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The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the perceived leadership behaviors of upper-level student affairs officers and levels of psychological ownership among entry-level employees working in student services roles in higher education in the United States. Specifically, this study identified whether there are leadership behaviors, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2004), that relate to higher feelings of psychological ownership as measured by the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (Avey & Avolio, 2007) among entry-level professionals. The relationships between institution type and leadership style and psychological ownership were also assessed.

Both the MLQ and POQ are valid and reliable instruments (Avey, Avolio, Corssley, & Luthans, 2009; Bass & Avolio, 2004); however, the responses of the participants in this study did not align with the models as proposed by the developers of the instruments. Based on the results of exploratory factor analysis, the models were modified. The new modified models reflected the overarching theoretical constructs of the original models. Significant results were found in the relationship between participants’ perceptions of leadership as measured in the MLQ and their feeling of psychological ownership as measured in the POQ. Additionally, there were several combinations of MLQ predictor variables which resulted in higher levels of psychological ownership, including Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Management-by-Exception Active, Individual Consideration, and Laissez faire. Surprisingly, neither perceptions of leadership nor feelings of psychological ownership were influenced by the type of institution where participants were employed.
The results of this analysis provided support for Avey et al. (2009), who suggested that a relationship exists between psychological ownership and transformational leadership. Based on this research, it appears that leaders can greatly influence follower feelings of psychological ownership by tailoring their leadership behaviors to be more transformational. These findings reinforce the critical role that leaders play in helping followers to feel ownership over their organization and their role within the organization.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Throughout the development of U.S. higher education, the collegial culture, where small communities of scholars work closely together towards common goals, has been the predominant culture in much of student affairs (Thelin, 2004). Many factors have contributed to the changing face of U.S. higher education. One of them is the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 which helped to establish large public universities (Lucas, 2006). Another factor is the massification of higher education, which occurred in the 20th century following World War I and the return of U.S. troops after World War II. The new focus on mass higher education and a large influx of students supported by the GI Bill following World War II forced colleges and universities to change to accommodate the new scale of education on their campuses (Thelin, 2004).

In recent years U.S. higher education has come under some scrutiny with increased calls for accountability and efficiency within the academy. Changes in the perception of what the mission of the university should be have contributed to this scrutiny. There is some debate as to whether higher education is a private good or a public good both of these arguments influence the academy. If higher education is viewed more as a private good, then states may choose to defund programs with the belief that it should be funded by the individual. Whereas if it is deemed a public good, then states may try to take more control over the enterprise because it is in the states interest. Gumport (1997) suggested that the mission of higher education should go beyond training future leaders in the society and should focus on areas and subjects that meet local and national needs. Lingenfelter (2004) supported the notion that higher education could be considered a public good even if one does not directly participate in the education process.
Higher education is expected to drive the state economy and provide a steady supply of skilled workers to meet workforce demands.

A good example of the demand for increased efficiency and accountability in U.S. higher education is can be found in Florida. Beginning in 2009 the state of Florida implemented what is called the excess hour surcharge. The legislature passed a law that stated:

> It is the intent of the Legislature to encourage each undergraduate student who enrolls in a state university to complete the student’s respective baccalaureate degree program in the most efficient way possible while providing for access to additional college coursework. Therefore, the Legislature intends to enact a policy that provides incentives for efficient baccalaureate degree completion. (Florida Statutes, 2016)

The incentive for completions is to avoid facing financial penalties. The state subsidizes tuition up to 132 credit hours attempted, ten percent above what is required to achieve their degree. Beyond that, students become responsible for one hundred percent of the tuition rate for each additional credit meaning that they pay out of state tuition on each credit beyond 132 (Florida Statutes, 2016). The other side of this incentive is that the universities in Florida also are penalized by reductions in state funding if they have too many students in excess hours. The result of this is that students are being forced out of majors and or departments if they become at risk for excess hours. Students are often convinced to graduate with generic degrees and then come back to school for a master’s degree in their area of interest as not to count against excess hours metrics for the college or university as graduate hours don’t count towards this metric.

Thus, administrators are being held to a higher expectation of accountability for protecting public funds. Another example in Florida is the Targeted Educational Attainment (TEAm) Grants. These grants were distributed by the board of governors of Florida in 2013 and allocated 15
million dollars (TEAm, n.d.). The state identified gap areas within the projected Florida workforce and these targeted monies were awarded to universities who felt they could increase the number of students and graduates in the identified professions. In the documentation regarding the grant the board of governors stated:

It is the expressed intent of this Initiative to support Florida’s public universities’, and their partners’, provision of strategically identified access points to the high-demand areas employers are seeking to fill by expanding or building academic program capacity. By systemically addressing areas of need, the Board of Governors envisions making a marked improvement, ensuring that the educational standing and thereby the workforce of the state improves wisely (TEAm, n.d.).

The University of South Florida and the Lynn Pippenger School of Accountancy and two partnering institutions were awarded 3.6 million dollars for “Innovative, Collaborative Approach to Increasing the Supply of Quality Accounting Graduates in Florida” (TEAm, n.d.). The awarding of these funds has placed pressure to perform on the academic unit. The pressure comes both externally from the state and board of governors and internally from the provost and president to meet projected expectations. These two examples show how financial constraints and the influence of state government have increased the demand for accountability from higher education administrators.

Connor, Lake, and Stackman (2003) defined culture as, “the set of values, guiding beliefs, understandings, and ways of thinking that is shared by members of an organization and is taught to new members as correct. It represents the unwritten, feeling part of the organization” (p. 54). Organizational culture enables members to understand how to relate to each other and the organization. The concept of organizational culture and the importance of learning how to
navigate it are not unique to U.S. higher education. This concept of culture is important because it addresses the connection between employees and their work place.

Birnbaum (1988) identified four types of organizational cultures and described the organizational characteristics commonly found in each culture. First, the collegial culture is a community of scholars where mutual respect is valued, everyone is considered equal, and each person’s input and opinion is valued. This culture is most often associated with small private colleges (Birnbaum, 1988). Second, the political culture is much less homogeneous than the collegial campus. Within an organization, different constituent groups split up into subgroups. These subgroups in the political culture can be split up based on title, work group, age, sex, ethnicity, and other social factors, and may cause an us-versus-them mentality where each group looks out for its own self-interest. The political culture is most often associated with the comprehensive regional public university. Third, the bureaucratic culture is very structured and hierarchical. Unlike the collegial system it is very much based on the organizational chart. Birnbaum (1988) described it as being “machine like” (p. 132). This system is often adopted by the comprehensive community college. Finally, the anarchical culture is described as organized anarchy. This type of culture lacks consistent participation in decision-making, and members do not perceive the need to develop commonly agreed upon goals. The members of this culture relate more with and are guided by standards for their profession not what is in the best interest of the organization. Major research universities with large professional schools are most often associated with this type of governance structure. This was supported by Hirt (2006) who found that the nature of: the work environment, how things get done, relationships, and rewards differ for student affairs professionals depending on the type of campus one work on. Hirt (2009) research supported the differences in institution types based on Carnegie classification. Hirt’s
research found that larger more complex organizations lead to more specialization and less collaboration with colleagues, whereas smaller organizations student affairs professionals tend to be more generalists and campus collaboration is a necessity.

It is important to keep in mind the tremendous diversity within U.S. higher education with regard to institutional culture. However, we must be cautious about categorizing institutions. Taylor and Machado-Taylor (2010) wrote,

Institutions can and do vary enormously in their missions, circumstances, cultures and historical heritages. External environmental factors can, and do change at a pace today that can best be described as exponential. All of these intricate variables come together in each unique institutional situation that defines the circumstances that exist. Thus, a simple formula for leadership does not and never will exist. Our penchant for defining, categorizing, compartmentalizing and over simplifying such complex interactions must give way to a more open and flexible analysis of the necessities for effective leadership in a higher education institution. (p. 182)

In the context of U.S. higher education, there has been little research on the effect of leadership styles on followers in the academy. Likewise, there has been little research conducted on followers’ feelings of belonging and ownership within the organizational setting. In a review of the literature, most of the current research on leadership in higher education shows a focus on various transformational leadership styles, Bass (1997) defined transformational as where “leaders move followers to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country. Transformational leaders motivate followers and other constituencies to do more than they originally expected to do as they strive to higher order outcomes” (p. 133). Little attention was given to alternative styles of leadership. Scholars such as Kezar (2001,
2004) and Komives and Woodard (2003) have proposed that transformational leadership styles are effective in higher education. These styles of leadership are likely the most prevalent because of the history of collegial organizational cultures in U.S. higher education organizations (Thelin, 2004), and the relationship orientation of the transformational leadership style (Bass, 1997).

However, within higher education administration leadership research, there appears to be an almost nostalgic slant towards the collegial model. Much of the current literature focuses on the collegial organizational culture framework, and the transformational leadership paradigm (Birnbaum, 2004; Cosner, 2009; Kezar, 2001, 2004; Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Kezar, Betram Gallant, & Lester, 2011; Komives & Woodard, 2003; Komives & Wagner 2009; Malm 2008; Woodard, Love & Komives, 2000). There are many leadership models or theories which are rooted in transformational leadership. At their core these theories are relationship based, and emphasize leaders and followers working together towards common goals. This leadership style closely aligns with Birnbaum’s (1988) assertions of collegial campus cultures of a community of scholars who have mutual respect for one another, where hierarchy is not important, and where there is a shared set of values. However, if every campus has some elements of collegial, bureaucratic, political, and anarchical cultures in them (Birnbaum, 1988), then other leadership paradigms may be effective in higher education. Therefore, organizations in which the collegial framework is not the predominant organizational culture may be better suited to be led by alternative leadership styles, such as transactional leadership, passive avoidant leadership, or situational leadership.

Amey and Reesor (1998) suggest in modern universities the term “collegial” is used more to describe the friendly behavior and relationships with colleagues on campus and does not
necessarily correlate with the campus culture. Because of reductions in state funding, competitions for students, and growth in size and cultural diversity, they posit that all organizations are becoming increasingly political. Birnbaum (1988) stresses the need to use relationships to build coalitions to navigate the complexity of these large organizations.

Birnbaum’s framework provides rationale for why various leadership styles exist and are successful on U.S. colleges and universities. Some aspects of each of these culture types can be found on every campus within departments or divisions and the larger campus culture typically fit into Birnbaum’s (1988) framework. For example, faculty in a professional school like a College of Business at a doctoral research university may more closely associate with their professions and be more guided by standards set by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) than they are by their own institution. Likewise, within anarchical type institutions it is possible to see differing cultures within the same division depending on function of the specific area. In student affairs, for example, a large auxiliary such as residence life may function more bureaucratically, while student activities may function more from the collegial frame based on the differences in their job tasks and functions. One of the core concepts of the collegial culture is its relationship orientation. Those followers who are in a collegial culture have a high level of engagement with others, and expect to have feedback and ownership over decisions within the organization.

Because of this expectation for involvement in decisions making and the governance of the organization, a concept called psychological ownership was examined in the present study. This is a concept that has been studied in a variety of fields including psychology, child development, management, and leadership studies (Pierce, O’Driscoll, & Coghlan, 2004). Md-Sadin, Sambasivan, and Muniandy (2010) wrote, “the core essence of psychological ownership
is ‘the feeling of possessiveness and being psychologically tied to an object’” (p. 50, internal citation omitted). Similarly, some research has suggested that employees can feel psychological ownership over their job, their department, and the organization itself (McIntyre, Srivastava, & Fuller, 2009). In cases where employees feel psychological ownership over the organization, McIntyre et al. (2009) said that “employees feel possessive about the organization, get a sense of being psychologically tied or attached to it, and the organization becomes part of the employees’ identity” (p. 383). One study has suggested that there is a connection between levels of psychological ownership among followers and transformational leadership behaviors of their leaders (Avey, Avolio, Crossley & Luthans, 2009). Hence it was included as a variable in this study.

The concept of psychological ownership parallels the definition of organizational culture proposed by Connor et al. (2003). A strong sense of psychological ownership is believed to be connected to organizational success because, “employees who feel and act like owners of the organization will assume personal risk, responsibility, and accountability towards their actions and decisions affecting their organizations” (Md-Sadin et al., 2010, p. 50). There are also studies that found correlations between psychological ownership and factors related to organizational climate such as job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Pierce et al., 2004, and O’Driscoll, Pierce, Coghlan, 2006). Thus, there is a relationship between psychological ownership and an employee’s connection to the organization in which they work (Pierce, 2004).

**Student Affairs Context**

U.S. higher education became more professionalized in the early 20th century as academic affairs and student affairs were more specialized (Thelin, 2004). This was epitomized by the division of labor which occurred when professional administrators and later student affairs
practitioners took on much of the day-to-day administrative responsibility not pertaining to teaching and research in U.S. colleges and universities during this time. Rentz (2004) suggested that the culture of student affairs is continuously changing and that a paradigm shift away from student development and towards student learning was occurring in student affairs. This shift has occurred because of increased calls for accountability in higher education and student affairs divisions were asked to show how they contributed to the academic mission of the university by enhancing the student learning experience through co-curricular involvement designed to educate the whole student (Carpenter, 2004). This division of labor has meant that much of the responsibility for meeting the increased demand for colleges and universities to be more efficient and accountable to the public has fallen on student affairs professionals and administrators.

At its core student affairs functions focus on developing an inclusive learning environment which emphasizes student learning and personal development. Student affairs professionals contribute to the academic mission of the university by enhancing the student learning experience through co-curricular involvement designed to educate the whole student (Rentz, 2004). Carpenter (2004) and Rentz (2004) cited several documents including *The Student Personnel Point of View* (1936 & 1949), the 1987 NASPA statement, and the *Student Learning Imperative* (1994) as guiding documents for student affairs work in U.S. higher education. The American College Personnel Associate (1995) proposed a list of five characteristics in student affairs departments which are committed to student learning and development:

1. The student affairs division mission complements the institution’s mission, with the enhancement of student learning and personal development being the primary goal of student affairs programs and services;
2. Resources are allocated to encourage student learning and personal development;

3. Student affairs professionals collaborate with institutional agents and agencies to promote student learning and personal development;

4. The division of student affairs includes staff who are experts on students, their environments, and teaching and learning processes; and

5. Student affairs policies and programs are based on promising practices from the research on student learning and institution-specific assessment data (as cited in Rentz, 2004, p. 53-54)

The current study focused on staff working in student affairs functional areas. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in higher education (CAS) developed standards for 45 different functional areas. Some of these areas include academic advising, campus activities, programs, college unions, housing and residential life programs, orientation, and student leadership programs to name a few (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2015). While some of these professionals may have been in academic units, their job was part of a student affairs function. Research suggests that the collegial environment may be preferred by student affairs professionals (Thelin, 2004). This would suggest that student affairs professionals may have a preference for leadership which is transformational in nature (Birnbaum, 1988). Given the hypothesized relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and psychological ownership (Avey et al., 2009), one must question if organization type may also have a relationship with feeling of psychological ownership.

**Statement of the Problem**

Like never before there is a concern for colleges and universities to be held accountable to state and federal governments and to the citizenry. Issues regarding funding, resource
allocation, productivity, cost containment, degree attainment, and relevance of the curriculum are under fire (Taylor & Machado-Taylor, 2010). Universities have a reputation for being slow to change, having high costs both in spending and tuition, and overall poor management, and are now being held to a higher standard of accountability (Taylor & Machado-Taylor, 2010). Organizational leaders must begin to focus on how they can affect organizational output by developing increased psychological ownership among followers. Much of the current literature focuses primarily on transformational leadership styles, and fails to address the need for multiple styles of leadership in higher education (Kezar et al., 2006; Bass, 1997; Bennis, 2007; Burns, 1978; Northhouse, 2004; Kouzes and Posner, 2007; Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2009). Situational leadership theories suggest that to effectively build a strong organizational culture, and to be an effective leader, multiple leadership styles must be used (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2008). In situational leadership, “there is no one best way to influence people. The leadership style a person should use with individuals or groups depends on the performance readiness level of the people the leader is attempting to influence” (Hersey et al., 2008, p. 132). Thus, in this context, it could be argued that the leadership style that will be most effective in a given organization will vary depending on the context that the leader is faced with in the individual organization. Taylor and Machado-Taylor (2010) shared similar findings noting,

A distinction can be made between transactional and transformational leadership. The former is the more traditional leadership role that maintains or incrementally improves upon existing and acceptable institutional performance in time of high certainty. The latter, when needed, focuses on visioning, identifying opportunities, setting a long-term direction for the institution and moving in dramatic fashion beyond the status quo when
entirely new strategies and courses of action are called for. Both forms of leadership have their place and time. (p. 178)

Likewise, within the field of higher education and student affairs (HESA), no one has examined the relationship between leadership style and psychological ownership. If a relationship can be established it would allow leaders to take proactive measures which may affect organizational outcomes as well as enhance satisfaction and level of commitment of new professionals, which has been a growing concern in the literature (Tull, 2006; Tull et al., 2009). Research in higher education and student affairs does not seem to be focusing on leadership in the same way that other fields such as business, and leadership studies are, which focus on improving leadership behaviors to affect outputs. The majority of leadership literature conducted in HESA focuses on student leadership development, or on the study of senior level leaders and or faculty, with “little about the leadership capacity or activities of others on campus” (Kezar, Gallant, & Lester, 2011, p. 129). Higher education scholars have developed leadership models like the social change model of leadership development (Komives et al., 2009), but these are predominantly used for the development of student leaders. Student affairs professionals utilize these models as well as other popular leadership models to develop students, and meet institutional missions and learning outcomes dealing with student leadership development. Many of the leadership models used for student leadership development, including the social change model (Komives et al., 2009), and the Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2007), are transformational leadership styles. Much of the non-student leadership research is dominated by the transformational leadership paradigm (Abbasi & Zamani-Miandashti, 2013; Al-husseini, Elbelagi, & Dosa, 2013; Chipunza & Gwarinda, 2010; Kezar, 2001; Kezar et al., 2006; Kezar et al., 2001; Ong 2012; Pope, 2004; Power, 2013) and ignores
need for transactional leadership styles, which are rewards based (Bass, 1997, Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2008), in the real world practice of leadership.

