3 indicated that a university leader only completed each task “sometimes”, “once in awhile” or “not at all”. Therefore, total combined mean scores of 3 and greater are indicative of the university’s president being transformational. Responses for each subgroup (faculty, staff and administration) and each individual transformational characteristic were summed, with a total mean score of 3 or more indicating that the university president is perceived as a transformational leader by that subgroup or is perceived as having that individual characteristic.

This study was undertaken to determine whether today’s faculty, staff and administration see their leader displaying the qualities of transformational leadership. Additionally, this study will provide urban public university presidents
a chance to see in detail their perceived level of transformational leadership. This study will incorporate an efficient quantitative research study that proves that university stakeholders do care about higher education's leadership, which will justify the original land-grant concept, which has served the nation for so many years.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH RESULTS

The survey and the methodology for this research were discussed in Chapter III. The main focus of this research was to determine whether key urban university stakeholders saw their leaders as exhibiting transformational leadership qualities.

The survey

The questionnaire was sent to 1,800 faculty, staff, and administrators from 20 public universities in the U.S. The final list of approved universities included representatives from a wide range of states and represented the full range of geographical areas within the United States (Appendix G).

Within a three-week period (August 25 – September 15, 2005), three e-mails were sent to the entire population. This generated the required power analysis return rate of 50 replies for faculty and administration. However, the response rate for staff at this point was only 24. To increase the staff response rate, two additional separate e-mails were sent to staff only. This resulted in an increase to 40 overall staff responses.
Response rate

Overall, 173 responses (9.6%) were received. Administration had the best return rate at 12.3% (74 responses), while the faculty had a return rate of 9.8% (59 responses) and the staff return rate was 6.7% (40 responses) (Figure 1).

Descriptive analysis of demographics of those who participated

Respondents were asked optional demographic questions about race, tenure status, employment status and name of university (Figures 2-6).
92% or 160 of the respondents provided their gender with males accounting for 55% (88 respondents) and females making up 45% (72 respondents).

Figure 2: Gender of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>COUNT %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
89% or 155 individuals provided their race with Caucasians accounting for 88% (137 individuals), African Americans accounting for 4.5% (7 individuals) and Other representing 7% (11 responses).

![Pie chart showing race distribution]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>88.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 155 100.00%

Figure 3: Race of respondents
165 individuals (95%) reported whether they were Full or Part Time employees, with 94% (156) stating they were Full Time and 9 (5%) stating they were Part Time.

90% (157) of the total respondents stated their position in regards to tenure with 60% (95) declaring that they were not tenured and 39% (62) stating that they were tenured.
80% (139) of the respondents acknowledged their university with the following breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>California State University, Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Clayton College and State University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Indiana University Northwest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Louisiana State University in Shreveport</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Northern Kentucky University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>University of Colorado at Colorado Springs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>University of South Carolina - Spartanburg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>University of Southern Maine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>William Patterson University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 138 100.00%

Figure 6: Number of respondents by university
Table 3 presents the total mean scores for overall transformational leadership skills perceived by faculty, staff and administration. These total mean scores give an accurate account of the president’s perceived transformational leadership skill set. It was determined that a total mean score of 3 or above would constitute a transformational leader, confirming that a leader was perceived as transformational “Fairly often.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Descriptives for overall transformational leadership scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (n=58)--overall transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty—mean transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=39)--overall transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff—mean transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (n=74)--overall transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration—mean transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate (n=173)--overall transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate —mean transformational leadership score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive information for the individual transformational leadership scores for all stakeholders is presented in Table 4.
Table 4: Total mean scores for transformational leadership characteristics for the aggregate sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6876</td>
<td>1.25287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0244</td>
<td>.95408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.2364</td>
<td>.88033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.0085</td>
<td>1.22191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.7914</td>
<td>1.25287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison between the mean score for all transformation leadership items was conducted between each of the three subgroups of the sample. Differences between the mean scores for the concepts of Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individual Consideration were determined using a one-sample T-test and ANOVA. One-sample T-tests were performed for the three employment categories (faculty, staff and administration) using the mean score for each total and each of the five characteristics (idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration) to determine how each group’s mean score for each transformational leadership characteristic differed from the score of “3” which is the cut point for determining whether or not a leader has that characteristic.
The level of “3” or greater was chosen because it signified on the Likert Scale survey that the leader was at least “Fairly Often” transformational. The level of “2” was only graded as “sometimes” transformational and this was deemed not appropriate support for a leader to be classified as transformational. A one way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between each of the three groups of stakeholders for each of the five leadership characteristics. Statistical significance was considered for all results with p values <.05. All analysis was completed using SPSS for Windows 13. Results of these analyses are presented within each of the hypotheses.

Hypotheses results

Hypothesis 1

Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics.

Table 3 shows the total mean score for faculty is 2.527, indicating that faculty do not perceive their president to be transformational.

