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ABSTRACT

Globalization and emerging technologies have had a profound impact on the U.S. economy, making a highly skilled workforce a national priority. The community college, with its great number, openness to nontraditional students, and key role in workforce development, is poised to become a more prominent contributor to America's success in the new economy. However, new technologies, reduced budgets, and higher levels of accountability are adding to the challenges facing community colleges.

These new challenges have brought about the need for a different kind of educational leader, one who can manage the needs of a diverse group of stakeholders, empower others to accept responsibility, and get results without being autocratic. Such leaders are known as transformational leaders. In contrast, transactional leaders focus on the efficient running of the system within the context of existing organizational constraints. Transformational leaders are compared with transactional leaders in this investigation. The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between transformational leadership factors, transactional leadership factors, and measures of community college performance.

Forty-six North American community colleges participated in the study. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used for this investigation. Information on the leadership behaviors of college presidents was collected using the Multifactor Leadership
Questionnaire. Information on college effectiveness was collected using the Institutional Performance Survey. Both leadership and effectiveness data were based on faculty perceptions at the respective colleges. The relationship between presidential leadership and college effectiveness was evaluated using multiple regression analysis. A subset of presidents in the study was interviewed to achieve a better understanding of the social complexities associated with community college leadership.

Transformational leadership was shown to be a better predictor of organizational effectiveness than transactional leadership for this sample. Based on the interviews, transformational presidents rely more on strong personal convictions, open communication, and trust to establish and articulate their vision than do their transactional counterparts. Leadership behaviors of the president predict only a portion of the overall performance of a college. Many other factors contribute to college performance, including the culture of the college and the conditions under which a leader assumes the presidency.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Globalization and emerging technologies have had a profound impact on the U.S. economy. The changing nature of economic competition has thrust the need for a highly skilled workforce to the forefront, putting more pressure on America’s educational institutions – from K-12 through higher education – to prepare graduates who can compete internationally. As a skilled workforce becomes increasingly important, educators are being held more accountable for the employability skills of graduates. With technology and work practices changing rapidly, the concept of lifelong learning becomes critical to career growth and earning potential. Since many of the new jobs require more than a high school diploma and less than a bachelor’s degree, the community college has become a critical resource for the social and economic growth of many citizens.

These changes have driven the need for a different kind of educational leader: one who can manage the needs of a diverse group of stakeholders, who can empower others to accept responsibility, and who can get results without being autocratic. This leadership approach, called transformational leadership, will be required for community college leaders, and their colleges, to be successful in the next century.
The New Economy and the Changing Role of Education

The end of the Cold War, the subsequent expansion of democracy and capitalism, and dramatic innovations in information, transportation, and telecommunications technologies have created a global economy. These innovations make it possible to accomplish tasks internationally, independent of traditional boundaries such as geography, language, currency, or time zones (Reich, 1991). In the 1960s, only 7% of the U.S. economy was exposed to international competition. In the 1980s, the number went past 70%, and will keep climbing. Today, 20% of American jobs are tied directly or indirectly to international trade (Cascio, 1995). This percentage will surely go up in the future.

The global economy has forced a change in some of the basic assumptions that established the United States as a wealthy nation. If factories can be built anywhere, and citizens of other nations can be trained to run them, the logical extension is that companies will put them wherever labor is the cheapest. This is a supreme threat to the American middle class (Reich, 1991).

As a result, the jobs that could be done with the skills produced by the compulsory education system in the United States – the jobs that made up most of the middle class – are rapidly leaving this country. In their place are new high-value jobs in new industries spawned by the same globalization and emerging technologies that caused the middle class industrial jobs to move overseas. Also in their place are service jobs that, in general, do not support a middle class lifestyle. Of the 2.8 million manufacturing workers who lost their jobs in the early 1980s, one-third were rehired in service jobs paying at least 20 percent less (Reich, 1991). The dichotomy between high value, high
skill jobs and low skill, low paying jobs has created a substantial skill gap among the U.S. population. American society is now divided into a skilled group with rising incomes and an unskilled group with falling incomes. Less education leads to reduced income; more education leads to increased income (Thurow, 1993).