For successful leadership to occur, leaders must know when to utilize both transformational and transactional leadership styles. Policy changes provide a great example of this type of situational leadership. In housing for example the residence life staff may look to change their practices by altering their programming model. The leader would likely try to be very transformative in making this change by getting staff from various levels involved in evaluating the old model and developing a new model. However, not everyone will agree with the need for change. In some situations, leaders may need to utilize non-transformational leadership approaches in order to implement the change to the new model (Hersey et al., 2008). For example, leaders are sometimes given directives that they themselves may not agree with from the state, the board of trustees, or the president, being transformational when trying to implement mandated change is not always possible. If the president says changes A, B, and C need to happen to increase first year retention rates, the leaders may need to dictate the required changes and not take time to develop buy in among followers.

In a review of the current literature, articles were identified that addressed the implications of leadership style on various aspects of leadership outcomes. In the literature there are studies, which link leadership style with job satisfaction (Chung, Jung, Kyle, & Petrick, 2010; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996), and increased effectiveness, increased organizational citizenship behaviors, and willingness to put in extra at their jobs (Power, 2013). All of these are leadership outcomes that are influenced by leadership style.

There is a lack of research addressing psychological ownership in the context of higher education. However, there are studies that examine factors which contribute to psychological
ownership such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, trust, and other factors (Avey et al., 2009; Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, & Gardner 2007; O’Driscoll, & Pierce, 2006; Pierce et al., 2001; Pierce et al. 2003; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

There is an established relationship in the literature connecting the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to various outcome measures such as job satisfaction, intent to stay in the organization, and organizational citizenship behavior (Chung et al., 2010; Podsakoff et al., 1996). Similar relationships have been found to exist in a few studies between psychological ownership and job satisfaction, intent to stay in the organization, and organizational citizenship behavior (Avey et al., 2009; Mayhew et al., 2007; O’Driscoll, & Pierce, 2006; Pierce et al., 2001; Pierce et al. 2003; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). The relationship between the MLQ and outcomes, and Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ) and outcomes has already been explored. The relationship between leadership and psychological ownership is one that has not had the same level of study. The present study focused on that relationship, and not the outcomes associated with either concept (see Figure 1). While outcomes are not the focus of this study they do remain important because both leadership and psychological ownership have on the have to ability to influence organizational goals and outcomes.
Likewise, there is a lack of research examining the influence that institution type has on leadership style and the outcomes of leadership. Birnbaum (1988) outlined four specific types of organizational cultures and related them to various types and sizes of institutions which typically exhibit traits associated with one of his organizational cultures. New professionals often undergo similar training and preparation at similar universities for their roles in student affairs but enter the field of student affairs in a diverse context with divergent cultures (Hirt, Schneiter, & Amelink, 2005). For this reason, it is important to determine if a relationship exists between institutional type and the measured levels of psychological ownership, and perceptions of a leader’s leadership style among entry-level professionals.

Studies have shown that entry level professionals experience lower levels of job satisfaction, and a significant number of them leave the profession within the first five to ten years of employment (Evans, 1988; Lorden, 1998; Renn & Hodges, 2007; Tull, 2006). This loss negatively affects colleges and universities in from a human resources prospective. The university will need to hire new professionals and retrain new employees which can be an expensive and time consuming process. This also will affect middle management as well with so
many professionals leaving the field the pool of quality candidates for middle management positions shrinks and may cause employers to seek external candidates. This high attrition rate could also have negative effects on organizational culture and measures of positive organizational commitment. While external candidates are not undesirable it is important to consider the lost productivity and investment of resources that occurs when someone leaves and is replaced by an external candidate. Institutions spend a great deal of time and money training new staff only to lose many of them from the institution.

Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner (2007) found that both organization-based and job-based psychological ownership are significantly related to job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. Likewise, Gill (2008) theorized that building trust in management has the potential to improve employee job satisfaction as well as their dedication to the organization. Research has shown that there is a strong positive relationship between employee perceived trust in management and employee job satisfaction in the area of business (Gill, 2008).

The study provides evidence to support the use of certain leadership behaviors over other in building a strong sense of psychological ownership among entry-level employees, and that institutional size has no significant influence on perceptions of leadership or feelings of psychological ownership. These results allow organizational leaders to better understand how their leadership influences an employee’s sense of psychological ownership within the organizational culture. This knowledge will enable leaders to act proactively to build a positive organizational climate that fosters psychological ownership among its entry level employees. Furthermore, the results could allow future leaders to tailor their leadership style in a way, which enables them to manipulate psychological ownership factors which have been linked to
employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and other positive organizational behaviors.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the perceived leadership behaviors of upper-level student affairs officers and levels of psychological ownership among entry-level employees working in student services roles higher education in the United States. Specifically, this study allowed me to identify the extent to which leadership behaviors, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Avey & Avolio, n.d. b), which relate to higher feelings of psychological ownership among entry-level professionals. The relationship between institution type and leadership style and psychological ownership were also assessed.

**Research Questions**

1. Is there a relationship between entry-level professionals’ perceptions of their direct supervisor’s leadership behaviors and their feeling of psychological ownership of their current job within the organization? Does the relationship differ based on the different subscales of MLQ?

2. What combination of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire variables (transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant) predicts high levels of psychological ownership?

3. Do entry-level professionals’ perceptions of their direct supervisor’s leadership styles differ by different institutional types?

4. Do entry-level professionals’ feelings of psychological ownership differ by institutional types?
Definitions

In order to follow this line of inquiry it is important to have an understanding of some of the terms that will be used throughout the remainder of the study.

**Entry-level professionals** were considered professionals with less than 5 years of full time professional experience working in student services functions which may include a variety of areas with a college community.

**Institution types** were self-identified by the respondent as part of the demographic data collection. The respondents were given five options associated with various types and sizes of institutions. These options coincide with the Carnegie classifications (Carnegie Foundation, 2015).

**Leadership** was defined by Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson (2008) as occurring “whenever one person attempts to influence the behavior of an individual or group, regardless of the reason. It may be for one’s own goals or the goals of others, and these goals may or may not be congruent with organizational goals” (p. 6).

**Multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ)** is a quantitative instrument developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) which measures follower perceptions their leader’s leadership behaviors in relation to three different leadership styles as well as outcomes of leadership. These leadership styles include transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant leadership.

**Passive/avoidant leadership** refers to a leadership style measured on one of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire subscales. Leaders who exhibit passive avoidant leadership behaviors typically give up power by avoiding involvement in leadership decisions, or use transactional
leadership styles after the organization has failed to meet established goals and outcomes (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003).

**Psychological ownership** defined as “that state in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership (material or immaterial in nature) or a piece of it is ‘theirs’ (i.e., ‘It is MINE!’)” (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001, p. 299). The measure used to assess these feelings in the study was the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire. This instrument measure negative feelings of psychological ownership called preventative, and positive feelings of ownership called promotive. Promotive psychological ownership is measured across four subscales: accountability, sense of belongingness, self-efficacy, and self-identity (Avey et al., 2009).

**Accountability** is one of the subscales on the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire. Accountability coincides with the follower feeling like they should hold others within the organization accountable for their actions. This includes individuals above them on the organizational chart (Avey and Avolio, n.d.).

**Self-efficacy** is a construct measured as a subscale of the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire which measures the degree to which individual feels able to successfully complete their work (Avey & Avolio, n.d. a).

**Self-identity** is a construct measured as a subscale of the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire which measures to the degree to which an individual personally identify with parts of the organization as part of their self-identity. For example, this could include physical structures or buildings, processes, organizational goals, or even specific departments or work teams (Avey & Avolio, n.d. a).
**Sense of belongingness** is a construct measured as a subscale of the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire which measures to the degree to which individuals feel that the organization is a place they feel at home (McIntyre, Srivastava, & Fuller, 2009).

**Transactional leadership** is a leadership style measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. This style of leadership is rewards based and functions on the exchange of rewards from the leader to the follower in exchange for the completion of tasks (Antonakis et al., 2003, p. 265).

**Transformational leadership** is a leadership style measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Bass (1997) defined as follows “Transformational leaders move followers to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country. Transformational leaders motivate followers and other constituencies to do more than they originally expected to do as they strive to higher order outcomes” (p. 133).

**Upper-level student affairs administrator** because of the diversity of our respondents and the institution structures in which they work the leader being assessed could not be linked to a specific title. For the purposes of this research upper-level administrators was defined as the entry-level professional’s supervisor.

**Overview of the Study**

In this study, professionals who self-identify as entry-level student affairs professionals, i.e., five years of professional experience or less, were asked to take two quantitative surveys to determine how the perceptions of the leadership style of a direct supervisor at an institution affects their sense of psychological ownership within the organization. The first survey was the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire or MLQ, was developed by Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999). The MLQ identifies characteristics of transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant
leadership (Avolio et al., 1999). Because entry-level professionals report to middle managers, or senior student affairs officers depending on the size and complexity of the organization, the sample was asked to complete this survey based on their perceptions of the leadership style of their direct supervisor. This showed how they perceive their leader with regard to observed leadership behaviors. This was measured because their perception, whether accurate or not, are a reality for the respondent.

Respondents were also asked to take the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire or POQ developed by Avey and Avolio (n.d. a). The POQ measures two psychological ownership constructs: preventative and promotive. Preventative psychological ownership addresses negative feelings of possession or territoriality and can lead to feeling the need to protect what is theirs Avey et al. (2009). Promotive psychological ownership consists of positive feelings of ownership and is measured across four subscales: the followers’ sense of self-efficacy, accountability, belongingness, and self-identity. Self-efficacy refers to the follower’s belief in their ability to successfully accomplish work responsibilities (Avey et al., 2009). Accountability coincides with the follower feeling like they should hold others within the organization accountable for their actions. This includes individuals above them on the organizational chart. The third factor, sense of belongingness, refers to the follower’s sense of feeling at home in the organizational climate. The last factor is self-identity. This factor measures the extent to which an individual identifies with the organization. Individuals who score highly in this area would identify their organization as part of who they are as individuals (Avey & Avolio, n.d. a).
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This overview of the literature provides the background knowledge needed to understand and evaluate the current study. In this study the relationship between follower’s perceptions of leadership behaviors of their supervisor, and their feelings of psychological ownership towards the university or their job. The participants in this study all work in student affairs functional areas in U.S. colleges and universities. Typically, these professional work in administrative functions which contribute to student learning and development outside of the areas of research and teaching. Examples of these functional areas include but are not limited to: academic advising, campus activities, programs, college unions, housing and residential life programs, orientation, and student leadership programs to name a few (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2015a).

To begin, the history of leadership studies and a working definition of leadership will be provided. Next, current trends in leadership theory will be explored and evaluated for commonalities. Third, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the theoretical background on the leadership styles measured with this instrument will be discussed. These include transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive avoidant leadership. Then empirical research which utilized the MLQ will be presented. This will be followed by an introduction to the concept of psychological ownership, and the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ). This chapter concludes with a brief look at the empirical research conducted using the POQ. Chapter II provides the basic knowledge of leadership theory, psychological ownership and the related MLQ and POQ instruments which will be used during data collection. Note that in the literature reviewed in this chapter on the MLQ and POQ that researchers have found that there is a relationship between leadership and measurable work
related outcomes. Likewise, studies have shown that there are similar relationships between psychological ownership and work related outcomes. This study sought to determine if similar relationships exist between leadership style and levels of psychological ownership among followers.

**Leadership**

The study of leadership as a concept is little more than a century old, with contributions to the literature coming from disciplines such as business, education, social sciences, anthropology, politics science, and theology. However, in more than a century, no clear definition has emerged for the term leadership (Rost, 1991). Even among scholars, definitions of leadership differ. Often times scholars fail to even define the term. Rost (1991) said,

> It is almost a ritual for the authors of books and articles on leadership to make two statements at the beginning of their works. The first statement goes like this: “Many scholars have studied leaders and leadership over the years, but there still is no clear idea of what ‘leadership’ is or who leaders are.” The second statement usually takes the form of several paragraphs summarizing the popular theories of leadership: great man, trait, group, behaviorist, and situational. (p. 13)

When definitions for leadership are given or developed, they are influenced by the paradigmatic view of the author, as well as the leadership philosophy, or style being advocated by the author. Generally, these theories tend to be strongly influenced by the Western industrialist paradigm (Rost, 1991).

Some research within higher education suggests that participatory leadership styles, which are often transformational in nature, may be more desirable on college campuses. Higher
education has a history of being a place to debate and explore new ideas, thoughts, and develop critical thinkers. Kezar et al. (2011) said,

faculties and staff are drawn to campus employment because they believe that the academy provides opportunity to debate interesting ideas. So, consistent with the intellectual climate of college and university campuses, a prominent grassroots leadership tactic used by both faculty and staff is the creation and organization of intellectual opportunities, where issues of interest can be intelligently discussed and debated. (p. 139)

Likewise, one overarching structure common in U.S. higher education is shared governance. This is a system whereby faculty, staff, students, and various other external constituents share in the governing of a college or university. While shared governance is not specifically leadership it is connected with how the organization is led to achieve organizational objectives. Traditionally the collegial model of shared governance has played a big part in the collegiate ideal. Birnbaum’s collegial model was cited as an ideal for how shared governance should work. Systems theory can be used to show how changes in the administration affect the technical core (faculty). The theory also showed how some parts of both faculty and administration overlap with administrators working in academic areas and faculty working as administrators (Toma & Kezar, 1999). According to Kezar, “Others worry that administrators have become fixated on meeting political and social pressures, stabilizing finances and promoting efficiency and accountability” (Kezar, 2004, p. 35). People and the relationships that they build are the heart of organization and governance of the educational enterprise and is a key to the success (Kezar, 2004).

This suggests that given the history and culture of higher education, and the types of individuals who are attracted to working in the field of higher education may prefer
participatory and transformational leadership styles, and that autocratic or transactional styles may be less successful in higher education. Others suggest that the context and/or organizational culture in which a leader is operating will affect the preferred and most effective leadership style for any given situations (Birnbaum, 1988; Hersey et. al., 2008; Taylor & Machado-Taylor, 2010). The present study will focus on three divergent styles of leadership. The first of these styles is transformational leadership and the various theories which fall under the umbrella of transformational styles. The second is transactional leadership, and the third will be passive avoidant leadership.

**Leadership Defined**

The three styles of leadership which will be measured in this study were mentioned earlier but I will recap them here. Transformational leadership was defined by Bass (1997) as follows: “Transformational leaders move followers to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country. Transformational leaders motivate followers and other constituencies to do more than they originally expected to do as they strive to higher order outcomes” (p. 133). Transactional leadership was defined by Antonakis et al. (2003) as follows; “This style of leadership is rewards based and functions on the exchange of rewards from the leader to the follower in exchange for the completion of tasks” (p. 265). Leaders who exhibit passive avoidant leadership behaviors typically give up power by avoiding involvement in leadership decisions, or use transactional leadership styles after the organization has failed to meet established goals and outcomes (Antonakis et al., 2003).

