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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this descriptive-correlational study was to describe leadership practices of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) at The Ohio State University (OSU). Relationships between personal and professional variables and leadership practices were investigated. Relationships between the respondents leadership practices scores on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Leadership Practices Inventory-Individual Contributor (LPI-IC) were also investigated.

The researcher utilized a census of identified formal leaders for the study that included 67 Administrative Cabinet members, Extension Administrative Cabinet members, OARDC Director's Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council. The questionnaire included three sections. Section I included a standardized instrument, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to describe Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council leadership practices. Section II included standardized instrument, the Leadership Practices Inventory-Individual Contributor (LPI-IC) to describe Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council leadership practices.
Advisory Council leadership practices. Section III, developed by the researcher, collected personal and professional demographics. A final response rate of 90.5% was achieved. The data was analyzed using SPSS 10.0.5. Correlational statistics and basic frequencies were used to satisfy the objectives of the study.

Five transformational leadership behaviors were investigated through this study on the MLQ including: (1) Idealized Influence - Attributed; (2) Idealized Influence - Behavior; (3) Inspirational Motivation; (4) Intellectual Stimulation; and (5) Individual Consideration. All five groups in the study practiced the five transformational leadership constructs "fairly often". All groups practiced Contingent Reward, a construct of transactional leadership, "fairly often". All five groups practiced the outcomes of leadership (extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction) "fairly often".

Five leadership constructs were also investigated through this study using the LPI-IC instrument including: (1) challenging the process; (2) inspiring a shared vision; (3) enabling others to act; (4) modeling the way; and (5) encouraging the heart. All groups practiced the five constructs "fairly often". The results would indicate the participants view themselves as leaders and practice the constructs of leadership on a routine basis.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Our quality of life depends on the quality of our leaders. Leaders are important. They are responsible for the effectiveness of organizations. The change and upheaval of the past years have left us with no place to hide. Lastly, there is a pervasive, national concern about the integrity of our institutions. (Bennis, 1994, p. 15)

As an institution, The Ohio State University (OSU) and the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) can be representative of Bennis’s concern. Institutions as vast as OSU can become a huge manifestation of bureaucracy (Sisson et al., 1994). Inefficiencies develop with these types of organizations and effectiveness henceforth suffers. “The greatest leadership challenge facing organizations is maximizing the development of human potential. Yet the development of this human potential is a highly personal process involving an understanding of the nature of change” (Colella & Chirichello, 1998, p.2).

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin (Hord et al., 1987) concluded that change is (a) a process; not an event, (b) accomplished by individuals, (c) a highly personal experience, (d) related to developmental growth, and (e) best understood in operational terms. It was noted the focus of change facilitation should be on individuals, innovations, and context.
With the rate of change today, leaders are required to learn and deliver at the same time, rather than simply deliver a new product or service (Smith, 1996). Smith continued by noting with the pace of change occurring today, leadership should not spend a great deal of time convincing others to change, but should facilitate others through the change process. Leaders must be visible when implementing change, they must understand the context in which people work, and they must constantly communicate on the need for change (DePree, 1992).

Research in the field of leadership is vast and never ceasing. Kreitner (1995) stated “leadership has fascinated people since the dawn of recorded history. References to both good and bad leadership in the literature of every age give testimony to the search of good leaders that has been a common thread running through human civilization” (p. 469). Based on the number of references attributed to leadership, and the history associated with leaders of the past and present, interested individuals will continue to seek knowledge in this field.

Northouse (1997) asserted that many individuals believe having leadership ability is a way to improve upon their presentation of themselves to others. He also concluded that companies in the business world want individuals with leadership ability because these individuals possess qualities that are valuable assets. Leadership is a highly sought after quality and is highly valued.

Gardner (1990) noted the subject of leadership is so gripping that once it is given center stage, it draws attention away from everything else. He surmised the topic of leadership is actually a subtopic of a larger topic: the accomplishment of group purpose.
This task is actually accomplished by effective leaders and by innovators, entrepreneurs and thinkers who have resources available using them in a moral and cohesive way.

Various authors have identified many different styles or approaches of leadership. A popular approach today is transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990a; Burns, 1978; Kuhnert, 1994; Tichy & DeVonna, 1990). President John F. Kennedy may have introduced the American people to this approach when he stated one of his most famous quotes: “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country” (Northouse, 1997, p.132). Bass (1985) indicated, “the transformational leader can move those influenced to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country” (p. 15). He continued by stating:

Transformational leaders attempt and succeed in raising colleagues, subordinates, followers, clients, or constituencies to a greater awareness about the issues of consequence. This heightening of awareness requires a leader with vision, self-confidence, and inner strength to argue successfully for what he sees is right or good, not for what is popular or is acceptable according to the established wisdom of time. (p. 17)

Burns (1978), a well-known researcher in the field of leadership, defined transformational leadership as leadership occurring 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 (p. 101). The purpose of both leader and follower may have started out as separate but related, as in transactional leadership, but become fused together. Burns also pointed out transformational leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it “raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming affect on both” (p. 101).
Background of the Problem

In 1994, the CFAES at OSU took a leadership role in a grant procured from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to “Reinvent the Ohio State University” (Sisson et al., 1994). “Project Reinvent” was instituted to recast the mission, structure, and role of not only the college but of the university, to fulfill its role as a land-grant university into the next century. Kellogg emphasized the term “food system” and used it to define agriculture as much more than the production phase. The term is used in relation to the total food environment – food production, processing, marketing, distribution and all relationships, policies, and issues impacted by food production, distribution, and use. The primary goal of the Kellogg initiative is to “change” the direction of today’s land grant university from a “self-serving role” to the original mission of a land grant: to serve the people. Covey (1997) stated, “that if there isn’t a process of continual organizational renewal the most successful organizations will soon decay. There needs to be continued reinvention of any organization – government, business, non-profit, or even family. They must constantly revisit their mission to see if their structures and systems are in alignment with it” (p. 28).

OSU (Sisson et al., 1994) has collaborated with universities across the country to examine and address the challenges confronting food systems professionals. A monumental task has been undertaken by leadership in the College to reinvent its mission and vision. College leaders looked into the future and concluded that change is inevitable as the university began a major restructuring process in 1990. Colleges and departments were merged and streamlined, eliminating duplication of efforts and eliminating weaker programs in favor of progressive disciplines. In a speech delivered by Ohio State President E. Gordon Gee on October 11, 1994, he stated, “we (the university) must
develop and support leadership throughout the University. I commented to the Senate that our department chairs are in a pivotal role. Indeed as we know, they are in the pivotal role to lead change and improve quality” (Sisson et al., 1994, p. 6-7). Gee also stated “we (the staff and faculty of The Ohio State University) must be the architects of change, not its victim” (p. 5). Roach (1976) found that 80% of institutional decisions at universities are made at the departmental level.

OSU administrator’s espoused leadership must be developed and supported throughout the University (Sisson et al., 1994). Based on that philosophy, those in leadership roles at OSU appeared to exhibit the transformational leadership approach. Leadership at OSU was empowering others in the organization to lead the organization. As the Dean of the CFAES implemented Project Reinvent, the new contemporary leadership approach at the College level appeared to be a transformational leadership style.

In Charting a Course That Our Future Demands (Moser, 1998), it is explained that a culture of experimentation was to be implemented in the CFAES (p.4). Vice President Moser, the leader of the College, supported a dramatic shift of leadership philosophy that in order for change to occur within the College, a cultural change was needed. Moser (1998) suggested to faculty and staff “to join him in actively establishing a culture of experimentation” (Moser, p. 6). The new culture demanded a shift in the way of thinking and acting, and “grounded itself in three guiding principles:

(a) Questions are more compelling than answers; (b) learning is more a function of critical thinking than being right; and (c) purposeful experimentation is more effective than predictive planning” (p. 4).
To be successful, the organization “transforms itself by the learning taking place within shadow structure experiments. As this learning increases and is transferred to other areas of the organization, ‘power’ becomes more a function of learning than entitlement” (Moser, 1998, p. 4). As learning progresses over a period of time, changes that occur become a part of the new formal system of the College. Organizational dynamics change as the power within the organization is transferred from the formal structure to the shadow structure over a period of time.

**Problem Statement**

In order for the organization to embrace this change of culture, new relationships between the formal organization system (policies, procedures, funding, and hierarchy) and the shadow structure (grass roots, informal ideas and relationships) that exist in the College, as in every organization, need to develop. As these two systems move toward this experimentation process, power relationships shift and an appeal for institutional change emerges.

Leadership practices of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, the department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council of the CFAES, have never been formally explored. In a paper produced by the leadership in the college, a need for a transformational leadership style was stated (Moser, 1998). Policy has been implemented by the college suggesting the use of constructs associated with the transformational leadership style. Learning what style of leadership these groups practice and if they practice the same style may yield information as to how successful the college may be at attaining its mission.
Significance of the Problem

The leaders of the CFAES appear to want to achieve its reinvented mission. Leadership is about coping with change and setting the direction of that change (Wren, 1995). Direction for the college has been an ongoing process with the first phase of the current plan formally started in 1993 with five priority areas identified to guide teaching and outreach education, research, and international programs. In 1994, the college received the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Grant and Project Reinvent was initiated. The future of the college hinges on the decisions of its leaders, therefore, it is important to determine the leadership styles or approaches of college administration. The success of the college in achieving its mission could be correlated with the styles exhibited by its leadership groups.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate leadership practices of CFAES leaders (including members of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council of the CFAES). To achieve the purpose of this study, the following specific objectives were developed:

1. Describe leadership practices of the identified formal college leaders (including members of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council in the CFAES), as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ, Bass and Avolio, 1995) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI, Kouzes and Posner, 2001);
2. Describe selected personal variables;

3. Describe selected professional variables;

4. Investigate relationships between leadership practices of the members of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council in the CFAES and selected personal and professional variables; and

5. Investigate relationships between respondents leadership practices scores on the MLQ and the LPI.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Land Grant University/The Ohio State University: OSU was founded in 1870, a result of the Ohio General Assembly’s decision to establish the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College. The new college was a direct result of the provisions of the Morrill Act. The Morrill Act was commonly referred to as the Land Grant Act. President Abraham Lincoln signed this act into law in 1862. The purpose of the act was to provide opportunities for higher education to all young people who had the desire to obtain a college degree. Previously, only those with financial resources could attend private colleges around the state. (Founding of The Ohio State University, 1998).

2. College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences: One of 18 colleges at The Ohio State University consisting of three major components; teaching (academia), research (Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center), and extension (Ohio State University Extension, formally known as the Ohio
Cooperative Extension Service). The college contains seven academic departments.


4. College Administrative Cabinet: Leadership of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, consisting of the Vice President and Dean and Associate Deans.

5. Extension Administrative Cabinet: Leadership of the Ohio State University Extension, consisting of the Director, Assistant Directors, District Directors, and Assistant Department Chairs.

6. OARDC Administrative Cabinet: Leadership of the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, consisting of the Director and Assistant Directors.

7. Department Chairs/Heads: Members of college faculty who are appointed to lead a college department administratively.

8. Vice President’s Advisory Council: A group of 35 appointed by the Vice President of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences to act in an advisory capacity concerning issues the college should address. This group consists of a cross-section of external constituencies and faculty/staff members.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. The research was a correlational study that was descriptive in nature. The study only intended to describe accurately the incidence, distribution, and
characteristics of, and explore the possible relationships among selected variables.

2. The study was limited to the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council of the CFAES at OSU. Therefore, the results and conclusions of this study were generalized only to the five groups who completed the survey and cannot be inferred to other College or University administrations.

3. The study represents only a moment of time; therefore, the results can only be generalized for the period in which the respondents completed the research instrument, as leadership learning and practice continually evolve.

4. Despite assurances of confidentiality, participants in the study may have been hesitant to provide accurate information due to perceived negative consequences associated with providing negative responses.

5. Participants in this study may not have understood the importance of the research, and therefore may not have devoted sufficient time or thought to their responses.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter is a summary of literature reviewed and related to leadership. This chapter is divided into three sections: (a) Definitions of leadership; (b) leadership theories; and, (c) research on leadership.

**Definitions of Leadership**

In the literature, many attempts have been made to define leadership. In fact, Stogdill (1974) indicated, “in a review of leadership research, there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it” (p. 7). Northouse (1997) compared the word leadership to concepts such as love, democracy and peace. “Although each of us intuitively knows what he or she means by such words, the words can have different meanings for different people” (p. 2). When an attempt is made to define leadership, we discover it has many meanings.

Fleishman, Mumford, Zaccaro, Levin, Korotkin, and Hein (1991) discovered over the past 50 years, as many as 65 different systems of classification have been developed to define the dimensions of leadership. One view to which Northouse subscribed, is the scheme proposed by Bass (1990). He suggested some definitions view leadership as the “focus of group processes” (p. 2). This perspective suggested the leader is at the center of group change and activity, and embodies the will of the group.
Northouse (1997) summarized that even though leadership has been conceptualized in a multitude of ways, several recurring themes surface to describe leadership: (a) leadership is a process; (b) leadership involves influence; (c) leadership occurs within a group context; and (d) leadership involves goal attainment. Northouse defined leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 3). Gardner (1990) defined leadership as “the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers” (p. 1).

Leadership defined as a process means it is not a trait or characteristic of the leader, but is a transactional event that occurs between the leader and his or her followers (Northouse). Communication and influence flow in both directions between leaders and followers (Gardner, 1990). Northouse continued by suggesting the leader affects and is affected. Leadership becomes available to everyone in this manner.

Leadership also involves influence. Bass (1990) stated “leadership exercises a determining effect on the behaviors of group members and on activities of the group” (p. 13). It is also recognized leaders can influence other members by their own actions or behaviors.

Leadership is also a phenomenon of groups. Leadership cannot exist with an individual only. “Leadership involves influencing a group of individuals who have a common purpose” (Northouse, p. 3). The size of the group can extend from very small, consisting of three or four individuals, to the size of a large corporation.
The final portion of the definition of leadership involves the attainment of goals. Leadership has to do with assembling and directing a group of individuals and accomplishing a given task (Northouse, 1997). Leaders’ energies are directed toward individuals who are attempting to accomplish something together.

Bass (1990) defined leadership as the following:

Leadership has been conceived as the focus of group processes, as a matter of personality, as a matter of inducing compliance, as the exercise of influence, as particular behavior, as a form of persuasion, as a power relationship, as an instrument to achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, as initiation of structure, and as many combinations of these definitions. (p. 38)

Depending on the situation, the definition of leadership can mean different things to different people. Wren (1995) suggested although there are many definitions of leadership, it is important to understand that there is no single “correct” definition. The varying definitions can help us to understand the multitude of factors that affect leadership, as well as different perspectives from which to view it.

**Leadership Theories**

**Trait Approach**

The trait approach was one of the first systematic attempts to study leadership in the early 1900s (Bass, 1990). Leadership traits were studied to determine what made certain people great leaders. A distinct trait or characteristic or a combination of traits seemed to lead certain people to the role of leaders. Theories that were developed were called “great man” theories due to the focus on identifying innate qualities and characteristics possessed by great social, political, and military leaders (e.g. Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Mahatma Gandhi). Northouse (1997) stated, “It was believed that people were born with these traits and only the great people possessed
them” (p. 13). During this period of time, research concentrated on determining the specific traits that clearly differentiated leaders from followers (Bass, 1990; Jago, 1982).

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) asserted that:

The trait approach was brought into question during the 1950s when a prominent theorist, Ralph Stogdill, after a thorough review of the literature concluded that, “A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits”. (p. 134)

“Stogdill believed this because the research showed that no traits were universally associated with effective leadership and that situational factors were also influential”, according to Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991, p. 142). An example of this theory was demonstrated when observations were made of military leaders not having traits identical to business leaders.

However, trait theory is making a resurgence in leadership research but in an altered form. Recent research has indicated that successful leaders are not like other people (Kirkpatrick & Locke). Research has demonstrated that a certain core of traits exists which contributes to a successful leader. Traits alone though do not necessarily mean an individual will be successful – they are only a precondition (Kirkpatrick & Locke). They point out that possessing the appropriate traits (identified as drive, the desire to lead, honesty/integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business) only makes it more likely that such actions will be taken to be successful.

Northouse (1997) summarized the strengths and criticisms of the trait approach as follows:

**Strengths**

1. It is intuitively appealing because it fits clearly into the popular idea that leaders are special who are “out front” leading the way with society.
2. A great deal of research exists that validates the basis of this perspective.
3. By focusing exclusively on the leader, the trait approach provides an in-depth understanding of the leader component in the leadership process.
4. The trait approach has provided some benchmarks against which individuals can evaluate their own personal leadership attributes.

**Criticisms**

1. The trait approach has failed to delimit a definitive list of leadership traits.
2. The approach has failed to take into account the impact of situations.
3. It has resulted in subjective lists of the most “important leadership traits,” which are not necessarily grounded in strong, reliable research.
4. It has not adequately linked the traits of leaders with other outcomes such as group and team performance.
5. This approach is not particularly useful for training and development because individuals’ personal attributes are relatively stable and fixed, and, therefore, their traits are not amenable to change (p.30).

**Style Approach**

As opposed to the trait approach, which emphasized the personality characteristics of a leader, the style approach emphasizes the behavior of the leader (Northouse, 1997). Fleishman (1973) noted, “the shift in emphasis . . . was from thinking about leadership in terms of traits that someone ‘has’ to the conceptualization of leadership as a form of activity” (p. 3). The style approach focuses on how leaders act and what leaders do. The interaction between leader and follower expanded the study of leadership.

In a study conducted by Hemphill et al. (1957) a questionnaire was developed to rate leader behavior and called the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire – the LBDQ. This questionnaire discovered two factors that describe leadership behavior: (a) consideration and; (b) the initiation of structure (Fleishman, 1973).

Bass (1990) described the factor of consideration as “the extent to which a leader exhibits concern for the welfare of the other members of the group” (p. 511). Some of
the characteristics of a considerate leader include: (a) expresses appreciation for good work; (b) stresses the importance of job satisfaction; (c) shapes the self-esteem of employees by treating as equals; (d) is easy to approach, and; (e) involves the employees in major decisions.