The results of the one-sample T-test for the individual transformational characteristics for faculty are presented in Table 5.
Table 5: One-sample T-test – faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(attributed)</td>
<td>-2.109</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.31466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(behavioral)</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.08621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.24856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>-7.482</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.17273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>-10.273</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.49561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational score</td>
<td>-4.004</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.47307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p<.001) indicating that the mean faculty score for overall transformational leadership was significantly different from the predetermined cut point of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 2

Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics. The total mean score for staff is 2.750, suggesting that staff do not perceive their president to be transformational.
The results of the one-sample T-test for the individual transformational characteristics for staff are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: One-sample T-test – staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence (attributed)</td>
<td>-.722</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>-.11325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence (behavioral)</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.00214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>2.280</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.31838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>-4.177</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.82432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>-4.256</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational score</td>
<td>-1.623</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.24969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .113), which suggests that the mean staff score for overall transformational leadership is not statistically different from the predetermined cut point of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 3

Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics. The total mean score
for administration is 2.527, showing that administration do not perceive their president to be transformational.

The results of the one-sample T-test for the individual transformational characteristics for administrators are presented in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence (attributed)</td>
<td>-2.852</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.41554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence (behavioral)</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.01239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.18356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>-6.350</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.94032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>-7.408</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.10248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational score</td>
<td>-3.611</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.43908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows the results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .001) indicating that the total mean administration score for overall transformational leadership was significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.
Hypothesis 4

There will not be differences in how faculty, staff and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president’s transformational characteristics.

The results of the one way analysis of variance between all three groups of stakeholders for transformational leadership scores are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: ANOVA test results for overall transformational leadership scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>161.098</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162.393</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple comparison test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Compared to</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.2234</td>
<td>.20278</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-.0340</td>
<td>.17173</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.2234</td>
<td>.20278</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.1894</td>
<td>.19377</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.0340</td>
<td>.17173</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.1894</td>
<td>.19377</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of this analysis of variance between the three groups of stakeholders showed that there were no statistically significant differences between each of the three subgroups for any of the transformational leadership
concepts (p = .511). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported. These results are presented in Table 8.

**Hypothesis 5**

Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributes).

Descriptive information for the idealized attribute scores for each group of stakeholders is presented in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Descriptives for idealized influence (attributes) scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (n=74)—overall score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration—mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (n=58)—overall score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty—mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=39)—overall score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff—mean score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the total mean score for idealized attributes for faculty is 1.136, signifying that faculty do not perceive their president as having idealized attributes. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .039)
indicating that the mean faculty score for idealized influence (attributes) was significantly different from the predetermined cut point of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 6

Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributed).

The total mean score for idealized attributes for staff is 2.887, indicating that staff do not perceive their president as having idealized attributes. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .474), which suggests that the mean staff score for idealized influence (attributes) is not statistically different from the predetermined cut point of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 7

Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributed).

The total mean score for idealized attributes for administration is 2.585, suggesting that administration do not perceive their president as having idealized attributes. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .006) indicating that the mean administration score for idealized attributes was
significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 8

There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (attributed).

The results of the one way analysis of variance between all three groups of stakeholders for the trait of idealized influence (attributed) are presented in table 10.

Table 10: ANOVA test results for idealized influence (attributed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.334</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>224.723</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227.057</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple comparison test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Compared to</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.2014</td>
<td>.23950</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.1009</td>
<td>.20283</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.2014</td>
<td>.23950</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.3023</td>
<td>.22885</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-.1009</td>
<td>.20283</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.3023</td>
<td>.22885</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of this analysis of variance showed that there were no statistically significant differences between each of the three subgroups for the characteristic
of idealized influence (attributed) (p = .420). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 9

Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).

Descriptive information for the idealized behavior scores for each group of stakeholders is presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Descriptives for idealized influence (behavioral) scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration (n=74)--overall score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>11.729</td>
<td>4.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration—mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (n=58)--overall score</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>11.448</td>
<td>3.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty—mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.086</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=39)--overall score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>11.282</td>
<td>4.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff—mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the total mean score for idealized behaviors for faculty is 3.086, showing that faculty do perceive their president as having idealized
behaviors. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .442), which suggests that the mean score for faculty idealized behaviors is not statistically different from the predetermined cut point of “3”. However, the threshold of “3” was met. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 10

Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).

The total mean score for idealized behaviors for staff is 3.002, suggesting that staff do perceive their president as having idealized behaviors. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .990), which suggests that the mean score for staff idealized behaviors is not statistically different from the predetermined cut point of “3”. However, the threshold of “3” was met. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 11

Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).

The total mean score for idealized behaviors for administration is 2.988, showing that staff do not perceive their president as having idealized behaviors. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .916), which suggests
that the mean administration score for idealized influence (behavioral) is not statistically different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 12

There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of idealized influence (behavioral).