In order to understand and differentiate between transactional, transformational, and passive avoidant leadership styles it is important to understand the current climate within leadership research. In recent decades there has been a stigma around transactional leadership
styles and management, which are seen by some as less effective or less ideal styles of leadership. Management and leadership as defined by Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson (2008) share some similarities. Management is defined by Hersey et al. (2008) as “the process of working with and through individuals and groups and other resources (such as equipment, capital, and technology) to accomplish organizational goals” (p. 5). Hersey et al. (2008) defined leadership by saying,

Leadership occurs whenever one person attempts to influence the behavior of an individual or group, regardless of the reason. It may be for one’s own goals or the goals of others, and these goals may or may not be congruent with organizational goals. (p. 6)

The primary difference between these definitions is that management consists of the pragmatic administrative functions undertaken to achieve a goal, while leadership is focused less on task orientation and more on a social orientation between the leaders and follower (Connor et al., 2003). A leader uses the ability to build social relationships with others in the organization to build coalitions and garner influence within the organization. Another difference between management and leadership is its focus. Management tends to be task-oriented, stressing results and outcomes, while leadership has more of a future orientation focusing on positioning the organization to succeed in the future. Warren Bennis (2000) effectively differentiated between managers and leaders when he said:

Leaders conquer the context- the volatile, turbulent, ambiguous, surroundings that sometimes seem to conspire against us and will surely suffocate us if we let them- while managers surrender to it. The manager administrates; the leader innovates. The manager is a copy; the leader is an original. The manager maintains; the leader develops. The manager focuses on systems and structures; the leader focuses on people. The manager
relies on control; the leader inspires trust. The manager has a short-range view; the leader has a long-range perspective. The manager asks how and when; the leader asks what and why. The manager has an eye on the bottom line; the leader has his eye on the horizon. The manager imitates; the leader originates. The manager accepts the status quo; the leader challenges it. Managers do things right; leaders do the right things. (p. 5)

While both transactional leadership and transformational leadership are needed within an organization (Birnbaum, 1988; Hersey et. al., 2008; Taylor & Machado-Taylor, 2010) much of the current literature focuses on leadership (transformational leadership) as desirable and management which are often associated with non-transformational leadership styles as undesirable. Birnbaum (1988) went so far as to say that within some organizational cultures non-transformational leadership styles may be more effective and preferred over transformational leadership.

**Leadership Trends**

In an examination of the literature from higher education, as well as the private sector, some themes became clear as exemplars for modern leadership. Bennis (2007) summed up his thoughts on leadership by saying, “I believe all exemplary leaders have six competencies: they create a sense of mission, they motivate others to join them on that mission, they create an adaptive social architecture for their followers, they generate trust and optimism, they develop other leaders, and they get results” (p. 5). Likewise, relational leadership, as espoused by Kezar, Carducci, and Contreras-McGavin (2006), is a theory which is transformational in nature and was developed by HESA scholars. This theory has five primary components:

1. leadership is inclusive of people and diverse points of view
2. empowers those involved
3. is purposeful and builds commitment towards common purposes
4. is ethical
5. recognizes that all four of these elements are accomplished by being process oriented. (Kezar et al., 2006, p. 64)

This leadership theory is indicative of the themes identified throughout the higher education leadership literature. In this model leaders and followers work collaboratively toward a common purpose. These are not new concepts and leadership theorists have espoused them across disciplines.

Several trends that were common throughout the literature are relationship orientation, follower participation, and common shared organizational goals (Bass, 1997; Bennis, 2007; Burns, 1978; Kezar et al., 2006; Northhouse, 2004; Tull et al., 2009). Essentially most of the modern leadership trends are extensions of transformational leadership theory based on their high level of relationship orientation, using those relationships to motivate and influence followers to move towards common goals.

One model that incorporates all of these themes is Kouzes and Posner (2007) The Leadership Challenge. Kouzes and Posner (2007) stressed the importance of relationship based leadership styles, and developing a common shared vision. Their model outlines five leadership practices for effective leadership: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart, two of the five practices of their model are inspiring a shared vision and enabling others to act are directly relatable to transformational leadership. While this model is a good example of transformational leadership in practice, for the purposes of this study it was important to select an instrument that assesses multiple leadership styles. For this reason, the MLQ assessment was selected. This assessment tool will
provide data on transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership styles utilized by leaders.

In the leadership trends, the ideas of relationship orientation, follower participation, and common shared goals were common across all of the literature. Notice that the commonalities among the leadership literature all fall within the scope of transformational leadership. There is limited mentioning of any other types of styles. When other styles are discussed it is typically done for comparison purposes.

**Relationship Orientation**

Relationships for many researchers have been found to be a key component to successful leadership. Bennis (2007) argued that too often leadership is viewed as an individual phenomenon. He believed that leadership was relational and was grounded in interaction with others. Moreover, Bennis (2007) said, “in its simplest form, it [leadership] is a tripod, a leader or leaders, followers, and the common goal they want to achieve. None of those three elements can survive without the others” (p. 3). This suggests a relational leadership perspective, with leaders and followers working together towards a common goal (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

In his research, Avolio (2007) stressed the importance of leader-member exchange theory in determining the success of leaders. The relationship between leaders and followers was important in achieving desired results. This theory was supported by O’Toole (as cited in Kaufman, 2005) who said, “Leaders fail when they have an inappropriate attitude and philosophy about the relationship between themselves and their followers. Those who do not respect and trust their followers cannot lead them.” (p. 54). Leaders who believe that they can do everything alone may find themselves struggling to succeed.
Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) is another leadership theory which has been explored in the higher education context. This theory focuses on the leader’s ability to foster and develop high quality relationships with followers. Power (2013) said, “The ideal is for a leader to develop as many high-quality relationships as possible. This will lead to increases in subordinates’ sense of job satisfaction and organizational citizenship, as well as increased productivity and attainment of organizational goals” (p. 277). While transformational leadership focuses a lot on the promotion of the visions of the leader and influencing followers to buy into that vision, LMX focuses on “the behaviors of those leaders that will inspire others to follow them towards the transformation of higher education” (Power, 2013, p. 278). LMX theory at its core is simple. Leaders focus on building individual, mutually beneficial, and differentiated relationships with followers, then using the social capital developed in those interactions to put the right people in the right place at the right time (power, 2013). LMX theory has been described as

A perfect complement to transformational leadership because of its support for the autonomous nature of academic faculty and its ability to create social capital, act as antecedent to organizational citizenship and transformative behaviors, and promote higher quality relationships between coworkers. (Power, 2013, p. 78)

Research has also shown a correlation between LMX theory and both transformational and transactional leadership outcomes. The relationship orientation LMX has clear linkages with transformational leadership theory. Through these relationships leaders are able to influence followers to work hard towards organizational goals. From a transactional point of view, the relationships are leveraged to achieve transactional outcomes of leadership such as “more effective task performance, increased organizational citizenship behaviors, and increased
willingness amongst followers to take on extra roles and change how they do their job” (Power, 2013, p. 280).

Fullan (2010) also espoused the value of relationship building. He stressed that relationships needed to be the first priority of a leader in an organization. Often leaders rashly implement change before they understand the organization and the culture. This is a dilemma for leaders. How quickly should they act to implement change within an organization? If they act too quickly, Fullan (2010) said, “the leader comes on too strong, the culture will rebel (and guess who is leaving town- cultures don’t leave town)” (p. 18). If the leader moves too slowly out of respect for the current culture, then the leader risks becoming acculturated into that culture. Developing relationships that allow one to understand the intricacies of the culture will help a leader develop support and buy in from others in the organization. At the same time the leader must not fully integrate into the culture of the organization because, they may become hesitant to make changes when needed (Fullan, 2010).

The ability of leaders to develop relationships with followers is a topic which is beginning to be researched more frequently and is part of the foundation to transformational leadership theory. Ong (2012) conducted a qualitative study looking at leadership within multiple paradigms in higher education. Ong found that mid to senior level executives did not question the technical skills or competency of university leaders but found them lacking in soft skills areas. Leaders struggled to build relationships, develop trust, inspire others, or help followers develop a feeling of self-efficacy. The respondents in this study were afraid to speak their mind and give their opinion to the university leaders for fear of discrimination or dismissal (Ong, 2012). Three staff motivational factors were identified in this study these include; feelings of self-efficacy, feeling like their work is appreciated, salary and compensation. Ong (2012)
said, “it is essential for university leaders to work to develop the positive people skills and necessary communication skills to maintain the respect and treatment that members of the organization deserve” (p. 97). The findings of this study echo those of many other higher education leadership researchers. While the term transformation leadership is never stated links can easily be made between the conclusions of this study and the ideals that are at the core of transformational leadership.

**Follower Participation and Common Shared Organizational Goals**

The follower participation and common shared organizational goals trends parallel each other throughout the research. As discussed earlier it is important for leaders to develop trusting relationships with an organization. This is important because effective leaders leverage those relationships to influence followers to buy in to common goals and participate in activities that will advance those goals within the organization. It is essential for leaders to allow followers to participate in decision making and buy in to common goals if a leader is going to be successful.

Kaufman (2005) advised leaders to, “respect followers, capture their imagination, value their opinions, and involve them in the process of change” (p. 54) in order to be a successful agent of change. Followers are a determining factor in the ability of a leader to succeed or fail. The follower empowers the leader to be able to lead the group and ultimately determines the success of the collaborative relationship (Avolio, 2007). This is a major shift in traditional thoughts on leadership which focused primarily on leaders. In research exploring the leader follower dyad Avolio (2007) cited Grint who described leadership studies as “theoretically inadequate from its inception because it primarily excluded followers when explaining what constitutes leadership”. Likewise, “it only requires the good follower to do nothing for leadership to fail” (p. 26).
Similar themes occurred in the higher education leadership literature. Komives, Lucas, McMahon, Wagner, and Ostick (2008) suggested that terms like leader and follower are undergoing a re-defining process, and suggested that in the future, the term follower may be less passive, as followers expect a more collaborative working relationship with leaders. Leadership appears to be changing in U.S. higher education, and is being viewed as a “relational process of people together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good” (Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000, p. 81).

Kezar (2001) focused on five assumptions that are key for successful leadership. Two of these assumptions speak well to the concepts identified throughout the literature. These two assumptions are that “Leadership involves a team, group or community rather than an individual” and “interdependence and connectedness with the organization/people as part of a larger system” (Kezar, 2001, p. 88). These assumptions stress the importance of relationships in participatory leadership, and that leadership is not an independent endeavor. Leaders cannot be successful without the assistance and cooperation of others within the organization. These ideas again are very similar to the concepts stressed by non-higher education leadership scholars. In writing about leadership and planning Taylor and Machado-Taylor (2010) said, “the process of planning must revolve around shared governance and be a truly participator process. Personal ownership by the many individuals who will ultimately make it succeed can be achieved in no other way (p. 176).

The theme of common shared organizational goals was clearly addressed by Kouzes and Posner (2007) with their practice of inspiring a shared vision. This theme was pervasive throughout the research, and was common across most of the literature on the transformational
leadership models. For example, Kaufman (2005) advocated similar ideals believing that leaders often believe that their ideas, thoughts, and plans are best despite resistance from their followers.

Komives et al. (2008) touched on two themes that identified in the literature. They assert that successful leadership involves a change in the role and relationships between traditional leaders and followers, and the idea of working towards a common good. This is important in that HESA scholars are advocating that higher education leaders move away from transactional leadership practices and advocate the adoption of approaches that are transformational in nature.

A synergistic approach to supervision was proposed by Tull et al. (2009) as ideal for new student affairs professionals as they become socialized to the profession. This style of supervision is relationship oriented and driven by joint cooperation between leader and follower. Tull et al. (2009) said synergistic supervision had “a dual focus: accomplishment of the organization’s goals and support of the staff in accomplishment of their personal and professional development goals” (p. 134).

MLQ Leadership Focus

The multifactor leadership questionnaire is a quantitative instrument, which measures follower perceptions of the leadership style of one of their leaders. These perceptions correspond to three different leadership styles as well as outcomes of leadership. The leadership styles measured by the MLQ are transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Outcomes of leadership are less theoretical within the MLQ. The final three subscales in the instrument assess the followers’ perceptions of the leader’s ability to get the follower to display extra effort, perceptions of the leaders’ effectiveness in their position, and whether the follower is satisfied with the leadership style and the leader’s interaction with followers (Avey & Avolio, n.d. b).
**Transformational Leadership Theory**

Transformational leadership was first proposed by Downton (1973) and later made popular by James MacGregor Burns. He proposed that transformational leadership is a process in which a leader engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation of both the leader and the follower (Burns, 1978). Leadership is based on the context of the situation, built on relationships and trust, is future oriented, and grounded in moral and ethical principles (Northouse, 2004). These are key concepts in Transformational leadership which was defined by Bass (1997) as:

Authentic transformational leaders motivate followers to work for transcendental goals that go beyond immediate self-interest. What is right and good to do becomes important. Transformational leaders move followers to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country. Transformational leaders motivate followers and other constituencies to do more than they originally expected to do as they strive to higher order outcomes. (p. 133)

**Transactional Leadership Theory**

In contrast to transformational leadership, transactional leadership is rewards based and functions on the exchange of rewards from the leader to the follower in exchange for the completion of tasks. This exchange is the “fulfillment of a contractual obligation and is typically represented as setting objectives and monitoring and controlling outcomes” (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003, p. 265). Leaders assign roles, tasks, and goals to followers, then either actively or passively manage followers. Followers are motivated to complete goals by some type of material and psychological rewards structure (Antonakis et al., 2003).
Passive/Avoidant Leadership Theory

Passive avoidant leadership styles are widely considered the least effective forms of leadership practiced by organizational leaders. Leaders who practice this style of leadership use transactional approaches to intervene only after outcomes have failed to be met or some type of error has occurred. In other situations, these leaders completely abdicate power by avoiding involvement in leadership decisions. These leaders do not use transactional or transformational approaches to leadership they simply fail to lead (Antonakis et al., 2003).

MLQ Empirical Research

As discussed in the leadership literature, much of the empirical research done using the MLQ within higher education focuses on transformational leadership paying little to no attention to transactional, or passive/avoidant leadership styles. The need for non-transformational leadership styles is often overlooked even in light of the political and economic realities leaders are faced with when making difficult decisions. Likewise, the research using the MLQ tended to look at leadership from the organization’s highest levels, be it a university president or a department of education.

In research conducted in the higher education system in Iraq it was found that there was a relationship between components of transformational leadership and process and product innovation. Al-Husseini, Elbeltagi, and Dosa (2013) conducted research in Iraq using exploratory factor analysis and structural equation modeling and found that four components (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) positively related to both product and process innovation. Idealized influence resulted in higher levels of respect, trust, and faith in their leaders. Increased feelings of respect, trust, and faith resulted in employees being more innovative in their work (Al Husseini et al.,
Inspiration motivation also positively related to innovation. Followers preferred leaders with a vision and felt that this helped them during times of change while working towards long-term goals. Followers reported feeling more valued and that their work was important (Al Husseini et al., 2013). Data suggested that followers felt intellectually stimulated and encouraged by leaders who scored high in intellectual stimulations. Followers felt valued, like they were free to challenge old ways of thinking and doing things, and try new ideas (Al Husseini et al., 2013). Finally, leaders who rated highly in individualized consideration helped to increase follower morale and provided them with coaching and training (Al Husseini et al., 2013). While product and process innovation were affected by all four components of transformational leadership the strength of that affect varied depending on whether the institution was public or private. Likewise, process innovation was more affected at all institutions (Al Husseini et al., 2013).

Another study conducted in South Africa looked at transformational leadership approaches as leaders were asked to merge higher education institutions across the country. The Ministry of Education charged the leadership with implementing the mergers of multiple institutions of higher education. Institutional leaders were given deadlines for implementation and told what needed to happen. Leaders attempted to develop buy-in among staff, provide staff with an opportunity to influence the merger process, prepare the staff for the process, and deal with the emotional effects on the staff (Chipunza & Gwarinda, 2010). Sixty-seven percent of leaders believed that they provided followers with an opportunity to make and influence decisions, in contrast 67% of followers “indicated that they lacked the opportunity to influence decisions during the merger process” (Chipunza & Gwarinda, 2010, p. 6). Leaders (67%) and followers (65%) agreed that the staff did not have enough time to prepare for the university
mergers (Chipunza & Gwarinda, 2010). When asked if the university had taken steps to adder the emotional distress felt by staff because of the merger leaders were split at 50%. Chipunza and Gwarinda, (2010) found that 65% of the followers felt that “nothing had been done to ensure they were emotionally prepared before or after the merger” (p. 7). These findings illustrate two key points. First, follower perceptions of leadership are real and valid from their perception of reality. While in some cases the leaders believed they were being transformational it was not perceived that way by followers. Likewise, the present study focused on follower perceptions of leadership. Second, if the outcome is predetermined, and inclusion in the decision process is done as a formality with little or no influence on the outcome leaders will struggle to gain the trust of followers. In this case leaders felt that “the process was just imposed on employees” (Chipunza & Gwarinda, 2010, p. 8). With 67% of employees feeling that they had little influence over the outcome it appears that they would agree with their leaders.

