A COMPARISON OF OHIO UNIVERSITY’S COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL
CLASSES USING KOUZES AND POSNER’S LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY

A dissertation presented to

the faculty of

the College of Education of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Leroy A. Scribner

March 2005
This dissertation entitled
A COMPARISON OF OHIO UNIVERSITY’S COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL
CLASSES USING KOZIES AND POSNER’S LEADERSHIP PRACTICES
INVENTORY

by

LEROY A. SCRIBNER

has been approved for
the Department of Counseling and Higher Education
and the College of Education by

MARC CUTRIGHT
Assistant Professor of Higher Education

JAMES HEAP
Dean of the College of Education
A Comparison of Ohio University’s College Student Personnel Classes Using Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (147 pp.)

Director of Dissertation: Marc Cutright

Abstract

This study was conducted to determine the extent of difference in leadership practices of the Master’s CSP program matriculating cohort consisting of 15 participants and the graduating cohort consisting of 13 participants. Data was collected using Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) instrument. This instrument measures the level of transformational leadership practices of the respondent on five constructs. Profile analysis was used to examine level, parallelism and flatness of survey results using an alpha of .10 for exploratory research.

The results indicate there is no difference in the LPI scores of the matriculating and graduating cohort with the exception of the LPI practice of Challenging; $F(1, 26) = 3.36, p = .079$. The results demonstrated an improvement in Challenging scores by the graduating cohort. Challenging the process consist of two major commitments, “search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve” and “experiment and take risk by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes.” With the exception of acquiring additional training via the Master’s CSP program this researcher has no opinion as to why the graduating cohort scored significantly higher on the LPI practice of Challenging.

It was found that both the matriculating and graduating cohort scored the five LPI practices in the same order as numerous previous LPI studies. This would indicate that
both cohorts prioritize the five LPI practices in the same order as over 100,000 leaders who have completed the LPI survey.

This researcher declines to generalize to other Master’s CSP programs. Generalization of this study is limited to CSP students and graduates of Ohio University.

This study included a limited qualitative component that resulted in insightful additional information. The Master’s CSP program participants at Ohio University strongly (96%) believe that leadership training is very important to the program. More than half of the participants indicated that they had received their leadership training from exposure to leaders as a result of fieldwork but some students (6.5%) volunteered information indicating it was a counterproductive experience.

Research indicates if transformational leadership training interventions occur that LPI scores should improve. Research also indicates that university leaders should have LPI scores at or better than the LPI norms. This study indicates that neither the graduating nor matriculating cohorts achieved LPI norm scores.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background of Study

Leadership has never been more important in the success of institutions of higher education than it is today (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The present downturn in the financial situation, new technologies, public insistence on accountability, and the need for institutions to “improve the excellence of teaching and research” (Nesbit, 2001, p. 16) will call for “transformational” leaders (Kouzes & Posner).

Kouzes and Posner (2002) referred to transformational leadership in terms of interpersonal interaction. These interactions are described by Burns (1978) as follows:

[T]ransforming leadership . . . occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. . . . But transforming leadership ultimately becomes normal in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and the led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both. (p. 20)

In order that a leader succeed in higher education and other endeavors, Kouzes and Posner (2002) stated that he or she should employ strong transformational leadership practices, and should be able to “model the way” by informing people of their inner philosophies and demonstrating by action as well as words that they live up to their philosophy; a leader who is demonstrating impeccable honor and integrity (pp. 43-108); a transformational leader who is capable of “inspiring a shared vision” by painting a clear
enthusiastic vision of the big picture but yet is clearly demonstrating to each employee their role in the vision (Kouzes & Posner). This should be a transformational leader who is making the effort to know the employees on a business level as well as a personal level. The leader should be engaging humanistic traits from within in order to develop a higher level of trust, which will enhance improving internal relations; a transformational leader that is capable of communicating to an employee a spirit of concern for their professional and personal development by letting the employee know they are a member of a team who cares about their well being (Kouzes & Posner, pp. 109-172). The leader should be a transformational leader who “challenges the existing processes” by asking questions when a process seems unreasonable; who is willing to make changes and therefore take risk to improve the situation (pp. 173-240); and who is willing to delegate power and provide necessary training, which “enables others to act”(Kouzes & Posner, pp. 241-314). This should be a transformational leader who “encourages the heart” by recognizing subordinates’ small wins as well as big wins and is willing to give credit where it is due and does it publicly as well as privately (Kouzes & Posner, pp. 315-382).

Kouzes and Posner (2002) have studied leadership for more than 20 years and developed the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which incorporates the practices of modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart. All of the variables are factors influencing transformational leadership. The five practices and ten commitments of Kouzes and Posner’s LPI are the constructs that make up the transformational leadership model.
Kouzes and Posner (2002) stated the five practices and ten commitments as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>1. Find your voice by clarifying your personal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Set the example by aligning actions with shared values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>3. Envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Enlist other in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>5. Search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enable Others to Act
7. Foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust.
8. Strengthen others by sharing power and discretion.

Encourage the Heart
9. Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence.
10. Celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community. (p. 22)

Authors in the field of education indicate that it may be difficult to implement transformational leadership in higher education on a large scale because of the decentralization of many departments. But according to these authors transformational leadership is the preferred leadership style that provides for visionary and moral growth via open collaboration in the academic environment. That leadership is everyone’s business and should be included in program curriculum just as much as technical skills (Moore, 1993; Siegrist, 1999; Batchelor, 1993; Love & Estanek, 2004).

There are many authors that support transactional leadership and refute transformational leadership as the appropriate style of leadership (F. B. Dressel, personal communication, March 8, 2005). It is not the intent of this research to rehash the transactional verses transformational leadership debate but to focus on transformational
leadership and the resulting benefits in higher education administration based on transformational leadership support from scholars of student administration (Batchelor, 1993; Komives, 1993; Moore, 1993; Love & Estanek, 2004).

Are there programs to improve transformational leadership skills in upcoming higher education leaders? It is believed one such program is the Ohio University College of Education’s College Student Personnel Master’s degree (Master’s degree CSP) program. “The focus of the . . . program is upon the knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills needed for the entry-level professional” (College of Education, 2004a, ¶).

“The curriculum in the . . . program has been developed to meet the standards and guidelines of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education [CAS]” (see Definition of Terms) (College of Education, 2004c, ¶). The CAS has over 100,000 professional constituents and represents “the vast majority of higher education practitioners in student programs and services throughout the country and beyond, no other body exists that so comprehensively speaks for this important field of endeavor” (CAS, 2004a, ¶). In 1997 CAS published standards for student leadership programs in higher education. They noted that, “colleges need to develop not just better, but more leaders, and that efforts should be directed toward the entire student body” (CAS, 1997, p. 111). Regardless of academic discipline, organizational affiliation, cultural background, gender, or ability all students should engage in some activity that involves the practice of leadership (CAS).

The Lilly Endowment and the Johnson Foundation funded an effort by higher education leaders Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson to determine the best practices of
effectively educating undergraduates. The funding of the effort was as a result of several reports critical of undergraduate education (ACPA/NASPA, 1997).

Two professional constituents of CAS are the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) (CAS, 2004b, ¶). These two organizations partnered to produce a consolidated set of practices known as “Principles of Good Practice” (PGP) (ACPA/NASPA, 1997, ¶). The PGP inventory sets the stage to emphasize leadership in CSP graduate programs by including basic Kouzes and Posner’s leadership qualities (ACPA/NASPA, 2004).

One individual who strives to carry out the PGP and enhance leadership skills in College Student Personnel (CSP) graduate students is Dafina Lazarus Stewart, Ph.D., assistant professor in the Ohio University College of Education’s College Student Personnel and Higher Education program, who stated,

The CSP program has a stated objective to prepare its students to become leaders within the profession of student affairs as well as on their individual campuses where they work. However, we don't have a course that specifically or uniquely deals with leadership for student affairs professionals. Nevertheless, what we do have a running stream within all of our courses that implicitly discusses leadership and being leaders within the context of the course discussions. For instance, in my Multicultural Student Development course, I think the students are given the consistent message that in order for them to be leaders on their campuses and student development advocates, they
must gain an appreciation and understanding of the experiences of diverse constituencies on campus. Further, I think the courses in the program are crafted with an eye toward what is necessary to prepare someone to be a leader both in the profession and on their respective campus. (D. L. Stewart, personal communication, March 1, 2004) (see Appendix A)

Batchelor (1993) suggested college student personnel can learn lessons from business, “Business has long discussed and defined the terms of management and leadership” (p. 379). She quotes Kouzes and Posner, stating, “Shared values foster strong feelings of personal effectiveness, promote high levels of company loyalty, facilitate consensus about key organizations goals and stakeholders, encourage ethical behavior, promote strong norms about working hard and caring, and reduce levels of job stress and tension (1987, p. 193)” (Batchelor, p. 379).

By utilizing the five practices and ten commitments of the LPI, it was possible to assess the transformational leadership practices of the Master’s degree CSP program. Surveys were conducted before and after training intervention to determine if there was a difference in LPI leadership practices by Master’s degree CSP program participants.

The literature supports the position that improving skills measurable by the LPI can lead to continued improvement of skills for practicing leaders (Lafferty, 1998), promote job satisfaction (Xu, 1991; Dauffenbauch 1995; Brown, 1996; Kouzes & Posner, 2002), and success in the work environment (Burgess, 2002; Kouzes & Posner).
Statement of the Problem

The research problem was to determine the extent of difference between and within groups regarding the five leadership practices of the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

Sub-problems

The first sub-problem was to determine the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Modeling between the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

The second research sub-problem was to determine the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Inspiring between the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

The third research sub-problem was to determine the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Challenging between the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

The fourth research sub-problem was to determine the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Enabling between the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

The fifth research sub-problem was to determine the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Encouraging between the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

Null Hypothesis

The null hypotheses examined in this research was as follows:
There is no significant difference between and within groups regarding the five leadership practices of the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

Five sub-hypothesis provided the statistical evidence to support or refuse the null hypotheses. The five LPI practices do not sum up to reveal the status of a leader; each practice is examined individually. An individual may excel in one practice and not in another and final analysis is on an individual leadership practice basis. The sub-hypotheses are as follows:

- Ho$_1$ There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Modeling for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.
- Ho$_2$ There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Inspiring for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.
- Ho$_3$ There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Challenging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.
- Ho$_4$ There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Enabling for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.
Ho₅ There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Encouraging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted to determine the extent of difference in leadership practices, as measured by the LPI, between and within graduating and matriculating Master’s CSP cohorts. A second purpose was to provide indicators of the status of transformational leadership practices employed by Master’s degree CSP program students.

Significance of the Study

As a result of this study the College of Education has indicators of the transformational leadership practices of the Master’s degree CSP program participants as well as a measure of leadership changes or improvements or lack thereof. Even if the results indicate there are no significant differences between the before and after Master’s degree CSP program exposure, the College of Education will have a benchmark on the level of transformational leadership practices of the participants. Study results were compared to LPI 2003 norms (norms) (see Appendix B) and therefore provide a relative indicator of leadership practices of Master’s degree CSP program students to today’s organizational leaders. Once the study is completed the College of Education will have an opportunity to consider the value of the study and determine if more study is needed or if there is, or is not, sufficient reason to change Master’s degree CSP program curriculum to improve transformational leadership practices.
Delimitations

The subjects of this study were two cohorts—one graduating and one entering—in the College Student Personnel Program of Ohio University with statistical inference applying to past and future program cohorts. Generalizability to other CSP programs will be limited due to program emphasis on leadership, effectiveness of intended leadership skill education, differences in student abilities and dispositions, and other factors.

Limitations

1. The study did not control for history, maturation or environmental effects and therefore cannot, “be considered a true experiment” (Tuckman, 1999, p. 160). And therefore the problem statement cannot unequivocally attribute changes purely to the Master’s degree CSP program.

2. The participants in this study provide a purposeful-sample that consists of an intact group sometimes referred to as a convenience sample. Intact groups do not allow an opportunity for random sampling, which may cause bias to be introduced. A purposeful or convenience sample was used because it was desired to measure the difference in leadership practices of Ohio University Master’s degree CSP program cohorts before and after program intervention for the benefit of Ohio University’s College of Education. Due to the design of this study, no cause or effect could be determined.

3. The research participants consisted of two different groups of people but were assumed to be very similar to each other because they had a common interest in the Master’s degree CSP program and met the same admission requirements (see
Background of Study). Therefore it was an assumption of this study that the two groups of research participants were comparable, although this in reality was very unlikely to be a perfect correlation, therefore entering bias.

4. Since the participants were aspiring higher education leaders it was possible the participants had already been exposed to leadership training and experiences and therefore the Master’s degree CSP program would have little affect on leadership practices. This along with difference in leadership aspiration of the two groups could potentially introduce bias. If transformational leadership practices had already been acquired or aspirations were above average the results should have demonstrated above average LPI norms (see Appendix B).

5. It was a goal of this study to compare a post training intervention survey and a control survey; the results were biased to some degree when comparing the scores to the LPI norms, which were developed using 360-degree survey data (See definition of terms). According to the research the LPI is more valid when a 360-degree evaluation is conducted but many studies find the results are not significantly different (see self-reporting in Chapter 2). For this study the self-reporting scores were considered the same as the 360 degree scores when comparing to norms (see Appendix B) realizing this may introduce bias.

**Definition of Terms**

*Leadership*

Kouzes and Posner (2002) define leadership as “an art form. And just as with any other art form—whether it’s painting, playing music, dancing, acting, or writing—
leadership is a means of personal expression. To become a credible leader you have to express yourself in ways that are uniquely your own” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 56).

Transformational Leadership

Kouzes and Posner (2002) define transformational leadership by quoting Burns as follows:

Transformational leadership occurs when, in their interaction, people raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. . . . But transforming leadership ultimately becomes normal in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and the led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both. (p. 153)

The Five Practices and Ten Commitments of Leadership

Modeling the way (Modeling). Consists of two major commitments, “find your voice by clarifying your personal values” and “set an example by aligning actions with shared values” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 22). It is extremely important for a leaders to find their unique voice. The voice should be internally created and the words should be from the leader’s heart. If a leader employs someone else’s voice or speaks of something the leader does not believe then it is impossible for the leader to be consistent. If a question is asked and the concept creator isn’t there, the answer will likely lack confidence and therefore have little strength and conviction. To be a convincing leader, doubt and hesitation, cannot take place, a leader should appear confident and in control.
For this to occur consistently the values should be the leader’s personal values (Kouzes & Posner).

A leader should lead by example. If a leader says one thing and lives and works contrarily the leader will quickly lose credibility and therefore constituents. A leader ideally will have a flawless character. Character is determined not only by what a leader says but by what a leader does. The leader’s values should be shared with the constituents. If values are not shared there will be no one behind to lead. A leader should be honest to be trusted and the longer the leader demonstrates honesty the deeper the trust (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

*Inspiring a shared vision (Inspiring).* Consists of two major commitments, “envision the way by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities” and “enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 22). To inspire others to follow a leader’s vision it is imperative that the leader is able to clearly portray the vision so that it is exactly that, a vision. It should be described so the constituents can picture how the entire system logically fits together. When constituents can understand the process and realize the benefit of the process and where they fit in the picture, then the constituents will take ownership and demonstrate their highest potential (Kouzes & Posner).