The results of the one way analysis of variance between all three groups of stakeholders for idealized influence (behavioral) are presented in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Compared to</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>.0841</td>
<td>.19852</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.0986</td>
<td>.16813</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-.0841</td>
<td>.19852</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.0145</td>
<td>.18970</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-.0986</td>
<td>.16813</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.0145</td>
<td>.18970</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of this analysis of variance showed that there were no statistically significant differences between each of the three subgroups for the characteristic.
of idealized influence (behavioral) \((p = .831)\). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

**Hypothesis 13**

Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

Descriptive information for the inspirational motivation scores for each group of stakeholders is presented in Table 13.

**Table 13: Descriptives for inspirational motivation scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.487</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=74)—overall score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration—mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (n=58)—overall score</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>9.086</td>
<td>2.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty—mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.247</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=39)—overall score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>8.872</td>
<td>3.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff—mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the total mean score for inspirational motivation for faculty is 3.247, indicating that faculty do perceive their president as having inspirational motivation characteristics. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant \((p = .039)\) indicating that the mean faculty score for inspirational
motivation was significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 14

Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

The total mean score for inspirational motivation for staff is 3.318, showing that staff do perceive their president as having inspirational motivation characteristics. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p = .028) indicating that the mean staff score for inspirational motivation was significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 15

Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

The total mean score for inspirational motivation for administration is 3.184, signifying that administration do perceive their president as having inspirational motivation characteristics. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were not significant (p = .088), which suggests that the mean score for administration inspirational motivation is not statistically different from the
predetermined cutpoint of “3”. However, the threshold of “3” was met. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 16

There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of inspirational motivation.

The results of the one way analysis of variance between all three groups of stakeholders for inspirational motivation are presented in table 14.

Table 14: ANOVA test results for inspirational motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>131.269</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131.746</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple comparison test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Compared to</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.0698</td>
<td>.18305</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.0650</td>
<td>.15503</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.0698</td>
<td>.18305</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.1348</td>
<td>.17491</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-.0650</td>
<td>.15502</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.1348</td>
<td>.17491</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of this analysis of variance showed that there were no statistically significant differences between each of the three subgroups for the characteristic of inspirational motivation ($p = .737$). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

**Hypothesis 17**

Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.

Descriptive information for the intellectual stimulation scores for each group of stakeholders is presented in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15: Descriptives for intellectual stimulation scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (n=74)—overall score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration—mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (n=58)—overall score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty—mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=39)—overall score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff—mean score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows the total mean score for intellectual stimulation for faculty is 1.827, suggesting that faculty do not perceive their president as having intellectual stimulation characteristics. The results of the One-Sample T-Test
were significant (p<.001) indicating that the mean faculty score for intellectual stimulation was significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 18

Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.

The total mean score for intellectual stimulation for staff is 2.176, signifying that staff do not perceive their president as having intellectual stimulation characteristics. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were significant (p<.001) indicating that the mean staff score for intellectual stimulation was significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 19

Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.

The total mean score for intellectual stimulation for administration is 2.059, indicating that administration do not perceive their president as having intellectual stimulation characteristics. One-Sample T-Test were significant (p<.001) indicating that the mean faculty score for overall transformational leadership was
significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 20

There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of intellectual stimulation.

The results of the one way analysis of variance between all three groups of stakeholders for intellectual stimulation are presented in table 16.

Table 16: ANOVA test results for intellectual stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3.034</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>243.322</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246.356</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple comparison test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Compared to</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.3484</td>
<td>.25978</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-.2324</td>
<td>.21752</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.3484</td>
<td>.25978</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-.1160</td>
<td>.24600</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.2324</td>
<td>.21752</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.1160</td>
<td>.24600</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of this analysis of variance showed that there were no statistically significant differences between each of the three subgroups for the characteristic of intellectual stimulation ($p = .364$). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Hypothesis 21

Faculty at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their president as having transformational characteristics of individualized consideration.

Descriptive information for the individual consideration scores for each group of stakeholders is presented in Table 17.

Table 17: Descriptives for individual consideration scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration (n=74) -- overall score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>7.176</td>
<td>5.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration — mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.898</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (n=58) — overall score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>5.456</td>
<td>4.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty — mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td>1.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=39) -- overall score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>6.500</td>
<td>5.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff — mean score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the total mean score for individualized consideration for faculty is 1.504, signifying that faculty do not perceive their president as having
individualized consideration characteristics. The results of the One-Sample T-
Test were significant (p<.001) indicating that the mean faculty score for
individualized consideration was significantly different from the predetermined
cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 22

Staff at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive their
president as having transformational characteristics of individualized
consideration.

The total mean score for individualized consideration for staff is 2.028,
indicating that staff do not perceive their president as having individualized
consideration characteristics. The results of the One-Sample T-Test were
significant (p<.001) indicating that the mean staff score for individualized
consideration was significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”.
Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 23

Administration at urban and metropolitan public universities will perceive
their president as having transformational characteristics of individualized
consideration.