In a study of university presidents Basham (2012) found that there is not always a clear delineation between transactional and transformational leadership practices. Basham (2012) said, “both transactional and transformational leadership practices and concepts will have to be applied at an institution of higher education to ensure change due to the reluctance of tenured faculty and staff to consider changes due to personal impact” (p. 56). Because of the influence of external pressure for state and federal government who control funding and research dollars higher education leaders “will require critical application of transactional and transformational leadership practices and concepts to ensure that the institution of higher education’s succeeds in its purpose of learning” (Basham, 2012, p. 56).

Improving the performance and meeting the ever increasing demands for efficiency and output metrics are a growing concern for higher education leaders. A recent study explored the
relationship between transformational leadership practices and two dependent variables. The first dependent variable was learning organizational culture. This variable was defined as “Accepting new methods and don’t resistance against changes, Extent to which the managers don’t blame members for their errors and mistakes, extent to which innovative member are supported and encouraged” (Abbasi & Zamani-Miandashti, 2013, p. 510). The second dependent variable was organizational learning which was defined by Abbasi and Zamani-Miandashti (2013) as the “extent to which the faculty members create and achieve new knowledge, extent to which the created and achieved knowledge shared and disseminated between faculty members, extent to which the new knowledge apply in procedures of the faculty” (p. 510). The data showed a positive relationship between transformational leadership practices and both learning organizational culture and organizational learning. When transactional practices are utilized to impose the leaders will on followers these organizational outcomes are less successful (Abbasi & Zamani-Miandashti, 2013).

Psychological Ownership

Psychological ownership is defined as “that state in which individuals feel as though the target of ownership (material or immaterial in nature) or a piece of it is ‘theirs’ (i.e., ‘It is MINE!’)” (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001, p. 299). In the employment context, Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) refined the definition of psychological ownership and stated that, “Psychological ownership is the psychologically experienced phenomenon in which an employee develops possessive feelings for the target” (p. 439).

The primary focus of psychological ownership is found in its three main motives: “(1) efficacy and effectance, (2) self-identity, and (3) having a place” (Pierce et al., 2001, p. 300). Efficacy was identified as the feeling of control over decisions, or actions, which lead to
desirable outcomes within the target of ownership (Pierce et al., 2001). Self-identity was defined as when “employees perceive ownership for the purpose of defining themselves” (McIntyre et al., 2009, p. 384). McIntyre et al. (2009) further defined having a place for employees as “when it fulfills the desire to have a place that one calls one’s own, analogous to the strong desire shared by most people to have a home” (p. 384).

Psychological ownership theory was developed by Pierce et al. (2001) using the literature on theories of possession, ownership, and other related topics from sociology, philosophy, psychology, and human development research. Beyond mere feelings of possession, psychological ownership fosters feelings of self-identity between the target and the owner. Pierce et al. (2001) said,

The core of psychological ownership is the feeling of possessiveness and being psychologically tied to an object. One’s possessions are felt as extensions of the self (Belk, 1988; Dittmar, 1992; Furby, 1978 a,b) ‘what is mine becomes (in my feelings) part of ME’ (Isaacs, 1933; 225) and, thus, the state of psychological ownership emerges…thus, the target becomes part of the psychological owner’s identity. (p. 299)

The close relationship between feelings of ownership and possession can be connected to either the organization, which the owner works for, or a specific portion of the organization. For example, in higher education someone working in residence life may feel ownership over the building that they manage, the students who live in their building, and the staff who work for them. This is evident by the language used by some professionals, when they refer to “my building, or my staff”. They experience feelings of ownership over part of the organization, which is related to their particular role in the university. These types of feelings can also be associated with work groups, projects, and other intangible items (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).
Avey, Avolio, Crossley and Luthans (2009) postulated that there was a link between psychological ownership and positive organizational behavior. These positive organizational behaviors were also identified by Pierce et al. (2003); Van Dyne and Pierce (2004); Pierce et al. (2001); O’Driscoll, and Pierce (2006); and Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner (2007) in their work labeled as various constructs including organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, work environment structure, and extra-role behavior.

Avey et al. (2009) expanded on the works of Pierce et al. (2001), McIntyre et al. (2009), and Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) by adding two new concepts the theory. The first concept that was added as a core concept in psychological ownership was that of accountability. The idea behind this addition is that with feelings of ownership over the organization individuals feel that they have the right to hold others accountable for their influence over or actions towards the target of ownership. Likewise, those with high levels of psychological ownership expect to be held accountable and feel responsible for the safe stewardship for the organization (Avey et al., 2009). The second concept that was added by Avey et al. (2009) was the feeling of territoriality that can come with feelings of ownership. This is a preventative and defensive form of psychological ownership in which owners exhibit self-serving behaviors that serve to protect their target of ownership from change or perceived threats from within the organization. Territoriality comes from a place of fear. Fear of losing resources, their job, control, or identity. This leads to preventative actions being taken to maintain ownership Avey et al. (2009).

**Psychological Ownership Questionnaire**

The psychological ownership questionnaire was developed by Avey et al. (2009) to measure levels of psychological ownership based on their theory. This instrument measures
psychological ownership over two scales. The first scale is preventive psychological ownership which measure territoriality. The second scale is promotive psychological ownership, and is measured across four subscales: Self-efficacy, Accountability, Sense of Belongingness, and self-identity. In total the instrument contains 16 items and takes around 10 minutes to complete (Psychological Ownership Questionnaire, n.d.).

**Psychological Ownership Empirical Research**

In the context of the present study psychological ownership is being examined based on the definition stated by Van Dyne and Pierce (2004): “Psychological ownership is the psychologically experienced phenomenon in which an employee develops possessive feelings for the target” (p. 439). In this case the target may be the college/university, the follower’s position or specific aspects of their position within the college/university, facilities, programs, supervisees, a class, a department, or some part of their job in which they feel ownership and responsibility and has become part of their identity. Numerous studies have been conducted on this theory, which I will address here to provide a more detailed understanding. Much of the research conducted on psychological ownership explores relationships between psychological ownership and another variable. However, all of the research that I have identified place psychological ownership as a dependent variable with other independent variables such as job satisfaction, work environment, organizational citizenship, or effectiveness measures. While the current study will not analyze psychological ownership in the same way it is still important to address the current empirical research on the topic.

Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) conducted a study exploring the relationship between psychological ownership, and outcomes such as employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. The study used three different samples of more than 800 individuals,
across professions and organizations throughout the country (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). In all three samples a significant correlation was found between psychological ownership and organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organization-based self-esteem (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). In analyzing their data Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) found that “results demonstrate that psychological ownership for the organization increased explained variance in the organizational citizenship behavior (for both supervisor and peer assessments of citizenship) over and above demographic characteristics, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction” (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004, p. 454). Furthermore, results showed that “psychological ownership added significantly to the prediction of organization-based self-esteem, over and above the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction” (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004, p. 454). Regression analysis results did show “a positive relationship between psychological ownership for the organization and organizational citizenship” (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004, p. 452). While their correlational results were significant, Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) found after conducting regression analysis that after controlling for demographics some of their hypothesis testing failed to reach significance. When controls were put in place for demographics regression results failed to reach significance in showing a relationship between psychological ownership and employee performance (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

In a study conducted by Avey et al. (2009) they found that Psychological ownership was positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior, affective commitment towards the organization, job satisfaction, and intentions to stay in the organization. A negative correlation was found between psychological ownership and workplace deviance. Avey et al. (2009) also found a positive correlation between transformational leadership and psychological ownership. Their data “suggests that transformational leaders may be able to create conditions to enhance
psychological ownership” (Avey et al., 2009, p. 186). Additional data analysis provided evidence of positive correlations between transformational leadership and promotive psychological ownership, PO-accountability, PO-self-identity, PO-self-efficacy, PO-belonging, job satisfaction, individual citizenship behavior and organizational citizenship behavior (Avey et al., 2009). Based on these relationships, Avey et al. (2009) believe that there are practical implications with regard to management and organizational performance, for the study of psychological ownership and its relationship with transformational leadership (Avey et al., 2009).

**Summary**

The present review of the literature provides a baseline of knowledge which will allow for better understanding of the present study. Explanations and definitions of key concepts such as: leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, passive avoidant leadership, psychological ownership, and organizational culture were provided. Literature was presented which established the relationship between leadership behaviors and outcomes such as job satisfaction (Chung et al., 2010; Podsakoff et al., 1996; Tull 2006), as well as increased organizational citizenship behaviors, and willingness to put in extra at their jobs (Power, 2013). Likewise, literature was presented which established the relationship between psychological ownership and outcome variable such as, job satisfaction, intent to stay in the organization, and organizational citizenship behavior Avey et al., 2009; O’Driscoll & Pierce, 2006; Pierce et al., 2001; Pierce et al. 2003; Mayhew et al., 2007; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). The need for the present study was also addressed in this literature review. A lack of research was found which addressed the relationship between psychological ownership and leadership behaviors. The results of the present study could allow leaders to utilize specific leadership behaviors to increase
levels of psychological ownership among their followers. Thus influencing the aforementioned outcomes. The instruments used in this study, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass, and Avolio, 2004) and the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (Avey & Avolio, 2007), were also presented briefly and will be further explained in the next chapter. The methodology pertaining to data collection and analysis is also outlined in chapter three.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

The current study examined the relationship between entry-level student affairs professionals’ perceptions of their direct supervisor’s leadership style and their levels of psychological ownership over their current job. Furthermore, this study attempted to determine if entry-level professionals’ perceptions of leadership and their levels of psychological ownership differed based on institutional types. This research may allow leaders to vary which leadership styles is used in order to promote higher levels of psychological ownership among their entry level employees in various types of institutions.

Research Questions

1. Is there a relationship between entry-level professionals’ perceptions of their direct supervisor’s leadership behaviors and their feeling of psychological ownership of their current job within the organization? Does the relationship differ based on the different subscales of MLQ?

2. What combination of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire variables (transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant) predicts high levels of psychological ownership?

3. Do entry-level professionals’ perceptions of their direct supervisor’s leadership styles differ by different institutional types?

4. Do entry-level professionals’ feelings of psychological ownership differ by institutional types?

Population and Sample

The population of interest for this study was entry level professionals with 0-5 years of professional full time experience working in student services functions within higher education. The sample consisted of 171 graduates of the Bowling Green State University, College Student
Personnel (CSP) master’s program, and 124 graduates of the University of South Florida, College Student Affairs (CSA) master’s program total sample of 295. The response rate was much lower than anticipated from the BGSU participants at 29.82%; for this reason, participants were recruited from USF to achieve an adequate number or responses to in order to analyze the data. A total of 102 participants completed the survey with 51 respondents from each graduate program.

Bowling Green State University has one of the largest CSP Masters programs in the country. The program began in 1964 and has developed a strong national reputation based on the number and quality of the graduates from the CSP program. The program is a two-year master’s program taught by a nationally respected faculty who have been leaders in higher education and student development research based on the research and scholarship produced. The program is designed to prepare educators to serve in student services functions on university campuses. Students study theory-based curriculum and are asked to put their theoretical knowledge into action in a two-year professional internship. On a yearly basis approximately 35-40 students graduate from the CSP program and move on to full time student services positions at universities around the country (Bowling Green State University, n.d.). Less information was available about the USF College Student Affairs program. However, through the assistance of the dean of the USF College of Education and one of the faculty members from the College Student Affairs program access was granted to distribute surveys to graduates of this program.

**Instrumentation and Variables**

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 5X short form measures leadership styles across twelve subscales which correlate with, transformational, transactional, and passive
avoidant leadership styles, and outcomes of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The full instrument contains 45 questions and takes an average of 15 minutes to complete (Avey & Avolio, n.d. b). Nine of these subscales correspond with the three leadership styles measured by the MLQ. Three of the subscales (nine questions) measure leadership outcomes. As the present study was interested in the relationship between leadership behaviors and psychological ownership, the outcomes subscales are beyond the scope of this study and were excluded from much of the data analysis. The MLQ has two forms, a self-report form (not used in this research), and an observer-report form. The current research only uses the observer-report form, which focuses on the entry-level professional’s perceptions of the leader of the department or division.

Nine leadership style subscales will be used in the MLQ (see Table 1). Transformational leadership is measured using four questions across five subscales. The five subscales depicting transformational leadership include idealized influence attitude (IA), idealized influence behavior (IB), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individual consideration (IC) (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Transactional leadership is measured on two subscales consisting of eight questions. The subscales are contingent reward (CR), and management-by-exception (Active) MBE (A) (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Passive/avoidant leadership is measured on two subscales consisting of eight questions. The subscales are management-by-exception (passive) MBE (P), and laissez-faire (LF) (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Institution type, will be draw from demographic information requested of participants. The institution type was selected to determine if size and complexity of the organization and is culture (based on institution type) influence perceptions of leadership, and psychological ownership among entry-level professionals.
Table 1

*Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ Subscales</th>
<th>Associated Questions</th>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Attributed</td>
<td>10, 18, 21, 25</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Behavior</td>
<td>6, 14, 23, 34</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>9, 13, 26, 36</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>2, 8, 30, 32</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>15, 19, 29, 31</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>1, 11, 16, 35</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception Active</td>
<td>4, 22, 24, 27</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception Passive</td>
<td>3, 12, 17, 20</td>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership</td>
<td>5, 7, 28, 33</td>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>39, 42, 44</td>
<td>Outcomes of Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>37, 40, 43, 45</td>
<td>Outcomes of Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>38, 41</td>
<td>Outcomes of Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent variables for the study were be drawn from the respondents scores on the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ) and include preventative psychological ownership or territoriality, and promotive psychological ownership which has four subscales; self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belongingness, and self-identity. The POQ measures two
forms of psychological ownership: preventative and promotive. Preventative psychological ownership is based on the theory that ownership can lead to territoriality and defensive behavior. Examples of this form of psychological ownership include not wanting to share the object of ownership; this can include resources, ideas, or information. It may also lead to a stronger desire for control over the future of the object (Avey et al, 2009). Data on preventive psychological ownership are collected using items one through four on the POQ (Avey & Avolio, n.d. a).

Promotive psychological ownership was measured across four subscales: self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belongingness, and self-identity. The self-efficacy subscale is measured using items five though seven on the POQ, and measures the owner’s confidence level in their ability to accomplish tasks. Accountability is measured using items eight through 10 on the POQ, and is defined by Avey and Avolio (n.d. a) as “the tendency for an individual to feel a sense of responsibility to hold individuals and organizations accountable for the object of ownership” (para. 5). The third subscale measures sense of belonging and measured using items eleven through thirteen on the POQ. Belongingness or sense of place measures “the extent to which an individual feels ‘at home’ in their place of work” (Avey & Avolio, n.d. a, para. 6). The final subscale is for self-identity. This dimension of promotive psychological ownership assesses the extent to which an individual personally identifies with the target of ownership. Individuals with high levels of this type of psychological ownership may feel as if the target of ownership is an extension of themselves (Avey & Avolio, n.d. a). In total the instrument contains 16 items and takes around 10 minutes to complete (Avey & Avolio, n.d. a).

Data Collection

Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) approval was secured for the study from both BGSU and USF (See Appendix F & G), data collection with this population occurred with the
assistance of the Bowling Green State University CSP program, and the University of South Florida CSA program. Working with the respective department staffs, the instruments were distributed to the chosen populations via email. A recruitment letter was provided to participants which outlined informed consent, provided information regarding the nature of the study as well as access to an electronic survey. See Appendix B and C. The survey consisted of three sets of questions. The first questions were demographic questions. See Appendix A. The second set of questions consisted of the 45-question MLQ observer form which measure perceptions of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership behaviors and outcomes of leadership. The third set of questions were the 16 questions of the POQ which measure preventative, and promotive (sense of accountability, sense of belongingness, self-efficacy, and self-identity) forms of psychological ownership. The data were collected and stored in a password protected survey software pack (Qualtrics) to which only I had access. No personal identification information was collected from participants.

Data Analysis and Cleaning

The data cleaning process was used to ensure that data that was inaccurate or invalid was identified and removed from the data set or transformed before statistical analysis was conducted. As part of the data cleaning the Mahalanobis distance statistic was calculated, and stem-and-leaf diagrams and boxplots were used to identify outliers which are data responses that fall outside the normal distribution. One outlier was identified in this process (Case 15). Analyses were run both with and without case 15 and no statistically significant difference was observed thus, case 15 was included in all analysis. No data transformation was required. Descriptive statistics for the data are reported in the results section (see Chapter IV).
Because most of the research conducted utilizing the MLQ and POQ has been done outside of higher education, and because of the unique culture that exists in student affairs, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was run to examine the construct validity of both instruments. This was done to ensure that the subscales or factors which were developed by Avolio and Bass (2004) (MLQ) and Avey and Avolio (2009) (POQ), as they developed the instruments, remain valid and reliable with the population of this study. Because the CFA results did not validate the same constructs as the original models, a subsequent Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was also run to determine the model fit for both instruments with this group of participants. This process allows researchers to test a predetermined number of factors in which the survey questions should fall into, and test goodness of fit of the model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Ideally the 36 survey questions related to the MLQ leadership behaviors should factor into a nine-factor model outlined in Table 1, excluding the leadership outcomes variables. Similarly, the POQ survey questions should factor into the five factors identified by Avey and Avolio (2009), including preventative, accountability, self-efficacy, self-identity, and sense of belongingness.