The second factor of leadership style or behavior described by Bass, initiation of structure, “shows the extent to which a leader initiates activity in the group, organizes it, and defines the way work is to be done” (p. 512). The leader will insist on a deadline and will detail the assignment and how it is to be accomplished. Channels of communication and patterns of work organization are stated clearly. Bass also stated “the leader acts directly without consulting the group” (p. 512).

Another way the factors of “consideration” and “initiation of structure” has been acknowledged in the literature is the recognition of relationships (consideration) and tasks (initiation of structure) (Hersey & Blanchard, 1979). These factors have also been labeled “employee-oriented” and “production-oriented”; “authoritarian” and “equalitarian”; and “goal achievement” and “group maintenance”.

For a period of time, it was believed that tasks and relationships were an either/or style of leader behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1979). Hersey and Blanchard indicated “either style would be depicted on a single dimension along a continuum, moving from very authoritarian (task) leader behavior at one end to a very democratic (relationships) leader behavior at the other” (p. 144).

However, leadership studies conducted at OSU by the Bureau of Business Research (1945), questioned whether leader behavior could be delineated on a single continuum. The studies demonstrated that leadership styles vary considerably from
leader to leader. Some leaders exhibited a strong task orientation behavior, while other leaders exhibited a strong relationship behavior. Other leaders expressed both behaviors in varying degrees. Hersey and Blanchard (1979) reported, “no dominant style appeared” (p. 145). Instead, various combinations were manifested and rather than appearing on a continuum, actually could be plotted on a separate axis.

The Ohio State studies (Hersey and Blanchard) resulted in the development of four quadrants to illustrate leadership styles in terms of initiating structure (task) and consideration (relationship). The quadrants are low task, low consideration; low task, high consideration; high task, low consideration; and high task, high consideration. The most desirable style is that of high consideration and high task or of high relationships as pointed out by Andrew W. Helpin, a member of the Ohio State research team.

However, recent empirical research clearly indicated there is no single all-purpose leadership style that is universally successful (Hersey & Blanchard). They pointed to research conducted by Korman (1966), which dispelled the idea of a single best style. Korman found that “the use of consideration and initiating structure had no significant predictive value in terms of effectiveness as situations changed (Hersey & Blanchard, p. 148). This suggested as situations change, so must the style of the leader.

Northouse (2001) summarized the strengths and criticisms of the style approach as follows:

**Strengths.**

1. The style approach marked a major shift in the general focus of leadership research as researchers treated leadership exclusively as a personality trait.
2. It broadened the scope of leadership research to include the behaviors of leaders and what they do in various situations.
3. A wide range of studies on leadership style validates and gives credibility to the basic tenants of the approach. The style approach is substantiated by a multitude of research studies.

4. On a conceptual level, researchers from the style approach have ascertained that a leader's style is composed of two major types of behaviors: task and relationship. The significance of this idea is not to be understated. Whenever leadership occurs, the leader is acting out both task and relationship behaviors; the key to being an effective leader often rests on how the leader balances these two behaviors. Together, they form the core of the leadership process.

5. The style approach is heuristic. It provides us with a broad conceptual map that is worthwhile to use in our attempts to understand the complexities of leadership. Leaders can learn a lot about themselves and how they appear to others by trying to see their behaviors in light of the task and relationship dimensions. Based on the style approach, leaders can assess their actions and determine how they may wish to change to improve their leadership style (pp. 44-45).

**Criticisms.**

1. The research on styles has not adequately shown how leaders’ styles are associated with performance outcomes. Researchers have not been able to establish a consistent link between task and relationship behaviors and outcomes such as morale, job satisfaction, and productivity. According to Yukl (1994) the “results from this massive research effort have been mostly contradictory and inconclusive” (p. 75). Yukl also pointed out that the only strong finding about leadership styles is that considerate leaders have followers who are satisfied.

2. Another criticism is that this approach has failed to discover a leadership style that could be applied universally; a style that could be effective in almost every situation.

3. The last criticism of the style approach is that it implies that the most effective leadership style is the high-high style (i.e. high task and high relationship).
Some researchers have suggested that high-high managers are the most effective. Indeed, that may not be the case in all situations. Certain situations may require different or flexible leadership styles; some may be complicated and require high task behavior, and others may be simple and require supportive behavior (Northouse, 2001).

The style approach to leadership is quite different than the trait theory (Northouse, 1997). Style approach focuses on what leaders do rather than who leaders are. This theory suggests there are two behaviors leaders exhibit: task behaviors and relationship behaviors. How leaders utilize each of these behaviors and to what degree is the central purpose of the style approach. Overall, the style approach is not refined to provide a neatly organized answer for effective leadership behaviors. Rather, it provides a framework for assessing leadership in a broad way – both task and relationship dimension. The style approach reminds leaders that they can impact followers along both dimensions.

Situational Approach

“One of the most widely recognized approaches to leadership is the situational approach, which was developed by Hersey and Blanchard based on Reddin’s 3-D Management Style Theory” (Northouse, 1997, p. 53). Northouse indicated the situational approach has been refined and revised many times since it was conceived. This approach has been used extensively in training and development for organizations throughout the country.

Reddin’s 3-D Management Style Theory postulated the importance of a manager’s relationship orientation and task orientation in conjunction with effectiveness
(Vecchio, 1997). Reddin evaluated these relationships and how they were interrelated and proposed three types of management styles: the autocrat, the missionary, and the deserter. Vecchio elaborated further that Reddin suggested that his theoretical framework explained effectiveness as a function of matching style to situation, but his approach did not identify specific situational attributes that could be incorporated into a predictive situation.

Apps’ (1994) interpretation of the situational approach indicates leaders were successful because the approach they used “matched” the situations in which they found themselves. Depending on the situation, leaders would adapt their behaviors to the new situation. Some critiques of this approach argued that some people were “not cut out” to lead in certain situations and henceforth, should be steered away from them.

Wren (1995) suggested that situational leadership “assumes a dynamic interaction where the readiness level of the followers may change and where the leaders’ behavior must change appropriately in order to maintain the performance of the followers” (p. 207). Readiness is defined as “the ability and willingness of followers to perform a certain task” (pp. 207-208).

Vecchio (1997) asserted the situational approach has received little attention at the empirical level. Several of the studies he looked at contained no hard evidence to support the theory. Vecchio stated, “Although the theory contains strong intuitive appeal, the veracity of the theory has not been assessed via a rigorous empirical test” (p. 338).

The following strengths of the situational leadership approach (Northouse, 1997) are:
1. The approach has stood the test in the market place. This approach is one of the most well-known and widely used approaches for training leaders in organizations. It is perceived by organizations to be a credible model.

2. It is practical. The approach is easy to understand, intuitively sensible, and easily applied in a number of settings.

3. Its prescriptive value. Many theories of leadership are descriptive in nature. The theory tells you what you should and should not do in various contexts.

4. The final strength of situational leadership is that it emphasizes the concept of leader flexibility. This approach suggests that leaders find out about their followers’ needs and then adapt their style accordingly.

The following are the criticisms of situational leadership:

1. First and foremost, there is a lack of empirical research to justify the assumptions and propositions set forth by the approach.

2. There is an ambiguous conceptualization in the model of subordinate’s development levels. There appears to be a conflict of how “commitment” and “competence” are combined to form four distinct levels of development (Graff, 1997; Yukl, 1989).

3. A third criticism of the approach is how commitment is conceptualized in the model. The model lacks logic when it appears it should move across a continuum from low commitment to high commitment.

4. Another problem with the model has to do with how it matches leader style with follower development level, the prescription of the model. A study by
Vecchio failed to validate the theory. Overall, the findings point to a need for additional research.

5. From a practical standpoint, the approach does not fully address the issue of one-on-one versus group leadership in an organizational setting.

6. Lastly, a final criticism can be directed at the leadership questionnaires that accompany the model. The questionnaires are designed to force respondents to describe leadership style in terms of the specific parameters of situational leadership rather than in terms of leadership behavior. The best answers available have been predetermined biasing the questionnaire to situational leadership (Northouse, 2001).

**Contingency Theory**

Chemers (1984) summarized the study of leadership by dividing the period of time into three phases. The trait period existed from around 1910 to World War II; the behavior period, from the onset of World War II to the late 1960s; and the contingency period, from the late 1960s to mid-1980s.

Research concerning the contingency theory model of leadership effectiveness spanned three decades (Ayman, Chemers, & Fiedler, 1995). The ability to reliably predict the effects of leadership style on organizational outcomes awaited the development of modern contingency theories (Chemers). “The model predicts that a leader’s effectiveness is based on two main factors: a leader’s attributes, referred to as task or relationship motivational orientation (formally referred to as style) and a leader’s situational control (formally referred to as situational favorability)” (Ayman, Chemers, Fiedler, 1995, p. 351). Chemers (1984) stated, “Fiedler saw the most important
dimension of the situation to be the degree of certainty, predictability, and control which the leader possesses” (p. 86).

The contingency theory is a “leader-match” theory determined by Fiedler and Chemers (1974), which implies it attempts to match leaders to suitable situations. The reason it is called “contingency” is because it suggests a leader’s effectiveness depends on how well the leader’s style fits the context of the situation (Northouse, 1997).

Chemers (1984) and Northouse both indicate that to understand the performance of leaders, one must comprehend the situations in which they lead. Fiedler developed the theory by studying the styles of many different leaders, particularly of military organizations. The model states that leaders with high Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scores perform best in situations moderately favorable to them. The person who fills out the questionnaire is asked to rate an individual with whom the rater had a difficult time accomplishing a given task (Chemers). Leaders who score low on the survey perform best in situations extremely favorable or extremely unfavorable to them. The LPC measures how many of the 16 to 18 attributes reflect respondents’ feelings about a person with whom they can work least effectively (Bass, 1990).

With the contingency theory, Fiedler developed a scale of situational control based on three factors of a situation: (a) Leader-member relations, or the degree of trust and support given to the leader by the followers; (b) task structure, or the degree to which the goals and procedures for accomplishing the group’s goals are clearly defined and specified, and; (c) position power, or the degree to which the leader has authority to reward or punish followers (Ayman, Chemers, & Fiedler, 1995; Chemers, 1984; Northouse, 1997).
Evaluating these three situational factors together help to determine the favorableness of various situations in organizations (Northouse, 1997). Northouse also pointed out situations that are rated “most favorable” are those having good leader-follower relations with defined tasks and strong leader position power. Henceforth, situations that are “least favorable” situations are just the opposite; poor leader-follower relations, unstructured tasks, and weak leader-position power.

Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (1995) and Northouse list the strengths of the Contingency Theory as follows:

1. The theory is supported by a great deal of empirical research with a long tradition. Many researchers have proven that it is a valid and reliable approach to explain how effective leadership can be achieved.

2. The study of the theory has broadened our understanding of leadership by forcing us to consider the impact of situations as a leader. Leadership is beyond a one-dimensional approach, such as trait theory would suggest.

3. The conceptual and statistical independence of its central constructs, LPC, and situational control. It is possible to predict the probability of success for a given individual in a given situation. This predictive power is most important as compared to other leadership theories.

4. The theory has an advantage in that it does not require people to be effective in all situations. Many leaders feel they need to be all encompassing – all things to all people. Expectations of the leader may be overwhelming. The theory argues that leaders should not be expected to lead in all situations. Leaders should be “placed” in situations that capitalize on their leadership
style. The theory “matches” the leader and the situation but does not demand that the leader fit every situation.

5. Contingency theory provides an assessment of a leader’s style by using the LPC. Approximately 15 minutes worth of questionnaire administration provides a multi-level analysis of person-situation match that can be used in selection, placement, training, and organizational development. Organizations can then develop leadership profiles. This assessment, along with other assessments in human resources planning, could be used to determine how and where an individual would best serve an organization.

Criticisms of the Contingency Theory as researched by Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (1995) and Northouse (1997) are:

1. The model was inductively developed. The LPC construct has little face or concurrent validity. Also, evidence for its construct validity requires some faith. The LPC scale measures a person’s leadership style by asking the person to characterize another person’s behavior. Because projection is involved in the measure, it is difficult for respondents to understand how their descriptions of another individual on the scale are a reflection of their own leadership style. It does not make sense to measure your style of leadership through the evaluation of another person’s style.

2. It fails to explain fully why individuals with certain leadership styles are more effective in some situations than in others. Fiedler’s (1993) study calls this the “black box” problem because a level of mystery remains about why task-
motivated leaders are good in extreme settings and relationship-motivated leaders are good in moderately favorable settings.

3. The use of Contingency Theory is cumbersome in real-world settings. It is cumbersome because it requires assessing the leader's style as well as the relatively complex situational variables; leader-member relations, task structure and position power. Each variable requires a different instrument. Administering a complex set of questionnaires would interrupt the "normal" flow of organizational communications and operations.

4. The Contingency Theory does not recommend a plan of action to organizations when a mismatch is encountered between the leader and the situation in the workplace. Because Contingency Theory is a personality theory, it does not advocate teaching leaders how to adapt their leadership styles to various situations as a means to improve leadership. The leader is actually asked to engage in "situational engineering": changing situations to fit the leader. Fiedler and others argue that most situations can be changed in one respect or another, but the step-by-step process for how one would engage in situational engineering is not brought forth in research (Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler, 1995; Northouse, 1997).

**Path-Goal Theory**

Another prominent leadership theory is referred to as the Path-Goal Theory. Path-Goal Theory is about how leaders motivate followers to accomplish designated goals (Northouse, 1997). Chemers (1984) suggests the theory deals primarily with the
effects of specific leader behavior on follower motivation and satisfaction, rather than general issues such as decision-making and performance.

Path-goal theory first appeared in the literature in 1957 in the works of Georgopulos, Mahoney, and Jones, and in the research of Evans (1970), House (1971), House and Dessler (1974) and House and Mitchell (1974). Through the 1970s the goal of this leadership theory was to enhance employee performance and employee satisfaction by focusing on employee motivation (Northouse).

Path-Goal Theory is unlike situational theory. Situational theory suggests that a leader adapt to the development level of its followers. Contrary to the contingency theory that underscores the match between the leader’s style and specific situational variables, the path-goal theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader’s style and the characteristics of the followers and the work setting (Northouse).

Path-goal theory is grounded in a more general motivational theory called expectancy theory (House & Mitchell). Expectancy theory suggested that “an individual’s attitude (e.g., satisfaction with supervision or job satisfaction) or behavior (e.g., leader behavior or job effort) could be predicted from: (a) The degree to which the job, or behavior, is seen as leading to various outcomes (expectancy) and; (b) the evaluation of these outcomes (valences)” (House & Mitchell, p. 259). Hence, “people are satisfied with their job if they believe it leads to things that are highly valued, and they work hard if they believe that effort leads to things that are highly valued” (House & Mitchell, 1974, p. 259). This type of theory leads to the ability to predict a variety of phenomena related to leadership, such as why leaders behave the way they do or how leader behavior influences the motivation of followers.
Northouse (1997) suggested the challenge for the leader is to use a leadership style that best meets followers’ motivational needs. “This is accomplished by choosing behaviors that complement or supplement what is missing in the work setting” (p. 89).

According to Bass (1990) path-goal theory is an exchange theory of leadership. “It attempts to explain why contingent reward works and how contingent reward influences the motivation and satisfaction of subordinates” (p. 627). Leaders point out the path to success by “increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, and making the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route” (House, 1971, p. 324).

Path-goal theory is designed to explain how leaders can assist followers along the path to their goals by specifying certain behaviors that are suitable to the follower’s needs and to the situation in which the followers are working (Northouse). If the leader chooses the appropriate style, leaders increase follower’s expectations for success and satisfaction.

**Leader Behaviors.**

“Although many different leadership behaviors could have been selected to be a part of path-goal theory, this approach has so far examined directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership behaviors” (House & Mitchell, 1974, p. 265). Path-goal theory is left open to additional variables.

**Directive Leadership.**

Directive leadership is similar to the “telling” style described in situational leadership. Directive leaders are characterized by giving followers instructions about
their tasks, including expectations, how it is to be done, and the time line for completion of the task (House & Mitchell, 1974; Northouse, 1997). A directive leader sets clear standards of performance and makes the procedure to accomplish the task clear and concise. Bass (1990) stated that accordingly, “such directive leadership is needed only if the task is complex, difficult, or ambiguous and its goals are unclear” (p. 628).

**Supportive Leadership.**

Supportive leadership refers to being friendly and approachable as a leader (Northouse) and includes sensitivity to the well-being and human needs of the followers by the leaders. Leaders who are supportive go out of their way to create a pleasant working environment for the followers. Leaders also treat followers as equals and respect them for their status.

**Participative Leadership.**

Leaders exhibiting participative leadership behavior invite followers to share in decision-making. A participative leader will consult with followers, obtain their ideas and opinions, and integrate their suggestions into the decisions on how the group or organization will proceed (Northouse).

Mitchell (1974) described four ways in which a participative leadership style would impact on followers’ attitudes and behaviors:

1. A participative climate should increase the clarity of organization contingencies. Through participation in decision-making, followers will learn what step leads to what. Participation would lead to greater clarity of the paths to various goals.
2. Another impact of participation is that followers hopefully, would select goals they highly value.
3. Participation leads to increased control by the individual as to what happens on the job. If motivation is higher, based on the first two points, then having
greater autonomy and ability to carry out intentions should lead to increased
effort and performance.

4. Under a participative system, pressure towards high performance should come
from sources other than the leader or the organization. When people
participate in the decision process, they become more ego-involved; decisions
are made in part on their own. Peers in the group or organization know what
is expected and, therefore, the social pressure has greater impact. Motivation
to perform well stems from internal and social factors as well as formal
external ones (Mitchell, 1974, p. 268).

Achievement-Oriented Leadership.

Achievement-Oriented Leadership behavior challenges followers to perform work
at their highest possible level (Northouse, 1997). The leader establishes a high standard
of excellence for followers and seeks continuous improvement. In addition to high
expectations, the leaders show a high degree of confidence in the followers that they are
capable of establishing and accomplishing challenging goals.