The total mean score for individualized consideration for administration is
1.898, suggesting that staff do not perceive their president as having
individualized consideration characteristics. One-Sample T-Test were significant
(p<.001) indicating that the mean faculty score for overall transformational leadership was significantly different from the predetermined cutpoint of “3”. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 24

There will be no differences between how faculty, staff, and administration perceive their urban and metropolitan public university president as having transformational characteristics of individualized consideration.

The results of the one way analysis of variance between all three groups of stakeholders for individualized consideration are presented in Table 18.

Table 18: ANOVA test results for individual consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.770</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>253.027</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260.568</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple comparison test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Compared to</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.5234</td>
<td>.26443</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-.3931</td>
<td>.21890</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.5234</td>
<td>.26443</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.1303</td>
<td>.25240</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>.3931</td>
<td>.21890</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>-.1303</td>
<td>.25240</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of this analysis of variance showed that there were no statistically significant differences between each of the three subgroups for the characteristic of individualized consideration (p = .090). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

Summary

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine how key stakeholders of the university community perceive the transformational leadership qualities of their university presidents and to determine the implications of this research for modern public universities.

As the research results show, three key stakeholder groups were surveyed – faculty, staff and administrators – to determine how each group perceived its university leader. It was proposed that each group would view its university leader as transformational. However, this was not the case. While each group saw its university leader as possessing transformational leadership traits “sometimes”, none of the groups saw its leader as being transformational “fairly often”. Thus, hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 were not supported.

However, when individual transformational characteristics were considered, there were areas where the presidents were perceived as having specific transformational traits (Table 1). This is especially true with regard to inspirational motivation and individualized behavior characteristics (Tables 6 and 7). Faculty, staff and administration all gave in excess of 3.0 in regards to inspirational motivation with the highest total mean score (3.236). The total
mean score for idealized behaviors was also in excess of 3.0 (3.024). The faculty and staff both gave ratings over 3.0 and administration was very close with 2.988.

The areas where most improvement is needed are individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. Individualized consideration had the lowest total mean of 1.791 with faculty giving the lowest mean score of 1.504 (a rating between “once in a while” and “sometimes”). Intellectual stimulation had a total mean score of 2.00 with faculty again providing the lowest score (1.827). These results will be discussed further in the conclusion.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

As the previous chapters demonstrated, transformational leadership has become more prevalent in the post-industrial world of work. As Cascio (1995) has pointed out, the traditional manufacturing or service job, a fixed bundle of tasks performed by an individual worker, has been replaced by a manufacturing or service process completed by a flexible team with diverse skills, interests and attitudes. As a consequence, "today’s networked, interdependent, culturally diverse organizations require transformational leadership to bring out...in followers...their creativity, imagination, and best efforts" (Cascio, 1995, p. 930).

The advancement of technology and the evolution of the nature of the relationships people have to their work have made traditional methods of bureaucratic management less effective, and these old models of management will likely continue to lose efficiency as time passes. While the university is not a classic bureaucracy, it does have bureaucratic components but the overall environment is collegial. The complexity of the challenges faced by modern universities in this environment are likely to become more complex as more constituencies must be served and resources are further divided and become more difficult to secure.
Transformational, values-driven visionary leadership that results in a culture committed to attaining the vision only recently has been recognized fully as a concept for leadership in organizations (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). The products of transformational leadership are thought to include greater organizational effectiveness, greater member commitment to the mission and organization, willingness to exert extra effort, higher moral and motivation levels and emotional responses such as inspiration to excel and attachment to the leader (Stoner-Zemel, 1991). Burns (1978) saw basic leadership as transforming, resulting in changes to the performance and outlook of both the leader and his associates, and ultimately, as transformational for the organization.

Today’s leaders need to be the coaches who guide their associates through organizational life. They delegate responsibilities, facilitate the process and motivate their fellow employees to pursue excellence. Therefore, leaders need to be well educated on the variety of leadership styles, including transactional, transformational, positional and situational. As Komives (1998) discusses, there is no right way to lead. Every leader needs to find what is right for themselves, their organization and their associates. Then, the leader must use those tactics to make positive, ethical and efficient progress possible.

Good leaders must be able to use different motivational tactics when needed. These leaders must be able to handle and to lead change. They have to lead by example, and cannot be deterred by negativity that could be displayed by others in their organization. They need to be visionaries, seeing where they want the organization to go, and they must work backwards to establish the
course their organization will take. They need to plan the steps needed to get themselves, their managers, their people and their organization to their goal.

If new leadership is transformational, its charisma or idealized influence is envisioning and confident, and sets high standards for emulation. Its inspirational motivation provides followers with challenges and meaning for engaging in shared goals and undertakings. Its intellectual stimulation helps followers to question assumptions and to generate more creative solutions to problems. Its individualized consideration treats each follower as an individual and provides coaching, mentoring and growth opportunities (Bass, 1985). If such transformational leadership is authentic, it is characterized by high moral and ethical standards in each of these dimensions.

The discussion of the formal analysis of this research, as well as the implications for transformational leadership in theory and practice, will be covered in the following pages. Finally, possibilities for future research will be examined.