Prior to beginning data analysis for research questions three through six, all raw data collected were transformed to provide scale scores for each subscale of both the MLQ and POQ. This was done by adding the raw scores under each subscale then dividing that number by the number of questions that corresponded to that subscale. This established scale scores for the IA, IB, IM, IS, IC, MBE (A), CR, MBE (P), and LF subscales of the MLQ. Scale scores were also calculated for three primary scales of the MLQ (Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant leadership). This process was repeated to provide scale scores
for the preventative psychological ownership or territoriality, self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belongingness, and self-identity subscales of the POQ.

The first research question was analyzed using a series of bivariate correlations. The Spearman rho correlation coefficient was used to determine if a relationship exists between the MLQ (IV) transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership scales and the five subscales of the POQ (DV). Both variables were expressed on a Likert-type scale thus Spearman rho is the appropriate measure of correlation in this research application (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

In research question two, the variance attributable to each leadership style and the cumulative variance explained by the three MLQ leadership scales were determined using stepwise multiple regression analyses. The MLQ transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership scales were the independent variables. The five POQ subscales—preventative psychological ownership or territoriality, self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belongingness, and self-identity—were used one at a time as the dependent variables. Stepwise regression process was utilized to identify the proportion of variance in the five POQ subscales accounted for by each of the three leadership styles of the MLQ (See Table 2). Based on the leadership literature in higher education, one would expect to find that factors in the five subscales related to transformational leadership styles will have a stronger positive correlation with higher reported levels of psychological ownership.

By collecting valid and reliable data, the multiple regression analysis provided good enough statistically significant data to make generalizations and predication. I was able to speak to the relationship between entry level professionals’ perceptions of the leaders MLQ factors and their levels of psychological ownership. Likewise, I was able to predict which types of
leadership styles promote or hinder the development of psychological ownership within a given organizational context.

For research questions three and four, a bivariate correlation was proposed for the analysis for this research questions. However, because institutions type is a categorical variable, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was chosen as an alternative means of analyzing the data to determine if differences in perceptions of leadership were significantly related to the type of institutions participants were employed at. In question three, institution type was the independent variable and the MLQ transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership scales were the dependent variables. For question four, institution type was the independent variable and the five subscales of the POQ were the dependent variables (See Table 2).

Limitations

The primary limitation of this study was the small sample size including participants from only two institutions. While the sample size was large enough to legitimately conduct the analysis, further research is needed with a larger sample. The low number of respondents lessens the generalizability of these findings and limits the validity of the factor analysis results. In addition to the number of responses the sample was also not representative of the gender, ethnic diversity, or diversity of institution in the field.
Table 2

Overview of Research Questions and Method of Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Method of Analysis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a relationship between entry-level professionals’ perceptions of their direct supervisor’s leadership behaviors and their feeling of psychological ownership of their current job within the organization? Does the relationship differ based on the different subscales of MLQ?</td>
<td>Correlation (Spearman rho)</td>
<td>MLQ scales: Transformational, Transactional, Passive/Avoidant, and outcomes of leadership</td>
<td>POQ scales: (1) preventative psychological ownership or territoriality, (2) self-efficacy, (3) accountability, (4) sense of belongingness, and (5) self-identity</td>
<td>$r_s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a different relationship between leadership subscales (transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant) and level of psychological ownership?</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
<td>MLQ scales: Transformational, Transactional, Passive/Avoidant, and outcomes of leadership</td>
<td>POQ scales: (1) preventative psychological ownership or territoriality, (2) self-efficacy, (3) accountability, (4) sense of belongingness, and (5) self-identity</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

*Overview of Research Questions and Method of Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Method of Analysis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do entry-level professionals’ perceptions of their direct supervisor’s leadership style differ by institutional type?</td>
<td>One-way Analysis of Variance</td>
<td>Institution type</td>
<td>MLQ scales: Transformational, Transactional, Passive/Avoidant, and outcomes of leadership</td>
<td>$p$ value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do entry-level professionals’ feelings of psychological ownership differ by institutional types?</td>
<td>One-way Analysis of Variance</td>
<td>Institution type</td>
<td>POQ scales: (1) preventative psychological ownership or territoriality, (2) self-efficacy, (3) accountability, (4) sense of belongingness, and (5) self-identity</td>
<td>$p$ value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note MLQ = Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; POQ = Psychological Ownership Questionnaire
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

Presented in this chapter are the findings for this research study. Data were collected using two valid and reliable instruments: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ). A summary of descriptive statistics related to the participants of this study is followed by the data screening process that was utilized and a detailed analysis of the six research questions.

Participants

Surveys were distributed to 295 graduates of the Bowling Green State University (n = 171) and the University of South Florida (n = 124) master’s programs. The response rate was 34.6% and there were 102 participants in this study. Participants were evenly distributed between both programs with 51 participants from each program. The majority of the participants identified as women (n = 71, 69.6%). As reported in Table 3, the majority of participants reported to be Caucasian (n = 91, 89.2%), between the ages of 25-29 (n = 77, 75.5%), and work at public colleges and universities (n = 70, 68.6%). The majority of participants reported to be employed at Doctoral Universities (n = 52, 50.9%). Note that several demographic categories relating to gender and race/ethnicity were combined as to limit the ability of participants to be identified.
### Table 3

**Participant Demographic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Graduate Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Not Listed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Students of color</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 or older</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which best describes the institutions you work for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral University</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s College</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Focus Institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which best describes your institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private not for profit</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private for profit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Data Screening**

Analysis was done to determine outliers. Using Mahalanobis distance, one participant (case 15) was identified as a multivariate outlier and a Mahalanobis distance for each person was compared to a critical Chi-square value. The degrees of freedom were equal to the number of variables included in the Mahalanobis distance calculation. The critical value was 20.52 for the psychological ownership Mahalanobis distance, and 32.91 for the MLQ Mahalanobis distance. SPSS was used to calculate the p-value. Case 15 was the only respondent who had a p-value lower than .001 for psychological ownership. All analyses were run including case 15 and excluding case 15. There was no significant difference when case 15 was included; thus, all reported data below includes all cases.

Normality of the data was analyzed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. This test showed that data were not normally distributed. Because tests of normality are sensitive to both small and large sample sizes skewness and kurtosis statistics were used to evaluate normality. Nearly all of the MLQ and POQ scales’ skewness and kurtosis statistics were between ± 1.0, falling within an expectable range for normality. The POQ Self-Efficacy scale was the one scale which fell outside of this range (skewness = -1.333, and kurtosis = 2.011), but were within tolerable ranges to assume normality and proceed with data analysis without data transformation (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

**Factor Analysis Results**

Before conducting correlation and regression analyses, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) for both the 36 Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the 16 Psychology Ownership Questionnaire (POQ) items was conducted. Maximum likelihood estimation was
employed to estimate all models, and both Varimax and Promax rotation methods were used when analyzing the data. Both rotation methods produced similar results and the same model fit.

**MLQ Exploratory Factor Analysis**

The original MLQ model includes nine factors and each factor includes four items. See Table 4. I tested three different factor models. First, I tested a nine-factor model, based on the original model. I also tested a three-factor model, based on the three leadership constructs that the nine factors correlate with: transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership. Additionally, I also tested a six-factor model because of evidence observed in scree plots and eigenvalues. The SPSS analysis showed six-factors with eigenvalues above 1.0 which indicates that a six factor model may be present. The rotated pattern matrix was used to interpret which factors loaded together within the various models. The six-factor and nine-factor models were difficult to interpret and are presented Appendix D.

Table 4

**MLQ Original Model Factors and Leadership Scale Constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Name</th>
<th>Factor abbreviation</th>
<th>MLQ Leadership Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Attributed</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence Behavior</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Active</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez Faire</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception Passive</td>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three-factor EFA provided a clearer interpretation of the factor structure. See Figure 2. A modified three-factor model was clear in the data. The original transformational leadership factor consisted of the idealized influence attributed, idealized influence behavior, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation variables developed by Avolio and Bass (2004). However, the modified transformational leadership factor, produced by the EFA, also contains the contingent reward variables in this study. In the original construct, these variables were attributed to transactional leadership meaning that they were considered as a negative quid pro quo transaction between leader and follower. The passive avoidant factor contains all of the laissez faire and management-by-exception passive variables. These variables load negatively in relation to the modified transformational leadership variables. The third factor is a modified transactional leadership scale and contains the management-by-exception active variables, and load negatively in relation to the modified transformational variables.

In the original model, there were high levels of correlation between transformational variables and the transactional leadership contingent reward variables (Avolio, & Bass, 2004). This correlation may be attributed to three causes. First, transformational and transactional leadership are both active and positive styles of leadership. Second, leaders regularly exhibit both transformational and transactional behaviors. Third, leaders who consistently uphold contingent reward transactions with followers “build trust, dependability, and perceptions of consistency with leaders” (Avolio, & Bass, 2004, p. 75). Avolio and Bass’ research observed high positive correlations between contingent reward variables and transformational leadership variables. While these variables did correlate highly together in their analysis, the original model factor analysis still identified nine distinct factors. This was not the case in the present analysis. Based on the three-factor EFA, the remainder of the research questions were analyzed using the
modified three-factor model. Contingent reward variables were removed from the transactional leadership construct and added to the transformational construct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Passive Avoidant</th>
<th>Transformational Modified</th>
<th>Transactional Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA 1</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 2</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 3</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 4</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 1</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 2</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 3</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 4</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 1</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 2</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 3</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 4</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 1</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 2</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 3</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 4</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 1</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 2</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 3</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 4</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 1</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 3</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 4</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 1</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 2</td>
<td>-0.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 3</td>
<td>-0.667</td>
<td>-0.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 4</td>
<td>-0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP1</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP2</td>
<td>-0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP3</td>
<td>-0.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP 4</td>
<td>-0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

*Figure 2.* Leadership EFA Three-Factor Model.
Scale reliability analysis was conducted on the modified scales. The transformational modified scale consists of 24 items and has a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.964. The transactional modified scale consists of four items and has a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.765. When contingent reward items were included in the transactional scale, as in the original model, the Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.438. Finally, the passive avoidant scale consists of eight items and has a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.892.

**POQ Exploratory Factor Analysis**

An EFA was conducted to determine if any underlying structures existed between the 16 questions in the POQ which were used to develop the original five-factor model. In the original model, preventative psychological ownership had four questions associated with the factor, promotive psychological ownership is a construct comprised of four subscales—self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belongingness, and self-identity—with each subscale containing three variables. See Table 5. When tested by Avey, Avolio, Crossley and Luthans (2009) the model produced a good fit with CFI = .096, SRMR = 0.006, and RMSEA = 0.07 when confirmatory factor analysis was conducted.

Table 5

*POQ Original Model Factors and Psychological Ownership Constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Name/ Abbreviation</th>
<th>Number of Variables</th>
<th>POQ Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventative/PRE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preventative Psychological Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy/SE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotive Psychological Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/ACC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotive Psychological Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belongingness/BEL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotive Psychological Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identity/SI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotive Psychological Ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three models were analyzed. First, based on eigenvalues and the scree plot, a three-factor model was analyzed. The SPSS analysis showed three factors with eigenvalues above 1.0, which indicated that a three-factor model may be present. Second, a five-factor model was also analyzed based on the original model findings of Avey et al. (2009). Additionally, a four-factor model was analyzed based on the original model results from the previous two EFAs. The rotated pattern matrix was used to interpret which factors loaded together within the various models. The three-factor models rotated pattern matrix shows three factors but the self-efficacy variables do not load as strongly on factor one as self-identity and sense of belongingness do, suggesting there may be more factors. Based on the original model, a five-factor model was also analyzed. In this model, four distinct factors appeared in the rotated pattern matrix. The fifth factor had only one variable load to it and should be eliminated from the model. See Appendix E for these results.

Based on the finding of the three-factor and five-factor EFA analysis, a four-factor model was also analyzed. The rotated pattern matrix again shows four clearly defined factors. Preventative psychological ownership, self-efficacy, and accountability variables each loaded to their own distinct factors. The sense of belongingness and self-identity variables loaded together as a single variable. Based on the literature, this is not entirely surprising. Avey and Avolio (2007) again said these two sets of variables are “distinct yet related” (p. 7). Avey and Avolio (2007) defined sense of belongingness as when “an individual feels at home in their place of work” (p. 7). They continued by stating that self-identity relates to an “individual personally identify with the object (such as an organization) of ownership” (Avey & Avolio, 2007, p. 7). As demonstrated in Figure 3. It is not surprising that individuals who feel like they belong in the
organization where they work would also have feelings identifying with their organization as part of who they are as individuals. See Figure 3.

However, because these two factors loaded together in my data, the original five-factor model which presented preventative (PRE), accountability (ACC), self-efficacy (SE), and a combined variable of self-identity (SI) and sense of belongingness (BEL) as five factors could not be used. The remainder of the research questions were analyzed using the new modified four-factor model: preventative (PRE), accountability (ACC), self-efficacy (SE), and a combined variable of self-identity and sense of belongingness (SIandBEL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SI/BEL</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 2</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 3</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 1</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 3</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 1</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 2</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 3</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

*Figure 3. Psychological Ownership Four-Factor Model.*

Scale reliability analysis was conducted on the modified psychological ownership scales. The preventative ownership scale consists of four items has a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.810. The
Accountability scale consists of three items, and has a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.755, self-efficacy consists of 3 items and has a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.899. The modified scale in the model is the combined factor of self-identity and sense of belongingness, this factor consists of six items, and has a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.946.

**Research Question 1**

*Is there a relationship between entry-level professional’s perceptions of their institution’s upper-level administrative leadership style and their feelings of psychological ownership of their current job within the organization?*

Spearman Rho correlation was used to determine if a relationship exists between observed leadership styles as measured by the modified MLQ scales, and feelings of psychological ownership, as measured by the modified POQ scales among entry-level professionals. Full analysis is presented in Table 6. Please note that the leadership outcomes variable in Table 6 will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Evans (1996) outlined criteria for evaluating the strength of correlations: Very Weak 0 - .19, Weak .20 - .39, Moderate .40 - .59, Strong .60 - .79, Very Strong .80 -1.00. There was a strong positive correlation between transformational leadership (modified scale) and the self-identity and sense of belongingness (modified scale) (\( r_s = .682, p < .01 \)). A strong positive correlation exists between the MLQ leadership outcomes scale and the self-identity and sense of belongingness modified scale (\( r_s = .677, p < .01 \)). Moderate correlations were also present in the analysis. A moderate correlation exists between the MLQ passive avoidant leadership scale and the POQ preventative scale (\( r_s = .424, p < .01 \)). Self-efficacy on the POQ had two moderate correlations with sets of MLQ variables, the transformational (modified scale,) (\( r_s = .494, p < .01 \)), and MLQ leadership outcomes (\( r_s = .497, p < .01 \)). A moderate negative correlation was
also found between the MLQ passive avoidant scale and the POQ modified self-identity and belongingness scale (\( r_s = -0.490, p < .01 \)). Weak negative correlations were found between the MLQ modified transactional scale and the POQ self-efficacy scale (\( r_s = -0.307, p < .01 \)), and the modified self-identity and belongingness scale (\( r_s = -0.389, p < .01 \)). There was also a weak correlation observed between the preventative POQ scale and the modified transactional leadership MLQ scale (\( r_s = 0.260, p < .01 \)). These findings suggest that a relationship exists between leadership behaviors exhibited by a leader and feelings of psychological ownership among followers.
Table 6

*Spe*arman Rho Correlations for MLQ and POQ Modified Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational MLQ Modified</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transactional MLQ Modified</td>
<td>-.402**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Passive Avoidant Modified</td>
<td>-.649**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leadership Outcomes MLQ</td>
<td>.904**</td>
<td>-.452**</td>
<td>-.755**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preventative POQ</td>
<td>-.241*</td>
<td>.260**</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>-.292**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-efficacy POQ</td>
<td>.494**</td>
<td>-.307**</td>
<td>-.283**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>-.304**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accountability POQ</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-identity &amp; Belongingness Modified</td>
<td>.682**</td>
<td>-.389**</td>
<td>-.490**</td>
<td>.677**</td>
<td>-.409**</td>
<td>.614**</td>
<td>.223*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). N=102
Research Question 2

What combination of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire variables (transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant) predicts high levels of psychological ownership?