Path-goal theory is a practical leadership theory (Northouse). The theory is
straightforward. An effective leader has to attend to the needs of the followers. The
leader should assist the followers in defining goals and the paths to take to accomplish
the goals. As obstacles confront the followers, the leader will help the followers handle
these situations. This may mean totally removing the obstacle or helping the follower
around it. The objective of path-goal is to help the followers attain their goals by
directing, guiding, and coaching them along the way.

The strengths of path-goal theory noted by Northouse are as follows:

1. Path-goal theory provides a useful theoretical framework for understanding
how various leadership behaviors (e.g., directive, supportive, participative,
and achievement-oriented) affect the satisfaction and goal-directed activity of
followers in differing work contexts.

2. It attempts to integrate the motivation principles of expectancy theory into a
theory of leadership. This makes path-goal unique because no other
leadership approach deals directly with motivation this way. The leader is cognizant of continually asking what it takes to motivate followers.

3. The path-goal theory model is very practical. The model demonstrates how the leader will assist the followers into attaining their goal. The theory reminds leaders that the overarching purpose of leadership is to guide and coach followers as they move along a path to achieve a goal. (pp. 95-96)

The criticisms of path-goal theory are as follows:

1. Path-goal theory is very complex. It incorporates many varying aspects of leadership that interpreting the meaning of the theory can be confusing. For instance, path-goal theory makes predictions about which four different leadership styles is appropriate for tasks with different degrees of structure, for goals with different levels of clarity, for workers at different levels of ability, and for organizations with different degrees of formal authority.

2. The theory has received only partial support from many empirical studies that have been conducted to test its validity (House & Mitchell, 1974; Indvik, 1986; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977; Schriesheim & Schriesheim, 1980; Stinson & Johnson, 1975; Wofford & Liska, 1993).

3. It fails to adequately explain the relationship between the behavior of leaders and worker motivation. Path-goal theory is unique because it incorporates the characteristics of expectancy theory; however, it must be criticized because it does not go far enough in explaining how leadership is related to these characteristics.

4. A final criticism that can be made of path-goal theory concerns a practical outcome of the theory. The theory suggests that it is important for leaders to provide coaching, guiding, and direction for followers. This approach, in
effect, treats leadership as a one-way event – the leader affects the follower. The potential problem is the reliance of the follower on the leader. This kind of leadership could be counterproductive because it promotes dependency and fails to recognize the full abilities of the followers.

**Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory was first known as the vertical-dyad linkage theory of leadership. The vertical dyad of boss and subordinate is an interaction linkage of mutual influence (Bass, 1990).

“This emphasizes the relationship between the leader and each individual follower, rather than between the leader and the group as a whole” (Bass, 1990, p. 48). Graen’s (1987) study assumed that the leader behaved differently toward each follower and that the differences must be analyzed separately. This theory is contrary to most of the earlier theories of leadership, as the consensus was the leader behaved the same way toward all of the members of the group. According to Graen, leaders would categorize members into two distinct groups; the in-group and the out-group.

“Research with the Vertical-Dyad Linkage model has shown that a leader or manager develops a specific and unique exchange with each of his or her subordinates” (Chemers, 1984, p. 91). These exchanges might range from a true partnership, in which the subordinate is given considerable freedom and autonomy in developing his or her work-related role to a subordinate retaining little freedom but controlled and nothing more than a “hired hand” (Chemers). Vecchio (1986) referred to the in-group as the boss’s trusted assistants. He also referred to the out-group as hired hands.
Dansereau (1995) wrote “leaders develop different relationships with different people because they support the sense of self-worth of people differently” (p. 487). The result of the scenario could be on occasion an attack of the self-worth of some non-followers. Personality and other personal characteristics become involved as the relationship is established between leader and follower. Also, how a follower involves himself or herself in expanding their role responsibilities to become a member of one group or another is vital to the leader-follower relationship, as noted in Graen and Uhl-Bien’s (1991) research.

Followers who are willing to negotiate with the leader concerning what they can do for the group become a part of the in-group (Northouse, 1997). The negotiations between leader and follower involve exchanges in which the follower goes beyond the normal duties of the job description, and in return, the leader does more for the follower. Therefore, if a follower does not go beyond the confines of the job description, they become a part of the out-group.

Because of the relationship established between the leader and the in-group followers, the in-group receives more attention from the leader as well as other rewards (Bass, 1990). Dansereau’s (1975) research showed followers of the in-group received more information, influence, confidence, and concern from the leader over the out-group followers. In addition, the in-group followers were more dependable, more highly involved, and more communicative than the out-group followers. Northouse noted that in-group members do extra things for the leader and the leader reciprocates while out-group followers are less compatible with the leader and usually come to work, perform their job, and go home.
The initial studies of leader-member exchange began with the difference between the in-group and out-group; however, recent research addresses how the leader-member exchange relates to organizational effectiveness (Northouse, 1997). Specifically, the research focused on how the quality of leader-member exchanges was related to positive outcomes for leaders, followers, groups, and the organization in general (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Researchers found that high-quality leader-member exchanges produced less employee turnover, more positive performance evaluations, higher frequency of promotions, greater organizational commitment, more desirable work assignments, better job attitudes, more attention and support from the leader, greater participation, and foster career progress over 25 years of research (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden, Wayne & Stilwell, 1993).

Based on the previous research, organizations have much to gain from having leaders who create good working relationships with followers. When the relationship or exchange is good between leader and follower, they feel better, they accomplish more and the organization prospers (Northouse, 1997).

Research by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) on leader-member exchange (LMX) theory focused on how exchanges between leader and follower can be used for “leadership making”. Northouse referred to leadership making “as the prescriptive approach to leadership that emphasizes that a leader should develop high quality exchanges with all of his or her subordinates, rather than just a few” (p. 113). The attempt is to make all followers feel like they are a part of the in-group and to avoid the negative connotation associated with the out-group. Graen and Uhl-Bien suggested that leadership making promotes partnership building in which the leader attempts to build
effective dyads with all followers in the work group. In addition to the partnership created between the leader and follower, an organization can benefit by the networking of the partnerships to achieve goals and to enhance career development.

The leadership-making model developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991) proposed that leadership making develops over a period of time consisting of three phases: (1) The stranger phase; (2) the acquaintance phase; and (3) the mature partnership phase. In the stranger phase, the relationship between leader and follower are formal and more rule bound. The exchanges are of low quality, similar to the out-group exchange. The control structure of the leader over the follower is conscious as the leader attempts to achieve the prescribed goals. Motives exhibited by the follower are of self-interest and not for the good of the group (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

The second phase, the acquaintance phase, begins with an offer by the leader or follower. Increased social exchanges occur between leader and follower and not all exchanges are contractual or not a normal part of the job description. They begin to share more resources and information on both the business and personal level. However, these exchanges are a part of the test; will the follower assume additional roles and responsibilities? There is a switch in focus by the follower to disregard self-interest and to begin to concentrate on the goals of the group or organization (Graen & Uhl-Bien).

The last phase, classified as the mature partnership, sees the exchange between leader and follower as highly developed. Northouse (1997) described the relationship as experiencing a high degree of mutual trust, respect, and obligation toward each other. They can count on each other for loyalty and support. “The exchanges are not only behavioral but also emotional” (Graen & Uhl-Bien, p. 230). “In effect, partnerships are
transformational in that they assist leaders and followers in moving beyond their own self-interests to accomplish the greater good of the team and organization” (Northouse, 1997, p. 115).

The leader-member exchange theory works in two ways. First, it describes leadership by recognizing and defining the in-group and out-group of an organization (Northouse). Secondly, it prescribes leadership. Determining how to achieve goals with the existence of two groups is quite different. Working with an in-group allows a leader to accomplish more in an effective manner than without one. Northouse suggested that in-group members are willing to do more than what is listed on a job description and look for a variety of ways to achieve the group’s goal. In response, leaders give followers more responsibilities and opportunities along with more time and support.

Actions by the out-group followers are different than the in-group followers. Rather than assuming additional responsibilities, out-group followers only perform what is prescribed on their job description – no more or no less. Leaders treat the out-group followers fairly according to their formal arrangement but do not give them special attention. The out-group members receive the standard benefits as described by their job description.

From a prescriptive point of view, the leader-member exchange theory is best understood by the use of the Leadership Making Model of Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991). Graen and Uhl-bien (1995) suggested that leaders should create special relationships with all followers, similar to the relationship with the in-group. Leaders should allow the followers to take on additional responsibilities. Leaders should take the initiative to establish exchanges of trust and respect with all followers essentially creating one in-
group. Also, leaders should look beyond their own work unit and create quality partnerships with others in the organization.

Whether descriptive or prescriptive, LMX theory works by focusing our attention on the special, unique relationship that leaders can create with others. When those relationships are of high quality, the goals of the leader, the followers, and the organization are all advanced. (Northhouse, 1997, p. 116)

The strengths of the leader-member exchange theory (Northouse) are as follows:

1. Leader-member exchange theory is a strong descriptive theory. Anyone who has ever worked in an organization has felt the presence of the two groups; in-group and out-group. Even though it may not be fair and special relationships do exist, the LMX theory has accurately described the situation in the workplace. The LMX theory validates our experience of how people within organizations relate to each other and the leader. Some contribute more and receive more; others contribute less and receive less.

2. The LMX theory is unique because it is the only leadership approach that makes the concept of a dyadic relationship the center of the leadership process. No other leadership approach focuses on the relationship between the leader and follower. LMX theory underscores that effective leadership is contingent on effective leader-member exchanges.

3. The leader-member exchange theory directs our attention to the importance of communication in leadership. Communication is the vehicle through which leaders and followers create, nurture, and sustain useful exchanges. Effective leadership occurs when the communication of leader and followers is characterized by mutual trust, respect, and commitment.
4. A large body of research exists that substantiates how the practice of leader-member exchange theory is related to positive organizational outcomes. In a review of this research, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) pointed out that it is related to “performance, organizational commitment, job climate, innovation, organizational citizenship behavior, empowerment, procedural and distributive justice, career progress, and many other important organizational variables” (p. 117). By linking the use of LMX theory to real outcomes, researchers have been able to validate the theory and increase its practical value.

Criticisms of the leader-member exchange theory are:

1. It runs counter to the basic human value of fairness (Northouse, 2001). A value most individuals are taught is to get along with others and to treat everyone equally. We have been taught not to participate in cliques or in-groups as it excludes others and can be harmful to them. The appearance is that it discriminates against a group of people. In research reported by McClane (1991) the existence of in-groups and out-groups may have undesirable effects on the groups as a whole.

2. Another criticism of the LMX theory is that it is not fully developed. An example of this is it does not explain fully the way high-quality leader-member exchanges are created. When the theory was first developed, leaders found certain personalities and job related skills the follower possessed but the studies did not describe the importance of these factors or how the process worked. In recent research (Yukl, 1994), it is suggested that leaders create a
high quality exchange with all members or followers but does not provide the guidelines to establish this relationship.

3. Research by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) raised questions regarding the measurement of leader-member exchanges in LMX theory. Previously, the measurement of exchanges was done with different versions of the leader-member exchange scale so the results were not always directly comparable. Also, there have been questions regarding whether the standard scale used to measure exchanges is unidimensional or multidimensional.

LMX theory helps us become aware of how we relate to followers (Graen & Uhl-Bien). The theory gives leaders an appreciation for those followers who need special attention and those who do not. Fairness to all employees is suggested and allows each of them to become more involved in decision-making processes. Leaders should also be respectful of followers and build trusting relationships with all followers, recognizing the fact that all individuals are unique and relate in a special way.

Team Leadership Theory

Fiedler’s (1993) empirical research over the past 40 years has dealt with theory development as it relates to small groups or teams. An interesting observation concerning the past research on teams suggested growth has not been smooth in activity or increased knowledge about team functioning. According to Ilgen, Major, Hollenbech, and Sego (1993) significant quantities of research on teams and groups occurred from the late 1940s through the middle 1960s. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, activity had slowed down in the area of team research. By the late 1980s, teams were back to the forefront but the interest in teams was generated outside the fields of social psychology
and sociology. Some of the first literature generated in this time period was published in the *Journal of Management* (Ilgen et al., 1993). Interest in the business world was high as stories related to teams were making the covers of *Time* and *Fortune* magazines.

One of the more popular areas in leadership theory today is leadership in organizational groups or work teams. "Teams are organized groups composed of members who are interdependent, who share common goals and who must coordinate their activities to accomplish their goals" (Kogler Hill, 1997, p. 150). Steiner (1989) concluded that a small group consists of: (a) Two or more members; (b) interact with each other; and (c) are interdependent in some way. McGrath (1991) added time. He argued that groups have a past, present, and future. Ilgen et al. (1993) added a fifth component that teams exist for some task-oriented purpose. Some of the reasons for increased interest in work teams have resulted from the rapid changes occurring in today's world. Organizations are facing restructuring, competition is global, an ever-increasing diversified work force is emerging, and technology is expanding (Kogler Hill). Parker (1990) has resolved through his research that with the rapidly changing business environment, the use of organizational teams has led to greater productivity, more effective use of resources, better decisions and problem solving, better quality products and services, and increased innovation and creativity. Teams have also failed; visibly. This has created a need for additional research on team effectiveness and team leadership (Ilgan et al.). Organizational restructuring in the United States today is shifting the decision-making process downward as opposed to the traditional hierarchy to self-managed teams, empowering the teams and individuals in new ways (Kogler Hill). The traditional team leader may exist or leadership can rotate around to other members.
formal team leader may only serve as a liaison with those external to the group, serving mainly as a process facilitator within the group, or both, according to research conducted by Wellins, Byham, and Wilson (1991).

Teams foster a shared leadership strategy. Kouzes and Posner (1993) have identified steps to develop leadership “capacity” in all team members. Their suggestions for top-level administrators are:

1. Stop making decisions. Rather than making decisions, you see to it that individuals/groups responsible for implementing decisions make them.

2. Stop talking at staff meetings. Leaders can often dominate the conversation, resulting in one-way communication. Sometimes without meaning, the message is communicated that the leader does not value other’s contributions.

3. Invite people to assume responsibility. Remember credibility is at stake if leaders consistently give away responsibilities, but then do not support decisions that are made by those whom they have delegated responsibilities.

4. Share the big picture. Shared leadership will not be achieved if the leader holds back information from team members.

Many models exist for understanding groups, teams, and leadership. Most models however, do not show the complex relationship of team leadership and team effectiveness. However, one model exists referred to as The Leadership and Group Effectiveness Approach (Kogler Hill, 1997) that provides the most useful framework for understanding the current theories of work teams and team leadership. This approach is practical because it is built around and focuses on group outcomes and productivity, which essentially is effectiveness. The “approach is theoretical in that it takes into
account the complexity of teamwork by focusing on the many structural, individual, contextual, and process factors that contribute to team effectiveness” (Kogler Hill, 1997, p. 161). Probably the most significant characteristic of the approach is that it demonstrates the role of leadership in designing and coaching teams to be more effective.

Outcomes of team leadership, those characteristics that make teams effective, are a clear and elevating goal, a results-driven structure, competent team members, an unified commitment, a collaborative climate, and perform to a standard of excellence, external support and recognition, and use principled leadership.

Team goals must be clear to determine if the objective was obtained. Groups often fail because tasks are vague. It is also imperative that the members believe the goal is worth accomplishing. Larson and LaFasto (1989) determined teams often fail because they let something else replace their goals, such as personal agendas or power issues.

To accomplish their goals, teams need to find the best structure. Teams have different work content with which to deal (Kogler Hill). There are three general types of team classifications: problem-resolution teams, creative teams, and tactical teams. Problem-resolution teams such as task forces must possess trust so that all members are willing to contribute. Creative teams must be free to take risks and must be free from censorship. Tactical teams such as an emergency room staff must emphasize clarity so that everyone knows what to do and when (Kogler Hill). Larson and LaFasto’s research (1989) found “all teams need to have clear roles for group members, a good communication system, methods to diagnose individual performance, and an emphasis on fact based judgment” (p. 165).

Strengths of team leadership theory include the following (Kogler Hill, 1997):
1. Team leadership is focused on real-life organizational structure. Teams are placed in context with the organization and are important subsets to make an organization successful. Focusing on performance and group effectiveness is necessary to identify and correct team deficiencies.

2. Leaders can design and maintain effective teams, particularly if teams are performing subpar. Leaders are good “medium” and possessors of information.

3. Any team member can implement critical leadership functions. In the past, the role of setting goals, coaching and rewarding have rested with one leader, but with organizational restructuring, these duties and responsibilities are shared and distributed across team members.

4. Team member theory may help to determine those individuals who are best adept for team leadership. Those individuals, who are perceptive, open, objective, analytical, and good listeners and who have good diagnostic skills would fall into a good leader category. Good leaders project skills such as negotiation, conflict resolution, problem solving, and goal focusing.

Criticisms of team leadership theory (Kogler Hill, 1997) are:

1. Models of team leadership theory have not been tested over a period of time.

   The concept of group effectiveness and the organizational work group is a relatively new approach to studying teams. Much of the earlier research on small groups did not directly apply to understanding real-life organizational teams. Hackman’s (1990) research indicates many questions still exist
regarding team patterns over time, self-fulfilling group cycles, authority issues, and content issues.

2. Team leadership theory is very complex by nature. Models are difficult to understand and do not provide easy answers to difficult decisions for leaders.

3. Relative to the complexity of the theory, on the spot answers to specific situations for the team leaders are not offered. Examples of situations are what the leader should say to a crying member, what to say when two members are screaming at each other, or the lack of reward for team members from the organization.

4. The group effectiveness approach suggests new and creative directions for leadership training and can be assumed to be a strength. But these directions for leadership training are vague, complex, and can be overwhelming. Hackman and Walton’s (1986) research suggested monitoring skills such as data gathering, diagnosis and forecasting, and hypothesis testing. Learning skills are advocated along with various action-taking skills such as envisioning, inventing, negotiating, decision-making, teaching, and implementing. A long list of leadership skills makes it hard to determine where to begin. If self-directed teams were the norm, all members would have to learn these skills. The role of leaders and followers can change at any time making it very important that each one needs to understand the other.