Leaders should share their power and enlist others. A wise leader knows the capabilities of others and matches up the constituent skills with the task. If the leader uses the appropriate skills the constituent will have confidence that they are the most
talented individuals available to do the job and take ownership of the project (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

*Challenging the process (Challenging).* Consists of two major commitments, “search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve” and “experiment and take risk by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 22). A great leader is continuously listening, reading, socializing and watching for any opportunity that may benefit the cause. A great leader listens well to those in the trenches for means to streamline internally and listens well to other external leaders to pick up larger conceptual opportunities (Kouzes & Posner).

Leaders as well as constituents should experiment and take risk. If innovation is necessary, it requires change and to determine the best change to benefit the cause, frequently requires taking risk. Nothing is gained unless something is tried and trying implies risk. When success occurs it should be celebrated on the individual basis as well as on a team basis and failure should be accepted as a learning opportunity to be capitalized on at a later date (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

*Enabling others to act (Enabling).* Consists of two major commitments, “fostering collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust” and “strengthening others by sharing power and discretion” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 22). In the multi-complex businesses of today with its research, technology, and the results thereof, requires that a leader realize, “they don’t know it all.” A leader should collaborate with the constituents and optimize productivity by maximizing the synergism
of the constituent’s skills and the task. A match of task that improves the constituent’s skills at the same time as it benefits the cause is a “win-win situation.” Not only does the constituent have a good feeling about self-improvement, they could also celebrate the positive results. When the constituent realizes the leader is doing everything possible to create win-win situations a trust forms, which benefits both parties by providing a satisfying goal (Kouzes & Posner).

The leader should share the power to enable the utmost efficiencies. This requires the leader to give discretionary power to constituents. When executed and monitored by the leader a trust can be formed, which allows on the spot execution by constituents, which improves efficiencies, customer satisfaction and constituency satisfaction (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

A leader should be aware of the skill sets of the constituents. And when skills are inadequate the leader should have a source of and provide the training necessary to make improvements in the constituent’s skills. Skill recognition demonstrates to the constituent that the leader cares and once skills are improved it elevates employees’ self-esteem (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

*Encouraging the heart (Encouraging)*. Consists of two major commitments, “recognizing contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence” and “celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 22). When a constituent has shown excellence a leader should cease the opportunity of recognizing the constituent. Recognition should be paced or its value will diminish but no recognition could cause the loss of enthusiastic engagement of a valuable
follower and therefore reduce overall gains. A leader should celebrate individual as well as group excellence that supports the value of the cause. This should be done in a manner to develop a spirit of community, team or family. If a leader can foster a spirit of community, team or family then the individual effort will be enhanced in order to ensure they do not let the community, team or family down (Kouzes & Posner).

Nothing more demonstrates a leader’s loyalty to team excellence than to pull fellow team members up the ladder when advancement occurs. When a leader is elevated in an organization the leader should do everything possible to bring worthy constituents up the ladder with them (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

The American College Personnel Association (ACPA)

ACPA is a national organization originated in 1924 from the National Association of Appointment Secretaries (Nuss, 1993). Today the organization has an office in Washington, D.C. (ACPA, 2004) and is active in the development of higher education student activities, testing, curriculum, doctoral programs and ethics, middle managers, self-directed learning, staff development, educational standards, job placement and technology (Batchelor, 1993).

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)

CAS was originally established in 1979 as a not-for-profit corporation called the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs. In 1992, CAS became the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, reflecting a broader context of services and programs in higher education. CAS has been the pre-eminent
force for promoting standards in student affairs, student services, and student development programs since its inception in 1979 (CAS, 2004c, History, 4¶).

. . for the ultimate purpose of fostering and enhancing student learning, development, and achievement and in general to promote good citizenship.

(CAS, 2004c, 1¶)

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA)

NASPA is a national organization that originated in 1919 as the National Association of Deans and Advisers to Men. Today the mission of NASPA is to “enrich the educational experience of all students. It serves colleges and universities by providing leadership and professional growth opportunities for the chief student affairs issues from an institutional perspective” (Nuss, 1993, p. 365).

Graduating Cohort

This cohort consisted of students that had completed the Master’s degree program in College Student Personnel at Ohio University and graduated in the fall, winter, and spring of 2004. Cohort was deemed an appropriate term by the director of the Ohio University Master’s CSP program. The term is used throughout this study in place of classes.

Matriculating Cohort

This cohort consisted of students that were eligible and committed to begin the Master’s degree program in College Student Personnel at Ohio University in the fall of 2004. Cohort was deemed an appropriate term by the director of the Ohio University Master’s CSP program. The term is used throughout this study in place of classes.
Surveys and evaluations can be conducted by soliciting feedback from supervisors, peers, subordinates, and others that might apply, such as, someone who represents the public. When information is received from the total gamut of people surrounding an individual then a true 360-degree survey, evaluation, etc. is obtained.

Organization of the Study

The first chapter of the study contains the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose, significance, limitations, delimitations, definitions of terms and organization of the study. The second chapter of the study contains the review of the literature. The third chapter of the study contains the methodology, which includes identification of the population and the selection of the sample, development and identification of the instrument, data collection procedures and description of the data analysis. The fourth chapter of the study contains the analysis of the data. The fifth chapter contains the summary, conclusion and recommendations. References and appendices follow the fifth chapter.
CHAPTER TWO
Review of the Literature

The literature review focuses on the importance of transformational leadership in the world today by examining research in many disciplines followed by a narrowing to research in higher education, support from scholars of student affairs administration and a description of Ohio Universities Master’s CSP program. The purpose of this review was to demonstrate how pervasive transformational leadership is in successful business as well as in educational endeavors.

The paradigms of leadership have been articulated by many authors. A few are Argenti (2002); Blanchard and Johnson (1982); Brehm, Kassin and Fein (1999); Jones, (1991); Kouzes and Posner (2002); Morley and Eadie (2001); Phillips (1992); and Yukl, (1998). The review of the leadership paradigms described by these authors and many others suggest a consensus on the value of transformational leadership.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) have studied transformational leadership for more than 20 years and have developed the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which incorporates the factors of modeling the way (Modeling), inspiring a shared vision (Inspiring), challenging the existing process (Challenging), enabling others to act (Enabling), and encouraging the heart (Encouraging). All of the variables are separate factors influencing transformational leadership. Kouzes and Posner’s LPI instrument has been shown to be highly reliable and valid (see chapter 3).
Today’s Leaders Often Employ LPI Practices

Modeling the Way

David Pottruck, president and co-CEO of The Charles Schwab Corporation stated that wherever he has been people want to work for someone of “impeccable character” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 47). Pottruck then quotes Kouzes and Posner’s first law of leadership: “If you don’t believe in the messenger, you won’t believe the message” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 48).

Seargent Jill Henderson, “the first woman to win the Army’s Drill Sergeant of the Year award” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 83) asked nothing of her trainees that she would not do herself. Henderson maintained a high level of spit shined and polished appearance and she expected it of her troops. If they ran Henderson was at the lead; if they did pushups she was right there (Kouzes & Posner).

Inspiring a Shared Vision

A very inspiring true story is about Tara Church, the founder of Tree Musketeers. When Church was eight years old she belonged to a Girl Scout troop (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The troop was perplexed about a discussion regarding global warming and the ramifications if it was not controlled. Church thought, “what if we plant trees?” The troop did plant trees and in 1990 were incorporated as “the world’s first environmental youth organization” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 117), when Church was eleven, called the Tree Musketeers. The goal of the organization was to plant a million trees by the year 2000 (Kouzes & Posner). Church inspired a shared vision.
One of Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) favorites “is this simple yet eloquent statement from Edward Goeppner, of the Podesta Baldocchi chain of flower shops: ‘We don’t sell flowers, we sell beauty.’” (p. 127). That’s it short and sweet. Selling beauty instead of just flowers would most certainly make the job environment brighter.

Yukl (1998) discussed ways to improve the opportunity of a shared vision. Yukl describes personal power as the power obtained via one’s character. Yukl states, “Effective leaders are likely to use power in a subtle, careful fashion that minimizes status differentials and avoids threats to the target person’s self-esteem” (p. 248). But Yukl does emphasize that position power is also important and that great leaders will need to orchestrate the appropriate balance of each. But “leaders who exercise power in an arrogant, manipulative, domineering manner are likely to engender resentment and resistance” (Yukl, p. 248).

Challenging the Process

Dick Nettell, corporate services executive challenges the process (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). He lived through the changes of two large banks merging. In the merge he lost a long-time friend and colleague, which upset him deeply. Nettell had to pull himself together. He said, “It’s ok to grieve, but if I can’t get through this and support it, then I need to go somewhere else” (Kouzes & Posner, pp. 174-175). Nettell took a chance and spoke at a staff meeting making his feelings known and asking his fellow workers to hang in there and do what they knew their former leader would want them to do. After he let his feelings be known, the staff eased up and the merger continued in a
smooth manner (Kouzes & Posner). Nettell seized the opportunity and took the risk of speaking up and as a result it improved the merging atmosphere.

Morley and Eadie (2001) describe an effective means to challenging the process. The president of Cornell University demonstrated what that means by coming forth with “the dramatic staging of a dump of materials mailed to incoming freshmen to show obvious inefficiency and the uncoordinated and wasteful process” (p. 43). The leader’s effective means of challenging the process changed the way freshman were introduced to Cornell from that time on (Morley & Eadie).

When a leader challenges the process, it requires taking risk and when risks are taken mistakes are made. Kouzes and Posner (2002) emphasized how mistakes when dissected constructively can prove supportive of future success. Mistakes should be thought of as learning opportunities and from what is learned, one should gain an edge to win a future match. Examples of wins created from learning opportunities stated by Kouzes and Posner are:

- Babe Ruth struck out 1,330 times. In between his strikeouts, he hit 714 home runs.
- R.H. Macy failed in retailing seven times before his store in New York became a success.
- Abraham Lincoln failed twice in business and was defeated in six state and national elections before being elected president of the United States.
These examples support challenging the process and demonstrate perseverance, when failure results, learn from the failure, try again and again until it becomes a success story.

*Enabling Others to Act*

Brian Coughlin, managing director of Brown Brothers Harriman Fund Administration Services Ireland, began by developing trust. When Coughlin began his leadership at Brown Brothers, he knew he had to develop trust, and to do that, it was necessary to do a lot of listening. Coughlin had enough acumen to realize he did not know the cogs and gears that made this clock tick. So Coughlin worked with every employee in the firm, finding out about them and discovering what motivated them. Mainly Coughlin listened and showed respect to the employees and their knowledge. By doing this the employees opened up and Coughlin “sums up the success of his own openness to influence this way: We had people from all levels of the organization talking to each other about ways of doing things differently and better” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 248). Coughlin goes on to state, “We had tremendous amounts of success identifying opportunities for improvement. We were able to mobilize people because they all had a sense of ownership and commitment. Isn’t this exactly what all leaders want?” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 248).

*Encouraging the Heart*

Joan Nicolo, Computing Resources, Inc., had a difficult time dealing with praising deserving employees due to a time-constraining transactional work environment. But Nicolo tried praising deserving employees and found it caused a feeling of general
humanity toward her from the staff and lines of communication progressively opened up. Nicolo felt much better about coming to work everyday, interoffice tensions faded, and camaraderie improved. Nicolo highly recommends praising your staff (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Keith Sonberg, Director of Site Operations for Roche Biosciences in Palo Alto, California, believed in staff and family having fun and developing a sense of community. Sonberg knew the community feeling results in happier more satisfied employees and therefore a more efficient company. Sonberg used the rolling hills and trees on the plant site as setting to create a family outing that brought community and more productivity to company employees (Kouzed & Posner, 2002). What Sonberg knew was confirmed in Kouzes and Posner’s research, “performance improves when leaders bring people together to rejoice in their achievements and to reinforce their shared principles” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 353).

Demographics Eliminated as LPI Concern

Kouzes and Posner (2003b), in about three-dozen studies, have found there is no correlation between demographics (such as age, marital status, educational level, years of experience) and LPI scores.

LPI studies that find similar demographic results are as follows: Dauffenbach (1995) studied “the impact of academic deans leadership practices on the job satisfaction of department chairpersons” (1ª). Leadership practices were measured with the LPI and job satisfaction was measured with the Job Description Index (JDI). Correlations of unmatched pairs of deans and chairs from a “random sample of 300 academic deans [N =
170] and 300 department chairpersons [N = 170]” (2¶) in four upper Midwest states were conducted. The study retained the null hypothesis indicating that “gender, age, type and size of institution and length of service” (Dauffenbach, 1995, 4¶) did not have a significant LPI affect.

Bauer’s (1993) researched the leadership practices of college leaders verses industrial leaders “in the economically challenged northeast” (4¶). The college sample consisted of 142 of 248 college presidents in New England and 512 LPI-observers. From the study Bauer (1993) concluded there was no significant differences in LPI scoring in regard to gender, type of college institution or “degree of environmental change” (4¶) when analyzing the data with a regression analysis.

Coffman (1999) researched “the perception of coaches’ own leadership behaviors, athletes’ perception of their coaches’ behavior, and satisfaction with those leadership behaviors” (1¶). The sample “population consisted of California Community College head coaches of team sports in which there was a male and female equivalent through the Blue Book of College Athletics” (Coffman, 1999, 2¶) and the soccer teams of the responding coaches. The research found that there was no significant difference between female and male coaches in regards to leadership practices.

Oliver (2001) “examined the leadership practices of chief student affairs officers (CSAO) in Texas” (1¶). The returned LPI survey instruments resulted in a sample of 94 leader participants, LPI-self and 82 LPI-observers. The research showed, “None of the demographic variables were found to contribute significantly to scores on the five leadership practices” (Oliver, 4¶).
Ottinger (1990) research involving a random sample of 300 women in higher education administration and 300 women in banking focused on describing and comparing “the leadership practices of female executives in higher education and banking.” (1¶). Ottinger states, “LPI scores did not significantly vary as a function of marital status, length of work experience…or by number of children” (4¶) either within or between groups.

Stephenson (2002) researched identifying “characteristics of chief financial officers most likely to promote teamwork in the community college environment” (1¶) revealed no significant differences in LPI scores due to gender, ethnicity, years of service or educational level. The results were taken from a “stratified sample (by size and geography) of 300 of 895 community colleges” (Stephenson, 1¶).

Tsend (2000) suggests using the LPI “the author selected the LPI from among other leadership instruments because: there are no statements that directly reflect American cultural values that could potentially confuse respondents from other nations” (3¶). Tsend’s research employing the LPI instrument and ANOVA explored the difference between Mongolian and American leadership. The study sample “consisted of 20 Rectors, 20 Deans, 40 Department Heads, and 200 faculty members from 10 public and 10 private higher education schools” (Tsend, 2¶). The study suggests culture is not of significant concern when using the LPI.

Xu (1991) studied a random sample of “50 academic deans and 285 department chairpersons at public universities in Tennessee” (1¶). Xu found that “demographic variables such as respondent age, gender, marital status, level of education, academic
rank, and number of years in position were not correlated to LPI-Observer scores nor
generally related to LPI-Self scores” (3¶).

By contrast, Amnuckmanee (2002) found that individuals that had postgraduate
degrees or were in higher levels of position in Thailand’s chief faculty were more likely
to have a higher LPI score. “Analysis by current job position or organizational level
revealed that the higher the position, the more the administrators saw themselves as
engaging in leadership practices of Challenging, Inspiring, Modeling and Encouraging”
(2¶). It was also found that “women scored higher on Challenging, Enabling, and
Encouraging than did their male counterparts” (2¶). The research sample consisted of a
“representative sample of 190 chief faculty officer from 13 facilities (departments) at
Kasetsart University (Bankok, Thailand)” (Amnuckmanee, 2¶). This was the only study
of approximately 40 studies reviewed that concluded demographics do make a difference
in LPI scores. It is interesting to note that the study is from a foreign country and
therefore this particular culture may have an influence on LPI scores. Disregarding this
study there is considerable inferential evidence that leads to the conclusion that
demographics are not an issue when utilizing the LPI instrument.