For this question four separate multiple regressions were conducted. A summary of the regression model is presented in Table 7 and partial correlations and standardized and unstandardized coefficients are presented in Table 8. In Table 7, the $R^2$ explains the amount of variance explained by the model. In Table 8, the standardized coefficients help to explain the magnitude of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable in a model, and allows for comparison of the strength of one independent viable to the strength of another independent variable in the model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Each regression included a different dependent variable: preventative, accountability, self-efficacy, and self-identity and sense of belongingness. Regression analysis was done using the stepwise method. This method was selected because it adds and deletes variables one at a time based on statistical criteria and only includes variables which significantly contribute to the regression (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Independent variables used in this analysis include the MLQ scales: idealized influence attributed (IA), idealized influence behavior (IB), individualized consideration (IC), inspirational motivations (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), contingent reward (CR), laissez faire (LF), management-by-exception active (MBEA), management-by-exception passive (MBEP), extra effort (EE), effectiveness (EFF), and Satisfaction (SAT).

Preventative

Regression analysis results indicated a model of two predictor variables (Laissez faire and management-by-exception active) that accounts for 27.1% of the variance in the preventative psychological ownership. Entry-level student affairs practitioners’ exposure to laissez faire and
management-by-exception active leadership behaviors are positively correlated with their perception of preventive psychological ownership. Meaning that the more followers are exposed to Laissez faire and management-by-exception active leadership behaviors, their feelings of feelings of preventative psychological ownership (negative feelings of ownership) will increase. Followers may demonstrated increased feelings of possessiveness and look out for their own self-interest rather than that of the organization.

**Self-efficacy**

Regression analysis results indicated a model of two predictor variables (inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation) that accounts for 36.4% of the variance in the self-efficacy psychological ownership factor. This model showed that when entry-level professionals encounter behaviors from their supervisor which both stimulate them to intellectually solve problems and think about things differently, and motivates and challenges their thoughts about the future of the organization, it will increase their confidence that they can accomplish their goals.

**Accountability**

Regression analysis results indicated a model of two predictor variables (intellectual stimulation and management-by-exception active) that accounts for 14.3% of the variance in the accountability psychological ownership factor. This model predicted that entry-level professionals will feel increased levels responsibility for the organization and hold others accountable who fail to meet expectations within the organization, the more they are exposed to leadership behaviors which challenge them intellectually to solve problems. When followers are challenged intellectually to think creatively and be innovative within the organization and are
held accountable by their leaders, they exhibit increased feelings of holding themselves and others within the organization accountable for the success and failure of the organization.

**Self-Identity & Sense of Belongingness Modified**

This regression used the modified variable based on earlier EFA analysis. Regression analysis results indicated a model of two predictor variables (inspirational motivation and individual consideration) that accounts for 52.3% of the variance in the modified self-identity and sense of belongingness psychological ownership factor. This model showed that entry-level professionals felt more at home in the work place, and had higher levels of personal identification with the organizations if they encounter leadership behaviors that inspire them to think positively about the future of the organization, and are treated as individuals and mentored by their direct supervisor.

Table 7

*Regression Analysis Summary of MLQ Predictor Variable for Higher Levels of Psychological Ownership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R²Adj</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Predictor 1</th>
<th>Predictor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POQ Preventative</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>18.427</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POQ Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POQ Accountability</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POQ Self-Identity &amp; Sense of Belongingness Modified</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>54.260</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Summary of Regression Coefficients of MLQ Predictor Variable for Higher Levels of Psychological Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Preventative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>4.707</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>3.979</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Self-Identity &amp; Sense of Belongingness Modified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>4.970</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 3**

*Is there a relationship between institution type and how leaders were perceived on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire?*

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if differences in perceptions of leadership were significantly related to the type of institutions individual were employed at. Table 9 presents descriptive statistics for the four MLQ scales by institutional type. Because of the low number of respondents from associate’s colleges and Special Focus Institutions they were not included in this analysis. Table 10 presents the ANOVA results. Results of the analysis showed that there was no significant difference in perceptions of MLQ leadership factors among individuals employed at different types of institutions. The transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership scales all have p values above .05. This indicates
that there are no significant differences between their perception of their leader and the type of institution they work at. Effect size analysis also showed that the percentage of variance accounted for by each variable was low. MLQ transformational (modified scale) $\eta^2 = .013$, MLQ transactional (modified scale) $\eta^2 = .052$, MLQ passive avoidant scale $\eta^2 = .016$.

Table 9

*Mean Scores on Four MLQ Factors as a Function of Institutions Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ factor</th>
<th>Doctoral Univ.</th>
<th>Master’s Coll./Univ.</th>
<th>Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Trans. Mod.</td>
<td>52 3.320 .871</td>
<td>18 3.076 .935</td>
<td>25 3.186 .767</td>
<td>95 3.240 .854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ Tns. Mod.</td>
<td>52 2.497 .909</td>
<td>18 2.014 .740</td>
<td>25 2.603 .969</td>
<td>95 2.433 .911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ PA</td>
<td>52 2.196 .919</td>
<td>18 2.498 1.069</td>
<td>25 2.355 .905</td>
<td>95 2.295 .942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

*One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary for Effects of Institutions Type on MLQ Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ Transformational Modified</th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>67.690</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.580</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MLQ Transactional Modified     | Between Groups | 4.099 | 2   | 2.049 | 2.548 | .84  |
|                               | Within Groups  | 73.993 | 92  | .804  |       |      |
|                               | Total          | 78.92  | 94  |       |       |      |

| MLQ Passive Avoidant          | Between Groups | 1.344 | 2   | .672  | .753 | .474 |
|                               | Within Groups  | 82.146 | 92  | .893  |      |      |
|                               | Total          | 83.490 | 94  |       |      |      |

**Research Question 4**

*Is there a relationship between institution type and levels of psychological ownership among entry-level employees?*

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if differences in feeling of Psychological Ownership were significantly related to the type of institutions individual were employed at. Descriptive statistics for this ANOVA are presented in Table 11. Because of the low number of respondents from associate’s colleges and Special Focus Institutions they were not included in this analysis. The ANOVA results are presented in Table 12. Results showed that there was no significant difference in perceptions of POQ factor among individuals employed at different types of institutions. With all four factors of psychological ownership, the p-values were above .05 which indicates that there are no significant differences between their feelings of psychological ownership among entry-level professionals and the type of institution they work at. Effect size analysis also showed that the percentage of variance accounted for by
each variable was low. POQ preventative $\eta^2 = .006$, POQ self-efficacy $\eta^2 = .015$, POQ accountability $\eta^2 = .010$, POQ modified self-identity & belongingness $\eta^2 = .010$.

Table 11

*Mean Scores on Four POQ Factors as a Function Institutions Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Preventative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Univ.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Coll./Univ.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.319</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Univ.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.077</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Coll./Univ.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.019</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.813</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.997</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Univ.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.032</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Coll./Univ.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.982</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.972</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Self-identity &amp; Belongingness Modified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Univ.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.064</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Coll./Univ.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.843</td>
<td>1.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>1.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.944</td>
<td>1.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary for Effects of Institutions Type on POQ Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Preventative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>80.693</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.176</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>78.704</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.888</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59.523</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.147</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POQ Self-Identity &amp; Belongingness Modified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>172.535</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174.256</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Significant results were found in the relationship between participant’s perceptions of leadership as measured in the MLQ and their feeling of psychological ownership as measured in the POQ. Additionally, there were several combinations of MLQ predictor variable which resulted in higher levels of psychological ownership, including: Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Management-by-Exception Active, Individual consideration, and Laissez faire. There was no significant relationship between institution type and perceptions of leadership or feelings of psychological ownership.
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between a follower’s perceptions of the leadership style of their leader and their personal feelings of psychological ownership over their job and the institution at which they work. As presented in Chapter II, this relationship is one that is not been studied extensively (Avey et al., 2009). Likewise, the study of leadership within the higher education context has focused primarily on transformational leadership models (Birnbaum, 2004; Cosner, 2009; Kezar, 2001, 2004; Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Kezar, Betram Gallant, & Lester, 2011; Komives & Woodard, 2003; Komives & Wagner 2009; Malm 2008; Woodard, Love & Komives, 2000). This study is unique in that it does not espouse that one leadership behavior is superior within the context of higher education; rather, it attempts to determine if there are leadership behaviors that significantly influence levels of psychological ownership. Data were collected using two valid and reliable instruments—the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and the Psychological Ownership Questionnaire (POQ) (Avey et al., 2009)—both of which needed to be modified from the original forms based on this group of participants.

Discussion

Several statistically significant results were identified. This section contains a detailed discussion of each of the four research questions. However, before covering the research questions, it is important to briefly discuss the participants in this study. The participants were a largely homogeneous group, consisting primarily of Caucasian/White women. There is limited racial and ethnic diversity within the participants of this study. There is also little gender diversity within the group. Institution type was also relatively homogeneous, with nearly 69% of
the participants employed at doctoral universities or master’s colleges. What could prove to be the most important demographic is age, with 97% of participants identifying between 25-34 years of age. This means that nearly all of the participant of the study would be classified as millennial. The respondents for this study are not representative of general population of higher education professionals. In their report of Gender, Race and Ethnicity of College Administrators, Faculty, and Staff, Fall 2013 the Chronicle of Higher Education reported that among executive, administrative, and managerial professionals 55% were women, 76.9% Caucasian/White, 3.4 % Asian, 9.7% Black, and 6% Hispanic (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 2016). These data were compiled as an analysis of data collected by the U. S. Department of Education. The U.S. Department of Education’s 2011 data showed similar trends in the gender and ethnicity makeup of college administrative professionals (U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

**Factor Analysis**

The instruments used to collect data in this study required modification from their original design. Based on exploratory factor analysis (EFA) results, it was clear that variables loaded into different scales than when the scales were originally developed. Within the MLQ, the transformational leadership scale had to be modified to include contingent reward, which originally factored in to the transactional leadership scale. This also meant that the transactional leadership scale was modified to not include contingent reward variables.

The validity and reliability of the MLQ has been questioned periodically in terms of the discriminant validity of its subscales (Antonakis et al., 2003). Similar to the current research, other studies have failed to produce the same nine-factor model produced by Bass and Avolio (2004). In their 2003 study, Antonakis et al. conducted a comprehensive analysis of the nine-
factor model. They compared this model with eight additional models which were proposed as alternatives by researchers who claimed that their analysis did not support the nine-factor model. One of the arguments against the nine-factor model is that there is a high degree of multicollinearity among transformational leadership variables. It is suggested by some scholars that this is an indication that these scales are not unique (Antonakis et al., 2003). However, Antonakis et al.’s (2003) research suggested that these factors are distinct but related, loading together under the construct of transformational leadership. Antonakis et al. (2003) also found that factor structures analyzed across nonhomogeneous samples—e.g., “mixing organizational type and environmental conditions, leader/rater gender samples, hierarchical levels” (p. 283)—may have contributed to inconsistency in the validation of the nine-factor model. Based on the homogeneous nature of the participants of this study, Antonakis, et al.’s findings related to nonhomogeneous samples would suggest that there may be justification for modifying the original MLQ scale.

In the present study, the nine-factor model did not prove to be a good fit with this group of participants. As suggested by Antonakis et al. (2003), the transformational leadership scales loaded together in this research. This does not invalidate the nine-factor model, but does show that there are related items that load onto the transformational leadership construct. The modified transformational scale identified by the present study’s EFA also included the contingent reward variable, which loads under transactional leadership in the original model. Initially, this was a surprising finding, but Bass and Avolio (2004) suggest that this could be because contingent reward was not being seen as intended in the original design. When reward is viewed as “pure exchange or quid pro quo” (p. 75), the result is a relationship with transactional leadership behaviors. However, when “higher level transactions such as
recognition” (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 75) take place, contingent reward more closely associates with transformational leadership behaviors. Based on this insight, the modified three-factor model is representative of the spirit of the three constructs, transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership behaviors, outlined by Bass and Avolio (2004). Some research also suggests that the correlations between transformational and transactional leadership constructs are attributable to the aforementioned relationship between contingent reward factors and both transactional and transformational constructs (Goodwin, Wofford, & Whittington, 2001). Hirt et al. (2005) found that, among student affairs professionals at liberal arts institutions, “(a) engaging in meaningful work, (b) working in a positive environment, (c) having good relationships with co-workers, and (d) having the ability to influence decisions” (p. 11), were the most highly rated rewards. Student affairs professionals have been found to be most satisfied with intrinsic rewards of their careers (Volkwein, Malik, & Napierski-Prancl, 1998), these finding support those found by Hirt et al. (2005), and Kuk, Banning, and Amey (2012). Because of the student affairs orientation towards recognition, and intrinsic rewards of their jobs it makes senses that among these participants they seem to be viewing contingent reward as more transformational, and not as a transactional quid pro quo reward.

It is beyond the scope of this study, because age was not a variable in the analysis, but there may be evidence that generational differences could account for the divergent view of contingent reward variables. Millennials are more self-confident than previous generations and believe in themselves (Coomes & DeBard, 2004). This self-confidence “has been nurtured through awards and rewards from what authority figures in their lives judged to be good behavior” (Coomes & DeBard, 2004, p. 36). The participants in the present study nearly exclusively are millennials, who likely have become accustomed to receiving recognition,
awards, and rewards not for achievement but for participation (Coomes & DeBard, 2004). This could have implications in regard to their perceptions of contingent reward variables. Millennials also wish to engage in meaningful careers. Wilson, Liddell, Hirschy and Pasquesi (2016) suggested that “focusing on the values orientation of student affairs work may resonate with Millennial employees, foster values clarification, and strengthen their connection to the profession” (p. 570), thus retaining them in the profession.

The POQ consists of two theoretical constructs—preventative psychological ownership and promotive psychological ownership, which includes four subscales (accountability, self-efficacy, self-identity, and sense of belongingness)—for a total of five factors in the model. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted and, based on the data collected from this sample, the POQ also had to be modified from its original form. Two variables, self-identity and sense of belongingness, loaded together as one factor and needed to be combined into one scale, reducing the model from five factors to four factors. Further research into the relationship between self-identity and sense of belongingness made it clear why these factors may have loaded together. Self-identity is described as feelings of personally identifying with the organization, where the organization is seen as a part of who the participant is (Avey et al., 2009). Sense of belongingness is when people feel like their work place is a second home for them (Avey et al., 2009). These two constructs are identified by Avey et al. (2009) as distinct yet related: “[A] newly hired employee at an organization such as United Way may strongly self-identify with the mission of the organization. However, it is unlikely the employee would feel at home and belongingness as a new hire in the organization” (Avey et al., 2009, p. 178). Anecdotally and in the literature it is evident that these constructs could easily correlate. The combination of confidence and conventional behavior attributed to the millennial generation are
evident in a return to traditional college experiences such as pep rallies, school songs, and the branding of the large college experience (Howe & Strauss, 2003). Millennials look to identify themselves with large collegiate brands in an effort to “brand themselves for life as a smart and capable person” (Howe & Strauss, 2003, p. 108). This behavior adapts well to the collegial work environment found in many student affairs areas (Birnbaum, 1988). Student affairs allows students who are passionate about their college experience to continue that college experience in a master’s program, then continue that experience as an administrator on a college campus. These young professional often continue to wear the school colors, support athletic teams, and engage in other campus traditions with undergraduate students as part of their jobs. These behaviors could lead to a blurring of the lines between self-identity and sense of belongingness.

The deviation from the original models is also attributable to the sample size. Determining an appropriate sample size for factor analysis is a complex task. There are a number of ratios in scholarly articles ranging from three participants per variable to ten participants per variable (Mundfrom, Shaw, & Tain Lu, 2005). One research study found that rather than a ratio of participants to variables that a better determination of appropriate sample size can be determined based on a ratio variable-to-factors (Mundfrom et al., 2005). In that same study, Mundfrom et al. (2005) found that the sample size also fluctuated depending on the level of communality in the variables. Based on their findings a minimum recommended sample size of 500-1400 would be needed depending on communality.

**Relationship Between Leadership and Psychological Ownership**

A relationship already exists between leadership styles and job outcomes such as job satisfaction, increased effectiveness, increased organizational citizenship behaviors, and willingness to put forth extra effort in their job (Chung et al., 2010; Podsakoff et al., 1996;
Power, 2013). Similar relationships have also been established between psychological ownership and outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and trust (Avey et al., 2009; Mayhew et al., 2007; O’Driscoll & Pierce, 2006; Pierce et al., 2001; Pierce et al., 2003; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

However, little research exists exploring the relationship between leadership behaviors and psychological ownership. There was no research exploring the relationships between these two constructs in the field of higher education. However, there was research exploring leadership and its influence on increased productivity or job satisfaction (Avey et al., 2009; Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, & Gardner 2007; O’Driscoll, & Pierce, 2006; Pierce et al., 2001; Pierce et al. 2003; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). One could infer from some of these studies a connection between leadership and components of psychological ownership. Al-Husseini et al. (2013) found relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and increased feelings of trust, faith, as well as feelings of being valued. These feelings led to behaviors in the followers which could correlate with self-efficacy, accountability, sense of belongingness on the POQ. These include feeling free to try new things, and innovate within the organization, as well as develop a culture or environment of trust and respect which staff buy into. Taylor and Machado-Taylor (2010) found that, for leaders to be successful, they need to inspire feelings personal ownership among followers if a strategic plan can be successful. Again this finding suggests a relationship between leadership behaviors being used to enhance feelings that resemble psychological ownership among followers.