The increased attention given to organizational teams and the leadership skills required within the team concept create a need to study and research team leader theory. Group effective issues are also addressed in this theory as accomplishing a goal has
typically been first and foremost. Another interesting observation is that team leadership was initiated out of real-world concerns. However, "the frightening issue is that expectations are exceeding both the knowledge base and, more than likely, the ability of teams to deliver" (Ilgen et al., 1993, p. 266). The challenge is to delve into team leadership theory and add to the body of knowledge.

**Transactional Leadership Theory**

Burns (1978) is most often cited as the modern theorist for transactional leadership. His interpretation of a transactional leader begins by defining leadership. Burns suggested how some individuals define leadership as "leaders making followers do what followers would not otherwise do, or as leaders making followers do what the leaders want them to do" (p. 100). He defined leadership as "leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations – the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations – of both leaders and followers" (p. 100).

Leadership is essentially inseparable from followers’ needs and goals. Burns suggested the essence of the leader-follower relationship is the interaction of persons with varying levels of motivation and of power potential, which includes skill, in pursuit of a common or joint goal or purpose (1978). He described two different forms of the relationship between the leader and the follower: the first is transactional leadership and the second is transforming leadership.

Transactional leadership occurs when "one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things" (Burns, p. 101). The exchange of "valued things" could be economic in nature, political, or psychological: e.g., utilizing the barter system as one good is exchanged for another or money.
exchanged for a good or service, a swap of votes between political candidates, or one offering a listening ear to assist a friend in need of compassion. Each person involved in the exchange is aware of the power resources and attitude of the other person. Each individual recognizes the other individual as a person. Their purposes are similar and are advanced by each willing participant. However, this relationship goes no further than beyond the initial exchange. There is no enduring purpose that holds the individuals together allowing them to part their separate ways. “Transactional leaders exchange things of value with subordinates to advance their own as well as their subordinates’ agenda” according to Kuhnert (1994, p. 34). Bass (1990) noted that leaders explain what is required of employees and what compensation they will receive if they fulfill these requirements. Burns stated a leadership act occurred, but not a relationship that would bind a “leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose” (1978, p.101).

The transactional leadership model is divided into two factors; contingent reward and management-by-exception. Contingent reward refers to an exchange process between leaders and followers in which the effort by followers is exchanged for specific rewards (Bass, 1985; Hollander, 1993; Northouse, 1997). The leader attempts to obtain agreement from the followers as to the goal to be achieved and what the rewards will be for those followers performing. A good example of contingent reward is in the university setting and the relationship between a department chair and a professor; a department chair negotiates with the professor about the number and quality of publications he or she needs to author in order to receive promotion and tenure. A contract is established
between the leader and follower that rewards the followers for effort and performance and recognizes accomplishments (Bass, 1990).

Another factor of transactional leadership is management-by-exception (MBE) and refers to leadership that involves corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement (Northouse, 1997). The transactional leader who exercises management-by-exception can take two approaches, active or passive. The leader using the active form of management-by-exception watches and searches for deviations from rules and standards. If followers deviate from the norm, the leader could take corrective actions (Bass). An example is the leadership of a sales supervisor who monitors daily activity of sales associates and how the sales associates approach customers; if the manager notes a problem, the sales associate is immediately confronted and given the proper procedure on how to approach a customer.

Leaders using the passive form of management-by-exception intervene only if standards are not met (Bass) or problems have arisen (Northouse). An example of the passive form of management-by-exception is the supervisor who meets with an employee for an annual performance evaluation. It has been determined that the employee has not performed to standards without the supervisor ever talking to the employee about prior work performance. Both forms of management-by-exception, active and passive use more negative reinforcement patterns than positive reinforcement patterns.

The transactional leadership theory does not individualize the needs of followers nor does it focus on personal development (Northouse, 2001). These characteristics may be considered criticisms of the theory. Transactional leaders exchange things of value with followers to advance the agenda of both leader and follower. Transactional leaders
may accomplish tasks for the organization but there may be a coercive environment between the leader and follower to accomplish tasks.

Transformational Leadership Theory

A current theory of leadership that has been the focus of much research in the 1980s and 1990s is the transformational approach. The term transformational leadership was first coined by Downton (1973). Downton explained in his book that Malcolm X experienced a transformation of character through the influences of a charismatic commitment. Downton also stated “this transformation of goals within the superego is likely to be accompanied by new values and norms, combined in a new moral code” (p. 260). Transformational leadership is a part of the new leadership paradigm researched by Bryman (1992). Burns (1978), in his Pulitzer Prize-winning book Leadership, defined what he termed as transforming leadership as:

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. Power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for common purpose. (p. 101)

Burns continued by noting “transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspirations of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both” (p. 101). Burns used Gandhi as a modern example of a transformational leader. Gandhi was able to arouse and elevate the hopes and demands of millions of Indians whose lives and personalities were enhanced in the process. Transformational leadership is a dynamic leadership in that leaders engage into a relationship with followers who then feel “elevated” by the relationship and often become more active themselves, thereby creating a nucleus from which to build new
leaders. Gardner stated, “Transactional leadership accepts and works within the structure as it is. Transformational leadership renews” (1990, p. 122).

Bass (1985), a prolific transformational leadership scholar, noted “transformational leadership can attempt and succeed in elevating those influenced from a lower to a higher level of need according to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs” (p. 14). Bass also indicated the “transformational leader can move those influenced to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country” (p. 15). Bennis and Nanus (1997) explained that a new transformational leader is “one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change” (p. 3).

Lee Iacocca, the head of Chrysler Corporation, may be one of the best-known modern transformational leaders (Bennis, 1994). The financial markets had nearly written Chrysler off as bankrupt, but Mr. Iacocca generated confidence among his creditors and convinced his employees that sacrifice and extra effort could turn the organization around. Henceforth, Chrysler became an automotive power again, thanks to efforts of the visionary leader and committed employees. “As organizations transform themselves, they will transform the world” (p. 181).

Apps (1994) described transformation as much more than a change:

It is an enhancement of personal reality, as well as a conversion of reality. It is a psychological process, an emotional experience, and an encounter that touches the soul. It is a venture that leaves behind old ideas, perspectives, attitudes, beliefs, and approaches, and mourns their loss. It is a process that celebrates endings and anticipates beginnings. Within the process are elements of great joy and celebration and dimensions of great sadness and despair. (p. 211)

Transformational leaders as observed by Bass (1995):
Attempt and succeed in raising colleagues, subordinates, followers, clients, or constituencies to a greater awareness about the issues of consequence. This heightening awareness requires a leader with vision, self-confidence, and inner strength to argue successfully for what he sees is right or good, not for what is popular or is acceptable according to the established wisdom of time. (p. 17)

House (1976) published a theory on charismatic leadership. Charismatic, a form of the word charisma, is a term Weber borrowed from Sohm, the church historian, who had borrowed it from St. Paul (Gardner, 1990). As St. Paul used the term, the word referred to “gifts or powers that were manifestations of God’s grace” (Gardner, 1990, p. 34). Weber used the term charisma in a somewhat different way. “The term ‘charisma’ will be applied to a certain quality of an individual by virtue of which he is set apart from other men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities” (Gardner, 1990, p. 34).

In many ways, charismatic leadership has been described as being similar to, if not synonymous with, transformational leadership. “The concept of charisma was first used to describe a special gift that select individuals possess that gives them the capacity to do extraordinary things” (Northouse, 1997, p. 132). House’s theory suggested that charismatic leaders act in unique ways that have specific charismatic effects on their followers. According to House, the personal characteristics of a charismatic leader include being dominant, having a strong desire to influence others, are self-confident, and have a strong sense of one’s own moral values.

Charismatic leaders also display specific types of behavior. First, charismatic leaders are strong role models for the beliefs and values they want their followers to adopt. Secondly, charismatic leaders appear competent to their followers. The third behavior expressed by charismatic leaders is they articulate ideological goals that have
moral overtones. Fourth, this type of leader communicates high expectations for their followers and exhibit confidence in the followers that the expectations will be fulfilled. Finally, charismatic leaders arouse task-relevant motives in followers that may include affiliation, power, or esteem (Northouse, 1997).

A model proposed by Bass (1985) used Burns (1978) model as a base for transformational leadership. The transformational leader is one who motivates a group to do more than what was originally expected to do. Burns noted that a transformation would be achieved in any one of three inter-related ways:

1. By raising our level of awareness, our level of consciousness, about the importance and value of designated outcomes, and ways of reaching them.

2. By getting us to transcend our own self-interest for the sake of the team, organization, or larger polity.

3. By altering our need level on Maslow’s (or Aldefer’s) hierarchy or expanding our portfolio of needs and wants.

Bass (1985) then supplemented to the model proposed by Burns (1978). First, Bass added the “expansion of the followers’ portfolio of needs and wants” (p. 20). Secondly, “Burns saw the transformation as one that was necessarily elevating, furthering what was good rather than evil for the person and the polity” (p. 20). Hitler was not a transformational leader according to Burns, despite the fact that Hitler energized a group of people to show aggression at the expense of personal freedom, prosecuting those whom chose to dissent or were a minority. According to Bass, Germany was still transformed, although the leadership was immoral. An indirect transformation occurred with the Jews who were prosecuted by Germany. The remnants of European Jewry were
converted from a people who were scattered and a powerless minority, to the most powerful national state in the Middle East. From a conceptual standpoint, Bass put the “emphasis on the observed change in followers and argues that the same dynamics of the leader’s behavior can be short term or long term benefit or cost to the followers” (1985, p. 21).

A third concept of Burns (1978) that Bass disagreed postured transformational leadership as the “opposite end of a single continuum from transactional leadership. Conceptually and empirically, Bass finds that leaders will exhibit a variety of patterns of transformational and transactional leadership. Most leaders do both but in different amounts” (Bass, 1985, p. 22). Yammarino (1993) explained Bass (1985) also extended House’s (1976) work by focusing on the emotional elements and origins of charisma, and suggested that charisma is a necessary but not sufficient condition for transformational leadership.

Northouse (1997) described the transformational leadership approach as a broad-based perspective that includes many facets and dimensions of the leadership process. “In general, it describes how leaders can initiate, develop, and carry out significant changes in organizations” (Northouse, 1997, p. 142). Although not definitive, the following are the steps that transformational leaders take (Northouse):

1. Transformational leaders begin by empowering followers and nurturing them in change. They attempt to raise the consciousness in individuals and to get them to transcend their own self-interests for the sake of others.

2. For change to occur, transformational leaders become strong role models for their followers. Avolio and Gibbons discovered transformational leaders have
a highly developed set of moral values and a self-determined sense of identity (1988). They are confident, competent, articulate, and they express strong ideals. They listen to followers and tolerate opposing viewpoints. Cooperation transcends the relationship between leader and followers. Followers want to emulate transformational leaders because they are trustworthy and stand up for their beliefs.

3. Transformational leaders develop vision statements. The vision materializes from the collective interests of various stakeholders and units within an organization. "The vision is a focal point for transformational leadership. It gives the organization a conceptual map for where the organization is headed; it gives meaning and clarifies the organization’s identity" (Northouse, 1997, p. 145). According to Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993), the vision gives followers a sense of identity within the organization and also a sense of self-efficacy.

4. Transformational leaders also act as change agents - initiating and implementing new directions within organizations. At times, leaders generate instability themselves by supporting opposing viewpoints or issues. Opposing viewpoints are embraced. Change is created by the uncertain situation.

5. The transformational approach also requires that leaders become social planners. Leaders clarify the emerging values and norms of the organization. They become involved in the culture of the organization and help to shape its meaning. Followers need to understand their roles and comprehend how they are contributors to the greater purpose of the organization. Transformational
leaders are vital in interpreting and molding the shared meaning that exists within organizations.

Transformational leadership theory has various strengths (Northouse):

1. This approach has been widely researched from many different perspectives including a series of qualitative studies of prominent leaders and CEOs in large well-known organizations. Transformational leadership has been the focal point of a large body of leadership research since its introduction in the 1970s. In a special issue of Leadership Quarterly (1993, 3), the topic was devoted entirely to charisma, a central characteristic of transformational leadership.

2. Transformational leadership has innate appeal (Northouse). The transformational perspective described how the leader demonstrates a genuine need for change for others. This concept is consistent with society's view of what leadership means. People are attracted to this leadership approach because it makes sense to them. "It is appealing that a leader will provide a vision for the future" (1997, p. 145).

3. This approach treats leadership as a process that occurs between leaders and followers. Since this process includes both followers’ and leaders’ needs, leadership is not the sole responsibility of a leader but rather emerges from the synergy between leaders and followers. The needs of others are the most important aspect of leadership to the transformational leader. Bryman (1992) verified followers gain a more prominent position in the leadership process
because the attributions of followers are instrumental in the evolving transformational process.

4. The transformational approach provides a broader view of leadership that enhances other leadership models. Many leadership models focus primarily on how leaders exchange rewards for achieved goals referred to as the transactional process. The transformational approach provides an expanded depiction of leadership that includes not only the exchange of rewards but also the leader’s attention to the needs and growth of followers according to Bass (1985).

5. Lastly, transformational leadership emphasizes the followers’ needs, values, and morals. Burns (1978) suggested that transformational leadership involve attempts by leaders to move individuals to higher standards of moral responsibility. It includes research by Avolio and Howell (1992) and Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) that suggested motivating followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the team, organization, or community. By emphasizing this value, this leadership style is set apart from all other approaches to leadership because it suggests that leadership has a moral dimension. By accentuating this value, the coercive uses of power by individuals such as Hitler, Jim Jones, and David Koresh can be disregarded as models of leadership (Northouse, 1997).

The following are criticisms of the transformational leadership theory:

1. Transformational leadership lacks conceptual clarity because it covers such a wide range of leadership attributes (Northouse, 1997). Those attributes
include creating a vision, motivating, being a change agent, building trust, giving nurturance, and acting as a social architect. At times, it is difficult to define clearly the parameters of transformational leadership. The parameters of transformational leadership often overlap with similar conceptualizations of leadership. For example, Bryman (1992) pointed out that transformational and charismatic leadership are often treated synonymously even though in some models of leadership (Bass, 1985) charisma is only one component of transformational leadership.

2. Another problem associated with transformational leadership is that it is often defined too simplistically as an “either-or” approach when in reality it is a matter of degree. Attempting to place transformational leadership along a continuum is not practical as it incorporates different characteristics of leadership.

3. A third criticism formulated by Bryman (1992) is that transformational leadership treats leadership as a personality trait or personal predisposition rather than a behavior in which people can be instructed. Bass (1993) stated that “transformational leadership can be learned, and it can – and should – be the subject of management training and development. Research has shown that leaders at all levels can be trained to be charismatic in both verbal and nonverbal performance” (p. 19). Fisher (1994) further supported the notion that “anyone of reasonable intelligence and motivation can learn to lead, but that the transformation style is the only approach for one who would help bring any kind of significant change to an institution (university)” (p.56). If it
is a trait, training people in this approach becomes more problematic because it is difficult to teach people how to change their traits. Even though many scholars, including Weber (1947), House (1976) and Bass (1985), emphasized that transformational leadership is concerned with leader behaviors, such as how leaders involve themselves with followers, there is an inclination to see this approach from a trait perspective. Perhaps this problem is aggravated by the image that one person is the most active component of the transformational leadership process. For example, even though creating a vision involves follower input, there is a tendency to see transformational leaders as visionaries; or possibly the only important component of the organization. There is also a tendency to see transformational leaders as individuals who have special qualities that transform others. Those images emphasize a trait characterization of transformational leadership.

4. Another criticism of transformational leadership is based primarily on qualitative data collected from leaders who were very visible serving in positions that were at the top of their organizations, according to Bryman's findings (1992). As Bryman pointed out, “the data apply to leadership of organizations but not necessarily leadership in organizations” (p. 157). For example, can the transformational leadership approach be applied to plant managers and CEOs when research studied senior leaders? Can supervisors and department heads learn about leadership from a model that was constructed from interviews with senior corporate leaders? Bass (1990) and his associates have begun to report findings from quantitative studies of
leaders (using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire – MLQ) at all levels that substantiate the assumptions of transformational leadership. When more data are available, these questions will be addressed of how transformational leadership applies to lower-level leaders.

5. Transformational leadership has the potential to be abused (Northouse, 1997).

Transformational leadership is concerned with changing people’s values and moving them to a new vision. But who is to determine if the new directions are good and more affirmin? Who decides that a new vision is a better vision? If the values to which the leader is moving his or her followers are not better, and if the set of human values is not more redeeming, then the leadership must be challenged. (Northouse, 1997, p. 149)

The charismatic nature of transformational leadership presents significant risks for organizations because it can be used for destructive purposes, according to research by Avolio and Howell (1992). History books are full of examples of charismatic individuals who used their compelling power to lead people toward evil. For this reason, individuals and organizations should be aware of how they are being influenced and in what directions they are being asked to go by the leadership.

Transformational leadership covers a process that begins with change within an organization, the creation of a vision, a collaborative relationship between leader and follower, and a strong emphasis on the followers’ needs, values and morals. Values and morals are instilled as part of the leadership process in both the leader and the followers. This form of leadership motivates followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the team, organization, or community (Northouse, 1997). This form of leadership is the only theory that suggests a moral dimension. Due to its popularity, it
appears more research will be conducted to further delineate the theory of transformational leadership.

**Leadership Research**

Research in the transactional leadership style (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978; Hollander, 1993; & Kuhnert, 1994;) and transformational leadership style has been the focus of leadership research in the 1980s and into the 1990s (Ackoff, 1999; Avolio, 1999; Avolio, Bass and Juny, 1994; Avolio, Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1989; Avolio & Howell, 1992; Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bennis, 1994; Bryman, 1992; Chemers, 1997; Gardner, 1990; & Yammarino, 1993). Burns proposed the interaction between leader and follower takes two fundamentally different forms. The first, referred to as transactional leadership theory, suggested “leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (p. 133). In contrast, the second form consisted of transforming leadership 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.