Formal analysis

While hypotheses 1 and 3 proposed for this research were not supported by the overall results, hypothesis 2 was supported, and the results for individual transformational leadership traits were mixed. It should be noted that among the three groups surveyed, the mean overall scores for perception of transformational leadership were greater than 2.5, which is above the midpoint in the Likert scale.
When the individual traits were broken down, there were signs of transformational leadership. This means that members of our subject group do perceive that their university leaders are practicing transformational leadership to some degree. For instance, all three groups surveyed believe their presidents are exhibiting transformational behavior when it comes to inspirational motivation. This would tend to suggest that university leaders at the institutions surveyed are doing a good job of speaking in positive terms about the university and its future. These presidents are able to inspire people to rally around the cause for higher education, and that predicts better results for the future.

The data showed that only one group (staff) perceived their presidents to be totally transformational. While their average rating was below “3” the additional mathematical analysis showed no statistical difference between their average score and our cut point of “3.”

Faculty members reported very low perceived levels of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. While it may seem obvious that the president of the university would have difficulty finding the time to visit each campus classroom or to coach individual professors, it is also apparent that there is a teaching and coaching role for university presidents to play, and engaging in this role would likely increase faculty perceptions of transformational leadership qualities.

Also of note are the responses from the three groups on idealized attributes (charisma). Administrators and staff are more than twice as likely to perceive their leader as charismatic than were faculty members. It is possible
faculty see the president as their opponent in union negotiations or as overhead and of little relevance to their jobs. Any number of cases might be suggested for the low scores among faculty members for this attribute, but administrators and staff do feel their leaders are charismatic, a feeling that could occur because they feel closer to the leader or because they have more reverence for the leader.

Faculty and staff were more likely to see their leader as possessing aspects of individualized behavior. It is possible the lower scores given by administrators might indicate a closeness or access to the president that faculty or staff do not enjoy, this familiarity breeding not exactly contempt, but a less idealized feeling with regard to their behaviors.

Staff and administrators perceived higher levels of individualized consideration in their leaders. It can be assumed that administrators have more personal contact with their president and thus are more likely to receive individual notice or recognition. Conversely, staff members appear to have relatively low levels of interaction with the president, but they may tend to more highly value the limited contact they have, and that time may leave them with a greater feeling of pride or recognition.

Implications for theory and practice

This research has raised several questions about transformational leadership. Is it just another concept or is it a management style? The complexity of modern universities has led to the rise of the importance of transformational leadership, both in theory and in practice. While our research
discovered that today’s presidents are seen as transformational with regard to inspirational motivation and idealized attributes, it also showed that they were not perceived as transformational in either intellectual stimulation or individualized consideration. Therefore, are university presidents not seen as fully transformational?

While the first two attributes tend to be more theoretical in nature, the second two need to be approached in a more practical manner. The mixed results for transformational leadership characteristics may demonstrate that parts of transformational leadership are more abstract while other parts are more based on interpersonal relationships. This difference among the characteristics between theory and practice deserves some consideration.

Presidents of our subject universities were perceived as having the theory (inspirational motivation and idealized behaviors) to accomplish their missions. One could conclude this means these presidents have the abilities to energize our subject groups on their vision and goals for the university. They have grasped transformational leadership theory insofar as they have the ability to be perceived as motivational in the larger, public portions of their job functions.

While some critics might believe these more public tasks can be accomplished with more effective university marketing, it should also be noted that in the case of inspirational motivation and idealized behaviors, perception is in fact reality. That is, the members of our subject groups have likely heard their president speak or seen their efforts to illuminate their visions for the future of the university, and having seen them, they do perceive the president as
transformational. The perception of these specific attributes can be assisted with proper handling of public statements and appearances, which do accomplish the task of enunciating a vision or promoting a charismatic persona.

However, the results of this research also suggest two areas of concern in the practical application of transformational leadership, as indicated by low scores on perceptions of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. The previous paragraphs outlined characteristics that can be partially accomplished through public appearances and statements. However, these two attributes will not be well served by an approach that does not include specific, one-on-one communication between the president and the members of the subject groups.

These two components of transformational leadership beg several practical questions. For instance, how can a university president spend the time necessary to visit each classroom or to coach each professor on an individual basis? How can these presidents find ways to engage and stimulate individual members of the faculty, staff and administration? While the modern public university is far too large to allow the president to spend the individual time necessary to complete these tasks face-to-face, are their other communication solutions that would allow them to increase their contact with more members of the university community?

Among possible ways to address these problems would be for presidents to spend more time promoting intellectual pursuits in smaller groups of university employees, from discussion of books or academic research that may be relevant
to teaching or staff work to a series of regular emails targeted specifically to members of the three subject groups. Presidents might choose to sponsor or host short workshops for staff members on various topics, or host luncheon speakers for groups of faculty members. The main purpose of such activities would be to allow the presidents to have more contact with university employees that was more relevant to their specific job functions while realizing the impracticality of individual contact with each employee. This increased contact is likely to lead all members of the university community to perceive a higher level of interest by the president in their specific activities.