There were two strong correlations between participants’ feelings of psychological ownership (self-identity and sense of belongingness) and their perceptions of leadership behaviors (transformational leadership and leadership outcomes) observed in their leaders.
Moderate correlations were also found between psychological ownership (self-efficacy scale) and both the transformational leadership scale and the outcomes of leadership. This study found more significant larger correlations between transformational leadership behaviors and feelings of psychological ownership in this sample than were found in a similar study conducted by Avey et al. (2009). The current study showed significant relationships between the modified transformational leadership factor and preventative, self-efficacy, accountability, and the modified self-identity and sense of belongingness factors. The correlation between transformational leadership and self-efficacy was moderate, and the correlation between transformational leadership and self-identity and sense of belongingness was a strong correlation. Avey et al. (2009) identified two significant correlations between transformational leadership and self-efficacy scale and the sense of belongingness scale which in their model were not a combined variable. However, both of these were weak correlations. These findings begin to allow us to add to the literature confirming relationships between leadership behaviors and leadership outcomes, and psychological ownership and leadership outcomes. Likewise, the results begin to establish a relationship between leadership and psychological ownership. From a pragmatic perspective the results of this study start to bring in to focus a framework by which leaders could tailor their leadership style to enhance feelings of psychological ownership among their employees.

These results are significant because they support the idea that leaders can influence followers’ feelings of psychological ownership by utilizing transformational leadership behaviors. Likewise, these results support the limited literature in this line of inquiry done by Avey et al. (2009). The results also support that transactional and passive avoidant leadership behaviors have a negative effect on psychological ownership and leadership outcomes. This is
particularly evident in the areas of self-efficacy and modified factor of self-identity and sense of belongingness. Followers’ feelings of confidence in their ability to do their work, feeling as if their work is part of who are, and feeling at home within the organization can be amplified or diminished by their perceptions of a leader’s behavior.

**Predictive Model for Leadership**

Beyond merely establishing a relationship between leadership behaviors and feelings of psychological ownership, this study also sought to identify which leadership predictor variables contributed to increased levels of psychological ownership among participants. Two MLQ variables (laissez faire and management-by-exception active (MBEA)) were identified as significant predictors of preventative psychological ownership. The preventative POQ variable is considered a negative aspect of psychological ownership as it relates to feelings of territoriality over job responsibilities, resources, or some object of ownership within the organization (Avey & Avolio, 2007). The two leadership behaviors that predict this negative form of psychological ownership—laissez faire and MBEA—are associated with passive avoidant leadership. Laissez faire leadership entails the act of avoiding leadership responsibility and making decision, whereas MBEA leadership tends to focus on actively seeking to find mistakes made by followers and take action to ensure that errors are corrected (Venger, 2009). By understanding the types of leadership behaviors that contribute to negative forms of psychological ownership, leaders will be able to foster an organizational culture which is collaborative, where followers work for the betterment of the organization rather than their own benefit. An example of this from student affairs could be a new student success and retention program. Followers are often asked to design and implement a program that increases student retention and helps students graduate more quickly and in higher numbers. If the leader provides little support or direction and gives
the followers freedom to succeed or fail, but then looks to find mistakes and takes retroactive corrective measures, followers may stop taking chances on new programs out of fear of mistakes and penalties. These preventative feelings of psychological ownership often are associated with feelings of territoriality and a fear of losing something such as resources, control, or even their jobs (Avey et al., 2009). In an organizational culture where followers fear making mistakes, innovation and change will be difficult. Followers will look out for themselves at the expense of the organization and self-preservation, and collaboration and information sharing between colleagues may not occur (Avey et al. 2009).

Inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation were identified as significant predictors of the self-efficacy POQ scale. By showing confidence in followers, encouraging followers to be innovative and inspiring optimism about their ability to achieve organizational goals, feelings of self-efficacy grow. The state of Florida, Targeted Educational Attainment (TEAm) Grants discussed earlier are a good example of this. The grant was designed to increase the number of accounting graduates in the state of Florida to meet the expected increased workforce demand (TEAm, n.d.). A challenge with this grant is that around half of all student majoring in accounting fail out after the first semester due to the rigor of the major. Historically, this has been viewed as a weeding out process eliminating those not capable of completing an accounting degree. With the funds from the grant the director of the school of accountancy is challenging (intellectual stimulation) those preconceived notions about weeding out students. The leader asked faculty and student affairs staff to develop innovative programs that could result in increased student success and program retention. This resulted in the implementation of tutoring programs, video tutorials done by faculty member, and the implementation of intrusive advising for students who are struggling in these courses. Likewise, the leader if the leader
utilizes inspirational motivation leadership behaviors and demonstrates confidence that goals will be achieved, and is able to get followers to buy in to a positive vision of what the accountancy program could look like in the future, followers should have increased feelings of self-efficacy.

Variables related to the accountability POQ scale and included MLQ intellectual stimulation and management-by-exception active variables. While these variables only predicted 14.3% of variability in the accountability scale, a better understanding of the meaning of the accountability scale aids in the interpretation in this finding. Accountability is the expectation that followers will both be held accountable and have the right to hold others within the organization accountable (Avey, et al. 2009). While MBEA leadership behaviors, in many cases, are viewed negatively (Bass & Avolio, 2004), they may in some cases, when combined with intellectual stimulation, encourage followers to hold others in the organization accountable to help move the organization in a positive direction (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Resident assistant programming may be a good example of this. As a hall director, I tried to get resident assistants to think outside the box when developing student programs to get their students involved on campus. The staff knew that there were high expectations of them and that if programs were not successful they would be held accountable and required to do additional programs. This led to staff members holding each other accountable and pushing one another to be more innovative in their programming efforts. The students didn’t want to be the ones who were providing substandard programs for their residents. Another good example of this is the excess hour surcharge implemented in the state of Florida which was designed to get student to graduate with a lower number of credit hours by eliminating financial subsidy for students after they research 132 credit hours (Florida Statutes, 2016). This policy has led to MBEA behaviors being exhibited by leaders, where followers (colleges, departments, and academic advisors) are being
held accountable to meeting the state mandated metrics and intervening when expectations are not met. Leaders are challenging followers to think of creative new ways to (1) help students avoid reaching the excess hour surcharge threshold, and (2) assist students who are nearing that threshold to graduate in a timely manner. This focus has led to followers expecting to be held accountable to meet the state metrics and holding each other accountable when students need help to graduate.

The predictor variables of inspirational motivation and individual consideration account for the largest amount of explained variance in any of the psychological factors. Together, these variables explain 52.3% of the variance for the modified self-identity and sense of belongingness scale. This combination of variables seems to go hand-in-hand. Individual consideration occurs when the leaders take on mentoring or teaching roles which are supportive of a follower’s individual needs and aspirations, whereas inspirational motivation inspires feelings of optimism about the future (Avey et al., 2009). If leaders are able to provide supportive, teaching relationships, it would seem to make sense that those followers would identify more closely with and feel like they have a place within the organization. This is particularly important for new professionals who are trying to become socialized to a new culture. Tull et al. (2009) suggested that new professionals who are engaged in effective mentoring relationships “should gain knowledge and a firm understanding of the organizational culture, receive social support, experience greater job satisfaction, and retention, develop professionally, attain their professional goals and advance their careers” (p. 147).

**Institution Type**

Analysis in this study showed no significant relationship between institution type and perceptions of leadership behaviors or levels of psychological ownership among participants.
These findings were among the most puzzling in the study. Based on the literature (Birnbaum, 1988), it was expected that participants working at smaller baccalaureate colleges, which are typically associated with more collegial cultures and transformational leadership practices, would prefer more transformational leadership behaviors and exhibit higher feelings of psychological ownership. The participants working master’s colleges and universities, based on the research, often are part of a political campus culture defined by an us-versus-them relationship with leaders (Birnbaum, 1988), suggesting possible increased feelings of preventative psychological ownership. The largest group of participants in this study work at doctoral universities, which Birnbaum (1988) described as anarchical cultures where followers lack consistent participation in decision making, and relate more to their professions than to the organization. It was expected that participants from these organizations would have lower perception of transformational leadership behaviors and would be more tolerant of alternative leadership behaviors. However, this was not the case. A partial explanation for this may be found in the explanation of the anarchical culture. Birnbaum (1988) described this culture as one where followers relate with and are guided by the standards of their profession. The student affairs profession is one that advocates for an inclusive, open, and collegial culture. From a leadership perspective, the overwhelming expectation for leadership in higher education is based on the transformational leadership paradigm (Birnbaum, 2004; Cosner, 2009; Kezar, 2001, 2004; Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Kezar, Betram Gallant, & Lester, 2011; Komives & Woodard, 2003; Komives & Wagner 2009; Malm 2008; Woodard, Love & Komives, 2000). The acculturation of student affairs professionals that takes place in master’s programs with similar curricular designs, and within national organizations such as ACPA and NASPA, may foster a student affairs culture that may be very influential. This could
be attributable to the homogeneous nature of the graduate programs in U.S. higher education. Hirt et al. (2005) said that “many student affairs graduate programs, however, fall short in terms of equipping new professionals with the kinds of skills and knowledge they need to succeed” (p. 6). This could be attributable to the fact that most graduate programs are located in research oriented master’s or doctoral universities. Students may not have the experience or exposure to diversity of organizational cultures and thus may be falling back on what their professional culture tells them is acceptable.

Another explanation may also be found in the work of Birnbaum (1988) when he suggested that all of his various campus cultures may be represented on a single campus. While the overall campus culture, for example, may be anarchical in nature there can be pockets of collegiality within it. In such a setting, a campus activities office led by student affairs professionals could be very collegial even on a large campus like the University of South Florida, whereas one might expect the overall campus culture to be more anarchical.

**Implications for Practice**

U.S. higher education is and will likely continue to be about education and the creation and acquisition of knowledge; however, it is becoming increasingly driven by outputs, Taylor and Machado-Taylor (2010) said that higher education institutions “are undergoing radical self-invention and being challenged by issues related to cost containment, quality improvement, outcomes assessment, and social relevance of academic offerings” (p. 167). Likewise, public officials, employers, parents, students, media, and society are demanding quality improvement and a better utilization of public resources (Taylor & Machado-Taylor, 2010). The success or failure of a leader is judged on various metrics and the achievement of organizational goals. The focus of this study was the relationship between leadership and psychological ownership, not the
outcomes associated with these variables. However, outcomes variables that lead to higher levels of organizational success could be enhanced if leaders learn to take advantage of the relationship between leadership behaviors and levels of psychological ownership.

This study begins to provide a framework for leader development that will foster increased feelings of psychological ownership among followers, and ultimately increased measurable outcomes. Leaders should use leadership behaviors which support the intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation predictor variable. Utilizing these behaviors, leaders will develop a culture that encourages innovation and allows followers to find meaning in their work without fear of making mistakes. These behaviors will inspire confidence in followers, and a sense of accountability for their work. Employees will want to do a good job because their job and the organizations success is part of their self-identity.

Outcomes measures were largely ignored in the analysis of this study. The leadership outcomes variables of the MLQ were not included in analyzing the research questions but some mention of them here is important for practice and future research. A very strong positive correlation was found between transformational leadership and outcomes of leadership, a moderate negative correlation was observed between transactional leadership and outcomes of leadership, and a strong negative correlation between passive avoidant leadership and outcomes of leadership (See Table 6). Likewise, significant correlations were found between both self-efficacy (moderate) and self-identity & sense of belongingness modified scale (strong) and leadership outcomes. These findings support the finding of previous research (Avey et al. 2009; Chung, Jung, Kyle, & Petrick, 2010; Pierce et al., 2001; Pierce et al. 2003; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Power, 2013; 2009, Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, & Gardner 2007; O’Driscoll, & Pierce, 2006; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004) noting that significant relationships...
exist between psychological ownership and outcomes variables and that significant relationships exist between leadership behaviors and outcomes variables. Leaders in student affairs can use this knowledge to better understand how their behaviors influence feelings of psychological ownership among their employees. If leaders properly utilize this knowledge, they could expect to see significant increases in outcome metrics such as job satisfaction, increased effectiveness, increased organizational citizenship behaviors, and willingness to put in extra effort in their jobs. Increases in these outcomes could result in higher levels of achievement of organizational goals.

It is important to note that based on the predictive model if a leader is perceived as having less desirable leadership behaviors, such as laissez faire or management-by-exception active, that feelings of negative psychological ownership among followers will increase.

The key to these findings, as leaders in student affairs, is using transformational leadership behaviors to build strong mentoring relationships based on mutual respect and trust. Trusting leader follower relationships may result in increased feeling of psychological ownership for the follower. Trust, which Driscoll (1978) defined as “the belief that the decision makers will produce outcomes favorable to the persons interest without any influence by the person” (p. 44), is essentially the idea that the leader will have the followers best interest in mind when making decisions. The modern conception of leadership is one that is built on a foundation of trust between leaders and followers. Trust is developed through a relationship oriented approach to leadership (Bennis, 2007; DeBard, 2001; Kezar 2001; Kezar 2004). When followers are involved in participatory, relationship oriented, trusting leader follower dyads they can experience a greater feeling of psychological safety within the organization, higher levels of trust, and emotional attachment to the organization (Cosner, 2009). This is particularly important with young professionals. Leadership behaviors which build relationships and narrow
the gap between leaders and followers because help build trust. Pope (2004) found that “distance in hierarchical relationships adversely affects trust of academic leadership” (p. 78). Trusting, relationship oriented leadership is a primary component of transformational leadership and has been promoted by scholars from multiple disciplines (Kezar, 2001; Komives & Wagner, 2009; Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Residence life professionals are often a good example of this in action. These young professionals often willingly and without being asked work 12-15 hour days for weeks at a time leading up to the opening of their buildings in the fall. These professionals have a high sense of ownership over their student staff and their building. Likewise, they often feel organizational responsibility to go above and beyond to provide the best residential living experience possible for their residents. Often young professionals in this area of student affairs show a willingness to put the achievement of organizational goals above their interests. While the data from the present study support the use of transformational leadership behaviors to increase both outcomes and feelings of psychological ownership among followers it is important for leaders to remember that other leadership behaviors are needed. Birnbaum (1988) suggested that senior level leaders (presidents) often need to be transactional more often than transformational, and that transformational leadership may only be desirable in specific situations. Theories of situational leadership also suggest that transformational leadership may not be feasible in all situations (Hersey et al., 2008). Positive, trusting leader-follower relationships may allow leaders to more easily implement transactional behaviors when needed (Jung & Avolio, 2000).

Generational expectations of leadership behaviors need to be examined based on this research. The analysis seems to show that millennial professionals’ perceptions of leader behaviors in this study may differ from perceptions of previous generations in the literature (Bass
& Avolio, 2004). This is particularly evident in the EFA findings in which contingent reward leadership behaviors loaded as a transformational rather than the transactional leadership construct. Specifically, millennials may have a higher expectation being recognized and validated for their efforts than previous generations (Howe & Strauss, 2003). This could be attributed to their achievement orientation and the confidence exhibited by followers in this age group who have received awards and recognition for everything (Coomes & DeBard, 2004).

Perhaps the greatest implications for this research are in the area of training and development for future leaders in student affairs. As introduced in Chapter II, a large portion of leadership research in higher education focuses on either senior level academic leaders (i.e., presidents and provosts) or their mentoring role as senior university officials (Amey & Reesor, 1998; Basham, 2012; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Malm, 2008; Tull et al., 2009) or on student leadership development (Komives et al., 2008; Komives & Wagner, 2009). In reviewing the academic programs of the two master’s programs involved in the present study, the content of the programs were similar. There were courses in student development theory, multiculturalism, campus environments, college outcomes, and a foundations course (Bowling Green State University, n.d. b; University of South Florida, n.d.). Student affairs professionals are too often expected to learn to be leaders through experience and incorporating what they learn about student leadership development into their own leadership behaviors, and learn on the job as graduate assistants in their graduate course work (Amey & Reesor, 1998). It is important to not underestimate the importance of graduate assistantships in the learning and development process of young professionals. Students participating in programs which do not require an experiential learning component may be missing a valuable part of their professional development. The internship experience was considered a vital part of professional preparation programs. The
Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education stated that “All programs of study must include (a) foundational studies, (b) professional studies, and (c) supervised practice. Demonstration of necessary knowledge and skill in each area is required of all program graduates” (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2012, p. 9). Likewise, Council for the Advancement of Standards (2012) requires that programs require that programs have and organization and administration component to their curriculum. However, depending on the quality and scope of the internship the practical hands-on experience and training may differ from significantly. Preparation programs seem to be preparing professionals who excel in their ability to help students learn and grow during their college experience. However, they may not be preparing new professionals to take on administrative leadership positions. This may be attributable to the of programs reliance on internship providers to train the next generation of professionals.