Studies by Bass (1985), Avolio, Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1989), Howell (1992), and Avolio, Bass and Juny (1994), all identified factors or components of transformational leadership. Bass affirmed, “Transformational leaders do more with colleagues and followers than set up simple exchanges or agreements. They behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the following components” (1998, p. 5):

1. Charismatic Leadership (or Idealized Influence). The behavior of transformational leaders results in there being role models for their followers. These leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Followers are able to
identify with the leaders and want to emulate them; leaders are endowed by their followers as having extraordinary capabilities, persistence, and determination. The leaders are willing to take risks and are consistent rather than arbitrary. They can be counted on to do the right thing, demonstrating high standards of ethical and moral conduct.

2. Inspirational Motivation. Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work. Team spirit is aroused. Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed. Leaders get followers involved in envisioning attractive future states; they create clearly communicated expectations that followers want to meet and also demonstrate commitment to goals and the shared vision. *Charismatic* leadership and *inspirational motivation* usually form a combined single factor of *charismatic-inspirational* leadership.

3. Intellectual Stimulation. Transformational leaders stimulate their followers’ efforts to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways. Creativity is encouraged. There is no public criticism of individual members’ mistakes. New ideas and creative problem solutions are solicited from followers, who are included in the process of addressing problems and finding solutions. Followers are encouraged to try new approaches, and their ideas are not criticized because they differ from the leader’s ideas.

4. Individualized Consideration. Transformational leaders pay special attention to each individual follower’s needs for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor. Followers and colleagues are developed to successively higher levels of potential. Individualized consideration is practiced when new learning opportunities are created along with a supportive climate. Individual differences in terms of needs and desires are recognized. The leader’s behavior demonstrates acceptance of individual differences (e.g., some employees receive more encouragement, some more autonomy, others firmer standards, and still others more task structure). A two-way exchange in communication is encouraged, and “management by walking around” workspaces are practiced. Interactions with followers are personalized (e.g., the leader remembers previous conversations, is aware of individual concerns, and sees the individual as a whole person rather than just an employee). The individually considerate leader listens effectively. The leader delegates tasks as a means of developing followers. Delegated tasks are monitored to see if the followers need additional direction or support and to assess progress; ideally, followers do not feel they are being checked on. (Bass, 1998, pp. 5-6)

The transformational leadership model as presented by Bass also included the components of transactional leadership behavior and laissez-faire or non-leadership behavior. The components of transactional leadership, that of contingent reward and
management-by-exception, were discussed in the previous section. Laissez-faire leadership is the avoidance or absence of leadership and, by definition, is the most inactive as well as ineffective form of leadership according to almost all research on the style (Bass, 1998). "As opposed to transactional leadership, laissez-faire represents non-transaction" (p. 7). Decisions that need to be made do not occur. Actions leaders must take are delayed. The responsibility of leadership is ignored. Authority remains unused by the leader.

Studies have been conducted in business and industry, government, military, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations regarding transformational leadership (Bass, 1998). According to Bass, all of the studies have shown that transformational leaders, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), "were more effective and satisfying as leaders than transactional leaders, although the best of leaders frequently do some of the latter but more of the former" (p. 8). Follow-up studies have shown that developing training with transformational leadership in its components can enhance effectiveness and satisfaction as a leader (Bass).

In addition to Bass's research, two other teams of researchers have contributed to the understanding of the nature of transformational leadership. The researchers are Bennis and Nanus (1985, 1997) and Tichy and DeVanna (1986, 1990). The methodologies used were qualitative instruments rather than quantitative instruments. They created an unstructured, open-ended question-and-answer format and identified a number of CEO’s or leaders of large corporations.
Bennis and Nanus (1985) asked 90 leaders basic questions such as: what are your strengths and weaknesses? What past events influenced your leadership approach? What were critical points in your career? Bennis and Nanus took the answers from these questions and identified four common strategies utilized by leaders in transforming organizations.

First, transformational leaders had a clear vision of the future state of their organizations. The image was attractive, realistic, and believable. Secondly, transformational leaders were social architects for their organizations. They helped create the shape or form for the shared meaning individuals maintained within their organization. Lastly, transformational leaders created trust in their organizations by acknowledging their own positions and standing firm for their beliefs. The last strategy identified by Bennis and Nanus was transforming leaders used creative deployment of self through positive self-regard. Leaders knew their strengths and weaknesses and emphasized the strengths rather than dwelling on the weaknesses. In addition to these findings, leaders in the study were committed to learning and relearning or life-long learning. Their organizations emphasized education for self-improvement.

Tichy and DeVanna (1986) studied the transformational leadership of 12 CEO’s at mostly large corporations. They were interested in knowing how organizations change or transform - particularly how the leaders carried out the change process. Tichy and DeVanna wanted to determine how transformational leaders worked under challenging conditions resulting from rapid technological change, social and cultural changes, increased competition, and increased interdependence with the global economy. Their data suggested that leaders manage change in organizations through a three-act process:
1. Act one of this transformation process involves recognizing the need for change. Many times, organizations become comfortable and resist change. Transformational leaders are change agents. They have a responsibility to point out how change could positively or negatively affect the organization. In order to encourage organizations to implement change, Tichy and DeVanna (1986) suggested several techniques for organizations to embrace openness to change. They recommended encouraging dissent and allowing people to disagree. They also recommended encouraging objective assessment of how well the organization is meeting its goals. Third, members are encouraged to network within and outside of the organization. Members are urged to visit outside organizations to consider alternative viewpoints of how others operate and solve problems. Finally, organizations are encouraged to assess their performance based on a wide range of economic and non-economic indicators relative to other organizations using the same indicators.

2. Act two in the transforming process requires the creation of a vision. Tichy and DeVanna’s research illustrated “the vision acts as a conceptual roadmap for where the organization is headed in the future and what it will look like” (Tichy & DeVanna, 1990, p.128). The vision is not constructed by an individual viewpoint but by bringing together the differing viewpoints within an organization. The central focus of creating a vision is developing a mission statement that describes the vision and the values implied by it.

3. The third act in transforming organizations involves institutionalizing changes. In order to accomplish this, leaders need to break down old
structures and establish new ones. Leaders need to identify appropriate followers to implement new ideas. It is possible that new groups of employees will need to be created who share the same vision. As new roles develop for employees, some may need assistance in adapting new roles to enhance the new direction of the organization (Tichy & DeVanna, 1990).

Summary

In summary, this review of the literature has attempted to define the term leadership, has addressed many of the popular theories associated with leadership and has discussed many of the empirical works about leadership. Transformational leadership theory is a relatively new form of leadership with its roots established in Downton (1973). Burns (1978) brought the theory to the forefront and the research has blossomed from that point. This theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader and follower (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978). The behavior of the transformational leader is often associated with positive results within organizations and correlates to commitment and citizenship of the leaders and followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bryman, 1992).

Both strengths and criticisms exist for all theories as researched for this thesis. With the existence of conflicting research findings, it is imperative to continue to study leadership styles to determine what is best for the individual and the organizations associated with the individual.

Conceptual Representation

For the purposes of this research study, leadership practices were conceptualized as possibly being dependent upon personal and professional characteristics. The conceptual representation for the study is shown in figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1: A conceptual representation of possible relationships between selected personal and professional variables and leadership practices of The Ohio State University College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences Administrative Cabinet, OSU Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the researcher describes the methodology utilized for this study. Sections included population, instrumentation, validity, reliability, data collection and data analysis. The researcher conducted a descriptive correlational study utilizing a written questionnaire.

Population

The researcher used a census of identified formal leaders to gather data from the target population that consisted of paid and unpaid leaders in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) at The Ohio State University (OSU) who have knowledge of the college. The five target composite groups of the population included the Administrative Cabinet, the Administrative Cabinet of OSU Extension, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC) Director’s Cabinet, the department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council. The list of the Administrative Cabinet members, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council was obtained from the Dean’s office in the CFAES. The roster of members for OSU Extension Administrative Cabinet was obtained from Extension administration. The OARDC Administrative Cabinet list was procured from the Director’s office. The census included 74 total members. Permission was secured from
Dr. Moser, Vice President of Agricultural Administration and University Outreach and Dean, to conduct the study. Permission was also approved by the Office of Human Subjects Research to conduct the research.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher’s instrument contained three components. Section I consisted of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ, Bass & Avolio, 1995). Section II included the Leadership Practices Inventory – Individual Contributor (LPI-IC, Kouzes & Posner, 2001). The researcher developed Section III to collect personal and professional characteristics of the population.

To further investigate the collected data by the use of the MLQ and its constructs, the LPI-IC, a standardized instrument to measure leadership practices, was administered to determine if similar constructs of the two instruments correlated.

The MLQ measured transformational (5 behaviors), transactional (3 behaviors), and laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990a). Three outcomes of leadership are also measured; (a) willingness to exert extra effort; (b) leadership effectiveness; and, (c) satisfaction.

Transactional leadership is considered the lower-order form of leadership as compared to transformational which is higher (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Bass and Avolio (1994, 1995) believe that transactional leadership depend on contingent reinforcement, either positive contingent reward (CR; questions 1, 11, 16, 35) or the negative associated active or passive forms of management-by-exception (MBEA; questions 4, 22, 24, 27 or by MBEP; questions 3, 12, 17, 20). The active form of MBE is practiced when the leader
carefully watches for deviations from the rules (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The passive form of MBE occurs when the leader only intervenes when standards are not met.

In essence, the leader and follower agree on what needs to be accomplished to be rewarded or not to be punished (Bass & Avolio, 1994). If the follower complies, the leader rewards the follower or does not impose negative reinforcement. Transactional leadership involves an exchange that has been agreed upon. These engagements are considered a means for leaders to motivate followers.

Leaders who mostly exhibit the transactional leadership style assist their followers to identify and clarify organizational goals, and then help them to achieve these goals. The main objective of the relationship is based primarily on the needs of the organization. On the contrary, transformational leaders prioritize the needs of the follower first, and relate those individual needs to the needs of the organization and its goals (Gasper, 1992).

Behaviors that align with the transformational leadership style, as measured by the MLQ, are: (a) Attributed Charisma (AC; questions 10, 18, 21, 25); (b) Idealized Influence (II; questions 6, 14, 23, 34); (c) Inspirational Motivation (IM; questions 9, 13, 26, 36); (d) Intellectual Stimulation (IS; questions 2, 8, 30, 32); and, (e) Individual Consideration (IC; questions 15, 19, 29, 31). Attributed Charisma is the emotional behavior attributed by followers to leadership whose transformative practices provided vision and sense of mission toward personal and organizational goals. The leader instilled respect, gained respect and trust (Bass, 1990).

Idealized Influence occurred when leaders are seen as role models. The leadership style commanded admiration, respect and trust and are seen as having high ethical standards using power only when necessary (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Leaders who
exhibit Inspirational Motivation are typically associated with learning organizations and environments where high levels of enthusiasm and optimism are observed because of active involvement of the followers in the shared vision and goal commitment (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Intellectual Stimulation practiced by leaders encouraged followers to ask questions and to problem solve. Followers are challenged by the leader to be creative when offering solutions. Organizations have realized that encouragement rather than criticism of new ideas is more valid by creating a better attitude and working environment for the follower. Inspirational Consideration defined the transformational leader as someone who sharply arouses or alters the strength of dormant needs. The behavior can bring about large changes in groups or organizations. Bass (1985) suggested transformational leaders attempt to and succeed in raising people to a greater awareness about issues.

The questionnaire would determine how close the respondents would align with the transactional and transformational leadership styles. The questionnaire has evolved over a twenty-year period of many investigations and field study of leaders in both private and public organizations (Stone, 1992).

The researcher elected to use all items on the 45-item survey. This section utilized a 5 point Likert-type scale to measure participants perceptions ranging from 0=not at all to 4=frequently, if not always (Appendix A).

Section II consisted of the LPI-IC to measure the leadership practices of the five target composite groups. The LPI was originally developed based on case study analysis of over 1,200 managers and their self-identified best leadership practices (LPI-IC, Kouzes & Posner, 2001). Kouzes and Posner developed the LPI (1987) for use with
corporate and for-profit managers. In later studies however, target populations have included professionals and managers from private, public, and non-profit organizations. Improvements in the LPI have led to the development of the LPI-IC (Kouzes & Posner, 2001). The LPI-IC was developed for non-managerial leaders such as the composite groups of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences Administrative Cabinet, OSU Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Committee. The researcher determined that the LPI-IC was an appropriate instrument for the target population (Appendix B).

The LPI-IC measured leadership practices in five construct areas: (a) Challenging the process (questions 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26); (b) Inspiring a shared vision (questions 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27); (c) Enabling others to act (questions 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28); (d) Modeling the way (questions 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29); and, (e) Encouraging the heart (questions 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30). Thirty behavioral statements that captured the leadership practices – six statements for each practice – were developed to create the questionnaire.

The first leadership practice identified was “Challenging the Process”. Strategies associated with the practice included searching for opportunities and experimenting and taking risks. “Inspiring a Shared Vision” was the second leadership construct. Strategies associated with the practice included envisioning the future and enlisting others. The third leadership practice identified was “Enabling Others to Act”. Fostering collaboration and strengthening others were strategies aligned with the practice. “Modeling the Way” was the fourth leadership practice and the strategies associated included setting the example and achieving small wins. The final leadership practice identified was
“Encouraging the Heart”. The strategies associated with the practice included recognizing individual contributions and celebrating team accomplishments.

Two forms for the instrument were developed; the LPI Self form and the LPI-Other form. The leader to self-rate used the LPI Self form. Those that work directly with the leader to rate the leader used the LPI-Other form. For the purpose of this study, only the LPI-IC Self form was used.

The most recent version of the LPI-IC instrument placed each item on a 10-point Likert type scale. The scale utilized consisted of:

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

Section III gathered information on personal and professional characteristics of the respondents. Personal characteristics investigated included age, gender, and highest level of education. Professional characteristics investigated included current position and tenure in career (Appendix C).

**Validity**

Validity is the extent to which an instrument or questionnaire measures what it is supposed to measure. “The latest version of the MLQ, Form 5X, has been used in nearly 200 research programs, doctoral dissertations, and masters theses around the globe over the last four years” (Bass & Avolio, 1995, p.6). The MLQ has been demonstrated in other studies (Basu & Green, 1997) so the scales remain valid and reliable, even when some items are removed.
Bass and Avolio has tested for construct validity using the two most powerful confirmatory factor analyses in order to develop an instrument that best represented each leadership component within the “full range” model of leadership (1995). Several different methods have been used for summarizing tests of convergent and discriminant validity of the MLQ. One analytical method used was Confirmatory Behavior Analysis that was used to determine whether data from combined samples that confirmed Bass and Avolio’s conceptual model (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bagozzi, Yi, & Phillips, 1991; Bobko, 1990). The second method was LISREL, which compared the implied correlation matrix and estimates the goodness of the fit of constructs (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bentler, 1990; Bollen, 1989; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993; Long, 1983a & 1983b). Furthermore, Jackson (1999) used the MLQ in research that pertained to his topic, Transformational and Transactional Leadership in Division Administration at Three Institutions of Higher Education: An Application of the Bass & Avolio Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Based upon these authors findings and the fact that the researcher has studied a similar population of higher education administrators and leaders, the researcher would expect the same validity to apply to the research.

Concerning the validity of the Leadership Practices Inventory, according to Kouzes and Posner (1992), it has remained consistent in the production of valid assessments of the leadership target populations. Since the instrument was originally developed for managers and executives/administrators and also applied to non-profit managers and executives/administrators, the researcher determined that the instrument was valid for the five composite groups of this research. The LPI-IC was specifically
developed for non-managerial leaders. The researcher concluded the LPI-IC was a valid instrument, as the leaders surveyed would be considered non-managerial.

The validity of Section III was not relevant. The questionnaire simply collected demographic data.

**Reliability**

The reliability of an instrument is the degree of consistency with which it measures whatever it is measuring (Ary, Jacobs, and Razaveih, 1990). Descriptive statistics and the reliabilities of the MLQ 5X are based on ratings by others evaluating a target leader. “Reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94. All of the scales reliabilities were generally high, exceeding standard cut-offs for internal consistency recommended in the literature” (Bass & Avolio, 1995, p. 9).

The researcher used Cronbach’s alpha as a measure of reliability. The five transformational constructs on the MLQ had a reliability of .80. Individual reliabilities were as follows: (a) Idealized Influence-Attributed, .53; (b) Idealized Influence-Behavior, .52; (c) Inspirational Motivation, .71; (d) Intellectual Stimulation, .59; and (e) Individual Consideration, .44.

The MLQ has been used with populations from inmates rating their supervisors to Japanese workers rating the top CEO’s in Japan and overall, the reliability and validity are generalizable (B. J. Avolio, personal communication, April 16, 1999). The MLQ has been used in larger populations of community leaders, cooperative extension staff, college deans and directors. The patterns of each group are similar to other samples. The MLQ considered relationships between leader and follower and so it has broad
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applicability. The researcher determined that since similar audiences have been surveyed with the instrument, the instrument was reliable to use in this study.

The reliability of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was established by Kouzes and Posner (1992). The internal reliabilities in Kouzes and Posner's first large sample ranged from .69 to .85 and initial test-retest reliability had an average of .93 (1987).

Other researchers have confirmed the findings by Kouzes and Posner (1992). Spotanski in a (1990) study similar to the one conducted by this researcher of university department heads and other faculty members reported reliability levels from .79 to .90 while test-retest reliabilities were .93 and higher.

The reliability of Section III was not relevant. Section III simply collected demographic data.

**Data Collection**

The questionnaires were hand delivered (OSU campus address) or mailed on March 29, 2001 with a cover letter signed by Bobby D. Moser, Vice President for Agricultural Administration and University Outreach and Dean. A self-addressed stamped envelope was enclosed to return the instruments. Participants were asked to respond by April 6, 2001. Each questionnaire had an identification number to assist with non-response identification.

On April 5, 2001, a reminder mailing was sent to all participants (hand delivered on campus and mailed) thanking those that had responded and asked non-respondents to reply immediately. On April 12, 2001, a follow-up phone call was made to non-respondents to remind them the survey information was important and to reply as soon as
possible. On April 19, 2001, an e-mail was sent to remind the potential participants to return the instruments. The researcher did not follow-up with non-respondents. The final return rate was 90.5% or 67 responses.