Self Reporting Compared to 360-degree Evaluations

A method of this study was to compare self-reporting survey results of two
groups utilizing profile analysis. The use of self-reporting versus a 360-degree
evaluation may cause one to question the reliability and validity of the results, but
the following studies and the Mean and Standard Deviation of 360-degree Survey
(see Appendix C) indicate this is not a significant concern.
Erickson’s (1992) research objective was “to determine concepts of public health leadership practices and behaviors which will provide a framework for course content in initial and continuing education for public health leadership and contribute to generating a substantive grounded theory specific to leadership in public health” (1¶). The participants were “12 school of public health deans and /or directors of graduate programs in community health/preventive medicine who each nominated five public health leaders [N = 22]” (Erickson, 2¶). Each health leader had five subordinates complete the LPI-Observer (N = 79). Each public health leader in Erickson’s study found “no statistically significant differences…between LPI-Self and LPI-Observer scores” (3¶).

Sherman (1989) found that “there is no significant difference between others’ perceived leadership effectiveness of supervisors and the perception of supervisors themselves” (p. 87). Sherman’s target population consisted of “208 regular education supervisors employed by county school systems in the state of Ohio” (p. 35). After random selection and indication of willingness to participate were considered along with return depreciation the n = 39 for supervisors, n = 57 for administrators and n = 197 for teachers. Sherman analyzed the results with a “one factor ANOVA [F (2, 112) = 2.479, p = .0884] with effectiveness scores of supervisors, administrators, and teachers” (p. 58).

Brightharp (1999) research objective was “to investigate the leadership practices of women in different ethnic groups and contribute to an understanding of leadership development issues for women in student affairs positions” (1¶). The sample population
“consisted of 88 African-American and 93 Caucasian women in mid-level administrative positions in student affairs units at four-year public institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students (85% response rate), along with 686 of their constituents (including graduate students; 64% response rate)” (Brightharp, 2¶). Brightharp concluded that the LPI self and observed showed no significant difference in ratings; there also was no difference due to ethnicity.

On the contrary Taylor (2001) found that the LPI self scores of chief student affairs officers (CSAO) were much higher than the LPI observer scores. “The sample involved five recognized higher education institutions (all public state institutions that were classified as Research Universities I)” (Taylor, 2¶).

Xu (1991) who studied a random sample of “50 academic deans and 285 department chairpersons at public universities in Tennessee” (1¶), also supports the difference between LPI-self and LPI-observer. He indicates that college deans’ LPI self scores are significantly higher than the chairpersons’ LPI observer scores.

Although there are a few contradictory studies, (Taylor, 2001; Xu, 1991), analysis by Kouzes and Posner (2003b) reveal “empirical tests of differences between leaders (using the LPI-Self form) and their constituents (using the LPI-Observer form) reveal no statistically significant differences (at the .001 level of probability) between these two groups on Modeling and Challenging” (p. 8). Although “statistically significant, the mean differences between these two groups on Inspiring, Enabling, and Encouraging have little practical significance, except to note that leaders view themselves
as engaging somewhat less in Inspiring and Encouraging, and slightly more in Enabling, than do their constituents” (p. 8).

Non-LPI Studies that Support Transformational Leadership

Hopfe (1968) concluded “leader-member relations appear to be a better predictor of departmental performance than the collegial chairman’s leadership style” (p. 84). Hopfe studied nine department’s leader-member relationships in a Midwestern college using the Group Atmosphere Scale (GA). Faculty and the chairmen both were above the decisive score. “A score of 4.55 divided the scale in terms of good or poor relations” (Hopfe, 1968, p. 60). The faculty score average was 5.86 while the chairman average was 6.96, which was significantly higher, t(91) = 2.80, p < .05 (Hopfe, 1968, p. 63). Hopfe (1968) found the most “relevant factor predicting group performance appeared to be the group atmosphere (GA) scores. The GA scores of the department faculty were compared with group performance scores. The correlation was significantly different from zero (rho = +0.70)” (p. 79). A higher GA score was an indicator that the leader understood group relations. These results indicate “the leadership style was accepted if the relation was good (Hopfe, 1968, p. 69) [therefore]…when dealing with co-acting groups the leader should strive to obtain good leader-member relations” (p. 79). Leader-member relations are measured by Kouzes’ and Posner’s LPI specifically by Inspiring, Enabling and Encouraging subordinates (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Moy (1972) study suggested that “leaders that are high in consideration and low in initiating structure are more likely to manage the organization along the participative model” (p. 83). The sample populations consisted of 803 participants from the full
gamut of a typical residence life staff. Consideration was defined as, “leadership behavior marked by friendship, mutual trust, respect for the subordinates ideas, and a consideration of his feelings” (Moy, p. 6). An initiating structure was defined as, “leader’s behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of work groups in an endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure” (Moy, p. 6).

Moy (1972) described the participative model as being “more productive, creative, satisfying, and rewarding for the individual and the organization. It is clear that an understanding of human behavior in organizations is essential” (p. 82). The participative model has similar traits as measured by the LPI. More support is given to the participative model as Madson (1972) states “hall directors should and do behave in a manner which indicates warmth, caring, and concern for members of the group” (cited in Moy, p. 83).

Yukl (1998) reported research by Bragg and Andrews (1973) demonstrated that participative leadership (which contains traits similar to the LPI) was successful in a hospital laundry where the manager employed an autocratic style of leadership. The manager of the laundry agreed to train, learn and employ participative leadership in the laundry. Production in the laundry increased by 42% in the first eighteen months. “The results were statistically significant and showed that the participation program was highly successful” (Yukl, p. 160). After three years no one in the laundry department wanted to go back to the autocratic style of leadership (Yukl).
Hoggatt’s (1990), qualitative study employing “narrative participant profiles” (p. 240) concluded that the managers of the most effective television station employ many of the elements contained in the LPI and defines the style of leadership as transformational. “To face the challenges, effective television station leadership requires a general manager who can create a vision on the future that provides staff members with an overall sense of purpose, direction, and values” (Hoggatt, p. 247). The television manager must be able to effectively communicate to the employees the purpose of the television station so the employees buy into the purpose as their own. The ever changing television business requires a continuous re-evaluation to, “keep the station alert to ever-present challenges and opportunities. This is what leadership—particularly transformational leadership—is all about” (Hoggatt, p. 247). Inspiring a shared vision (an LPI practice) was a key factor in successful television managers.

**Education Related LPI Studies**

*University/Business*

Bauer (1993) discovered that leaders of “economically challenged” institutes of higher education in the northeastern U.S. scored significantly higher on LPI than business leaders in the same area. This could suggest that transformational leadership practices are particularly valued and rewarded in a higher education context. Bauer analyzed the data by regression analysis and results indicated that both LPI-self and LPI-observer agreed on the order of the LPI practices. Both education and (industry) ranked Enabling first, “followed by Inspiring (5th), Challenging (2nd), Modeling (3rd) and Encouraging (4th)” (Bauer, 4¶). The difference in industry and education is demonstrated in the trait
rankings in that industry second ranking is Challenging, while education is Inspiring, and industry concern for Inspiring is the least determinant in leadership practices. This study found that 59 percent of the variance of leadership practices was accounted for in the LPI scores for educational institute in a state of change while $R^2 = .53$ for institutions in steady state (Bauer).

Ottinger’s research (1990), involving a random sample of 300 women in higher education administration and 300 women in banking, focused on describing and comparing the leadership practices of female executives in those fields. The “internal reliabilities for the LPI were good: Challenging (.71), Inspiring (.80), Enabling (.77), Modeling ing (.76), and Encouraging (.82)” (Ottinger, 2¶). The research concluded that women leaders in higher education adhered to the Kouzes and Posner’s practices and commitments significantly more strongly (MANOVA) than did women leaders in banking (Ottinger).

**College Athletics**

Elliot (1990) modified Kouzes and Posner’s LPI questionnaire to determine coaches "Personal Best Leadership Experience" (2¶). The modified survey was sent to “one hundred and ninety-five NCAA Division I head football coaches” (Elliot, 2¶) of which twenty-seven responded (Elliot). Elliot concludes that “common practices were evident. Ninety-three percent (N = 25) of the coaches’ personal best leadership experiences involved Challenging” (Elliot, 3¶) Inspiring was mentioned by 81% of the participants. Enabling was included by 74% of the coaches and Modeling, with emphasis on leadership by example, was mentioned by 100% of the coaches. “Finally, 78 percent
(N = 21) felt the need to recognize achievement and celebrate accomplishments (Encouraging the Heart)” (Elliot, 3¶). Upon further examination of the responses Elliot “suggested that communicating the vision and inspiring others to that vision were vitally important for coaches while they achieved their personal best. . . . he concludes: a competitive edge may be gained by successfully communicating the vision and inspiring others” (3¶).

Armstrong’s (1992) research objective was “to determine whether transformational leadership of head coaches and athletic directors in NCAA III institutions was related to success (win-loss record)” (1¶). The population sample “consisted of all athletics directors and head coaches with at least three years of experience in their position from two independent Midwest conferences” (Armstrong, 2¶). His research concluded that women athletic directors who scored high on the LPI were more successful. The research also found no correlation between team success, leadership practices, and male athletic directors. Armstrong found that there is a “relatively low development of transformational leadership with athletic directors and head coaches partly due to lack of exposure to the transformational modeling” (5¶). 

Administrative/Education Level

Amnuckmanee (2002) found that individuals that had postgraduate degrees or were in higher levels of position in Thailand’s chief faculty were more likely to have a higher LPI score. The research sample consisted of a “representative sample of 190 chief faculty officers from 13 facilities (departments) at Kasetsart University (Bankok, Thailand)” (Amnuckmanee, 2¶). Amnuckmanee conducted a five factor analysis that
“revealed and explained variance of 72.75 percent” (4¶) of leadership practices. This was the first study involving Asian respondents utilizing the LPI survey instrument therefore reliability was of special concern but was determined to be sound when reliability (Chronbach’s Alpha) results “ranged between .78 for Challenging to .91 for Encouraging” (Amnuckmanee, 4¶).

Carlson (1991) found that university presidential assistants scored in line with the mean of the normative scores on the LPI. “However, the rank order varied. Enabling was ranked most and Inspiring ranked least frequently by both groups [group surveyed and the normative group]. Presidential assistants ranked Encouraging second (versus third for the normative sample), modeling third (versus fourth), and Challenging fourth (versus second)” (Carlson, 3¶). The sample population consisted “of 37 presidential assistants in New England on the official mailing list of the Steering Committee for Presidential Assistants in Higher Education, American Council on Education” (Carlson, 2¶).

Tsend’s (2000) research, employing the LPI instrument and ANOVA, explored the difference between Mongolian and American leadership. The study sample “consisted of 20 Rectors, 20 Deans, 40 Department Heads, and 200 faculty members from 10 public and 10 private higher education schools” (Tsend, 2¶). The LPI results were moderate and “suggests that leaders in higher education institutions in Mongolia are learning about leadership practices by trail [sic] and error during the country’s transition from a socialist to a democratic system” (Tsend, 4¶).
Leadership Training Needs

Avalone’s (1999) research objective was “to develop a model leadership continuing education plan for health science college presidents to assist them in improving and expanding their effective leadership practices” (1¶). The sample population was, “…17 health science and 19 career technical college presidents” (Avalone, 2¶). The research showed that presidents of health science colleges and career technical colleges scored in the upper two thirds of the normative scores for the LPI in the areas of Challenging, Inspiring, Modeling and Enabling but were at the mean for Encouraging (Avalone).

Spontanski’s (1991) research consisted of a study of 41 match pairs of agriculture education department executive officers (DEO) and their faculty to determine the “existing and needed leadership practices of…[DEOs] in agricultural education” (1¶). Internal reliabilities of the study “ranged between .79 and .90” (Spotanski, 2¶). LPI scores indicate there are relationships between DEOs and their job duties. “DEOs who reported being more involved in administration had significantly higher scores on Inspiring and Encouraging than those with less administrative duties. DEOs more involved with teaching responsibilities reported significantly less Inspiring behavior than those with less teaching responsibilities” (Spotanski, 6¶). The researcher reported no improvement in LPI as a result of leadership workshops but demonstrated that, “DEOs who reported collegiate coursework in leadership engaged in various leadership practices more than those without such education (significantly more so for Enabling and Encouraging)” (Spotanski, 6¶).
La Vine’s (1998) research objective was “to gain a comprehensive profile of the self-efficacy, personality traits, and leadership characteristics of deans of colleges/schools of education and identify the degree to which they can serve as change agents” (1¶). The research employed the LPI, the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire and the Self Efficacy Scale. The study sample was “61 education deans from Research I and II universities and Doctoral-Granting I and II universities” (La Vine, 2¶). The researcher found that deans across several types and levels of institutions were not above average in leadership skills and suggest deans should receive leadership training. It was also recommended that hiring committees learn more about leadership and employ such knowledge when hiring new deans (La Vine).

**Job Success**

Burkhart (1999) discovered that women in two-year institutions were more successful than women in four-year institutions of higher education in reaching high-level leadership positions. According to the LPI scores there was no difference in the leadership practices of the two groups. However, “Women at two-year institutions reported having significantly more formal post-graduate leadership training than those at four-year institutions” (Burkhart, 5¶). The study abstract fails to indicate the level of the LPI scores.

The LPI has been used to measure transformational leadership in the educational setting. Rammel (1999) paraphrased in Burgess (2002, pp. 60-61) indicated that school superintendents that scored high on the LPI correlated highly with schools that students scored at a higher level on the Ohio Proficiency Exam. Burgess states, “Overall, the
findings of the study indicated that a relationship does exist between specific transformational behaviors of superintendents and the academic performance of students” (p. 61).

**Job Satisfaction**

Xu (1991) discovered that job satisfaction of the dean’s subordinates improved as the subordinates’ observers LPI scores increased. “The more effective the chairperson perceived the deans’ leadership behavior to be, the more they were satisfied with their jobs” (Xu, 4¶). Xu studied a random sample of “50 academic deans and 285 department chairpersons at public universities in Tennessee” (1¶). Satisfaction was measured utilizing the Index of Job Satisfaction (Xu). The study suggested that, the higher individuals’ LPI-Observer scores are, the more satisfied they are with their jobs. In other words if the more a leader is perceived as an transformational leader the more satisfied the subordinates are with their jobs.

Dauffenbach (1995) studied “the impact of academic dean’s leadership practices on the job satisfaction of department chairpersons” (4¶). Leadership practices were measured with the LPI and job satisfaction was measured with the Job Description Index (JDI). Correlations of unmatched pairs of deans and chairs from a random sample of deans and chairs in four upper Midwest states indicates that deans scored higher on the LPI than did the department chairs and that deans were more satisfied with the work environment than chairs (Dauffenbach).

Brown (1996) conducted research using the LPI “to examine the relationship between leadership practices, job satisfaction and leadership activities of trained reading
recovery teachers as practitioners of reading innovation and literacy leadership in the
infrastructure of the elementary school” (1¶). The sample population was “all teachers
affiliated with the New York University Reading and Recovery Project from 1989 to
1995” (Brown, 1¶). The research states, “Trained Reading Recovery teachers
demonstrate a significant relationship between leadership practices and job satisfaction,
and have higher average scores than business groups reported in the literature” (Brown,
5¶).