Programs like the one at BGSU tend to focus more on college student development. However, it is important to note that there are programs that are counseling based which again focus primarily on counseling college students (Azusa Pacific University, 2016), and higher education administration programs (Vanderbilt, n.d.) which focus more attention on training young professionals to take on administrative roles within U.S. higher education. However, while student affairs is becoming more professionalized with master’s and doctoral programs there are still many professionals working in student affairs functions on college campuses who have little to no background in student affairs. For example in a college of business there may be more value placed on administrative staff having a master’s of business administration over an education or counseling degree. This may result in administrators work with students or making administrative decisions with little knowledge of student development, shared governance, or
understanding of the mission of higher education in the U.S. Their professional training, experience, and acculturation differ significantly from those in student affairs. As a leader it will be important to remember that the background and training of your staff may influence their perceptions of leadership behaviors. The predictive models in this study may not lead to the same results with followers who do not come from a student affairs background.

This lack of attention to leadership development of administrators is not limited to master’s programs; organizations like ACPA also primarily focus on improving professionals’ knowledge in areas of social justice, and other important areas that assist professionals to provide quality services to students, with little substantive practical leadership development. In recent years organizations have attempted to address this issue by offering training sessions for mid-level managers and offering leadership tracks at conferences. Many new professionals will at some point become leaders within the organizations, this research could help new professionals better prepare to take on these positions, and the complexities of more senior level leadership. By learning to manage their leadership behaviors to influence their follower’s feelings of psychological ownership to achieve organizational goals earlier in their careers, new professionals may become more successful across the span of their career.

**Implications for Future Research**

Beyond institution type, which was addressed in the current study, there may be other factors that contribute to in differences in perceptions of leadership behavior and feelings of psychological ownership. As stated in in Chapter I, student affairs functional areas have developed of the last century out of a division of labor between academics and administrative support functions which support the academic mission of the university (Carpenter, 2004). Student affairs functions primarily encompass co-curricular programs and administrative
functions which emphasizes student learning and personal development (Rentz, 2004). Many non-teaching and research related functions on a college campus have become the domain of the student affairs professional. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in higher education (CAS) developed standards for and identified 45 different functional areas in higher education and student affairs, including academic advising, campus activities, programs, college unions, housing and residential life programs, orientation, student leadership programs, and others. With such diversity in the types of jobs within student affairs and educational background of the staff further exploration is needed to see if these factors would influence the findings of the current study. There may be significant differences in perceptions of leadership and feelings of psychological ownership an academic advisor with a fine arts master’s degree versus a residence hall director with a master’s from a college student affairs program.

In the development of this study, I did not intend to study the differences in generational expectations of leadership behaviors but that is where the data led me. First, a replication study needs to be done with a larger and more diverse sample. Factor analysis should be done on those data to see if there is a difference in factor loading from the original models as there was in this study. Similar results could prove significant particularly with more millennials entering the workforce every year. There may be a need to reexamine the theoretical constructs in the MLQ. Much of the research used to validate the MLQ was done in the late 1990s or early 2000s. Millennials began entering the workforce in 2004-2005 and will continue through the mid-2020s. It may also be worthwhile to replicate the study with older and/or more experienced student affairs professionals to see if there is a difference in between generations within student affairs. If similar results are found across generations within student affairs, that could suggest that the
differences in perceptions of leadership behaviors may not be based on generational differences but may be attributable to individuals working in student affairs.

Additional research could be conducted with this sample. It could prove beneficial to conduct qualitative research with these participants to help make meaning of some of the ways in which they deviated from the original MLQ and POQ models. In that same line of inquiry, a longitudinal study with these participants would also aid in understanding how perceptions of leadership may change over time. As new professionals become mid-level managers and are put in positions where they experience more of the politics and bureaucracy, and pressure to produce measureable outcomes associated with these positions, will their perceptions of leadership change?

Another area for future researches to explore would be the relationship between perceptions of leadership and feelings of psychological ownership in relation to various aspects of social identity. Particular attention should be given to leader-follower dyads in which social identity is dissimilar. A study by Carter, Mossholder, Field and Armenakis (2014) found that racial dissimilarity can affect the level to which transformational leadership behaviors influence organizational citizenship behaviors. The same effect was not observed in supervisory relationships with gender differences (Carter, et al., 2014). In a field that emphasizes the importance of social identity, research should be done to see if perceptions of leadership behaviors and feeling of psychological ownership differ in leaders, follower relationships with dissimilar social identities.

A final area for future research are the results of the exploratory factor analysis done in this study. While both of these instruments have been found to be valid and reliable (Bass & Avolio, 2004; Avey et al., 2008) the finding of this research did not result in the same factor
loadings as the original models. Research could be done to determine if these findings would be similar in a larger more representative sample. If these modified factors are consistent in future student affairs research this may mean that student affairs professional’s views on leadership differ from other professionals. There could also be future exploration on the influence that age has on perceptions of leadership. The current study seems to suggest that the characteristics of the millennial generation may influence their perceptions of leadership.

Specifically, further exploration of the relationship between contingent reward variables of the MLQ and the transformational leadership construct. The data from the present study suggest that the nature of reward in student affairs may be different than in other fields, as contingent reward is not being viewed as pure exchange as intended in the original design (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Rather, among this group of participants, it appears that contingent reward was viewed as “higher level transactions such as recognition” (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 75) resulting in a correlation with transformational leadership behaviors. Research should be done to determine if these results are generalizable to the student affairs profession. Likewise, the modified self-identity and sense of belongingness scale should also undergo further research. In terms of the logical connections that can be made when examining the definitions of these scales, it makes sense that they would relate. Being that both of the measures are subscales for the promotive psychological construct and that Avey et al. (2008) have stated that these constructs are “distinct yet related” (p. 7), this modification is more in line with the research than the previously discussed modification. Still further exploration is warranted.

There is also a need for further research to identify what the target is of their feelings of psychological ownership. What is it that they are truly feeling a sense of ownership for? This is an increasingly interesting question with the professionalization of the field of student affairs.
Research suggests that among professional faculty that they may more closely identify with their profession rather than the university (Rice, 1986). Many faculty members identify with their profession, specifically within an academic discipline not just as a faculty member. Rice (1986) said, “professional identity among academicians is disciplinary: ‘I am a psychologist,’ or ‘I am a physicist.’ There is a kind of bonding to a disciplinary perspective, a way of thing (theory) and doing (method)” (p. 199). Are student affairs professionals feeling ownership for the university, a department, a functional area, their specific role, or for their profession of student affairs? Research exploring what follower feel ownership towards, may help to identify where student affairs professional most identify.

**Limitations**

The homogeneous nature of the participants in this study were major limitation. The participants were primarily female, with limited, age, and racial and ethnic diversity. The demographic representation of this group of participants was not representative of the national population. Likewise, the participants were recruited from two student affairs master’s programs; this fact eliminated participation of entry-level student affairs professionals who come from alternative master’s programs. Many entry-level positions require a master’s degree but may not require a student affairs degree. There is a population of entry-level professionals who may perceive leadership very differently who were not surveyed. While the exploratory factor analysis was conclusive, more respondents were needed to provide more power to substantiate the modification to the MLQ and POQ. A final limitation was the instrument itself. Including demographic questions, the MLQ and POQ the survey was 67 questions and took just over 20 minutes to complete. The length of the survey could have discouraged participation.
Conclusion

This study assessed the relationship between observed leadership behaviors and feelings of psychological ownership among entry level student affairs professionals. Two valid and reliable instruments were used in conducting this research; however, the responses of the participants in this study did not align with the models as proposed by the developers of the instruments. The modified models were in line with the overarching theoretical constructs of the original models. The results of this analysis provided support for Avey et al. (2009) who suggested that a relationship exists between psychological ownership and transformational leadership. In business, organizations have often used stock options and compensation plans to enhance feelings of ownership in the organization. Based on this research it appears that leaders can greatly influence follower feelings of psychological ownership by tailoring their leadership behaviors to be more transformational. Surprisingly, neither perceptions of leadership nor feelings of psychological ownership were influenced by the type of institution participants were employed by. These findings reinforce the critical role that leaders play in helping followers to feel ownership over their organization and their role within the organization.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY QUESTIONS

Demographic Survey Questions

1. With which gender do you identify?
   a. Man
   b. Woman
   c. Transgender
   d. Genderqueer
   e. Not listed. Please specify: _____________________

2. With which race(s) and/or ethnicity(ies) do you identify? (May select more than one.)
   a. African American / Black
   b. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   c. Asian
   d. Hispanic/Latinx
   e. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   f. Caucasian / White
   f. Not listed. Please specify: ____________________________

3. What is your age?
   a. < 25 years of age
   b. 25 - 29 years of age
   c. 30 - 34 years of age
   d. 35 - 39 years of age
   e. 40 - 44 years of age
   f. 45 - 49 years of age
   g. 50 - 54 years of age
   h. 55 - 59 years of age
   i. 60 - 64 years of age
   j. 65 years of age or older

4. What year did you graduate from the Master’s program?
   a. 2011
   b. 2012
   c. 2013
   d. 2014
   e. 2015

5. Which best describes the institution for which you work? (Based on Carnegie Classification)
   a. Doctoral University (Institutions award at least 20 research doctoral degrees, typically large research universities)
   b. Master’s College or University (Institutions award more than 50 master’s degrees and less than 20 doctoral degrees, typically regional universities or colleges)
c. Baccalaureate (Baccalaureate or higher degrees represent at least 50% of all degrees awarded but with fewer than 50 master’s degrees and less than 20 doctoral degrees, typically liberal arts colleges)

d. Associate’s College/Community College (Institutions at which the highest degree awarded is an associate’s degree typically junior/community colleges)

e. Special Focus Institutions (degrees are highly specialized in a single field such as ITT Tech, art and design schools, medical schools or law schools)

f. Tribal College

6. Which best describes your institution?
   
a. Public
   
b. Private not for profit
   
c. Private for profit
Greetings! I hope that your semester is finishing up well. My name is Reggie Shouse and I am an administrator at the University of South Florida, and a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration program at Bowling Green State University. This summer, I will begin collecting data for my dissertation. The data will be published in my doctoral dissertation at Bowling Green State University. My research will focus on new student affairs professionals’ perceptions of their supervisor’s leadership style, and the relationship between that style and the student affairs professionals’ feelings of psychological ownership over their job.

You have been identified as a new student affairs professional based on your graduation from the College Student Affairs program at USF within the past five years. You are being asked to provide information about your perceptions of your supervisors’ leadership style, and your levels of psychological ownership over your current job. Additional demographic questions are also included that concern you, your work, and your institution.

This research could have potential benefits for future leaders within US higher education institutions. The results could allow leaders to utilize leadership styles which foster an environment where new professionals feel more connected with the institution they work for and exhibit higher levels of psychological ownership over their job. As new professionals this research could also benefit you by allowing you to seek positions where these leadership styles are pervasive.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638 or contact by email at RSCH-IRB@usf.edu. If you have questions regarding the research, please contact the Principal Investigator at Reggie Shouse at (813) 974-6512.

The survey will be administered online and will be available for you to complete from Tuesday July 5th until Tuesday July 19th. The survey should take you approximately 20 minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation in this study.

http://usf.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_eFqkAzQvNSw0qW1

Reggie Shouse
Student Success Advisor
USF Muma College of Business
Lynn Pippenger School of Accountancy
Greetings! I hope that your semester is finishing up well. My name is Reggie Shouse and I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration program at Bowling Green State University (BGSU). This spring, I will begin collecting data for my dissertation. The data will be published in my doctoral dissertation at Bowling Green State University. My research will focus on new student affairs professionals’ perceptions of their supervisor’s leadership style, and the relationship between that style and the student affairs professionals’ feelings of psychological ownership over their job.

You have been identified as a new student affairs professional based on your graduation from the BGSU College Student Personnel program within the past five years. You are being asked to provide information about your perceptions of your supervisors’ leadership style, and your levels of psychological ownership over your current job. Additional demographic questions are also included that concern you, your work, and your institution.

The survey will be administered online and will be available for you to complete from March 31st through April 15th. The survey should take you approximately 20 minutes to complete.

- The survey software will safeguard the confidentiality of the information you provide.
- These responses will be kept in a secure, password-protected database that only I will have access to.
- Results will be presented only in a summary manner - connecting them with your contact information is not possible.
- Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can refrain from answering any questions without penalty or explanation.
- Your decision to participate will not impact any relationship you may have with BGSU.
- You are free to withdraw consent and discontinue participation in the study at any time by closing your browser and not submitting they survey.
- Some employers use software that tracks websites visited and keystrokes made. Therefore, we strongly recommend that that you complete the survey on a public or home computer. For additional protection, after completion of the survey, it is encouraged that you clear your Internet browser and page history.

Completion and submission of the survey indicates your consent to participate in this study. After completing the survey, please clear your browser cache and page history. There are no anticipated risks associated with completing this survey beyond that experienced in daily life.

This research could have potential benefits for future leaders within US higher education institutions. The results could allow leaders to utilize leadership styles which foster an environment where new professionals feel more connected with the institution they work for and exhibit higher levels of psychological ownership over their job. As new professionals this
research could also benefit you by allowing you to see positions where these leadership styles are pervasive.

Should you have any questions about your participation in this study, please contact Reggie L. Shouse, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at rshouse@bgsu.edu, 419-494-2295, his dissertation chairperson, Dr. Patrick Pauken, at paukenp@bgsu.edu, 419-372-7816. If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

LINK TO SURVEY

Reggie Shouse  
Doctoral Student  
Bowling Green State University
## APPENDIX D

### MLQ SIX-FACTOR & NINE-FACTOR MODELS

#### Leadership EFA Six-Factor Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA 1</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 2</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 3</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 4</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 1</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 2</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 3</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 4</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 1</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 2</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 3</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 4</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 2</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 3</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 4</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 1</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 2</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 3</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 1</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 3</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 4</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA 1</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA 2</td>
<td>-0.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA 3</td>
<td>-0.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA 4</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 1</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td>-0.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 2</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>-0.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 3</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>-0.497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 4</td>
<td>-0.562</td>
<td>-0.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP1</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP2</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>-0.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP3</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP 4</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>-0.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood. Varimax Rotation.

#### Leadership EFA Nine-Factor Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA 1</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 3</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 4</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 1</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 1</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 4</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 2</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 3</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 1</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 3</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 4</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 1</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 3</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 4</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 1</td>
<td>-0.327</td>
<td>-0.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 2</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 3</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>-0.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF 4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>-0.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP4</td>
<td>-0.376</td>
<td>-0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood. Varimax Rotation
APPENDIX E

POQ THREE-FACTOR & FIVE-FACTOR MODELS

Psychological Ownership Three-Factor Model EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 3</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Psychological Ownership Five-Factor Model EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 2</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 3</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 1</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 3</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 1</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 2</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 3</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
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Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board has determined this project is exempt from IRB review according to federal regulations AND that the proposed research has met the principles outlined in the Belmont Report. You may now begin the research activities.

Note that an amendment may not be made to exempt research because of the possibility that proposed changes may change the research in such a way that it is no longer meets the criteria for exemption. A new application must be submitted and reviewed prior to modifying the research activity, unless the researcher believes that the change must be made to prevent harm to participants. In these cases, the Office of Research Compliance must be notified as soon as practicable.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records.

If you have any questions, please contact Kristin Hagermyer at 419-372-7716 or khagemy@bgusu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board's records.
May 18, 2016

Reggie Shouse, PhD
School of Accountancy
Tampa, FL 33612

RE: Exempt Certification

IRB#: Pro00026353

Title: Examining the Influence of Perceptions of a Senior Administrators Leadership Style On Levels of Psychological Ownership Among Entry Level Professionals

Dear Dr. Shouse:

On 5/17/2016, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) determined that your research meets criteria for exemption from the federal regulations as outlined by 45CFR46.101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

As the principal investigator for this study, it is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted as outlined in your application and consistent with the ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report and with USF HRPP policies and procedures.

Please note, as per USF HRPP Policy, once the Exempt determination is made, the application is closed in ARC. Any proposed or anticipated changes to the study design that was previously declared exempt from IRB review must be submitted to the IRB as a new study prior to initiation of the change. However, administrative changes, including changes in research personnel, do not warrant an amendment or new application.

Given the determination of exemption, this application is being closed in ARC. This does not limit your ability to conduct your research project.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Schinka, Ph.D., Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board