**Data Analysis**

All data was analyzed using the SPSS Version 10.0.5 computer software program. After the data was entered, the researcher randomly selected 17 questionnaires to check for entry accuracy. An accuracy rate of 100% was established. The researched deemed this percentage acceptable and proceeded to analyze the data.

Descriptive statistics were measured of each group. Measures of association were applied to determine the relationship between leadership styles as determined by the MLQ and selected personal and professional characteristics. Correlational coefficients were calculated to describe relationships among the personal and professional characteristics and the leadership style identified. Correlational coefficients were calculated to describe relationships among the constructs of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). The conventions by Davis (1971), as shown in figure 3.1 were used in the description of the measures of association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very Strong Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Conventions Used to Describe Measures of Association
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter includes the presentation of the findings of this study, organized according to the objectives. Table 4.1 illustrates the number of Administrative Cabinet members, the number of Extension Administrative Cabinet members, the number of OARDC Director’s Cabinet members, the number of Department Chairs/Heads, and the number of the Vice President’s Advisory Council members who participated in the study, including non-respondents. As shown in table 4.1, 7 (10.4%) of the respondents were Administrative Cabinet, 13 (19.4%) of the respondents were Extension Administrative Cabinet, 5 (7.5%) of the respondents were OARDC Director’s Cabinet, 12 (17.9%) of the respondents were department chairs/heads, and 30 (44.8%) of the respondents were the Vice President’s Advisory Council. The overall response rate was 67 (90.5%). Using the rigorous methodology to collect data, non-respondents were not followed up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Surveys Sent</th>
<th>Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned Group</th>
<th>Percent Returned of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Cabinet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Administrative Cabinet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OARDC Director’s Cabinet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs/Heads</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President’s Advisory Council</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Frequency of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council participating in the study

Objective 1. Describe leadership practices of the Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council

Leadership Practices of Leaders in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences at The Ohio State University

As shown in table 4.2, measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, all of the transformational leadership constructs had mean scores over 3.00 or practiced “fairly often”. Individual Consideration and Inspirational Motivation ranked one and two of the five constructs. Individual Consideration had the highest median score of 3.50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>(.53)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>(.42)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of five behaviors</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Passive)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of three behaviors</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>(.53)</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>(.51)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>(.47)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring a Shared Vision</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Others to Act</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Leadership practices of the leaders in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences at The Ohio State University as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Leadership Practices Inventory-Individual Contributor — means of summated scales
The transactional leadership construct, Contingent Reward, was practiced “fairly often”. Management-by-Exception-Active and Management-by-Exception-Passive were practiced “once in a while”. The sum of the three transactional behaviors was practiced “once in a while”.

Laissez-faire leadership was essentially not practiced at all as the mean score was .75. The outcomes of leadership; Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction; were practiced “fairly often”.

Three of the constructs measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory-Individual Contributor; Enabling Others to Act, Encouraging the Heart, and Modeling the Way; were practiced “usually”. The construct Enabling Others to Act was practiced nearly at the “very frequently” level as it also had the highest median score of 8.83. The constructs Inspiring a Shared Vision and Challenging the Process were practiced “fairly often” and trending toward practiced “usually”.

Leadership Practices of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council

As shown in table 4.3, Administrative Cabinet members identified all of the transformational leadership constructs as utilized at least “fairly often”. Members also identified Contingent Reward (table 4.4), a construct of transactional leadership as utilized at least “fairly often”. The outcomes of leadership (table 4.5) are measured by the constructs Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction. Administrative Cabinet practiced all of these constructs as indicated by selecting “fairly often”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Construct</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet (n=7)</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)</th>
<th>OARDC Director's Cabinet (n=5)</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)</th>
<th>VP's Advisory Council (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</td>
<td>3.17 (.34)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.88 (.56)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.10 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>3.00 (.16)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.15 (.35)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.05 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>3.00 (.27)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.25 (.32)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.20 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>3.17 (.30)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.42 (.47)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25 (.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of behaviors</td>
<td>3.10 (.14)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.19 (.30)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.17 (.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Description of leadership practices of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – Transformational leadership constructs identified – means of summated scales
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Construct</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet (n=7)</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)</th>
<th>OARDC Director’s Cabinet (n=5)</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)</th>
<th>VP’s Advisory Council (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward(^1)</td>
<td>3.25 (.32)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.04 (.41)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00 (.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)(^1)</td>
<td>1.13 (.67)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.23 (.71)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.85 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Passive)(^1)</td>
<td>.92 (.88)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.38 (.58)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.05 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of behaviors(^1)</td>
<td>1.76 (.45)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.88 (.39)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.63 (.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership</td>
<td>.54 (.37)</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.83 (.39)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.55 (.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Description of leadership practices of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – means of summated scales – \(^1\) transactional and laissez-faire leadership constructs identified
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Construct</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet (n=7)</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)</th>
<th>OARDC Director’s Cabinet (n=5)</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)</th>
<th>VP’s Advisory Council (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>3.06 (.14)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.03 (.54)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.93 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.33 (.26)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.27 (.35)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.30 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.33 (.26)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.27 (.53)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.20 (.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Description of leadership practices of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – outcomes of leadership identified – means of summated scores
Extension Administrative Cabinet members identified four of the transformational leadership constructs as utilized at least “fairly often” with Idealized Influence (Attributed) practiced “Sometimes”. Only one of the transactional leadership constructs (contingent reward) was utilized “fairly often”. This group employed all the constructs of Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction by selecting “fairly often”.

OARDC Director’s Cabinet members identified all five transformational leadership constructs as used “fairly often”. Members of this group also practiced one of the three behaviors related to the transactional leadership style utilizing Contingent Reward “fairly often”. All three of the outcomes of leadership, Extra Effort, Effectiveness and Satisfaction, were utilized “fairly often”.

The fourth group in the study, department chairs/heads, identified all five of the transformational leadership style constructs as utilized “fairly often”. This group had the highest mean score when all behaviors of transformational leadership style were summed. Contingent Reward, a construct of transactional leadership, was utilized “fairly often” while the summation of transactional constructs rated this group as utilizing “sometimes”. Members also utilized two of the outcomes of leadership (Effectiveness and Satisfaction) “fairly often”.

The Vice President’s Advisory Council identified four of the transformational leadership practices as utilized “fairly often”. Idealized Influence (Attributed) was utilized “Sometimes”. Contingent Reward, a construct of transactional leadership, was utilized “fairly often”. The outcomes of leadership (Effectiveness and Satisfaction) were used “fairly often” while Extra Effort was used “Sometimes”.
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As shown in table 4.6, and using the Leadership Practices Inventory instrument, all of the groups identified the leadership construct Enabling Others to Act as practiced “Usually”. Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, and the department chairs/heads identified Modeling the Way and Encouraging the Heart as practiced “usually”. All groups practiced the remaining constructs, Challenging the Process and Inspiring a Shared Vision, “fairly often” while in addition, the Vice President’s Advisory Council practiced Modeling the Way and Encouraging the Heart “fairly often” as identified by the LPI.

Objective 2. Describe selected personal characteristics of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council

Gender

As shown in table 4.7, 71.4% of Administrative Cabinet were male and 28.6% were female; 69.2% of Extension Administrative Cabinet were male and 30.8% female, 100% of OARDC Director’s Cabinet were male, 91.7% of Department Chairs/Heads were male and 8.3% female, and 80% of the Vice President’s Advisory Council were male and 20% female. Overall, the male gender represented 80.6% of the participants while 19.4% were female.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Construct</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet (n=7)</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)</th>
<th>OARDC Director’s Cabinet (n=5)</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)</th>
<th>VP’s Advisory Council (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
<td>7.25 (.12)</td>
<td>7.74 (.75)</td>
<td>7.67 (1.03)</td>
<td>7.85 (1.04)</td>
<td>7.84 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring a Shared Vision</td>
<td>7.53 (.81)</td>
<td>7.90 (.83)</td>
<td>7.97 (1.18)</td>
<td>7.86 (.86)</td>
<td>7.86 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Others to Act</td>
<td>8.42 (.79)</td>
<td>8.89 (.61)</td>
<td>8.47 (.75)</td>
<td>8.67 (.78)</td>
<td>8.54 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling the Way</td>
<td>8.19 (.70)</td>
<td>8.13 (.73)</td>
<td>8.27 (.84)</td>
<td>8.35 (.61)</td>
<td>7.70 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>8.14 (.99)</td>
<td>8.14 (.75)</td>
<td>8.37 (.68)</td>
<td>8.51 (.91)</td>
<td>7.95 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Description of leadership practices of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council using the Leadership Practices Inventory – means of summated scores
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>OARDC Director's Cabinet</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads</th>
<th>VP's Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council by gender
Age

The minimum age of the five groups; Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council was 23, the maximum age was 70, and the mean was 52.63, the median was 54.00 and the standard deviation was 8.46 (table 4.8).

Level of Education

Fourteen point three percent (1) of Administrative Cabinet had completed some postdoctoral course work in addition to a doctoral degree, 57.1% (4) had obtained their doctoral degree, and 28.6% (2) had obtained their master’s degree. A majority (76.9%) (10) of Extension Administrative Cabinet had completed a doctoral degree, 15.4% (2) had completed some post master’s graduate work, and 7.7% (1) had a master’s degree. All (100%) (5) OARDC Director’s Cabinet members had completed a doctoral degree and 20% of those members had obtained postdoctoral course work. All 12 (100%) of the department chairs/heads had doctoral degrees while 33.3% (4) members had postdoctoral course credit. The Vice President’s Advisory Council consisted of 6.7% (2) postdoctoral members, 26.7% (8) had completed doctoral degrees; 13.3% (4) held master’s degree; 10% (3) held an undergraduate degree in addition to some graduate work, 30% (9) had obtained an undergraduate degree, 10% (3) had some college/technical school, and 3.3% (1) held a high school diploma (table 4.9). Degrees in undergraduate coursework (4 years of college) were held by 86.7% of the participants (table 4.9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>OARDC Director's Cabinet</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads</th>
<th>VP's Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 53.40  52.00  59.20  55.30  50.80  
SD: 4.98  7.38  6.14  4.81  10.05  
Median: 54.00  53.00  61.00  55.50  53.00

Table 4.8: Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council by age
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>OARDC Director's Cabinet</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads</th>
<th>VP's Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/technical school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College – 4 yr. degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Master’s work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council by education level
Objective 3. Describe selected professional characteristics of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council

Current Position

Table 4.10 describes the current professional position of the respondents: (a) Administrative Cabinet members, 6 (85.7%) administrators and 1 (14.3%) manager; (b) Extension Administrative Cabinet members, 13 (100%) administrators; (c) OARDC Director’s Cabinet members, 4 (80%) administrators and 1 (20%) faculty; (d) Department chairs/heads, 12 (100%) administrators; and (e) Vice President’s Advisory Council members, 4 (13.3%) administrators, 6 (20%) faculty, 1 (3.3%) consultant, 4 (13.3%) managers, 6 (20.0%) corporate executives, 8 (26.8%) owner/operators, and 1 (3.3%) other.

Tenure of Work Experience

Table 4.11 describes the tenure of work experience for the respondents: (a) Administrative Cabinet members, 1 (14.3%) 16-20 years, 1 (14.3%) 21-25 years, 1 (14.3%) 26-30 years, 1 (14.3%) 31-35 years, and 3 (42.8%) 36-40 years; Extension Administrative Cabinet members, 1 (7.7%) less than 15 years, 1 (7.7%) 16-20 years, 3 (23.0%) 21-25 years, 4 (30.8%) 26-30 years, 2 (15.4%) 31-35 years, and 2 (15.4%) 36-40 years; OARDC Director’s Cabinet members, 1 (20%) 16-20 years, 1 (20%) 26-30 years, 2 (40%) 31-35 years, and 1 (20%) 36-40 years; Department chairs/heads, 1 (9.1%) 16-20 years, 6 (54.5%) 26-30 years, 2 (18.2%) 31-35 years, 1 (9.1%) 36-40 years, and 1 (9.1%) 41-45 years; Vice President’s Advisory Council members, 3 (10%) less than 15 years, 4 (13.3%) 16-20 years, 7 (23.3%) 21-25 years, 6 (20%) 26-30 years, 4 (13.3%) 31-35 years, 3 (10%) 36-40 years, 1 (3.3%) 41-45 years, and 2 (6.8%) 46-50 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Position</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>OARDC Director’s Cabinet</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads</th>
<th>VP’s Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency  %</td>
<td>Frequency  %</td>
<td>Frequency  %</td>
<td>Frequency  %</td>
<td>Frequency  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>6 85.7</td>
<td>13 100.0</td>
<td>4 80.0</td>
<td>12 100.0</td>
<td>4 13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>1 20.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>6 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>1 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1 14.3</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>4 13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Executive</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>6 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Operator</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>8 26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>0 00.0</td>
<td>1 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 100.0</td>
<td>13 100.0</td>
<td>5 100.0</td>
<td>12 100.0</td>
<td>30 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council by professional position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure of Career</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>OARDC Director’s Cabinet</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VP’s Advisory Council</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 30.00 27.92 30.80 30.36 27.67
SD: 7.72 7.47 7.43 5.99 10.43
Median: 29.50 27.00 33.00 30.00 27.50

Table 4.11: Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council by tenure in career
Objective 4. Investigate possible relationships between leadership practices and personal and professional variables of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council

Administrative Cabinet

Very strong positive associations were found between the following personal and professional variables and the sum of the behavioral constructs on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (tables 4.12, 4.13): total tenure in career (1.000) and highest level of education (.937). A substantial positive association was found between the dependent variable and the following personal variable: gender (.562). A moderate positive association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: age (.305). A low positive association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: current position (.178).

Very strong positive associations were found between the following professional variable and all of the constructs on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (tables 4.14, 4.15): total tenure in career (1.000). Very strong positive associations were also found between the following independent variables and the dependent variables: highest level of education and Challenging the Process (.852), Modeling the Way (.805) and Enabling Others to Act (.776); age and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.711). Substantial positive associations were found between the following independent variables and the dependent variables: age and Encouraging the Heart (.682); highest level of education and Encouraging the Heart (.553) and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.500). Moderate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Administrative Cabinet (n=7)</th>
<th>Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)</th>
<th>OARDC Director's Cabinet (n=5)</th>
<th>Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)</th>
<th>VP’s Advisory Council (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age(^1)</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^2)</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>—(^4)</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education(^3)</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Pearson product-moment coefficient  \(^2\) Point biserial (0=female, 1=male)  \(^3\) Eta correlation coefficient  \(^4\) All male

Table 4.12: Correlations of summary behavior scores of transformational leadership with selected personal variables of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Summary of 5 Transformational Leadership Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Cabinet (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OARDC Director's Cabinet (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP's Advisory Council (n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position¹</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure in career¹</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Eta correlation coefficient  ² All administrators

Table 4.13: Correlations of summary behavior scores of transformational leadership with selected professional variables of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director's Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Scoring of Leadership Practices Inventory Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age¹</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender²</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education³</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Pearson product-moment coefficient  
² Point biserial (0=female, 1=male)  
³ Eta correlation coefficient

Table 4.14: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected personal variables of Administrative Cabinet (n=7)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Challenging the Process</th>
<th>Inspiring a Shared Vision</th>
<th>Enabling Others to Act</th>
<th>Modeling the Way</th>
<th>Encouraging the Heart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current position¹</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure in career¹</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Eta correlation coefficient

Table 4.15: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected professional variables of Administrative Cabinet (n=7)
positive associations were found between the following independent variable and all of the dependent variables but Enabling Others to Act: gender and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.424), Challenging the Process (.404), Encouraging the Heart (.369), and Modeling the Way (.310). Low positive associations were found between the following independent variables and dependent variables: age and Modeling the Way (.283), Challenging the Process (.260); current position and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.184), Encouraging the Heart (.178), and Challenging the Process (.109); and finally, gender and Enabling Others to Act (.163). Negligible positive associations were found between the following independent variable and dependent variables: current position and Enabling Others to Act (.051) and Modeling the Way (.020). A negligible negative association was found between the following independent variable and dependent variable: age and Enabling Others to Act (-.059).

**Extension Administrative Cabinet**

A very strong positive association was found between the following personal and professional variables and the sum of the behavioral constructs on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (tables 4:12, 4.13): total tenure in career (.979). A moderate positive association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: highest level of education (.462). A negligible positive association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: age (.052). A negligible negative association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: gender (-.026). The independent variable, current position, was not a factor as all of the participants in this group were administrators.
Very strong positive associations were found between the following professional variable and the all of the constructs on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (tables 4.16, 4.17): total tenure in career (Enabling Others to Act, 1.000; Challenging the Process, .984; Modeling the Way, .982; Encouraging the Heart, .962; and Inspiring a Shared Vision, .930). A substantial positive association was found between the following independent variable and dependent variable: Modeling the Way (.613). It was noted that the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). A moderate positive association was found between the following independent variable and dependent variable: highest level of education and Encouraging the Heart (.488), Modeling the Way (.465), Inspiring a Shared Vision (.378), and Enabling Others to Act (.356). Low positive associations were found between the following independent variables and dependent variables: gender and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.297) and Encouraging the Heart (.218); age and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.298), Enabling Others to Act (.270), and Challenging the Process (.152); highest level of education and Challenging the Process (.183). A negligible positive association was found between the following independent variable and dependent variable: age and Encouraging the Heart (.005). Negligible negative associations were found between the following independent variables and dependent variables: gender and Challenging the Process (-.006), Enabling Others to Act (-.037), and Modeling the Way (-.076). The independent variable, current position, was not a factor as all of the participants in this group were administrators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Scoring of Leadership Practices Inventory Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Pearson product-moment coefficient  
<sup>2</sup> Point biserial (0=female, 1=Male)  
<sup>3</sup> Eta correlation coefficient  
<sup>*</sup> p < .05, two-tailed.