Leader/Subordinate Relations

Stephenson (2002) researched identifying “characteristics of chief financial
officers most likely to promote teamwork in the community college environment” (1¶).
The results, taken from a “stratified sample (by size and geography) of 300 of 895
community colleges,” (Stephenson, 2¶) indicated that teamwork is primarily explained
(41% of the variance) by inspiring a shared vision in the community college environment.
The author states:

These results confirm the importance of inspiring a shared vision as a
basic leadership role in team-based work environment. After inspiring a
shared vision and belief in the importance and benefits of teamwork,
encouraging the heart and modeling the way were the next two leadership
behaviors to contribute to the regression modeling. (4¶)

Taylor’s (2001) research was an effort to determine the leadership practices of
successful chief student affairs officers (CSAO) employing the LPI. “The sample
involved five recognized higher education institutions (all public state institutions that
were classified as Research Universities I)” (Taylor, 2¶). The Q-sort procedure was used to determine the general characteristics of effective CSAO’s. Each of the CSAO’s were interviewed including “73% of their staff and/or peers” (Taylor 2¶). The CSAO’s demographics included four “African-American (three men and one woman) and the fifth was a Caucasian male, and four of them were 56 or older. Four held doctoral degrees” (Taylor, 2¶). The CSAO’s had been at the same institution for more than 11 years with an average of 26 years experience.

Taylor (2001) discovered that the CSAO’s and the observers both agreed on the order of the leadership practices. They indicated that Enabling was rated highest followed by “Modeling, Encouraging, Challenging and Inspiring” (Taylor, 2¶).

*Effects of Training Intervention*

A longitudinal study by Lafferty (1998) observed leadership development of different cohorts of military leaders. “A quantitative approach was taken using Saskin’s Visionary Leadership Theory (VLT) to study the effects of a certificated military leadership school, the U. S. Air Force and Staff College, located at Air University in Montgomery, Alabama” (Lafferty, abstract). Lafferty wanted to determine if the leadership training was effective on the cohorts immediately after training, at one year and again at two years after training. The methodology included factorial analysis as well as univariate analysis. Lafferty concluded, for practicing leaders, the leadership scores continued to improve each year after the leadership training intervention. The study indicates that trained leaders use their knowledge to create an organization that fosters continued improvement of the learned leadership skills (Lafferty).
Jensen (1998) conducted a longitudinal study to determine if the Excellence in Leadership program at Grand Valley State University in Michigan improved the LPI trait of Modeling. The participants were “57 students enrolled (Spring 1998) in the Excellence in Leadership Program at Grand Valley State University [the participants] were asked to complete the LPI. Eighty percent agreed to participate (N = 45). Most respondents were female (75%). Twenty freshmen participated, 17 sophomores, 5 juniors and 3 seniors” (Jensen, 3¶). It was expected “to show an increase in students' motivation, balance and confidence through their four years” (Jensen, 3¶).

Results indicated that study participants improved scores on each of the six questions related to Modeling. “Balance, motivation, and confidence do indeed increase as students advance through the sequential Excellence in Leadership Program” (Jensen, 1998, 3¶). Details of statistical methods and results were not revealed in the source.

An evaluation of the difference in leadership practices due to a training intervention was conducted via an LPI survey at Franciscan University of Steubenville, Ohio by Schmiesing (2001). “The project used a non-probability, convenience sample of 10 participating employees and 30 of their direct reports, coworkers and manager at Franciscan University of Steubenville, who worked at the institution during the Spring [sic] 1999” (Schmiesing, 3¶). The participants were exposed to a training intervention of “three ninety-minute sessions of the Seven Habits curriculum” (Schmiesing, 3¶). The project found that the LPI scores increased for all participants with the exception of one that had a decreasing score in two LPI practices (Schmiesing). The results were given in terms of increases in mean and median without discussion of statistical significance.
Transformational Leadership Support from Educational Scholars

According to Moore (1993), “transformational leadership is desired but difficult to achieve in higher education. Dual decision-making systems, decentralization of academic decision making, the influence of external authorities and interests, and the lack of agreement on institutional goals—all impose constraints on leadership” (p. 160). Moore indicates transformational leadership enhances higher education’s leadership but is not normally accomplished on the macro scale.

Batchelor (1993) wrote that “organizations are over managed and have too little leadership. Therefore, leadership enhancement must be just as much a part of the development effort as learning new technical skills” (p. 379).

Siegrist (1999) was in agreement when he stated that “educational leadership must move beyond management to visionary and moral transformational leadership” (p. 297). Educational methods have been a great concern in primary education but “their message echoes loudly in the hallowed halls of academe as well. If leadership is vital to the schools, preparation of those leaders is very serious business indeed” (p. 297). Siegrist goes on to state that “graduate programs must move beyond the training of efficient managers, to the preparation of visionary, moral, and transformational leaders” (p. 297).

Additional support for college student personnel to be imbued with transformational leadership is provided from Komives (1993) who states, “Graduate programs should strive to develop leadership perspectives, attitudes, values, and skills in…students as an intentional outcome” (p. 406). Komives goes on to emphasize several
of Kouzes and Posner’s practices when she states, “Leaders should connect individuals with each other in fashioning an inclusive community and link people with ideas about shared vision. New-age leaders must see connections, value collaboration, and empower all stakeholders to make a difference in campus change” (p. 406).

Love and Estanek (2004) inculcate Kouze and Posner’s action oriented ideology in their work specifically written for new upcoming student affairs leaders. Love and Estanek indicate the Kouze and Posner’s ideology fits their recommended model of “both-and situations” necessary in today’s leadership successes verses the “either-or situations” which can lead to failure in dynamic leadership environments. Love and Estanek embrace the Kouzes and Posner’s pervasive leadership philosophy when they stated, “Leadership must become everyone’s business (Astin & Astin, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 1995)” (p. 40).

Master’s Degree CSP Program at Ohio University

Are there programs to improve transformational leadership (leadership) skills in upcoming higher education leaders? It is believed one such program is the Ohio University College of Education’s College Student Personnel Master’s degree program. “The focus of the . . . program is upon the knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills needed for the entry-level professional” (College of Education, 2004a, 1) The College of Education (2004d) describes the Master’s degree CSP program as follows:

Individuals from across the country come to Ohio University to study in the Master's Degree program in College Student Personnel. Fifteen to twenty students enroll each year. Over the past forty years, our graduates have
attained significant leadership positions in colleges, universities, and professional associations.

The program is focused on developing the knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills that are needed by student affairs professionals. The Master's Degree curriculum integrates theory and practice, blending courses in student development theory, student affairs administration, counseling, and higher education with hands-on experience in student affairs offices at Ohio University or at neighboring institutions.

The program requires the equivalent of two years of full-time study and follows national standards for professional education, while also personalizing study in order to meet individual needs. (1¶)

These students are evaluated by “academic credentials, experience, compatibility of personal characteristics and professional goals with advanced study in the field of counseling and counselor education are all taken into consideration” (College of Education, 2004b, 1¶).

Young (2004) stated the Master’s degree CSP program requirements are as follows:

1. Submission of transcripts of bachelor's degree work (2 official copies)
2. If undergraduate GPA is <2.9 (4.0 scale) overall or <3.25 for the last 90 quarter or equivalent semester hours, applicants must submit scores for the Graduate Record Examination; if GPA exceeds these levels, no test scores are required
3. Completed Graduate Admissions Application (2 copies) and application fee.

4. A 2-3 page autobiography (the autobiography provides a sample of your writing; it should tell us about you as an applicant and address important factors in your life journey that have shaped your interest in CSP and brought you to apply to this program)

5. Three letters of recommendation.

6. A personal interview. (10¶)

Summary of the Literature Review

Transformational leadership is touted as the leadership style that relates to success by numerous authors of leadership today. Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) instrument have been employed by a wide variety of businesses and educational research studies involving a large diverse population. The statistics continue to show reliability and validity of and the benefits derived from the transformational leadership style (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Transformational leadership was reviewed in relation to demographics, university-business comparisons, college athletics, leader-subordinate relations, administrative-educational level, training needs, job success, job satisfaction, scholarly support, and the effects of training intervention. A review of the effects of the many components of demographics on transformational leadership has found the component constructs to have an insignificant impact. (Erickson, 1992; Sherman, 1989; Lenz, 1982; Brightharp, 1999). Studies by Ottinger (1990) and Bauer (1993) suggest university
leaders have stronger transformational leader practices than business leaders. Research in college athletics, regarding leadership practices, ranges from no relationship to coaching success to a strong relationship to personal best leadership experiences (Elliot, 1990; Armstrong, 1992). Research also suggests that leaders enable subordinates to work on their own (Taylor, 2001); however, if a leader would practice Inspiring subordinates a stronger team relationship could result (Stephenson, 2002). The administrative-academic level of an individual appears to be positively correlated to the level of transformational leadership with some exceptions (Amnuckmanee, 2002; Carlson, 1991; La Vine, 1998; Spotanski, 1991; Burkhart, 1999). The Rammel study as well as Burkhart (1999) indicated job success has a positive relationship with transformational leadership (quoted in Burgess, 2002; Burkhart). The literature supports the idea that, if an individual perceives their leader or themselves as a transformational leader they are more satisfied with their job (Xu, 1991; Dauffenbach, 1995; Brown, 1996). The research findings suggests that transformational leadership training intervention is effective in changing leadership practices (Schmiesing, 2001; Lafferty, 1998; Jensen, 1998). It was also found that educational scholars support practicing transformational leadership (Moore, 1993; Batchelor, 1993; Siegrist, 1999; Komives, 1993; Love & Estanek, 2004).

The Master’s CSP program is designed to train leaders in higher education. The status of the program in relation to transformational leadership is the focus of this study.

In conclusion the findings in the literature review indicated that administrative affairs scholars support practicing transformational leadership. The findings also supported the assertion that the transformational leadership practices of the LPI are
related to leader success and job satisfaction in today’s educational institutions and are influenced by training intervention.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This study was an exploratory summative evaluation of a program, accomplished by comparing differences of students graduating from the Master’s degree CSP program to those of students matriculating to the Master’s degree CSP program. These groups are considered to be comparable since both the graduating cohort and the matriculating cohort must meet the same admission requirements. The summative evaluation was statistically analyzed by employing profile analysis between and within groups regarding the five LPI practices. Due to the exploratory nature of this research and the low number of participants an alpha of .10 was used for review criteria.

According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), profile analysis is appropriate if all independent variables are discrete and all dependent variables are continuous and commensurate (p. 903). The data and cohorts analyzed in this research matched the profile analysis criteria.

To accomplish the evaluation the director for the Master’s degree CSP program was contacted for the purpose of determining if the Ohio University College of Education would be interested in the subject research, if there were questions of interest, to seek an appropriate contact for the class roster, to verify the population for the study and to make arrangements for survey administration. The director of the Master’s CSP program indicated the research would be of value to the department (See Appendix A). It was agreed that the graduating cohort and the matriculating cohort would be appropriate populations of study. The survey was administered electronically for the graduating
Master’s degree CSP students (graduating cohort) and as an in-class survey for the matriculating Master’s degree CSP students (matriculating cohort). The difference in administration was a matter of convenience and has been shown to be of equal value. A review of the literature revealed there were no significant differences in electronic and printed media in learning (which requires completing test) (Sohee, 2002), reading comprehension (Pemberton, 2001), or in completion of various types of surveys (Saphore, 1999; Thomas, 2000). Numerous other studies were reviewed with no contradictory findings discovered (King, 1995; Knapp, 2003; Pettit, 2002, Potosky & Bobko, 1997; Schaefer & Dillman, 1998; Smith, Walker & Yap, 2004; Yun & Trumbo, 2000). Therefore it was assumed acceptable to conduct the subject research survey by e-mail or as an in-class survey with equal weight given to the data. The same information was presented to the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort except that the graduating cohort was asked three post-training questions.

The electronic version of the survey was in Microsoft Word format. The document was created with open cells within the document for data entry. The document was attached to an instructional e-mail and sent to the graduating cohort. The participants were asked to return the completed attachment via e-mail or in case of the hard copy directly to the surveyor as appropriate (see Appendix D, Appendix E and Appendix F to review the content of questionnaire, questionnaire cover letter and questionnaire instructions respectively).

The graduating and matriculating cohort were asked three questions, their gender, importance of leadership training in the Master’s degree CSP program, and if they
believe leadership is innate or can be learned. The graduating cohort was asked three additional questions, which applied to the training intervention (Master’s degree CSP program). They were asked if the program enhanced leadership skills, and if so how, they were also asked where in the program they acquired their leadership skills, and if there has been a change in their leadership style as a result of the program? Gender difference in leadership practices were investigated and noted in the research. A percentage was reported in regards to agreement or disagreement regarding the qualitative components of the study along with individual commentary regarding participants opinions and experiences.

*Operational Definitions of the Variables*

The operational variables were Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) five practices of leadership. Each practice has two commitments and each commitment has three questions associated with it. The sample participant was asked to score on a 10 point Likert scale from 1 = Almost Never, to 10 = Almost Always, in response to 30 questions (see LPI Questionnaire in Appendix D). The questions relate to the commitments and scores were totaled for each of the five practices. The five independent factors that determine the level of transformational leadership were: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act and encouraging the heart. The practice scores were derived from a specific group of questions (see LPI Statements by Leadership Practice in Appendix G).

To determine the leadership practices of the participant a score was given as a result of the response to each of the questions. The scores were added up for each
practice and resulted in a five-factor makeup of the leadership practices of the individual. Kouzes’ and Posner’s directions for hand-scoring are shown in Appendix H. The directions were not carried out in the prescribed manner in one regard. The researcher, instead of participants, recorded and totaled the scores to reduce the burden on the participants. The participants rated themselves on each question then returned the questionnaire electronically or via hard copy and this researcher entered the results.

*LPI 2003 Norms*

The matriculating and graduating cohorts were compared to the 2003 LPI norm scores (see Appendix B and Figure 1 and Figure 2). The exact source of the 2003 norm sample was not discovered but Kouzes and Posner (2003b) indicated the latest psychometrics were developed as a result of the LPI instrument being administered to over 100,000 participants from a variety of public and private organizations with an array of demographic backgrounds and indicates the data bases are continually updated. It is known from the reported norm results that there were 1259 participants’ scores used to calculate the 2003 norms (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a). Therefore it is believed the 2003 norms were developed from the latest available data from samples consisting of a variety of public and private organizations. The norm is used in comparison to the matriculating and graduating cohort because it represents the LPI normative score for a leader in 2003.

*Identification of the Population*

The participants of the study were identified by contacting the director of the Master’s CSP program. The study populations consist of two Master’s degree CSP
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Figure 1 Matriculating vs. Graduating vs. Norm
Leadership Practices- Outlier Removed

Figure 2 Matriculating vs. Graduating vs. Norm – Outlier Removed
program classes. One class started the Master’s degree CSP program in the fall of 2004 (matriculating cohort) and the second completed the Master’s degree CSP program in the fall, winter, and spring of 2004 (graduating cohort). The matriculating and graduating cohorts were expected to have approximately 15 participants. The participant groups were chosen because they were expected to most accurately demonstrate the difference in leadership practices of students in the Master’s degree CSP program during a two year learning experience. The list of participants was continually verified, as appropriate, by confirming data accuracy with the director of the Master’s degree CSP program.