While there is still much work to be done before the benefits of transformational leadership are fully realized by our colleges and universities, there are definite indications that our university leaders are moving in the direction of progress.

Limitations of study

The study was limited to public urban and metropolitan universities that provided IRB approval for the research and have presidents who have served in that capacity for at least three years. Given this, the results of this study may not be applicable to smaller and/or privately funded universities or to institutions whose presidents are relatively new.

Staff member responses were also very low. After five attempts, and the final attempt receiving only a .003 response rate, the survey was concluded. Eventually, the response rate necessary for overall statistical validity (100 total
responses needed per power analysis – 173 received) was received and data
collection was completed. There were a number of staff members who also felt
they were not “close enough” to the president to give an accurate measure of
his/her leadership skill set. A better method of obtaining results from this group
is needed.

As with any survey, those who respond are a self-selected sample.
Therefore, another form of mandatory responses would yield more responses.
However, this may be counterproductive to the overall principles of
transformational leadership.

This study looked at perceptions of transformational leadership among
presidents of public metropolitan universities. These perceptions were garnered
from three specific groups of university stakeholders – faculty, staff and
administrators. This research did not consider perceptions held by those outside
the university community – city leaders, donors, alumni and other key
stakeholders. This suggests a field rich for future study.

Future research

Should all four of the characteristics of transformational leadership be
weighted evenly? If one characteristic is not met, can that leader still be deemed
transformational, are they just a weaker transformational leader, or should they
be considered something else entirely? How many characteristics does a leader
need to exhibit to be considered transformational? It is possible that a pure
transformational leader does not exist, and that instead, transformational
leadership is a continuum of behavior towards this ultimate goal.

Additionally, there is still much research to be done among university stakeholders and with university presidents. Among possible additional research:

- How do students perceive the leaders of their universities?
- How do presidents perceive their own transformational leadership skills?
- How do transformational skills relate to levels of community engagement?
- Breakdown transformational skills by optional questions with regard to race, gender, age, full-time, part-time, and tenure.
- Is there a difference in transformational skills with length of service?
- Is there a difference in the perception of transformational leadership between public and private colleges and universities?
- Is there a definitive correlation between the transformational leadership skills of a university president and greater performance on key job functions, including enrollment numbers, fund raising accomplishments and community engagement?
- Do organizations led by transformational leaders enjoy higher levels of job satisfaction or greater feelings of accomplishment among various groups of employees?
- What other impact do transformational leaders have on their organizations?
• Are the benefits of transformational leadership significant enough that search committees looking to fill top jobs at universities should add a specific transformational leadership requirement to their criteria?

Summary conclusions

Transformational leadership can provide many benefits to the modern urban public university. However, this research suggests that few institutions have reached a point where true transformational leadership is providing them with meaningful benefits.

Values-driven transformational leadership that can result in a culture that is committed to achieving the goals set by the leaders has only been recognized as a viable option for leadership of organizations in the last 20 years, and the research may suggest that leaders who practice it are still moving toward the progressive end of the continuum of transformational leadership behavior.

Within the scope of this research, the perceptions of the transformational leadership skills of today’s university leaders were mixed. While only one group viewed their leaders as having overall transformational leadership characteristics, even that group’s results needed a little help from mathematical analysis to reach the cut point for our research. Additionally, while all groups surveyed saw their leaders as transformational in nature with regard to two of the defined attributes, the groups ranked their presidents lower on two other attributes.

These rankings led to a clarifying discussion on the differences between
the theory and practice of transformational leadership. However, this discussion
does not change the research results, which suggest that university presidents
are, in the aggregate, seen as having transformational characteristics only
“sometimes.”

While this research was limited by factors including the number of
universities studied and the groups surveyed, it does indicate that university
leadership is a field that warrants much additional study. Moreover, future
research can eventually be targeted at providing university leaders with specific
steps they can take to more fully embrace transformational leadership, which will
allow them to more completely serve both their universities and their
communities.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Final approved list of subject universities

Faculty, staff and administrators at the following 20 universities were surveyed for the research portion of this dissertation. All of these universities are state-supported, dues paying members of The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU), have a President who has served for at least three years and granted Institutional Review Board approval for this research project:

1. California State University, Dominguez Hills
2. Clayton College and State University
3. Cleveland State University
4. Indiana University Northwest
5. Kennesaw State University
6. Louisiana State University in Shreveport
7. Northern Kentucky University
8. University of Central Florida
9. University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
10. University of Illinois at Chicago
11. University of Memphis
12. University of North Carolina at Greensboro
13. University of South Carolina – Spartanburg
14. University of South Florida
15. University of Southern Maine
16. University of Texas at San Antonio
17. Virginia Commonwealth University
18. William Patterson University
19. Wright State University
20. Youngstown State University
APPENDIX B

The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU)

The following text is from the By-Laws and Constitution of the CUMU:

Declaration of Urban Universities

_We, the leaders of metropolitan universities and colleges._

- reaffirm that the creation, interpretation, dissemination, and application of knowledge are the fundamental functions of our institutions;
- accept a broad responsibility to bring these functions to bear on our metropolitan regions;
- commit our institutions to be responsive to the needs of our communities by seeking new ways of using resources to provide leadership in addressing metropolitan problems through teaching, research, and service.