Table 4.16: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected personal variables of Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Scoring of Leadership Practices Inventory Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position¹</td>
<td>__²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure in career¹</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Eta correlation coefficient ² All administrators

Table 4.17: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected professional variables of Extension Administrative Cabinet (n=13)
OARDC Director’s Cabinet

A very strong positive association was found between the following personal and professional variables and the sum of the behavioral constructs on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (tables 4.12, 4.13): total tenure in career (1.000), and highest level of education (.802). A low positive association was found between the following personal variable and the dependent variable: age (.140). A negligible positive association was found between the MLQ and current position (.089). The independent variable gender was not a factor as all of the participants in the group were male.

Very strong positive associations were found between the following personal and professional variables and the constructs on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (tables 4.18, 4.19): total tenure in career (1.000 on all constructs); highest level of education and Challenging the Process (.816), Enabling Others to Act (.771), and Modeling the Way (.711). Substantial positive associations were found between the following independent and dependent variables: highest level of education and Encouraging the Heart (.657); age and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.567); and current position and Challenging the Process (.544) and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.539). Moderate positive associations where found between the following independent and dependent variables: current position and Enabling Others to Act (.473) and Encouraging the Heart (.438). Low positive associations where found between the following independent and dependent variables: age and Modeling the Way (.270) and Encouraging the Heart (.237); current position and Modeling the Way (.178). Low positive associations were found between the following independent and dependent variables: highest level of education and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.095); age and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Scoring of Leadership Practices Inventory Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age¹</td>
<td>-.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender²</td>
<td>— ⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education³</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Pearson product-moment coefficient  
² Point biserial (0=female, 1=male)  
³ Eta correlation coefficient  
⁴ All male

Table 4.18: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected personal variables of OARDC Director’s Cabinet (n=5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Challenging the Process</th>
<th>Inspiring a Shared Vision</th>
<th>Enabling Others to Act</th>
<th>Modeling the Way</th>
<th>Encouraging the Heart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current position&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure in career&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Eta correlation coefficient

Table 4.19: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected professional variables of OARDC Director's Cabinet (n=5)
Enabling Others to Act (.056). A low negative association was found between the following independent variable and dependent variable: age and Challenging the Process (.198).

**Department chairs/heads**

A very strong positive association was found between the following personal and professional variables and the sum of the behavioral constructs on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (tables 4.12, 4.13): total tenure in career (.929). A moderate positive association was found between the following independent variable and dependent variable: highest level of education (.363). A negligible positive association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: gender (.022). A low negative association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: age (-.188). The independent variable current position was not a factor as all of the participants in the group were administrators.

A very strong positive association was found between the following professional variable and the constructs on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (tables 4.20, 4.21): total tenure in career and Enabling Others to Act (.999), Challenging the Process (.962), Modeling the Way (.910), Inspiring a Shared Vision (.868), and Encouraging the Heart (.855). A positive substantial association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: highest level of education and Challenging the Process (.572). A positive moderate association was found between the following personal variable and the dependent variable of Inspiring a Shared Vision: highest level of education (.488). Low positive associations were found between the following personal variables and the dependent variable: gender and Enabling Others to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Challenging the Process</th>
<th>Inspiring a Shared Vision</th>
<th>Enabling Others to Act</th>
<th>Modeling the Way</th>
<th>Encouraging the Heart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age(^1)</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>-.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^2)</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education(^3)</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Pearson product-moment coefficient \(^2\) Point biserial (0=female, 1=male) \(^3\) Eta correlation coefficient

Table 4.20: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected personal variables of Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring of Leadership Practices Inventory Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
<th>Challenging the Process</th>
<th>Inspiring a Shared Vision</th>
<th>Enabling Others to Act</th>
<th>Modeling the Way</th>
<th>Encouraging the Heart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current position(^1)</td>
<td>(^2)</td>
<td>(^2)</td>
<td>(\cdot)</td>
<td>(\cdot)</td>
<td>(\cdot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure in career(^1)</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Eta correlation coefficient
\(^2\) All administrators

Table 4.21: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory constructs scores with selected professional variables of Department Chairs/Heads (n=12)
Act (.202), Encouraging the Heart (.177), and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.132); highest level of education and Modeling the Way (.269) and Enabling Others to Act (.198). Negligible positive associations were found between the following independent variables and the dependent variables: gender and Modeling the Way (.093); highest level of education and Encouraging the Heart (.011). Negative low associations were found with the following personal variable age and the dependent variable: Challenging the Process (-.211), Inspiring a Shared Vision (-.228), and Modeling the Way (-.245). A negative low association was also found with the personal variable gender and the dependent variable: Challenging the Process (-.198). A negative moderate association was found between the following personal variable age and the dependent variable: Encouraging the Heart (-.478) and Enabling Others to Act (-.484). The independent variable current position was not a factor as all of the participants in the group were administrators.

**Vice President’s Advisory Council**

A very strong positive association was found between the following professional variable and the sum of the behavioral constructs on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (tables 4.12, 4.13): total tenure in career (.921). A substantial positive association was found between the following independent variable and the dependent variable: highest level of education (.562). A moderate positive association was found between the dependent variable and the professional variable current position (.481). A low positive association was found between the following personal variable and the dependent variable: age (.162). A negligible positive association was found between the following personal variable and the dependent variable: gender (.039).
Very strong positive associations were found between the following professional variable and the constructs on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (tables 4.22, 4.23): total tenure in career and Encouraging the Heart (.944), Inspiring a Shared Vision (.920), Challenging the Process (.888), Enabling Others to Act (.860), and Modeling the Way (.815). Substantial positive associations were found between the following personal and professional variables and the dependent variable: highest level of education and Challenging the Process (.699), Inspiring a Shared Vision (.608), and Encouraging the Heart (.512); current position and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.583) and Challenging the Process (.561); Moderate positive associations were found between the following independent variables and the dependent variables: highest level of education and Modeling the Way (.455) and Enabling Others to Act (.344); current position and Modeling the Way (.460), Enabling Others to Act (.333), and Encouraging the Heart (.317). Low positive associations were found between the following personal and professional variables and the dependent variable: age and Encouraging the Heart (.202); gender and Challenging the Process (.130). Negligible positive associations were found between the LPI and the following personal variables: gender and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.091); age and Challenging the Process (.098) and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.069). Negligible negative associations were found between the following independent variable and the dependent variables: age and Enabling Others to Act (-.037). A low negative association was found between the personal variable age and the dependent variable: Modeling the Way (-.129). Also, a low negative association was found between the personal variable gender and the dependent variables: Modeling the Way (-.138), Encouraging the Heart (-.158), and Enabling Others to Act (-.179).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Scoring of Leadership Practices Inventory Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Pearson product-moment coefficient  
<sup>2</sup> Point biserial (0=female, 1=male)  
<sup>3</sup> Eta correlation coefficient

Table 4.22: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected personal variables of Vice President’s Advisory Council (n=30)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Scoring of Leadership Practices Inventory Constructs (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position(^1)</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tenure in career(^1)</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Eta correlation coefficient

Table 4.23: Correlations of the Leadership Practices Inventory construct scores with selected professional variables of Vice President’s Advisory Council (n=30)
Objective 5. Investigate possible relationships between respondents leadership practices scores on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Leadership Practices Inventory of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, Department Chairs/Heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council

Substantial positive correlations were found between the following constructs of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and all of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) constructs: summary of the five behaviors identified on the MLQ of transformational leadership and Inspiring a Shared Vision (.736), Encouraging the Heart (.706), Challenging the Process (.680), Modeling the Way (.633) and Enabling Others to Act (.595). All of the correlations were noted significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences (CFAES) at The Ohio State University (OSU) embarked on a mission eight years ago to develop and implement a series of plans and programs to prepare for the future known as Project Reinvent. Those in leadership positions in the college determined that change was necessary to direct the college and university back to its original mission: to serve the people of the state of Ohio and beyond. The college elected to reinvent its mission and vision and plan for the 21st Century.

A new culture within the college was needed to move Project Reinvent forward. The researcher discussed many of the popular leadership theories. Based on the objectives of the college, a desire surfaced within the leadership to move toward the development of the transformational leadership style. This style appeared to be the best that correlated with the aspirations of those who would set the plan in action.

Statement of the Problem

In order for the organization to embrace this change of culture, new relationships between the formal organizational system (policies, procedures, funding, and hierarchy) and the shadow structure (grass roots, informal ideas and relationships) that exist in the
College, as in every organization, need to develop. As these two systems move toward this experimentation process, power relationships shift and an appeal for institutional change emerges.

Leadership practices of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council of the CFAES, have never been formally explored. In a paper produced by the Moser (1998), leadership in the college professed a need for a transformational leadership style. The college has implemented policy suggesting the use of constructs associated with the transformational leadership style. Learning what style of leadership these groups practice and if they practice the same style may yield information as to how successful the college may be at attaining its mission.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate leadership practices of CFAES leaders (including members of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council). To achieve the purpose of the study, the following specific objectives were developed:

1. Describe leadership practices of the identified formal college leaders (including members of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council in the CFAES), as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ, Bass and Avolio, 1995) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI, Kouzes and Posner, 2001);
2. Describe selected personal variables;

3. Describe selected professional variables;

4. Investigate relationships between leadership practices of the members of the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council in the CFAES and selected personal and professional variables; and

5. Investigate relationships between respondents leadership practices scores on the MLQ and the LPI.

Type of Study

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature with the purpose of describing leadership practices of College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council in the CFAES. The study also examined relationships between leadership practices and personal and professional variables.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire contained three distinct segments: Section I measured College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council members’ leadership practices through the standardized Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Section II measured the College Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council members’ leadership practices through the standardized Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). Section III was developed by the researcher to collect the personal and
professional variables. As Sections I and II are standardized instruments, both reliability and validity has been established by other researchers using the same type of participants as used in the study.

Data Collection

The questionnaires were hand delivered (OSU campus address) or mailed on March 29, 2001 with a cover letter signed by Bobby D. Moser, Vice President for Agricultural Administration and University Outreach and Dean. A self-addressed stamped envelope was enclosed to return the instruments. Participants were asked to respond by April 6, 2001. Each questionnaire had an identification number to assist with non-response identification. On April 5, 2001, a reminder mailing was sent to all participants (hand delivered on campus and mailed off-campus) thanking those that had responded and asked non-respondents to reply immediately. On April 12, 2001, a follow-up phone call was made to non-respondents to remind them the survey information was important and to reply as soon as possible. On April 19, 2001, an e-mail was sent to remind the potential participants to return the instruments. The researcher established April 30, 2001 as the final deadline for accepting data for analysis. The final return rate was 90.5% or 67 responses. No further follow-up was done with the seven non-respondents.

Data Analysis

All research data was entered and analyzed utilizing the SPSS 10.0.5 statistical program. After the data was entered, the researcher randomly selected 17 (25% of the total) questionnaires to check for accuracy. An accuracy rate of 100% was established.
The researcher used both descriptive and correlational statistics to meet the objectives outlined in chapter 1.

Findings and Conclusions

This section of chapter 5 will examine the findings from chapter 4 including: leadership practices of the leaders in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences at The Ohio State University, leadership practices of the members of Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI); personal variables of the population; professional variables of the population; relationships between leadership practices and personal variables; relationships between leadership practices and professional variables; and relationships between leadership practices on the MLQ and LPI.

Overall, the college leadership exhibited an above average self-reported leadership style as the transformational, transactional, and constructs of the LPI are used “fairly often”. The construct Enabling Others to Act on the LPI surfaced as the strongest style practiced. The college has allowed administrators to empower individuals in their day-to-day tasks. The style is associated with leaders encouraging followers to collaborate with others in order to improve the work environment. Synergies develop between individuals as new ways of doing tasks are discovered. Even though Challenging the Process was rated the lowest, it is practiced “fairly often” to “usually”. College leadership may want to concentrate on this construct and develop training programs geared toward encouraging this concept.
The college leadership practices a transactional behavior known as Contingent Reward “fairly often”. Contingent Reward is represented when a transaction occurs between the leader and follower. A reward of some sort is given by the leader to the follower that is contingent on job performance.

Five transformational leadership behaviors were investigated through this study on the MLQ including: (1) Idealized Influence – Attributed; (2) Idealized Influence – Behavior; (3) Inspirational Motivation; (4) Intellectual Stimulation; and (5) Individual Consideration. The college leadership as a whole practiced the five transformational leadership constructs “fairly often”. Individual Consideration explained as coaching or mentoring and Inspirational Motivation, interpreted as leaders motivating and inspiring followers, had the highest rating of the five constructs. These conditions are trending toward the leadership in the college exhibiting transformational leadership. As a coach or mentor, an attempt is made by the leader to motivate the follower to do more for the university. An opportunity exists for the follower to grow within the university that was created by the leader.

All five groups in the study practiced the five transformational leadership constructs “fairly often”. The mean scores of the five behaviors were summed and the values ranged from 3.32 (department chairs/heads) to 3.10 (Administrative Cabinet).

The researcher would surmise that the department chairs/heads scored highest on the MLQ as they have day-to-day contact with the individuals they lead, allowing the group more opportunity to practice leadership style. However, as Administrative Cabinet represents the highest leadership entity in the college, should it not be the group most reflective of this leadership style, since this group is encouraging others to adopt this
style? If department chairs/heads have the potential to make 80% of the decisions in the college (Roach, 1976), and President Gee stated department chairs/heads are important to implement institutional change, is it a negative attribute for the department chairs/heads to exhibit a high transformational leadership style?

The study findings also indicated the widest difference in the range of means of a construct was .42 (Idealized Influence – Behavior) and the narrowest at .20 (Inspirational Motivation). The construct Idealized Influence - Behavior exhibited the widest range as department chairs/heads scored a mean of 3.42 while Administrative Cabinet scored 3.00. The narrowest range of Inspirational Motivation consisted of the highest mean score by the Vice President’s Advisory Council (3.37) and the lowest mean score of Administrative Cabinet (3.17). The researcher finds it interesting that the department chairs/heads have a higher rating in the construct. Idealized Influence – Behavior is the emotional behavior attributed by followers to leadership whose transformative practices provided vision and sense of mission toward personal and organizational goals – a quality Administrative Cabinet should possess as the highest administrative unit. This construct has been associated with the charisma of an individual. A final comment is to recognize the participants of this study self-rated. A study by raters, those individuals who work directly with the participants rating the leader, may discover if followers actually find the qualities established by the participants.

Additional findings by the MLQ indicated all groups practiced the construct Contingent Reward “fairly often”, a construct of the transactional leadership style. This finding further corroborates the findings by Bass (1985) that leaders practice more than one leadership style and that a cascading type of effect actually occurs.
All five groups practiced the outcomes of leadership (extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction) "fairly often". Although not significant, three groups scored under the mean score of 3 associated with a behavior practiced "fairly often" of extra effort. The three groups were OARDC Director's Cabinet, department chairs/heads, and the Vice President's Advisory Council. The construct Extra Effort is getting others to do more than they expected to do by trying harder and creating a desire to succeed.

Five leadership constructs were investigated through this study using the LPI instrument including: (1) challenging the process; (2) inspiring a shared vision; (3) enabling others to act; (4) modeling the way; and (5) encouraging the heart. All groups practiced the five constructs at least "fairly often". The constructs Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging the Heart were practiced at the next highest level "usually", with the exception of the Vice President's Advisory Council. The results would indicate that the participants view themselves as leaders and practice the constructs of leadership on a routine basis.

The scores indicate a homogeneous population. However, Administrative Cabinet scored the lowest mean on two constructs: Challenging the Process and Inspiring a Shared Vision. The researcher recognizes that as the head leadership group in the college, the expectation of results may suggest mean scores of the group should be the highest. Leadership has indicated the construct Challenging the Process, or embracing experimentation/taking risks, would be a positive behavior for the college. Inspiring a Shared Vision, the second construct Administrative Cabinet scored lowest, suggests that leadership should envision the future and enlist others to commence the plan. The researcher finds it ironic that the head leadership group of the college had the lowest
mean score, but practice the construct “fairly often”. There is a pattern in the responses that indicate lower scores with Challenging the Process and Inspiring a Shared Vision. The researcher would believe that in order for change to occur in the College, the two constructs should rank higher. Inspiration of the faculty and staff to lead toward the vision is imperative if the vision is to occur. Administrative Cabinet may want to look inward and evaluate the study results of the two constructs.

**Characteristics of the population**

The personal variables of gender, age, and highest level of education were investigated in this study. Of the 67 participants in the population, 54 (80.6%) were male and 13 (19.4%) were female. The following is the breakdown of gender by group: Administrative Cabinet, 5 (71.4%) male and 2 (28.6%) female; Extension Administrative Cabinet, 9 (69.2%) male and 4 (30.8%) female; OARDC Director’s Cabinet 5 (100%) male; department chairs/heads, 11 (91.7%) male and 1 (8.3%) female, and; the Vice President’s Advisory Council 24 (80.0%) male and 6 (20.0%) female.

The mean age of Administrative Cabinet was 53.4 while 28.6% had obtained a Master’s degree with the balance possessing a doctoral or post-doctoral experience. Extension Administrative Cabinet’s mean age was 52.0 as 7.7% had a Master’s degree, 15.4% had post Master’s experience, and 76.9% had a doctoral degree. The mean age of OARDC Director’s Cabinet was 59.2 as all participants had obtained at least a doctoral degree. Department chairs/heads had a mean age of 55.30. The department chairs/heads had obtained a doctoral degree (66.7%) and 33.3% had post-doctoral experience. The Vice President’s Advisory Council mean age was 50.80. The Vice President’s Advisory Council was the most diverse in education level of the five groups. One had a high
school diploma (3.3%), three (10.0%) of the final group had some college/technical
school experience, 30.0% (9) had an undergraduate degree, 23.3% had some graduate
work or a master’s degree, 26.7% had a doctoral degree, and 6.7% had post-doctoral
course work experience.

Four of the groups in the study were homogeneous with mean age ranging from
50.79 through 55.33. The OARDC Director’s Cabinet had the most mature group with
the highest mean age at 59.2. It may be important to note that the researcher and the
participants in the study grew up in an era concentrating on management development
rather than leadership development. Gender equity in the college may be of question
also. Extension Administrative Cabinet had the highest representation of female
participants at 30.8% while OARDC Director’s Cabinet had no females. The researcher
finds the representation of female participants (19.4%) low (25% would be a reasonable
goal in five years). The make-up of the OARDC Director’s Cabinet would indicate that
members have been in their positions most of their career with little opportunity for
women to become members. However, department chairs/heads have had a higher than
normal turnover rate in the past five to ten years. Opportunities for female applicants
have been optimal with this group. Administrators need to make certain the applicant
pool contains an equal representation of qualified female candidates.