_Sampling Method_

This was not a random sample. The samples consisted of intact groups of students who chose to enroll in the Master’s degree CSP program voluntarily in the year 2002 and 2004. The sample was a purposeful or convenient sample. This research was conducted to determine if there is a difference in the matriculating and graduating Master’s degree CSP program cohorts at Ohio University in regards to LPI leadership practices. The research was expected to provide specific information to the College of Education at Ohio University regarding the Master’s degree CSP program and therefore intact groups instead of random samples of populations were employed.

_Instrumentation_

Numerous established leadership-measuring instruments were examined and as a result of the examination leadership practices were measured using the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) created and tested for reliability and validity by Kouzes and Posner. “There is considerable empirical support for the Five Practices of
Transformational Leadership framework” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 1). The LPI is in its third edition and has been a leading instrument used for self-evaluation of leadership practices since the late 1980s (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Kouze and Posner (2003b), “as well as other researchers, have conducted over a fifteen-year period consistently confirm the reliability and validity of the Leadership Practices Inventory and the Five Practices of Transformational Leaders model” (p. 2). The LPI was compared to numerous other studies, “The LPI is consistently rated among the best, regardless of the criteria. For example, in one assessment of 18 different leadership instruments, the LPI was the only one to receive the top score in psychometric soundness and ease of use” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 16).

The method of development of the LPI was a triangulation between qualitative and quantitative “research methods and studies. In-depth interviews and written case studies from personal-best leadership experiences generated the conceptual framework” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 1). Over 4000 case studies were conducted as well as 500 in depth interviews with some discourses lasting over 5 hours. The results of the qualitative studies have been consistent for over 20 years (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 3).

Five Practices of Transformational Leadership framework resulted in the five practices that make up the LPI. “The actions that make up these practices were translated into behavioral statements. The LPI contains thirty statements – six statements for measuring each of the five key practices of transformational leaders” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 3) (see Appendix G).
“Following several iterative psychometric processes, the resulting instrument has been administered to over 350,000 managers and non-managers across a variety of organizations, disciplines, and demographic backgrounds” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 2). In 1999 the LPI was reformulated by changing from a 5 point Likert Scale to a 10 point Likert Scale. Some questions were modified or altered slightly, some questions were added and some eliminated, “following lengthy discussions and iterative feedback sessions with respondents and subject matter experts as well as empirical analyses of various sets of behaviorally based statements” Kouzes & Posner, p. 3) some instrument modifications were made. There is an “ongoing analysis and refinements in the instrument... with a database involving well over 100,000 respondents” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 3).

The LPI was chosen over numerous other instrument such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5 X), Profile of Aptitude for Leadership (PAL), Leadership Competency Inventory (LCI), Leadership Skills Inventory (LSI), Leatherman Leadership Questionnaire Revised (LLQ), the LEAD survey, Blake and Mourton’s Managerial Grid and the Ohio State and Michigan State leadership surveys. All of the instruments have reliability and validity problems or concerns (Gebart-Eaglemont, 2003; Kerr, 2003; Lee, 2003; Pearson, 2003; Rain, 2003; Rudner, 2003; Schmitt 2003; Argenti, 2002; Brehm, Kassin & Fein,1999; Yukl, 1998; Sherman, 1989). The LPI was specifically recommended by Pearson, Tsend (2000), and Love and Estanek (2004). After a review of the various instruments it was decided the LPI is best suited for the measurement of leadership practices due to recommendations by other researchers (Pearson; Tsend; Love & Estanek) and the longevity (over 20 years) high use (over
100,000 respondents), and the clear statistical backing regarding reliability and validity (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 3).

Instrument Psychometrics

The psychometrics of the LPI have been analyzed and displayed in Appendix C. The table shows the LPI 360 degree survey mean, and standard deviation of the five practices of transformational leadership. It has been demonstrated in the most recent studies, which agree with past studies, that the order of leadership practices has a consistent order. Kouzes and Posner (2003b) stated that, “based upon mean scores, Enabling is the leadership practice most frequently reported being used” (p. 4). This is followed closely by “Modeling; with the average scores for Challenging and Encouraging being fairly similar. Inspiring is perceived . . . as the leadership practice least frequently engaged in” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 4).

Reliability

According to Tuckman (1999) reliability “means that a test gives consistent measurements” (p. 198) and the reliability coefficients should be at least .50 for an attitude test (p. 445). Kouzes and Posner (2003b) indicated a reliability coefficient of .60 is considered acceptable. Best and Kahn (1998) state, “A test is said to be reliable to the degree that it measures accurately and consistently, yielding comparable results when administered a number of times” (p. 378). Reliability has been extensively analyzed for the LPI and consistently delivers acceptable results above .60 (see Table 1) (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, 2¶).
Table 1

*Reliability (Cronbach Alpha) Coefficients for the LPI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Self (All)</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Direct Report</th>
<th>Co-Worker or Peer</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Copyright 2003 by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. Reprinted with permission (see Appendix I)
High levels of internal reliability have been demonstrated by numerous researchers in many fields, including engineering managers, LPI self, LPI observer, correctional institution leaders, Agricultural Education Department Executive Officers, telecommunication front line supervisors, cross section of mid-level managers, home healthcare agency directors, adults enrolled in a community leadership development program, female college student affairs officers, nursing managers and many more with the range of internal reliability from .60 to .97 (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 7).

Internal reliability proved acceptable in non-U.S. populations for example, Australian bank managers, therapeutic radiographers from Hong Kong, Mexican respondents, Chinese respondents and Mongolian higher education leaders. “The response options on the LPI are fairly straightforward. . . and there are no statements that directly reflect American cultural values that could potentially confuse respondents from other nations.” (Tsend, 2000 quoted in Kouzes and Posner, 2003b, p. 8).

Test-retest reliability for the LPI is very strong, normally near .90. Some areas where test-retest reliability has shown statistically significant reliability are school administrators, superintendents and school principals and LPI workshop participants (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 8).

External reliability is demonstrated by examining the various aspect of LPI use such as self-test compared to observer test, across various leaders, across gender, across functional groups, across ethnic background and across cultural groups. It has been demonstrated that individual differences do not affect the LPI reliability. Studies have been conducted that included variables of age, marital status, gender, race, years of
experience, educational level, organization size, functional area, line personnel compared to staff personnel, and different professions with results that support the external reliability of the LPI. “Multiple regression analyses revealed that age, educational level, or work experience had no significant influence on the leadership practices of either male or female in Thai managers” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 8).

Validity

To examine validity of the LPI, Kouzes and Posner (2003b) examined face, empirical, concurrent and discriminant validity. “Validity addresses the question of weather or not an instrument truly measures what it purports to measure and accordingly, whether its scores have meaning or utility for a respondent” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 13).

Face validity is a subjective evaluation of the survey instrument to determine if by appearances, when logically viewing the results, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure. The LPI was established and improved over many years from workshops in which participants described the practices of transformational leaders, the LPI therefore does in fact appear to have face validity (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b).

Empirical validity or objective validity requires scientific measurements to verify the validity of the instrument. In the case of the LPI the empirical validity was demonstrated by using factor analysis which demonstrates how much an, “instrument item measure common or different content” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b). As a result of factor analysis the LPI was shown to consist of five practices. The five factors demonstrated acceptable collinearity (Kouzes & Posner).
Kouzes and Posner (2003b) reported the following:

For example, responses to the thirty leadership behavior items were subjected to a principle factoring method with iteration and varimax rotation. Five factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounting for 60.5 percent of the variance. Five interpretable [sic] factors were obtained – consistent with the five subscales of the LPI – although a few item-factor loadings share some common variance across more than one factor. The stability of the five factor solution was tested by factor analyzing the data from different subsamples. In each case, the factor structure was essentially similar to the one involving the entire sample. (p. 14)

Other researchers have reported achieving comparable factor structures within a variety of organizational settings. Georgia Institute of Technology Professor David Herold and his colleagues, with their own LPI data, performed a confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL VII, analyzing a covariance matrix prepared from the raw data by PRELIS.

Their conclusion:

Estimating a correlated factors model corresponding to the oblique factor rotation, modified to reflect the intercorrelations among the error items for the LPI items that had correlations with other items exceeding .50, resulted in a confirmatory modeling with acceptable fit (Chi-Square = 399.9, d.f. = 363, p < .09). In addition, all of the hypothesized structural coefficients linking the observed variables to the five factors were highly significant with all t values
exceeding 7.0, suggesting that when modeled appropriately, the LISREL estimates confirm the LPI factor model. Applying a similar methodological approach (LISREL), with a sample of U.S. and Canadian community activists, the analysis confirmed the structural integrity of the LPI framework. A structured interview protocol within a school setting reported that participants validated 81 percent of the salient principal scores as actual patterns of behavior in their experience. (Herald et al., p. 10 quoted in Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 14)

Some of the most important validity results come from comparing the results of the LPI to results of other instruments. This comparison is referred to as concurrent validity. The LPI has demonstrated, “excellent concurrent validity, and leadership scores are consistently associated with important aspects of managerial and organizational effectiveness such as workgroup performance, team cohesiveness, commitment, satisfaction and credibility” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p.15). Kouzes and Posner conducted a study using just the observer LPI. By using the observer LPI the observers were basically doing an independent assessment of the leader. By conducting the study in this manner it eliminates self-bias. A regression analysis was conducted that used the five practices of the LPI as the independent variables and leadership effectiveness as the dependent variable. “The regression equation was highly significant (F = 318.88, p < .0001). The leadership practices explained over 55 percent (adjusted R^2 = .756) of the variance around constituents' assessments of their managers' effectiveness” (Kouzes & Posner, p. 15).
Concurrent validity has been reviewed by comparing the LPI to other instruments. “Correlations with other sociological and psychological instruments further enhance confidence that the LPI measures what it is purported to measure and not some other phenomenon” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 16). The LPI has been compared with numerous other study areas from motivation to public health to Myers-Briggs Type Indicators to self esteem and many more and found to satisfactorily measure levels of leadership (Kouzes & Posner).

Discriminate validity, the ability of an instrument to categorized leadership into low to high leadership abilities, was demonstrated by separating managers into various performance groups. Kouzes and Posner, (2003b) separated the group into the lower third performance group and the upper third performance group based on the observer LPI. Using the LPI scale groups were classified as low and high performance managers (p. 15).

Kouzes and Posner (2003b) wrote that:

Approximately 85 percent of the sample of LPI-Observer respondents was used to create the canonical discriminant function, with the remaining 15 percent used to create a holdout sample for classification purposes. One discriminant function was derived and it correctly classified 92.6 percent of the known cases and 77.8 percent of the cases in the holdout sample. Including the middle third of the sample in this analysis, resulted in correct classification of 71.1 percent of the known cases and 67.9 percent of the
holdout sample. All four of these results are beyond the .001 level of chance probability (p.16).

**Data Collection Procedures**

After the LPI standardized survey with one demographic and a few qualitative questions regarding gender, sources of leadership learning and differences in leadership practices was approved by the Institutional Research Board, the graduating cohort was sent a pre-notification e-mail from the director of the Master’s CSP program one day prior to the electronic LPI survey. The e-mail informed the graduating cohort that the electronic survey would be sent to them so that students would have confidence that the electronic documents were virus and scam free (see Appendix K). The graduating cohort was asked if they would participate in the LPI research via an e-mail containing the letter seen in Appendix E. The participants were respectfully asked to read the instructions shown in Appendix F and complete the questionnaire. (Note that questions 32, 33, and 34 were removed from the matriculating cohort participant’s survey questionnaire because they apply to a post-training experience.) The director of the Master’s CSP program sent one follow-up letter encouraging the graduate cohort to participate in the study. One e-mail was sent to participants by the researcher to participants that had not responded one week after the initial e-mail encouraging them to participate.

The matriculating cohort participants received an in-class administration of the LPI survey primarily because the opportunity was available. This researcher administered the LPI survey with the director of the Master’s CSP program present. The
matriculating cohort was asked if they would participate in the study, they did give permission and then the LPI survey was administered.

Once the questionnaires were completed the data was transferred to a LPI self response sheet shown in Appendix J by this researcher in accordance with LPI hand scoring instructions shown in Appendix H. Once the data was obtained it was entered into a statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version 12.0 for analysis. The final scores of the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort were compared to each other and the LPI norms.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Data from each of the two groups were entered into SPSS to conduct a profile analysis to determine the difference among and between the matriculating and the graduating cohorts. A profile analysis was performed to determine overall differences of the Master’s degree CSP program matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort regarding leadership practices as measured by the LPI.

Profile analysis includes three methods of testing: level, parallelism, and flatness. The most important of the three tests analyzes overall difference between groups or “level.” The levels test shows on average if one group scores higher on the collected set of measures than another and tested the null hypothesis and made inference about the stated problem.

The levels test was followed by a one-way ANOVA that tested the sub-hypothesis and made inference about the sub-problems. The flatness test, tested the within group hypothesis and made inference about the stated problem. The
multivariate test determined the significance of parallelism which indicates if there was significant interaction between the two groups but did not test any of the stated hypotheses or make inference about stated problems. These analyses were conducted via the GLM repeated measures between-subject test in SPSS version 12.0.

There was a qualitative component to the data analysis. This component was gleaned for additional insights to participant’s responses and individual commentary was provided.

Demographic variables are not expected to significantly contribute to transformational leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Brightharp, 1999; Erickson, 1992; Sherman, 1989; Lenz, 1982). Gender is the only demographic that was requested and explored.

Variables

The dependent variables were the five practices of Kouzes and Posner’s LPI. The practices are Modeling, Inspiring, Challenging, Enabling, and Encouraging. The practices are described in more detail in the definitions and in the introduction sections of this study. The LPI instrument produced a score for each of the five practices. The independent variables are matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort.

Assumptions

To conduct analysis via profile analysis which is a form of MANOVA certain assumptions must be met as described by Field (2002). “Independence: Observations should be statistically independent. Random sampling: Data should be randomly sampled from the population of interest and measured at an interval level” (p. 397). Note
random sampling was not conducted and is listed as a limitation. It should also be noted that MANOVA is robust and mitigates the impact of this limitation (Field).

Profile analysis which is a particular form of MANOVA has practical issues of conformity for best results. The sample size must be suitable for profile analysis. If there are more participants in the smallest group than there are dependent variables and the sample size of each group is nearly equal then there is little concern regarding multivariate normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance, univariate homogeneity of variance. The Box’s M test is readily available to confirm conformity to homogeneity of variance-covariance if there is concern. Of course power increases with an increase number of study participants. Profile analysis is also robust for multicollinearity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Profile analysis is sensitive to outliers. Therefore tests must be conducted for the presence of outliers.

Missing data must be viewed to determine if the weight of the missing data is an issue. If the missing data is evenly distributed and appears random then it should not be a problem. If the missing data has obvious weight in the analysis then correction measures must be taken to mitigate the imbalance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Checking Assumptions

The basic assumptions of independence and interval data were tested by review of the research design and the LPI instrument. The administration of the LPI survey was reviewed for the potential of the content of the surveys to be compromised and discussed.
Mahalanobis’ Distance and z-scores were used to screen for outliers. The Box’s M test was conducted to confirm conformity to homogeneity of variance-covariance.