Education and training opportunities are therefore pivotal to a competitive and fair society (Brown and Lauder, 1996). With the advent of a global economy, education is now seen as a means of national economic survival in an environment that is globally competitive. There is a new international consensus, which recognizes education to be of even greater importance than in the past to individual and national economic prosperity. The quality of a nation’s education system is seen to hold the key to future economic success (Halsey, Lauder, Brown, and Wells 1997). According to Brown and Lauder (1996), nations with the highest quality and most productive workforce will have a competitive economic advantage. “Knowledge, learning, information, and technical competence are the new raw materials of international commerce. National governments of all political persuasions have declared that it is the quality of their education and training systems which will decisively shape the international division of labor and national prosperity” (p. 174).

Economist Lester Thurow (1993) agrees that education is the primary path to national wealth in today’s global market. He holds that, historically, four factors have been the keys to wealth for individuals, firms, and countries. These factors are ownership of natural resources, having more capital, employing superior technologies, or having more skills. Thurow contends that of these four, only workforce skills will be a competitive factor in the next millennium.
If this is true, America has work to do. In a report ranking nations in the quality of public education, levels of secondary schooling and on-the-job training, computer literacy, and worker motivation, the U.S. ranks sixth behind (in descending order) Singapore, Denmark, Germany, Japan, and Norway (Cascio, 1995).

The kinds of jobs being created in the new economy are vastly different, requiring a higher level of skill. In its study, *Workforce 2000*, The Hudson Institute concluded that over half of the new jobs created after the turn of the century would require employees with education beyond the high school level, but many of these would not require a bachelor’s degree. Additionally, the report indicated that the demographics of the next century’s workforce would be much different, with women, African-Americans, Hispanics, and Asians comprising a much higher percentage of new entrants than native white males (Johnston and Packer, 1987).

The nature of the new workplace and the make-up of the new workforce combine to place community colleges in a critical role. Because of their great number (over 1,100 nationwide), openness to nontraditional students, and key role in vocational training, community colleges occupy a central place in higher education (Phillippe, 1997). Over the past 30 years, policymakers have designated community colleges to be the primary means of broadening educational opportunities and providing postsecondary vocational education. Additionally, community colleges are distinctive for their “open door” admissions policy. As a result, community college students are more heavily working class, minority, female, and older than are four-year college students (Dougherty, 1994). Each fall, more than 48% of all minority undergraduates enrolled in higher education attend a community college. According to Davis and Wessel (1998), “what goes on at
A Changing Environment for Community Colleges

Are community colleges prepared for their growing role in American society? As a group, they are at a crossroads. Technology is changing the way community colleges educate their students, and the needs of the students themselves — older, part-time, and culturally diverse — are transforming the community college mission and structure into one that better serves a global and technological society. Today's community college looks different from the way it did in the past, but it must change even more rapidly in the future (Phillippe, 1997).

Although relatively new as a major contributor to higher education, community colleges have grown rapidly. Between 1960 and 1970, the number of community colleges increased 250 percent, opening at a rate of nearly one a week. Enrollment at community colleges between 1965 and 1975 increased almost three and one-half times. Public community colleges now enroll 52 percent of all undergraduates in the U.S., making community college students the largest single group of higher education students (Phillippe, 1997). But the unbridled growth experienced over the last three decades has slowed. Enrollment growth between 1982 and 1992 averaged around 2 percent per year. Community college leaders face a new set of challenges in order to position their institutions to respond to the call of the global marketplace.
Three important factors contribute to the urgency of transformation at community colleges: accountability, technology, and diminished resources. These are described briefly below:

**Accountability**

"The American imperative for the twenty-first century is that society must hold higher education to much higher expectations or risk national decline" (Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993, p. 1). This quote is an example of the public sentiment that is elevating the accountability standard for colleges and universities. Driven in part by the increasing needs of higher education brought on by the global economy and in part by the public perception that the costs associated with higher education are increasing at an unreasonable rate, colleges and universities are being scrutinized as never before. Beginning in the 1980s, colleges, universities, and accrediting bodies began responding to calls from external constituents — including state legislators and other funding sources — for increased accountability by developing measures and procedures to assess programs, departments and divisions, and entire institutions. Funding agencies have responded to the desire for increased accountability, and the idea that public colleges should be funded, at least in part, based on performance is becoming popular. Some states have already adopted some form of performance-based funding (O'Banion, 1997).