The highest level of education is represented by the department chairs/heads. The
researcher did not find this unusual, as this administrative group is faculty serving in a
management role. Another observation made by the researcher is the diversity of the
Vice President’s Advisory Council. Individuals from different professional backgrounds
as indicated by position lend diverse opinion to the group. The researcher supports this
type of diversity as varying viewpoints are gathered to advise the Vice President on issues affecting the college.

The professional variables of current position and tenure in career were also investigated in this study. The researcher expected a mostly homogeneous population as four of the groups; Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, and department chairs/heads; were considered administrators. The study findings supported this notion as 94.6% identified themselves as administrators. The Vice President’s Advisory Council was composed of several types of employment background, congruent with the intention of the Vice President to have a diverse group of individuals. The following employment classifications were identified: 4 (13.3%) administrators, 6 (20.0%) faculty, 1 (3.3%) consultant, 4 (13.3%) managers, 6 (20.0%) corporate executives, 8 (26.8%) owner/operators, and 1 (3.3%) other (student representative). The researcher finds this composition to be acceptable and offers no suggestions or observations to the contrary.

Current tenure in career was also investigated in the study. The researcher believed that type of position and length in the position was associated as administrators are typically prepared and promoted through the ranks of employment. The findings indicated all five groups to be homogeneous as tenure in career ranged from a mean of 27.67 for the Vice President’s Advisory Council to 30.8 years for the OARDC Director’s Cabinet. A level of maturity is expected with the make-up of the advisory council. The researcher would find this acceptable as the Vice President reaches out for advise from this group. It should be noted that 23.3% of the Vice President’s Advisory Council had
20 years or less of work experience. The researcher would expect eagerness and new ideas to be generated by this group.

**Relationships between Leadership Practices of the Administrative Cabinet, Extension Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, department chairs/head, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council and selected personal and professional variables**

A very strong positive association was found for all groups and the instruments (MLQ and LPI) used to measure leadership style and the following independent variable: total tenure in career. The researcher expected this type of relationship. Other very strong associations discovered with Administrative Cabinet include highest level of education and the MLQ and the constructs of the LPI, Challenging the Process, Modeling the Way, and Enabling Others to Act. In addition, a very strong relationship was found between age and Inspiring a Shared Vision. As indicated in previous sections in this chapter, Administrative Cabinet had the lowest mean score on two of these constructs, Challenging the Process and Inspiring a Shared Vision yet strong relationships emerged. The researcher believes these constructs are important dependent variables to this group as the relationship demonstrates.

Another very strong positive association discovered for the OARDC Director’s Cabinet include the MLQ and the following dependent variable: highest level of education. Highest level of education and the constructs of the LPI Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Modeling the Way were also strong positive associations. Interestingly, this relationship exists for the same constructs identified by Administrative Cabinet. The researcher would expect age and level of education to correlate with these variables as the older and more educated an individual becomes, the
more engaged in finding new ways to achieve success, allowing followers more time to collaborate with others and certainly, setting an example for others.

Substantial positive associations were found for Administrative Cabinet between age and the LPI construct Encouraging the Heart. Also, the variable highest level of education and Encouraging the Heart and Inspiring a Shared Vision were substantial associations. Age and Modeling the Way was another substantial association discovered for Extension Administrative Cabinet while age and Inspiring a Shared Vision was also substantial for OARDC Director’s Cabinet. OARDC Director’s Cabinet and the Vice President’s Advisory Council shared similar results for substantial positive associations between current position and Challenging the Process and Inspiring a Shared Vision. Other substantial positive associations were ascertained for department chairs/heads and the relationship between highest level of education and Challenging the Process. The Vice President’s Advisory Council scored a substantial relationship between the MLQ and highest level of education and current position; current position and Inspiring a Shared Vision and Challenging the Process and; highest level of education and Challenging the Process and Modeling the Way.

When analyzing all of the very strong and substantial positive associations on the MLQ, a few relationships surface that merit special mention: (1) tenure in career was nearly perfect in correlation; (2) highest level of education was a very strong correlation for OARDC Director’s Cabinet, the most mature group in the study with a mean of 59.2; (3) highest level of education proved a high correlation for Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, and the Vice President’s Advisory Council; (4) current position was a substantial relationship for the Vice President’s Advisory Council as the
other four groups were homogeneous. The researcher is not certain why the highest level of education did not correlate as high as for Extension Administrative Cabinet or department chairs/heads but their correlations were moderate.

Analyzing all of the very strong and substantial associations on the LPI supports the following insights: (1) tenure in career was perfect for Administrative Cabinet and OARDC Director’s Cabinet while Extension Administrative Cabinet, department chairs/heads and the Vice President’s Advisory Council were nearly perfect; (2) Administrative Cabinet and OARDC Director’s Cabinet had significant or strong associations with highest level of education and all of the constructs with the exception of Inspiring a Shared Vision for the Director’s Cabinet; (3) Extension Administrative Cabinet (Modeling the Way) and department chairs/heads (Challenging the Process) had one high association each; (4) all groups with the exception of Extension Administrative Cabinet had high associations between Challenging the Process and highest level of education. The researcher believes more questions than answers have been discovered with these associations. Why was the independent variable highest level of education lower in association with the LPI constructs for Extension Administrative Cabinet and department chairs/heads? Why did Extension Administrative Cabinet and department chairs/heads have only one very strong or significant association when compared to the other groups? Finally, why did Extension Administrative Cabinet score mostly low associations other than tenure in career, as compared to the balance of the groups?

Moderate positive associations were revealed between the MLQ and for: Administrative Cabinet, age; Extension Administrative Cabinet, highest level of education; OARDC Director’s Cabinet, current position; and department chairs/heads,
highest level of education. Though not ranked substantial or very strong as
Administrative Cabinet, OARDC Director’s Cabinet, and the Vice President’s Advisory
Council, the relationship of highest level of education was moderate for Extension
Administrative Cabinet and department chairs/heads. A correlation did exist for all five
groups.

Moderate positive associations were discovered between the constructs of the LPI
and for: Administrative Cabinet, gender and Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared
Vision, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging the Heart; Extension Administrative
Cabinet, highest level of education and Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to
Act, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging the Heart; OARDC Director’s Cabinet, current
position and Enabling Others to Act and Encouraging the Heart; department chairs/heads,
highest level of education and Inspiring a Shared Vision; and the Vice President’s
Advisory Council, highest level of education and Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling
Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart, current position and Enabling Others to Act
and Modeling the Way, gender and Encouraging the Heart.

The researcher discovered several interesting observations when comparing
groups and moderate positive associations with the constructs: (1) Administrative
Cabinet had a correlation with gender and 4 of the constructs; (2) Extension
Administrative Cabinet had a correlation with highest level of education and 4 of the
constructs; (3) Vice President’s Advisory Council had a correlation with highest level of
education and all five of the constructs; and (4) highest level of education correlated with
Inspiring a Shared Vision.
The correlation for Administrative Cabinet between gender and the 4 constructs may relate to this group having the higher probability of gender surfacing as a variable since this is the second highest percentage of females. As most of the other groups have correlated with highest level of education, it is not surprising to see Extension Administrative Cabinet and the Vice President’s Advisory Council correlate moderately. Three groups moderately correlated with Inspiring a Shared Vision and highest level of education. OARDC Director’s Cabinet is the only group that correlated at the negligible level with Inspiring a Shared Vision. Why was there a lack of relationship?

A few correlations between the variables merit mentioning in regard to gender and total tenure in career. Gender correlated on both instruments for Administrative Cabinet on most of the constructs. This may be due to the higher percentage of females in the group but caution should be taken; Administrative Cabinet has two females.

Total tenure correlated almost perfectly for all constructs on both instruments. This finding would lead the researcher to believe the more career experience an individual possesses, the tendency to practice the identified leadership styles.

Several negative correlations occurred that are noteworthy. Age correlated negatively on both the MLQ and LPI on all constructs for the department chairs/heads. Score results on the MLQ show a low negative association. On the LPI, low negative associations occurred for Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Modeling the Way, moderate negative associations occurred for Enabling Others to Act, and a substantial negative association occurred for Encouraging the Heart. As the researcher analyzed each relationship, the following could be construed from the results of low negative associations with the following variables: (1) Challenging the Process is
searching for opportunities and experimenting or taking risks; the opposite is possibly conforming to what leadership dictates; therefore, as department chairs/heads get older, the tendency may be to conform to what their leadership expects; (2) Inspiring a Shared Vision includes envisioning the future and enlisting others; the opposite would be not creating a shared vision or at least not emphasizing a vision for the future as a department chair/head ages; (3) Modeling the Way is setting an example and achieving small wins; the opposite would be not setting an example or emphasizing the way followers should emulate leadership as department chairs/heads get older. A moderate negative association occurred between Enabling Others to Act and age. Enabling Others to Act is leadership fostering collaboration and strengthening others. The opposite would be not to foster collaboration or to strengthen others, as department chairs/heads get older. The last relationship between the variable Encouraging the Heart and age for department chairs/heads indicates a substantial negative association. The construct Encouraging the Heart is defined as recognizing individual contributions and celebrating team accomplishments. The opposite would be non-recognition of followers or lack of camaraderie as department chairs/heads age. The researcher believes leadership in the college should follow up the last two relationships.

The researcher also discovered a few negligible negative to low negative associations between age and constructs of the LPI among various groups in the study. Administrative Cabinet scored a negligible negative association between Enabling Others to Act and age. OARDC Director’s Cabinet scored a low negative association between age and Challenging the Process. Similar conditions would exist for OARDC Director’s Cabinet as department chairs/heads. A caution should be noted with this finding.
Finally, the Vice President’s Advisory Council had negligible negative associations between Enabling Others to Act and age. They also had a low negative association between Modeling the Way and age. Again, the research findings would be similar to the department chairs/heads and the OARDC Director’s Cabinet.

Relationships between respondents leadership practices scores on the MLQ and LPI

Substantial positive correlations were found between the constructs of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and all of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) constructs. Findings in the study indicate either instrument would suffice if leadership style were to be determined. Transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire leadership styles or any outcomes of leadership can be measured by using the MLQ.

Recommendations for Administrative Cabinet

The review of the literature, the findings of the study, and the subsequent conclusions led this researcher to make several recommendations for Administrative Cabinet in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences (CFAES). These recommendations include:

1. Administrative Cabinet should support the implementation of leadership training for all administrative units within the CFAES that support the mission and vision of the college. The training should occur by administrative group with an opportunity for the five groups to retreat for a day. Training is an important component for individuals to become better educated in the area of leadership.

2. Administrative Cabinet should require leadership training for new appointees in administrative positions in the college. Again, training in the area of leadership would foster an environment for leadership development.
3. Administrative Cabinet should require some leadership experience when advertising for new administrative positions in the college. In order to attain the vision of the college, hiring individuals with leadership qualities first and then considering management skills may benefit the college in the long term.

4. Administrative Cabinet should consider a mentoring program for those hired in leadership positions. Mentors would tend to provide an avenue for preventative measures and answers or ways to solve problems inherent with the system.

5. Administrative Cabinet should emphasize the addition of females into the ranks of administration within the college. Diversity is discussed frequently and appears to be embraced by the college. The challenge is to act upon this discovery.

6. Administrative Cabinet may consider a more proactive role engaging with and fostering a team approach with department chairs/heads. It is important to understand department chairs/heads make 80% of the decisions within the university scheme. They are the conduit between administration and faculty. If the department chairs/heads do not agree with Administrative Cabinet on particular issues, then attainment of the mission and vision of the college may be delayed or at worst case, not achieved.

7. Administrative Cabinet should occasionally look inwardly to make certain actions are congruent with the mission and vision of the college. Surveys of faculty and staff may provide a mechanism to accomplish this objective.
Recommendations for further research

1. It is recommend that this study be replicated to determine what other personal or professional variables might influence the leadership styles of the population.

2. It is recommended that this study be replicated with the population utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Rater Form in addition to the Self-form. In addition, when the Leadership Practices Inventory instrument is used, then the LPI-Observer form should be utilized. If there were a tendency for leaders to overrate themselves, the use of either the rater or observer forms would eliminate the potential bias.

3. It is recommended this study be replicated with other land grant institutions, particularly those participating in Project Reinvent. Base line data could be established and comparisons made between institutions. Importance should be placed on the use of a common instrument.

4. It is recommended to determine if intervening variables exist. Some examples include if participants in the study attended leadership training or if participants have utilized the instrument in prior research.

5. It is recommended that this study be replicated in five years to determine the current state of leadership style. This study was a moment in time. Individuals and leadership styles will change over time.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRES
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Leader Form (5X-Short)

Per a letter from Mind Garden, Inc. dated May 9, 2001, the instrument could not be used in this thesis. However, permission was given to reproduce 5 sample items from the instrument. The following are the sample items:

Use the following rating scale:

Not at all    Once in a while    Sometimes    Fairly often    Frequently, if not always

0             1                  2               3               4

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts ........................................ 0 1 2 3 4
2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate .......... 0 1 2 3 4
3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious ......................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
4. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise .................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
5. I talk about my most important values and beliefs ....................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY—INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTOR [LPI-IC]

SELF

Your Name: __________________________

INSTRUCTIONS

This instrument has been designed for leaders who are not in managerial positions. Write your name in the blank above. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each carefully. Then look at the rating scale and decide how frequently you engage in the behavior described.

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

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

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

For each statement, decide on a rating and record it in the blank to the left of the statement. Do not leave any blank incomplete. Please remember that all statements are applicable. If you feel that any statement does not apply to you, in all likelihood it is because you do not frequently engage in the behavior. In this case, assign a rating of 3 or lower. When you have responded to all thirty statements, turn to the response sheet on page 4. Make sure that you write your name on the response sheet in the blank marked "Your Name." Transfer your responses and return the response sheet according to the instructions provided.

For future reference, keep the portion of your LPI-IC: Self form that lists the thirty statements.
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY—INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTOR (LPI-IC)

SELF

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

1. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.
2. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
3. I develop cooperative relationships with the people I work with.
4. I set a personal example of what I expect from others.
5. I praise people for a job well done.
6. I challenge people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.
7. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.
8. I actively listen to diverse points of view.
9. I spend time and energy on making certain that people’s actions are consistent with the values and standards that have been agreed on.
10. I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.
11. I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.
12. I appeal to others to share in my dream of future possibilities.
13. I treat people with dignity and respect.
14. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.
15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I ask “What can we learn?” when things do not go as expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I show others how it is in their long-term interests to work together toward a common vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I support the decisions that people make on their own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I am clear with others about what it means to do one’s best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I experiment and take risks in my work even when there is a chance of failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I am contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I give others freedom and choice in making decisions about issues that affect them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I take an active part in making certain that achievable goals, concrete plans, and measurable milestones are set for the projects and programs we work on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I find ways to celebrate accomplishments with my team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I take the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I take an active role in helping people learn and develop in their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I make progress toward goals one step at a time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The information requested in this section of the instrument is to assist in the interpretation of the results of this study. The information provided will be kept confidential.

Please complete the following questions by circling the correct answer or by filling in the blank.

Example: What is your favorite color? RED BLUE GREEN YELLOW

1. In what year were you born? 19____

2. Which category describes your highest level of education?
   1. SOME HIGH SCHOOL
   2. HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/GED
   3. SOME COLLEGE/TECHNICAL SCHOOL
   4. COLLEGE – 2 YEAR DEGREE/CERTIFICATE
   5. COLLEGE – 4 YEAR DEGREE [please specify degree(s)]

   [blank]

   6. SOME GRADUATE WORK
   7. MASTER’S DEGREE [please specify degree(s)]

   [blank]

   8. POST MASTER’S WORK
   9. DOCTORATE [please specify degree(s)]

   [blank]

   10. POST DOCTORATE
   11. OTHER ________________

3. What category best describes your occupation?

   ADMINISTRATOR CONSULTANT CORPORATE EXECUTIVE
   FACULTY MANAGER OWNER/OPERATOR
   SALES OTHER ________________

4. How many years of work experience do you have (rounded to the nearest year)?
   _____ years
APPENDIX B

LETTERS TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS
March 30, 2001

Dear Leader in the CFAES:

I would like to invite you to participate in a voluntary study that Chuck Gamble is conducting, in collaboration with his adviser R. Dale Saffir, as his Master’s research. As you well know, the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Science is involved with “reinventing” itself. The data gathered from Chuck’s research will strengthen our insights as to the leadership needed to succeed in our mission.

I recognize your time is extremely valuable, yet believe the findings will help to guide the College as it supports agriculture and natural resources in Ohio. I ask that you spend approximately 30 minutes during the next week to complete the three enclosed questionnaires. Your responses are completely confidential. Your code number on the instrument will be used only to follow-up with non-respondents or possibly to clarify information submitted.

If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact Chuck at (614) 292-4278 during the day or (937) 585-5523 in the evening. He can also be reached by e-mail at gamble.19@osu.edu. Please complete the questionnaires and return them in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by April 6, 2001. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance to the College.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser
Vice President for Agricultural Administration & University Outreach & Dean

enc.
April 5, 2001

Dear Leader in the CFAES:

Recently, Vice President Moser sent a questionnaire in regard to your participation in a research study I am conducting for my Master’s theses. Both instruments will measure leadership styles you exhibit. As the College implemented Project Reinvent 8 years ago, Dr. Moser was most interested in knowing what leadership style leaders in the College were exhibiting by composite group, not individually.

If you have completed the questionnaire and returned via U.S. mail, my sincere thanks to you. If not, could you please return it today? As my population is small (n=74, 5 composite groups), all questionnaires will be most important to include in the study.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire or have mislaid it, please contact me at (800) 644-6377, (614) 292-4278, or at gamble.19@osu.edu and I will send another copy immediately.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chuck Gamble
Graduate Student
The Ohio State University
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