The profile analysis was conducted using SPSS version 12.0 via a GLM repeated measures analysis. The analysis produces three tables. The multivariate test is a test for parallelism, the between-subject test for level and the within-subject test for flatness. The sample size of each group was nearly equal so there was little concern regarding multivariate normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance, and univariate homogeneity of variance. Power was deemed suitable with an alpha of .10 for exploratory research. The multi-collinearity was verified by producing inter-item correlation matrix and examining the correlation between various constructs of the LPI instrument for conformity.

**Test Statistics**

The test statistic was chosen from Roy’s statistic, Hotelling’s trace, Wilks’ Λ and Pillai’s trace. Hotelling’s trace is seldom used in educational research, Roy’s statistic is most powerful if the group means are highly correlated, and Pillai’s trace is most powerful if groups means are diffusely correlated; since the correlation is not known, the best choice for this research is Wilks’ Λ, which is reasonably powerful if the group means correlation is between a strong and diffuse correlation (G. Brooks, personal communication, May 4, 2004).
CHAPTER FOUR
Presentation and Analysis of the Data

Introduction

This researcher examined the difference in LPI scores of the Master’s degree CSP program matriculating cohort, consisting of 15 participants and the graduating cohort, consisting of 13 participants. The results are reported graphically (see Figure 1 and Figure 2) as well as descriptively (see Table 2 and Table 3). The figures and tables display the means of the five LPI practices of the two cohorts as well as the means of the LPI norm data. Gender issues were researched but due to the small sample of males (4 in the graduating and 2 in the matriculating cohort) statistical analysis of results were not practical and therefore gender issues were reserved for discussion in Chapter Five.

Analysis of Data

There was 100% participation by both the Master’s degree CSP program matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort. There were no missing data. The administration of the in class survey was observed and there was no discussion of the survey content between participants. The graduating class was sent an e-mail (seen in Appendix K) requesting that participants not discuss the survey with colleagues. In both cases there was no driving force to motivate within subjects or between subjects to discuss the survey content. This researcher feels comfortable that the data is independent.
Table 2

_Means of LPI Practices_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>MTW</th>
<th>ISV</th>
<th>CTP</th>
<th>EOA</th>
<th>ETH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matriculating</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>46.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>47.02</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTW = Modeling, ISV = Inspiring, CTP = Challenging, EOA = Enabling and ETH = Encouraging

The survey instrument was reviewed for an appropriate scale for profile analysis. The survey instrument employed a 10 point Likert’s scale. This scale is accepted as continuous interval data in the social sciences. The same scale was used throughout the survey therefore all data is commensurate.

Seven out of 12 or 58.3% of the graduating cohort requested feedback while five out of 15 or 33.3% of the matriculating cohort requested feedback. An example of survey feedback is shown in Appendix L.

The data were screened for outliers by transforming data to standardized z-scores and using a score of 3.0 as the criteria for review. One z-score exceeded
Table 3

*Means of LPI Practices with Outlier Removed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>MTW</th>
<th>ISV</th>
<th>CTP</th>
<th>EOA</th>
<th>ETH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matriculating</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>46.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>44.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>47.02</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTW = Modeling, ISV = Inspiring, CTP = Challenging, EOA = Enabling and ETH = Encouraging

The scores of the one graduating cohort participant appeared much lower than the rest of the participants. The score had the potential to alter results of the study by causing the graduating cohort scores to be low. Initially the associated data were reviewed and it was decided to accept the data because it appeared consistent with the participant’s other responses. Further analysis of the data by regression provided a Mahalanobis’ Distance of 17.04 which exceeds the outlier critical value of 15 derived using five degrees of freedom at an alpha of .001. This indicates that over the five LPI practices the case had extreme values. Therefore it was decided to review the analysis with and without this case.
Profile analysis is robust to violation of multivariate normality and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices if the sample size of the smallest group is greater than the number of dependent variables and sample sizes are nearly equal. There are five dependent variables and the sample sizes of the matriculating cohort was 15 and the sample size of the graduating cohort was 13, this fact along with the fact of no missing data, in this researchers opinion satisfy the concern regarding multivariate normality and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Further support for this conclusion was provided by reviewing histograms of the data with normality curves and descriptive data regarding skewness. All dependent variables had reasonable distributions of normality and were all skewed in a negative direction. The Box’s M test was conducted and the result was 15.58 with p = .672. This statistically indicates the homogeneity of variance-covariance was not violated in the study.

The internal consistency of reliability estimates for the five LPI practices scales were conducted using data from both the matriculating and graduating cohorts. The analysis resulted in Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .710 for Enabling to .832 for Inspiring. Kouzes and Posner (2003b) indicated a reliability coefficient of .60 is considered acceptable. The inter-item correlation matrix is shown in Table 4 and demonstrate satisfactory research conformance regarding multicollinearity.

A profile analysis was performed to determine overall differences of the Master’s degree CSP program matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort regarding leadership practices as measured by the LPI. Profile analysis includes
Table 4

*Inter-Item Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI Practices</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Challenging</th>
<th>Enabling</th>
<th>Encouraging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

three methods of testing: level, parallelism, and flatness. A one-way ANOVA test was performed to determine individual LPI leadership practice differences of the Master’s degree CSP program matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 displays the visual aspect of the four test and a comparison against the LPI 2003 norms. The norm is used in comparison to the matriculating and graduating cohort because it represents the LPI normative score for a leader in 2003.

The most important of the three tests analyzes overall difference between groups or “level.” The levels test shows on average if one group scores higher on the collected set of measures than another and tested the null hypothesis and made inference about the stated problem.

The null hypothesis and the stated problem to be examined in this research were as follows:
Ho  There is no significant difference between and within groups regarding the five leadership practices of the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

The stated problem asked what is the extent of difference between and within groups regarding the five leadership practices of the matriculating and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI?

The levels test, analyzed only the between component of the hypothesis. The study findings indicate there are no differences between the matriculating and graduating cohorts regarding LPI practices, $F(1, 26) = .072, p = .791$ (see Figure 1 and Table 3) and therefore the null hypothesis is retained. Analysis with the outlier removed also resulted in an insignificant difference between the two cohorts, $F(1, 25) = .128, p = .723$ (see Figure 2 and Table 3).

The null hypothesis and the statement of the problem also have a within group component. The flatness test determined if the within group component is significant. At this point it is preferred to complete examination of comparing means of the two groups for the five practices this will be done with a one-way ANOVA. The flatness test will be presented following the one-way ANOVA.

A one-way ANOVA, which compares the dependent variables of Modeling, Inspiring, Challenging, Enabling and Encouraging to the independent cohorts of matriculating and graduating, was conducted to discover if there is a significant mean differences in the LPI practices of the two cohorts on any of the five LPI practices.
The first sub-hypothesis and sub-problem stated:

\( H_{01} \)  There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of 
Modeling for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as 
measured by the LPI.

The sub-problem asked, what is the extent of difference in the leadership 
practice of Modeling between the matriculating and the graduating cohort as 
measured by the LPI?

The one-way ANOVA result (see Table 5) for Modeling was as follows: \( F(1, 27) = .371, p = .548 \). The study findings indicate there was no significant difference 
between groups regarding the practice of Modeling for the matriculating cohort and 
the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI. Therefore the sub-hypothesis is 
retained.

The second sub-hypothesis and sub-problem stated:

\( H_{02} \)  There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of 
Inspiring for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as 
measured by the LPI.

The sub-problem asked, what is the extent of difference in the leadership 
practice of Inspiring between the matriculating and the graduating cohort as 
measured by the LPI?

The one-way ANOVA result for Inspiring was as follows: \( F(1, 27) = .016, p = .902 \). The study findings indicate there was no significant difference between
Table 5

*One-way ANOVA of LPI Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.534</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.704</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143.124</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>117.990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups regarding the practice of Inspiring for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI. Therefore the sub-hypothesis is retained.

The third sub-hypothesis and sub-problem stated:

$H_0_3$  There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Challenging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

The sub-problem asked, what is the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Challenging between the matriculating and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI? The one-way ANOVA result for Challenging was as follows: $F(1, 27) = 1.224, p = .279$. The study findings indicate there was no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Challenging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI, therefore the sub-hypothesis is retained.

The fourth sub-hypothesis and sub-problem stated:

$H_0_4$  There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Enabling for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.

The sub-problem asked, what is the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Enabling between the matriculating and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI? The one-way ANOVA result for Enabling was as follows: $F(1, 27) = 1.224, p = .279$. The study findings indicate there was no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Enabling for the matriculating
cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI, therefore the sub-hypothesis is retained.

The fifth sub-hypothesis and sub-problem stated:

\[ \text{Ho}_5 \quad \text{There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Encouraging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.} \]

The sub-problem asked, what is the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Encouraging between the matriculating and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI?

The one-way ANOVA result for Encouraging was as follows: \( F(1, 27) = 1.213, p = .281 \). The study findings indicate there was no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Encouraging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI. Therefore the sub-hypothesis is retained.

All the sub-hypothesis and sub-problems were tested with the outlier removed and the end results were the same with the exception of Challenging. When the one-way ANOVA was run for Challenging with the outlier removed significance was found.

The third sub-hypothesis and sub-problem stated:

\[ \text{Ho}_3 \quad \text{There is no significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Challenging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.} \]
The sub-problem asked, what is the extent of difference in the leadership practice of Challenging between the matriculating and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI?

The one-way ANOVA result for Challenging was as follows: $F(1, 26) = 3.36$, $p = .079$. The study findings indicated there was a significant difference between groups regarding the practice of Challenging for the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI, therefore the sub-hypothesis is rejected.

This would indicate a significant improvement in the LPI practice of Challenging by the graduating group over the matriculating group. This can be visually observed when comparing the means of Challenging for the two cohorts seen in Figure 2.

Profile analysis also examines flatness. Flatness concerns the similarity of responses to all dependent variables, independent of groups. Did the participants in this study score significantly higher or lower on any one of the five practices as measured by the LPI? Flatness is analyzed by the GLM repeated measures test of within-subject effects. The data used in this test included scores from both the graduating and the matriculating group. The null hypothesis and the stated problem to be examined in this study by the flatness test were as follows:

$H_0$ There is no significant difference between and within groups regarding the five leadership practices of the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI.
The stated problem asked what is the extent of difference between and within groups regarding the five leadership practices of the matriculating and the graduating cohort as measured by the LPI?

The flatness test, examined only the within component. The results, when compared to an alpha of .10 with sphericity assumed, indicated there was a significant difference within-groups for the LPI practices, $F(4, 104) = 2.193, p = .075$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. When the outlier is removed flatness is no longer significant $F(4, 100) = 1.759, p = .143$. Since significance was found with the outlier included a follow up test with a comparison of means with a Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons for the 10 combinations of within-groups for the five practices of the LPI was conducted to determine where within the group the significance lies. The results show numerous significant differences between the mean scores of the five LPI practices and are shown in Table 6. The order of the LPI practices can be determined by reviewing Table 6. The participants in this study scored from highest to lowest as follows: Enabling, Encouraging, Modeling, Challenging and Inspiring. The order of scores is exactly the same as the LPI Norms although some mean differences are not significantly different.

The third profile test of interest is parallelism. Regardless if there is a significant difference in groups, parallelism asks if there is an interaction between the two groups?

The profile analysis for parallelism revealed there was a significant interaction between the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort regarding LPI
Table 6

*Mean Differences in LPI Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI Practices</th>
<th>LPI Practices</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>5.846*</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>3.036*</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>-4.362*</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>-2.810</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>-10.208*</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>-6.251*</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>-7.397*</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>-3.441</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>3.956</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

* The mean difference is significant at the .1 level.

a Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.
practices based an alpha of .10 for exploratory research. SPSS multivariate results were as follows: Wilks’ $\Lambda = .717$, $F(4, 23) = 2.268$, $p = .093$. When the outlier is removed parallelism is no longer significant, Wilks’ $\Lambda = .733$, $F(4, 22) = 2.002$, $p = .129$. This can be visually observed when comparing Figure 1 and Figure 2. Note how the two lines representing the cohorts are more parallel in Figure 2 than they are in Figure 1. The outlier pulled the entire cohort means down in Figure 1 and once it was removed the line sprung up and appears much more parallel. Each LPI practice can be compared in Figure 1 and Figure 2 and the change can be visually detected in each of the practices for the graduating cohort. The significant result indicates that there is a difference in how the matriculating and graduating cohort responded to the inter-practice relationship of the five LPI practices. The significance of the study results is not explicit but may be simply the result of an outlier.

Information Derived from the Qualitative Component

Of the 28 participants in this study 96% indicated that leadership training is important in the Master’s degree CSP program. On a voluntary basis, without being prompted, 6.5% of the graduating cohort stated the Master’s CSP program needed a specific leadership course. Other participants, 6.5%, indicated they were learning poor leadership skills from field practitioners. The following is commentary from the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort:

Matriculating

One student stated leadership is, “very important bk [because] CSP graduates will eventually become future leaders @ [at] the University level. W/o
[without] leadership training/opportunities it will be hard to succeed and make others succeed.”

Another student wrote, “Yes. Most students have been leaders at their undergraduate institutions, but have had no formal training. It’s now time to motivate and cultivate new undergraduate leaders- without some idea of theory and style, I think this is difficult.”

A third student offered, “Yes, because not everyone has had leadership experience or knows how to lead effectively.”

A fourth student coments “Leadership is very important. CSP professionals are to be role models with which the students they work. Students should learn from leadership styles of CSP professionals; Therefore CSP should participate in a leadership program.”

A fifth student wrote, “I believe that it is one of the fundamental purposes of the program. Leadership is multi-dimensional and occurs in many different versions. Exploring strengths and weaknesses in leadership will not only benefit oneself but also the organization as a whole.”

A sixth student wrote, “Yes I do believe this. Without leadership skills, a person may struggle to find a way to work cooperatively with others. In the CSP program, we are training to become leaders to teach others how to be leaders. Without any skills to fall back on or new knowledge form others, we will not be able to grow & develop ourselves or those who work with us.”

A seventh student offered, “Yes- my definition of a leader is someone who is knowledgeable & [and] confident to think for themself, [sic] but compassionate &
[and] well rounded enough to do what’s best for the group. There are many overlying beliefs between being a leader & [and] a future CSP practitioner. You want to inspire the best in others & lead them on their search of greatness.”

An eighth student wrote, “Most definitely! It’s something that not everyone has– and for those of us who are weak in that area- we need strength- especially considering our future occupation in CSP.” A ninth student comments “I feel it is very important. If we are helping mold the leaders of tomorrow [sic] we must be good leaders ourselves.”

**Graduating Cohort**

One student wrote, “Of course. Our field is one of leadership. There is not one job out there that doesn’t require leadership skills. From RA’s to Judiciaries, leadership is extremely important. Knowing how to be effective, and avoid pretentious/egotistical behavior while leading is very important.”

Another student wrote, “We are expected to become future leaders at our institutions as well as help the students that we will work with to become leaders. How can we accomplish these tasks if leadership is not worked into the CSP program?” Another study participant stated, “Yes, work in student affairs often takes leadership in order to succeed in accomplishing desired outcomes.”

Another wrote, “Yes, because in our jobs we work with student leaders and are supposed to help them grow into better leaders. We also need leadership training so we can be “leaders” at the colleges in which we are employed.”
“I do” was another comment “I feel that college student personnel MUST be leaders to be successful in their job. That’s not to say they will all be the same kind of leader. But individuals must realize their own potential to inspire and challenge students. This cannot be acquired without some training and opportunities for reflection.”

“Yes, I believe leadership training is important in the CSP program” was offered. “As I am in the midst of the job search, I am realizing how vital formal leadership training is. The majority of jobs in student affairs involve advising program boards, chairing special committees, building a safe residence life environment, etc. One of the challenges with leadership training is designing a program or course that would target all of the students who are at different levels of their development process and have different skill sets.”