**Technology**

Technology is having a profound influence on society as a whole and on education in particular. This influence is an important concern of college and university leaders. In a survey of 112 colleges and universities, college leaders were asked to
identify the most important issues they face. Eighty-four percent of the respondents indicated that the effective use of technology was the most important issue on their campuses. This was especially true among the 21 community colleges in the study (Institute for Research on Higher Education, 1995). The cost-justification of technology investments is difficult in any industry, but it is even more complex when applied to student learning, measurements of which are already vague and often controversial. Additionally, much of the cost savings and efficiency that technology affords are opposed by many faculty, making it difficult for educational institutions to implement technology effectively (O'Banion, 1997).

Resources

Performance-based funding, investments in technology, flat or falling enrollments, and other factors have combined to limit the resources available to institutions of higher education, especially for community colleges. Nationwide, community colleges received 50 percent of their total revenue from their state governments in 1980. By 1994, that support had dropped to 39 percent. As a result, community colleges look to tuition revenues more and more for operating funds. In 1980, student tuition accounted for 15 percent of community college revenues. By 1994, that number was 20.5 percent (Phillippe, 1997). However, with essentially static enrollments, only a few community colleges nationally have the means to innovate in a way that is necessary to respond to the growing needs of their stakeholders, and their expanding role in the new economy. This has contributed to inconsistent and uneven quality among community colleges in the U.S. (Davis and Wessel, 1998).
New Organizations, New Leadership

Community colleges are not alone in their need to transform. Some organizations are thriving in the midst of this climate of change. Successful organizations in this new world of globalization and technology are those that remain aligned with their external environment. The organization must be able to change as rapidly as the environment around it. Organizations in environments with numerous disturbances should, therefore, be able to respond to these disturbances with correspondingly flexible internal processes (Bass, 1990).

Such organizations go by many names in the popular literature: post-modern (Hirschhorn, 1997), post-industrial (Cameron and Tschirhart, 1992), post-Fordist (Whitty, 1997), learning organizations (Senge, 1990), and high-performance workplaces (Kohlberg and Smith, 1992). The successful new organization has made the transformation from the Industrial Age to the Information Age; from a rigid, bureaucratic, formula-driven structure to one that responds rapidly and with flexibility (Dolence and Norris, 1995). The organizational structure in these firms is flatter; decision-making is distributed among all employees. This creates the need for increased information and intelligence throughout the organization. Whereas the emphasis once was on the employee's physical skills, the emphasis now shifts to intellect, reasoning, and judgement (Hirschhorn, 1997). These phenomena cause jobs to change very rapidly, and the skills required of employees must be continually renewed (Dolence and Norris, 1995). This changing environment places new stress on all organizations, but is particularly acute for bureaucratic organizations like institutions of higher education.
Managing Change

The transformation is difficult. Attributes of postindustrial environments have been shown to have a negative effect on institutional effectiveness, including scarcity of resources, increasing competitiveness, and turbulence (Cameron and Tschirhart, 1992). And as rapidly as the environment has changed in recent years, it can be expected that the 21st century will be even more complex, fast paced, and turbulent (Cascio, 1995).

Leaders have always had to deal with change. Initiating change or responding to change has always been an important responsibility of those in leadership positions. The new economy, however, has added confounding dimensions to managing change. These dimensions include the increasing rate of change, and the need to manage continuous change. According to Cleveland (1985), the character of the leadership role is systematically changing due to this turbulence. Drucker (1995) also contends that organizational leadership is currently undergoing unprecedented transformation. He maintains that leaders must learn to manage in situations where they do not have "command authority, where they are neither controlled nor controlling." This is a fundamental change. Information and perceptiveness is replacing authority and data analysis. Leaders must manage individuals with different skills and needs, and get personally involved. To build and lead successful organizations, the effective leader must replace power with responsibility. In the traditional organization, the internal structure was a combination of rank and power. In the emerging organization, it is mutual understanding and responsibility.

In order to transform organizations to the new paradigm, leaders must take risks and challenge the status quo. According to Bennis and Townsend (1995), leaders who
risk making changes and moving away from the conventional standards of business practices become better suited to respond to the external environment. Successful leaders use environmental instability to the advantage of their organization, challenging accepted practices, looking for disturbances that challenge and disrupt until work is reorganized around a new level of effectiveness (Wheatley, 1994).