Our teaching must:

- educate students to be informed and effective citizens, as well as capable practitioners of professions and occupations;
- be adapted to the diverse needs of metropolitan students, including minorities and underserved groups, adults of all ages, and the place-bound;
- combine research-based knowledge with practical application and experience, using the best current technology and pedagogical techniques.

Our research must:

- seek and exploit opportunities for linking basic investigations with practical application, and for creating interdisciplinary partnerships for attacking complex metropolitan problems, while meeting the highest standards of the academic community.

Our professional service must:

- develop creative partnerships with public and private enterprises that ensure the intellectual resources of our institutions are fully engaged in mutually beneficial ways;
· include close working relationships with elementary and secondary schools aimed at maximizing the effectiveness of the entire metropolitan education system;

· make the fullest possible contribution to the cultural life and general quality of life of our metropolitan regions.

Description of Metropolitan Universities

We are located in or near the urban center of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) with a population of at least 250,000.

We are universities, public and private, whose mission includes teaching, research, and professional service. We offer both graduate and undergraduate education in the liberal arts and two or more professional fields. The latter programs are strongly practice-oriented and make extensive use of clinical sites in the metropolitan area.

The majority of our students come from our metropolitan regions. Our students are highly diverse in age, ethnic and racial identity, and socioeconomic background, reflecting the demographic characteristics of their region. Many come to us by transfer from community colleges and other baccalaureate institutions, many are place-bound employees and commuters, and many require substantially longer than the traditional time to graduate, for financial and other personal reasons.

We are oriented toward and identify with our regions, proudly and by deliberate design. Our programs respond to regional needs while striving for national excellence.

We are strongly interactive. We are dedicated to serving as intellectual and creative resources to our metropolitan regions in order to contribute to their economic development, social health, and cultural vitality, through education, research, and professional outreach. We are committed to collaboration and cooperation with the many communities and clienteles in our metropolitan regions and to helping to bridge the socioeconomic, cultural, and political barriers among them.

We are shaping and adapting our own structures, policies, and practices to enhance our effectiveness as key institutions in the lives of our metropolitan regions and their citizens.

The By-Laws of this affiliation were signed on October 7, 2002, and state the following:

“The Coalition is an international affiliate organization of universities in large metropolitan areas that share common understandings of their institutional missions and values, as described in the “Declaration of Metropolitan
Universities.” Its purpose is to facilitate the exchange of information among its members about urban and metropolitan issues, create a unified approach to resolving its members’ common challenges and perpetuate a better understanding among policy makers, the higher education community, and the public about the distinctive roles played by urban and metropolitan universities. Any U.S. university or college that identifies its mission as being urban or metropolitan in nature and subscribes to the principles described in the Coalition’s “Declaration of Metropolitan Universities” is qualified to become a Member of the Coalition.” (Bylaws: The Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities: 2002).
APPENDIX C

Dues paying members of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU)

Arizona State University
Boise State University
California State University, Dominguez Hills
California State University - Fresno
California State University - Sacramento
California State University - San Bernardino
Clayton College and State University
Cleveland State University
Eastern Michigan University
Florida International University
Indiana University Northwest
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
Kennesaw State University
Louisiana State University in Shreveport
Metropolitan State University
Northern Kentucky University
Portland State University
Rutgers-Newark, The State University of New Jersey
San Jose State University
Southern Illinois University - Edwardsville
Southwest Missouri State University
Texas State University-San Marcos
Towson University
University of Alaska at Anchorage
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
University of Central Florida
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Colorado at Denver
University of Connecticut - Tri-Campus
University of Houston System
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Louisville
University of Memphis
University of Missouri - Kansas City
University of Missouri - St. Louis
University of Nebraska at Omaha
University of Nevada - Las Vegas
University of New Orleans
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
University of North Florida
University of North Texas System
University of Rhode Island
University of South Carolina - Spartanburg
University of South Florida
University of South Florida - St. Petersburg
University of Southern Indiana
University of Southern Maine
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Toledo
University of Washington, Tacoma
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Virginia Commonwealth University
Washington State University- Spokane
Washington State University- Vancouver
William Paterson University
Wright State University
Youngstown State University
APPENDIX D

E-mail cover letter and survey

Dear University Faculty, Staff or Administrator:

In the name of education, research and advanced leadership, I am asking for your assistance. I am currently a doctoral student in Public Administration and Urban Studies at The University of Akron. My dissertation is on the study of presidential/chancellor leadership at urban and metropolitan campuses across the country.