Another individual indicated, “Yes I do. I think that many leaders come into CSP, but I also think that many CSP students might have learned bad leadership techniques through their involvement in undergraduate experiences.”

Another wrote, “I think it depends on how much leadership development one has coming into the program. I was a respected student leader as an undergraduate and had other priorities coming into the CSP program. While I was involved in SPA, I did not feel I could devote a large amount of energy to it, nor do I believe I developed any skills by being involved. I feel I would have benefited from a Leadership Theory course. Others in my class, however, had not had the same type of leadership experience I had and in some situations ethics is an issue.”
A final example: “Yes. As student affairs practitioners, we work with students who are often campus leaders, and we need to be able to support them and challenge them to the best of our abilities. Also, we are looked to as role models on campuses and spearhead efforts, as well as working the front line with students.”

Of the 13 graduating participants 69% indicated they had changed their leadership practices in some manner as a result of the Master’s degree CSP program. The graduating cohort commentary is as follows:

One student wrote, “Yes, I think I am little less in your face about things which I use to view as a way to challenge people to critically think about issues or reach for more.” Another response was, “I have learned a great deal about the uses of cooperation and collaboration—but this has been more from my experiences in practica and my GA position this year, not from anything I’ve learned through coursework specifically.”

A third student responded, “I think the program has challenged me to learn how to work better with other people. I learned the importance of knowing how to deal with people in certain scopes. For example, I can work with some members of my cohort on an educational level, but not persona[l].”

A fourth student wrote, “Over the last two years, I have become a stronger leader at my GA site as well as in the classroom. I’m still somewhat of a follower until the ball gets rolling on a project, after the project is off the ground I like to become a leader. However, as my leadership skills strengthen, I find myself filling a leader type role.”
A fifth student offered, “I have become more confident in my abilities to work with students, challenge them in their development process, and I’ve just experienced an overall growth in self esteem.” Another students stated, “I try to utilize some of the theoretical knowledge I learned in the program to assist me in my leadership style.”

A seventh student wrote, yes they have changed but “more through my practical experiences than classroom experiences, my leadership skills have been enhanced and honed through application. I have had the opportunity to work in a diversity of situations with a diversity of people, and in each new experience, I find myself changing the way I work with others and how I lead.”

An eighth student responded, “I do not think that my style has changed but I have gained a better understanding of what exactly is my leadership style. Also, I have learned how I can effectively use my leadership style in a higher education setting with fellow staff members as well as when working with students.” One answer was simply “No” another response was, “Not directly due to my program experience.”

When the graduating cohort was asked where leadership skills were obtained 54% of participants indicated their source of leadership skills came from fieldwork (GA, practicum, other) experiences while 23% indicated it was a combination of coursework and fieldwork while 23% gave credit for their leadership skills to previous experience.

The graduating cohort commentary is as follows:
One student indicated, “In particular, my graduate assistantship in student activities advising a student organization has developed my leadership skills. Also, outside practica both at OU and beyond have provided a great deal of opportunity to improve and enhance my leadership development.”

Another student offered, “Through opportunities that allow me to work with people I respect. I enjoy shadowing leaders and learning from their style some of which I can incorporate into my work. Experience is best! Another quick response was via the “GA position this year, Graduate Student Senate involvement.”

A third student indicated, “I think that my work as a graduate associate really helped me develop my leadership skills. I was always placed in situations where I would have to step up and go beyond the call of duty.”

A fourth student wrote, “Different types of coursework have contributed to the development of leadership skills. I think I have been given an opportunity to test my leadership abilities in my GA site. The GA continuously evolved last year and more duties were added this year. I supervise students and the operational aspects of a business. The combination of the two have given me the confidence to step up to the plate while still having the supportive administrative hand to help guide me through difficult situations.” Another response was “The combination of my graduate assistantship and my theory classes (supervision, student development, etc.).”

A sixth student offered, it was “Mainly from my involvement with student organizations from an early age. I have been heavily involved with student groups
and athletics since elementary school. When my athletic career ended in high school, I became immensely involved in student orgs. I have held a leadership position in all the organizations that I have been involved which really helped me in my professional career, student affairs.” Another response was, “Field experience-
Student Organizations”

A seventh student indicated, “The assistantships and practicum experiences provide an opportunity to learn from current practitioners and examine effective leadership techniques and occasionally ineffective leadership techniques. They also provide the opportunity to practice apply our leadership skills in the offices.”

Participants also indicated that leadership is learned (96%) of which 56% believed leadership was learned but innate qualities had an effect. The commentary regarding this issue was fairly common throughout both cohorts a few comments are provided as follows:

One student wrote, “Both – I think everyone has a certain amount of leadership potential, but it is through practical application and experiences that potential is truly explored and enhanced, creating opportunities for it to be put into practice.”

Another student offered, “Leadership skills can be learned but the area in which a person becomes a leader is determined by their personality. A person can be a leader in the community, church, school, organization, or home. Some people become the natural leader in most situations, but they don’t believe they have to be and are comfortable just contributing to the group. Others choose to be leaders in
some aspects of their lives but not in everything they are involved. I think the ability to lead exists in everyone, it depends on if that ability is ever tapped into and developed.”

A third student indicated, “Yes, I think it can be learned. I think that most people have at least some qualities that are useful for leadership, and that there are many different components to leadership.” Another comment was, “I think everyone is a leader in some way and that some people may need help in bringing the leader out in them. Also, some people already consider themselves leaders even though they may be bad leaders. A leadership course would be beneficial to people like that as well so that they could enhance their leadership skills.”

A fifth student wrote, “I think a good leader is born with basic personality characteristics that help them become a strong leader. To a certain extent, leadership is an attribute that can be learned. Trial and error allows any type of leader to learn from mistakes and make better decisions in the future. Since I have contradicted myself in this answer, I guess I do believe leadership abilities are a part of the basic personality, but using the traits to become a stronger leader is an attribute that can be learned.”

A sixth student wrote, “I would say it is a combination of both. Some people have the natural abilities to lead, but they may not realize their own capabilities. They need to learn how to use their strengths and build upon their weaknesses. I don’t think anyone is “the best” leader, so no one could do without some leadership training.” Another short
comment was, “Both, someone needs to have basic instincts, but one also needs to learn and continue to improve their skills.”

A seventh student responded, “I do believe that for some people leadership is just a part of their personality. Some people are just natural leaders. Yet, with the proper guidance, assistance and encouragement, I believe that leadership and the ability to be a good leader can be learned by those who at first might not be the best leader.” Another comment was, “This is a age old debate. I believe it is a combination of both. You definitely can learn leadership skills, but personality really helps in the process.”

**LPI Total Score Comparison**

The five LPI practices scores were added together to get a total score for each of the 28 participants to search for relationships of interest. The scores were listed from lowest to the highest. Of the highest four total scores 50% stated they obtained their leadership practices from sources other than the CSP program. In regards to the source of leadership training, the highest total score was from a graduating cohort participant that stated, “Field experience-Student Organizations . . . Not directly due to my program experience.” The fourth highest score was from a graduating cohort participant that had this to say about sources of leadership training: “[It was acquired] mainly from my involvement with student organizations from an early age. I have been heavily involved with student groups and athletics since elementary school. When my athletic career ended in high school, I became immensely involved in student org[anization]s. I have held a leadership position in all the
organizations that I have been involved which really helped me in my professional career, student affairs.”

Another interesting fact was that the male participants received 60% of the top five scores although they were only 21% of the total sample. More support was discovered for the two groups lack of difference. Of the graduating class 46% were below the median and 56% were above the median of all participant’s total scores. This demonstrates a fairly even distribution of graduating participants scores across the entire set of graduating and matriculating cohorts scores.
CHAPTER FIVE
Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Discussion

Numerous authors and ongoing studies indicate transformational leadership as measured by the LPI is a desirable method of leadership for successful leaders. If transformational leadership is accepted to be a preferred method of leadership for the collegiate environment then it would be expected to find a difference in leadership practices of graduating Master’s CSP program students from students matriculating to the Master’s CSP program.

It was stated in the introduction of this report that if the matriculating cohort scored very similar to the graduating cohort, and they did, then one possibility was that transformational leadership had already been imbued in CSP students. There is support that undergraduate leadership training may have already been obtained as was written by one matriculating cohort participant, “I received a lot of leadership training during my undergraduate experience and the same is probably true of a lot of people in CSP.” Another matriculating cohort participant wrote, “I think many students in the CSP program have been through some type of basic leadership training, or have been in at least one position of leadership.” The results indicate there is very little difference in the LPI practices of the two cohorts. If the assumption is made that transformational leadership has already been obtained at the undergraduate level then the mean score for both cohorts would be expected to be at or above LPI norms. This does not appear to be the case. In fact, the cohorts did not
score at or above the LPI norm for any of the five practices. The literature review of this study suggests that if transformational leadership training has been given then LPI scores should improve (Lafferty, 1998; Jensen, 1998; Schmiesing, 2001).

Research also shows that university leaders scored higher than the LPI norm and their business counterparts (Bauer, 1993; Ottinger, 1990; Avalone, 1999). Therefore the graduating Master’s CSP students that are expected to assume university leadership positions would be better prepared if they score at or above LPI norms.

This research indicates students partake in a Master’s CSP program to become better leaders in collegiate environments. Of the 28 study participants 98% indicated that leadership training is important. Although the purpose of this study was to determine if there was a difference in the leadership practices of the matriculating cohort and the graduating cohort in reality it was expected that there would be a difference and that the graduating cohort would have scored significantly higher on the LPI then the matriculating cohort. With an outlier removed this was true for one of the five LPI practices and that was Challenging the process.

Challenging the process consist of two major commitments, “search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve” and “experiment and take risk by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 22). With the exception of acquiring additional training via the Master’s CSP program this researcher has no opinion as to why the graduating cohort scored significantly higher on the LPI practice of Challenging.
It is a concern with such a small sample that there simply would not be enough power or the effect size was too small for this study to significantly detect differences. But in this study the matriculating cohort actually scored higher on three of the five LPI practices. When the outlier is removed the graduating cohort scored higher on four of the five LPI practices. Significance was shown in parallelism and flatness. With the outlier removed the graduating cohort scored significantly higher than the matriculating cohort in regards to Challenging the process. Due to fact that the two cohorts alternate high scores and Challenging the process was found to be significant, it is this researcher’s opinion there was sufficient power in this research at a 90% probability to detect a difference. To verify the point at which a significant level difference would be achieved five points were added to each of the matriculating participants scores and the level or between subject test was conducted and showed significance, \( F(1, 28) = 5.304, p = .029 \). Significance may have been achieved on four of the five practices with the outlier removed if the study populations were larger but then the question would be is the difference meaningful? With the outlier removed significance was demonstrated with a mean difference of 4.7 on a 60 point Likert scale with 90% probability. It is this researcher’s opinion that a mean difference of less than 4.7 would unlikely be meaningful and therefore the methodology used in the research had sufficient power to detect difference.

Gender was an independent variable of interest in this study but due to the low numbers of males in the study (two males matriculating and four males
graduating) it was not appropriate to conduct statistical analysis. Observations were as follows: The number of males in the matriculating cohort is 50% lower than in the graduating cohort. The difference in level and parallelism is interesting with the matriculating males out scoring all groups while graduating males score low on the LPI (See Appendix N). It is interesting to note how consistent the female scores are when visually examining level, parallelism and flatness when the male component is removed. This observation along with the fact that the males received 60% of the highest scores while being only 21% of the sample population would suggest, contrary to review of the research that males respond differently than females to the LPI instrument. These observations do not have statistical power but were observed and may merit further study.

Another point of interest is the parallelism of the matriculating and graduating cohort and the LPI norm means as displayed in Figure 2. The curves have very similar shapes, which demonstrate that the matriculating and graduating cohorts have the same order of practices that have been found by Kouzes and Posner’s research this is confirmed by follow-up test to the flatness test. This research concurs with the established order of LPI practices and therefore adds to the face and concurrent validity of the LPI instrument and indicates CSP students are on track in prioritizing LPI practices in line with existing leader norms.

**Conclusions**

The results of this study must be weighed lightly due to the small segment of the Master’s CSP population that participated in the study. Another consideration is the
importance of transformational leadership to the Master’s CSP program and the future leaders of higher education. This study was focused on the pervasive support for transformational leadership. Of particularly important are statements made by authors of student affairs text that support transformational leadership.

The LPI survey instrument appeared to be reliable and valid and is believed to be a good choice for measuring transformational leadership practices. It would be a good tool to continually monitor the status of transformational leadership in applicable College of Education programs.

The results indicate there is no difference in the LPI scores of the matriculating and graduating cohort with the exception of the LPI practice of Challenging; \( F(1, 26) = 3.36, p = .079 \). The results demonstrated an improvement in Challenging scores by the graduating cohort. With the exception of acquiring additional training via the Master’s CSP program this researcher has no opinion as to why the graduating cohort scored significantly higher on the LPI practice of Challenging.

It was found that both the matriculating and graduating cohort scored the five LPI practices in the same order as numerous previous LPI studies. This would indicate that both cohorts prioritize the five LPI practices in the same order as over 100,000 LPI survey participants.

This researcher declines to generalize to other Master’s CSP programs. It is unlikely all CAS members actually comply with CAS leadership guidelines. Therefore it would be necessary to evaluate the curriculum of the programs and the leadership style of
university leaders to ensure the programs actually comply with CAS guidelines. This study does generalize to past CSP students and graduates of Ohio University.

This study included a limited qualitative component that resulted in insightful additional information. The Master’s CSP program participants at Ohio University strongly (96%) believe that leadership training is very important to the program. More than half of the participants had gotten their leadership training from exposure to leaders as a result of fieldwork but some students (6.5%) volunteered information indicating it was a counterproductive experience.

Research indicates that if transformational leadership interventions occur then LPI scores should improve (Lafferty, 1998; Jensen, 1998; Schmeising, 2001). Research also indicates that university leaders have scored at or better than the LPI norms (Bauer, 1993; Ottinger, 1990; Avalone, 1999). This study indicates that neither the graduating nor matriculating cohorts achieved LPI norm scores.

Recommendations

Actions

1. The College of Education should review this report and come to a consensus regarding transformational leadership and related practices. If it is determined that transformational leadership is important then further action is suggested.

2. Review the latest CAS leadership guidelines and determine if the guidelines support transformational leadership.

3. If the CAS leadership guidelines support transformational leadership, it should be determined if the Master’s CSP program is adhering to those guidelines.
4. Review the Master’s CSP curriculum and course content to determine the level of transformational leadership training that is being provided.

5. If transformational leadership training is not being provided in coursework or fieldwork, and if practices associated with the LPI are determined to be relevant, then programmatic modifications maybe advisable.

Further Research

1. Determine the level of transformational leadership being practiced and modeled at Ohio University in general but specifically during fieldwork and coursework exposures by survey using the LPI instrument.

2. Conduct a broader or longitudinal study at the university to gather data beyond this limited, exploratory study.

3. Conduct a national longitudinal study to determine if Master’s CSP programs participants’ scores increase significantly as a result of the program by employing the LPI instrument.

4. Study various college programs at Ohio University, specifically ones that are expected to graduate leaders, to determine the status of transformational leadership.
References


relations between academic deans and department chairpersons. (Abstract of 
from http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-9714.html

Elliot, R. D. (1990). Identifying and analyzing the practices utilized by coaches in 
achieving their “personal best” in coaching. (Abstract of Master’s thesis, Iowa 
State University, 1990). Retrieved August 18, 2004, from 
http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-9714.html

9714.html


Gebart-Eaglemont, J. E. (2003). Profile of aptitude for leadership. (Review in Mental 
Measurements Yearbook). Retrieved June 11, 2003, from 
http://web5.silverplatter.com/webspirs/showFullRecordContent.ws

television executives (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1990). ProQuest, 
AAT 9104385.

Hopfe, M. W. (1968). A case study of leadership in a college using Fiedler’s 
contingency modeling (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1968). ProQuest, 
AAT 6911575.


Ottinger, D. C. (1990). Differences in leadership practices and selected demographic characteristics of women executives in the top three positions of higher education


Appendix A

Communications from Professional in Charge of Master’s Degree CSP Program

It was a pleasure to meet you as well last week and I'm glad we had a chance to talk. Your project sounds intriguing and I think it will benefit the program as well as contribute to the larger literature on leadership as well.

In terms of explicit and implicit leadership foci, basically it's like this:
The CSP program has a stated objective to prepare its students to become leaders within the profession of student affairs as well as on their individual campuses where they work. However, we don't have a course that specifically or uniquely deals with leadership for student affairs professionals. Nevertheless, what we do have a running stream within all of our courses that implicitly discusses leadership and being leaders within the context of the course discussions. For instance, in my Multicultural Student Development course, I think the students are given the consistent message that in order for them to be leaders on their campuses and student development advocates, they must gain an appreciation and understanding of the experiences of diverse constituencies on campus. Further, I think the courses in the program are crafted with an eye toward what is necessary to prepare someone to be a leader both in the profession and on their respective campus.

In terms of whether students will have actually practiced in the field: The short answer is "yes." The longer answer is that each student is required to do 3 practicum experiences during their degree program. Additionally, most students hold a GA position within the Division of student affairs for at least 1 if not both of their 2 years in the program.

Other possible questions for the survey to get open-ended responses: Do you think that the program has prepared you to be a leader in the field of student affairs? Why or why not?
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Leadership Practices Inventory New Norms, May 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTW</th>
<th>ISV</th>
<th>CTP</th>
<th>EOA</th>
<th>ETH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.016</td>
<td>44.3442</td>
<td>46.1146</td>
<td>49.3973</td>
<td>47.0553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>48.0000</td>
<td>45.0000</td>
<td>47.0000</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>48.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.09851</td>
<td>8.79206</td>
<td>7.21505</td>
<td>6.41827</td>
<td>8.19911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%ile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

Mean and Standard Deviation of 360 degree Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Leadership Self</th>
<th>Leadership (All)</th>
<th>Manager Direct Report</th>
<th>Co-Worker or Peer</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D

LPI Questionnaire

Your Name (optional: only if survey feedback is desired, if no name is given your e-mail will be deleted as soon as research data is recorded) (Please note the tab key will not work, it is necessary to click into each box.)

To what extent did you typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the response number that best applies to each statement and record in the box directly below the statement. The range is from 1 to 10 with one representing Almost Never to 10 representing Almost Always. Please do not begin without carefully reading instructions.

1. I set a personal example of what I expect of others.

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

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

4. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.

5. I praise people for a job well done.

6. I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.
Appendix D (continued)

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

8. I challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.

9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.

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

11. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.

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

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

14. I treat others with dignity and respect.

15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.
16. I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance.

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

18. I ask “What can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected.

19. I support the decisions that people make on their own.

20. I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared value.

21. I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.

22. I paint the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish.

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

24. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.

26. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.

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

28. I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.

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

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

31. Your Gender (Insert X)

| Male | Female |

32. Has your experience in CSP program enhanced your leadership skills? (yes/no)

33. If “yes” to question 32, what changes have you experienced in your leadership style?
Appendix D (Continued)

34. If “yes” to question 32, what particular experiences (for example course work, graduate assistantships, Student Personnel Association, etc.) have helped develop your leadership skills?

35. Do you believe that leadership training is important in a College Student Personnel Program? Why or why not?

36. Do you believe that leadership is an attribute that can be learned, or rather is part of one’s basic personality? Why?

Please double check the questionnaire to ensure all boxes contain a response before saving to your desktop and e-mailing to scribner@ohio.edu with questionnaire attached. Please note: Using the reply or forward e-mail option will cause data to be lost. If you have problems please e-mail me. Thank you!

Appendix E

Questionnaire Cover Letter

Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701
College of Education
Department of Higher Education

May 22, 2004

Dear (Name),

I’m currently a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Ohio University and I am working with Dr. Marc Cutright on dissertation research dealing with leadership practices of students that will be in or have completed the Ohio University Master’s program in College Student Personnel.

I am respectfully asking for your participation in this study by completing 30 questions with responses given via a 10-point Likert scale and a few qualitative questions. The questionnaire should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. If it is indicated that feedback is desired your score will be returned to you with a table of the 2003 normative scores. If feedback is not desired your e-mail will be deleted as soon as questionnaire data is retrieved. There are no right or wrong answers as leadership practices may vary with different situations.

All information will be held in strict confidentiality. As soon as data is recorded your identification and the data will never again be connected unless you request specific return information. In that case your scores and the normative score table will be e-mailed to you but once that is done your identification and score link will be destroyed.

Completion and return of the questionnaire implies consent to use the data for research purposes.

Please read the instructions carefully and complete the questionnaire. Once the questionnaire is completed please save the document to your computer desktop and then return an e-mail with the attached questionnaire from the desktop. If you have any questions please e-mail scribner@xxxxx or phone 740-385-xxxx.

Sincerely

Leroy Scribner

Advisor contact information:
Dr. Marc Cutright
340 McCracken Hall
Athens, Ohio 45701
e-mail: cutrighm@xxxxx
Phone: 740-593-xxxx
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Questionnaire Instructions

Please type your name in the space provided at the top of the next page if you desire feedback. Below the space for your name, you will find thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. The thirty statements will be followed by four informational questions. Please read each statement carefully, and using the RATING SCALE below ask yourself:

“How frequently do I engage in the behavior described?”

- Be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in the behavior.
- Be as honest and accurate as you can be.
- DO NOT answer in terms of how you would like to behave or in terms of how you think you should behave.
- DO answer in terms of how you typically behave on most days, on most projects, and with most people.
- Be thoughtful about your responses. For example giving yourself 10s on all items is most likely not an accurate description of your behavior. Similarly, giving yourself all 1s or all 5s is most likely not an accurate description either. Most people will do some things more or less than they do other things.
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Questionnaire Instructions (continued)

- If you feel that a statement does not apply to you, it’s probably because you don’t frequently engage in the behavior. In that case, assign a rating of 3 or lower.

For each statement, decide on a response and then record the corresponding number in the box below the statement. After you have responded to all thirty statements, and 4 informational questions please go back through the LPI one more time to make sure you have responded to each statement. Every statement must have a rating.

The RATING SCALE runs form 1 to 10. Choose the number that best applies to each statement.

- 1 = Almost Never
- 2 = Rarely
- 3 = Seldom
- 4 = Once in a while
- 5 = Occasionally
- 6 = Sometimes
- 7 = Fairly Often
- 8 = Usually
- 9 = Very Frequently
- 10 = Almost Always
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Questionnaire Instructions (continued)

When you have completed the LPI-Self, please save the document to your desktop and then create an email addressed to scribner@xxxxxx with subject heading of LPI and attach the document that you saved to the desktop to the e-mail and send. If you have any problems with this process please e-mail scribner@xxxxxx or telephone 740-385-xxxx. I do sincerely thank you!

___________________________________________________________________

## Appendix G

### LPI Statements by Leadership Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th># of Survey Question</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modeling the way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Sets a personal example of what is expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Makes certain that people adhere to agreed-on standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Follows through on promises and commitments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect people’s performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Builds consensus around organization’s value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspiring a shared vision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Talks about future trends influencing our work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Describes a compelling image of the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Appeals to others to share dream of the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Shows others how their interests can be realized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Paints “big picture” of group aspirations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Speaks with conviction about meaning of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging the process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Seeks challenging opportunities to test skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Challenges people to try new approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Searches outside organization for innovative ways to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Asks “What can we learn?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Makes certain that goals, plans, and milestones are set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G (continued)

28. Experiments and takes risks

**Enabling others to act**

4. Develops cooperative relationships

9. Actively listens to diverse points of view

14. Treats others with dignity and respect

19. Supports decisions other people make

24. Gives people choice about how to do their work

29. Ensures that people grow in their jobs

**Encouraging the heart**

5. Praises people for a job well done

10. Expresses confidence in people’s abilities

15. Creatively rewards people for their contributions

20. Recognizes people for commitment to shared values

25. Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments

30. Gives team members appreciation and support

---

Appendix H

Instructions for Hand-Scoring

the Self-Only LPI Form

The LPI is designed as a 360-degree feedback instrument. We always recommend that it be used for this purpose. However, there may be occasions on which the LPI-Self may be helpful as a stand-alone tool.

For example:

• You may have only an hour to introduce leadership to a group, and you need something that will help participants personalize the information
• You may want to introduce the value of 360-degree leadership feedback to a group or organization, and you want a tool that will help you demonstrate how it might work
• Your organization is deciding between different leadership instruments and you need to demonstrate each one

In these situations, the LPI Scoring Software would not provide the instant data that you need. So here’s a quick and easy way to distribute and score the LPI-Self so that it can help you achieve your short-term objectives.

1. Distribute a copy of the LPI-Self questionnaire and the Self Response Sheet that is found at the end of this appendix to everyone in the audience.
2. Review the instructions with the group.
3. Ask the audience members to respond to the thirty items of the questionnaire and then transfer their scores for each item to the Response Sheet.
Instructions for Hand Scoring (continued)

4. After people have transferred their scores to their Response Sheets, ask them to add the responses in each column. There are five columns, so they will have five separate totals. There will be a total for the column with item numbers 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26; a separate total for the column with items 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27; and so on. Each total could range from a low of 6 to a high of 60. That’s because there are six items in each column and the ratings they could use ranged from 1 to 10.

5. After people have totaled their columns, tell them to write the letters “MTW” under the column to the far left (the column that starts with 1), “ISV” under column 2, “CTP” under column 3, “EOA” under column 4, and “ETH” under column 5. These initials stand for each of The Five Practices of Transformational Leadership:

MTW = Modeling the Way
ISV = Inspiring a Shared Vision
CTP = Challenging the Process
EOA = Enabling Others to Act
ETH = Encouraging the Heart

Appendix I

Permission to Use Copyrighted Material

Title Using the LPI for Your Research

**A note on getting permission to use the LPI for your research: We provide permission for faculty members to use the LPI in research projects they are conducting, as we also do for students at these institutions. We do not provide such permission for researchers connected with other institutions outside of higher education. Receiving permission does NOT include free copies of the LPI or Leadership Challenge packages, books, surveys, or instruments.

http://www.josseybass.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-9641.html

Retrieved 4/3/04
Appendix J

Leadership Practices Inventory [LPI]

Third Edition

SELF Response Sheet

Instructions

1. Transfer your ratings from the statements on the questionnaire to the blanks below.

Please notice that the numbers of the statements are listed from left to right. Make certain that the number you assigned to each statement is transferred to the appropriate blank.

2. Add the columns and fill in the totals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL

Appendix K

Pre-notification and Request to Remain Independent

This e-mail was sent to graduating CSP Master’s students on May 13th, 2004 by the Director of the Master’s degree CSP program

As an education colleague, under the direction of Dr. Marc Cutright, I am in need of your assistance. I am asking for your help in completing a dissertation survey as part of my study. The results of this study may provide important insights for the current CSP master's program. This preview email is so you will not consider the survey to be another e-mail scam or virus. It is important that the survey content not be discussed with other classmates until after the results are submitted to maintain the independence of the raw data. In addition, the N is small and therefore participation by every graduating student in the CSP Master’s program is very important in providing sufficient statistical power.
Appendix L

Sample Survey Feedback E-mail Letter

Greetings Jack,

I hope you remember me, you filled out a leadership survey for me on September 9th. Here are your results, please see attached

Have a safe day!

Leroy Scribner
xxxx Krinn Rd.
xxxx, Ohio 43138
740-385-xxxx

Sample Attachment

Greetings Jack,

Thanks again for participating in my survey on leadership. You probably thought I had forgotten you but I didn’t, the weather was just so nice I have procrastinated a little.

If your scores are below the table of norms don’t be concerned, keep in mind the source for the norms are for successful practicing business leaders who have practiced for years. Your score for “Model the Way” MTW was 49, “Inspiring a Shared Vision” ISV, 44, “Challenge the Process” CTP, 42, “Enabling Others to Act” EOA, 45 and “Encouraging the Heart” ETH was 46. You will find the table of norms at http://media.wiley.com/assets/155/26/lc_jb_norms2003.pdf. (Live link in actual letter)

To give you some background in order to clarify the scores the following is provided:

Kouzes and Posner (2002) have studied leadership for more than 20 years and developed the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which incorporates the traits of modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process,
enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart. All of the variables are factors influencing transformational leadership. The five practices and ten commitments of Kouzes and Posner’s LPI are the constructs that make up the transformational leadership model (Kouzes & Posner).

Kouzes and Posner (2002) stated the five practices and ten commitments as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>11. Find your voice by clarifying your personal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Set the example by aligning actions with shared values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>13. Envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>15. Search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Experiment and take risk by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>17. Foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Strengthen others by sharing power and discretion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>19. Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p. 22)
Kouzes and Posner (2002) define transformational leadership by quoting Burns as follows:

Transformational leadership occurs when, in their interaction, people raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. . . . But transforming leadership ultimately becomes normal in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and the led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both. (p. 153)

The scale to determine the percentile rank of transformational leadership skills possessed by the participants will be determined using the table shown at http://media.wiley.com/assets/155/26/le_jb_norms2003.pdf. (Live link in actual letter) The exact source of the 2003 norm sample was not discovered but Kouzes and Posner (2003b) developed the psychometric tables from a sample of “17,908 (Self = 2072; Manager = 1426; Direct Report = 5,232; Co-worker/Peer = 5,591; and Other = 3,585)” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, 2¶) and indicates the data bases are continually updated. Therefore it is believed the 2003 norms were developed from the latest available data.
## Descriptive Statistics (includes outlier)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>Matriculating</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.0000</td>
<td>4.24264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.3846</td>
<td>7.01829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.8000</td>
<td>7.58005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.2500</td>
<td>15.73478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.1111</td>
<td>4.07567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.9231</td>
<td>8.74130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>Matriculating</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.3077</td>
<td>9.67285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.5000</td>
<td>9.14695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.6667</td>
<td>8.36660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.2308</td>
<td>8.26795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>Matriculating</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.0000</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38.5385</td>
<td>6.70342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.5000</td>
<td>13.02562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.7778</td>
<td>5.95352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.3846</td>
<td>8.15004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>Matriculating</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.8462</td>
<td>4.63404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.0000</td>
<td>10.48809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.6667</td>
<td>5.07445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.8462</td>
<td>6.80498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>Matriculating</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.5000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.0000</td>
<td>7.23418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.5000</td>
<td>14.64013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.0000</td>
<td>13.46291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.0000</td>
<td>13.57080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

Gender vs. LPI Practices

Leadership Practices

Practice

mtw = model the way
isv = inspire a shared vision
ctp = challenge the process
eoa = encourage others to act
eth = encourage the heart