As an active stakeholder in your university community, I would like to find out your opinions of your president’s/chancellor’s leadership style. Your response will be anonymous. The Web survey, which will only take about 8 minutes to complete, is online at ---------- .

By completing and submitting the online questionnaire, you will have provided consent to use your responses for this research. Your responses, together with others, will be combined and used for statistical summaries only. This study is for research purposes exclusively. The information you provide will not be used for any additional purpose without written consent. Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may refuse to answer any questions.

Special precautions have been established to protect the confidentiality of your responses. Your questionnaire will be maintained in a secured data area. There are no foreseeable risks to you as a participant in this project, nor are there any direct benefits. However, your participation is extremely valued.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me at (330) 972-6328 or by e-mail at proberts@uakron.edu. If I am not available when you call, please leave a message and I will call back or you may contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Raymond W. Cox III, at (330) 972-7618 or rcox@uakron.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this research project, please contact Sharon McWhorter at The University of Akron Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (888) 232-8790 or sm48@uakron.edu.

Thank you for your help. I appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,
Patrick S. Roberts
Graduate Student
Survey

A five-point Likert Scale survey was used in which 4 = Frequently, If not always, 3 = Fairly often, 2 = Sometimes, 1 = Once in a while and 0 = Not at all

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise
6. Talks about their most important values and beliefs
7. Is absent when needed
8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems
9. Talks optimistically about the future
10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her
11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose
15. Spends time teaching and coaching
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action
21. Acts in ways that builds my respect
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions
24. Keeps track of all mistakes
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards
28. Avoids making decisions
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles
31. Helps me to develop my strengths
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments
33. Delays responding to urgent questions
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way
42. Heightens my desire to succeed
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements
44. Increases my willingness to try harder
45. Leads a group that is effective
APPENDIX E

University of Akron Institutional Review Board approval for study

May 17, 2005

Patrick S. Roberts

P. Roberts:

The University of Akron’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) completed a review of the protocol entitled “Transformational Leadership at Urban and Metropolitan Universities”. The IRB application number assigned to this project is 20050502.

The protocol qualified for Expedited Review and was approved on May 16, 2005. The protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for expedited review:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation or quality assurance methodologies

This approval is valid until May 16, 2006 or until modifications are proposed to the project protocol, whichever may occur first. In either instance, an Application for Continuing Review must be completed and submitted to the IRB.

Enclosed is the informed consent document, which the IRB has approved for your use in this research. A copy of this form is to be submitted with any application for continuation of this project.

In addition, your request for a waiver of documentation of informed consent, as permitted under 45 CFR 46.117(c), is also approved.

Please note that within one month of the expiration date of this approval, the IRB will forward an annual renewal reminder notice to you by email, as a courtesy. Nevertheless, it is your responsibility as principal investigator to remember the renewal date of your protocol’s review. Please submit your continuation application at least two weeks prior to the renewal date, to insure the IRB has sufficient time to complete the review.

Please retain this letter for your files. If the research is being conducted for a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, you must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.

Sincerely,

Sharon McWhorter
Associate Director

Cc: Raymond Cox, Department Chair
    Phil Allen, IRB Chair

The University of Akron is an Equal Education and Employment Institution
APPENDIX F

Presidents and chancellors at selected universities

Throughout this dissertation, we refer to university leaders as presidents.

It should be noted that the title of “president” is used by 14 of our subject universities, while the title “chancellor” is used by six of our subject universities.

Following is a list of our subject universities and the title they use for their chief executive.

1. California State University, Dominguez Hills - President
2. Clayton College and State University - President
3. Cleveland State University - President
4. Kennesaw State University - President
5. Indiana University Northwest - Chancellor
6. Louisiana State University in Shreveport - Chancellor
7. Northern Kentucky University - President
8. University of Central Florida - President
9. University of Colorado at Colorado Springs - Chancellor
10. University of Illinois at Chicago - Chancellor
11. University of Memphis - President
12. University of North Carolina at Greensboro - Chancellor
13. University of South Carolina – Spartanburg - Chancellor
14. University of South Florida - President
15. University of Southern Maine - President
16. University of Texas at San Antonio - President
17. Virginia Commonwealth University - President
18. William Patterson University - President
19. Wright State University - President
20. Youngstown State University - President
APPENDIX G

Subject universities by geographical distribution and state

NORTH - 6
Ohio – 3
Indiana - 1
Illinois – 1
Kentucky - 1

SOUTH - 8
Florida – 2
Georgia – 2
Louisiana – 1
North Carolina – 1
South Carolina – 1
Tennessee – 1

EAST - 3
Maine – 1
New Jersey – 1
Virginia – 1

WEST - 3
California – 1
Colorado – 1
Texas – 1

Ohio – 3
Florida – 2
Georgia – 2
California – 1
Colorado – 1
Indiana - 1
Illinois – 1
Kentucky - 1
Louisiana – 1
Maine – 1
New Jersey – 1
North Carolina – 1
South Carolina – 1
Tennessee – 1
Texas – 1
Virginia – 1