The impact of the post-industrial society on educational institutions is undeniable. In fact, few organizations are faced with as many disturbances, both external and internal, as schools. Consider this viewpoint from Peter Drucker (1995):

It is a safe prediction that in the next fifty years, schools and universities will change more and more drastically than they have since they assumed their present form more than three hundred years ago, when they reorganized themselves around the printed book. What will force these changes is in part new technology, such as computers, videos, and telecasts via satellite; in part the demands of a knowledge-based society in which organized learning must become a lifelong process for knowledge workers; and in part new theory about how human beings learn (p. 79).

Turbulence, competitiveness, lean resources, unpredictability, and decline increasingly characterize the environments of colleges and universities. More money is now spent on higher education outside of colleges and universities than inside them, and the percentage of postsecondary education delivered by colleges and universities is falling at an alarming rate as corporate universities, for-profit training firms, and Internet-based education providers grow rapidly. The failure rate is higher for colleges and universities than for either business or government organizations. Pressures are
mounting to cut spending, stop raising tuition, and to justify expenditures in almost every college and university in America (Cameron & Tschirhart, 1992).

Can community colleges transform to respond to the post-industrial age? If they are to survive, they have no choice. Dolence and Norris (1995) hold that nothing short of genuine transformation will enable community colleges to address the needs of Information Age learners. Merely making existing delivery mechanisms more efficient through information technology will be inadequate.

The process of transformation will be very difficult for community colleges because almost all current internal incentives and processes work against it. Massy and Wilger (1995) maintain that because of the freedom that faculty members have acquired over the last thirty years and the nature of higher education employment in general, the individuals whose jobs are being restructured are the ones in a position to have substantial influence on the outcome. It is the faculty who determine the nature of the curriculum, the priorities for faculty work, and even the faculty workload. The result is a difficult challenge for the college administrator. They must convince faculty of the need to change when they do not have command authority. According to Guskin (1994), the fundamental challenge to college administrators in the coming years will be to convince a highly resistant group to understand the economic and environmental realities within which they must work.

The New Community College Leader

Are community college leaders up to the task? In general, there is little in their past that would have prepared them for such a future. Administrators in higher education
are not prepared to manage effectively under such turbulent conditions. Characteristics of the environment in which colleges and universities exist—enrollment trends, financial instability, state and federal policy changes, and so on—are creating "conditions of decline" that require a new set of administrative and organizational responses. The experience of most community college administrators has been in responding to conditions of growth. Abundant financial resources and steadily increasing enrollments made conditions of growth almost universal during the 1950s, 60s, and 70s. Expansions in physical plant and programs were typical. It is under these circumstances that many current community college leaders ascended in their careers and developed their administrative and leadership skills. It creates a problem. Many skills that were highly desirable during the previous 30 years may be no longer needed in the next 30 years, replaced by a completely new leadership skill set (Cameron 1983).

Research has shown that in colleges and universities with declining resources, administrators tend to emphasize budgeting and fiscal concerns. Little emphasis is given to interaction with constituencies outside the institutions through public relations or public service. Administrators in growing institutions emphasize just the opposite—high emphasis on public relations and service, low emphasis on finances and budgeting. The emphasis on efficiency by administrators of declining institutions is reflective of the leadership paradigm of the past (Cameron 1983).

Each generation of community college leaders has faced new leadership challenges. In the 1960s and 1970s, leaders were called upon to be builders and creators of community colleges. In the early 1980s, community colleges began responding to needs in workforce development as a result of the downturn in the economy, creating an
emphasis in job training. In the 1990s, many colleges have been forced to do more with less as governments throughout the U.S. downsize their investments in higher education. The 21st century will bring further challenges for community college leaders as colleges rely more on technology to serve students who expect “learning on demand” (Campbell and Leverty, 1997).

Clearly, in order to respond to increasing external demands while faced with substantial internal constraints, significant organizational changes will be required. The need for a new kind of leadership is clear. In the years to come, some colleges will be much more successful than others in effecting student learning, sustaining staff morale, presenting a positive public image, managing growth, raising funds, and answering challenges promptly and effectively. According to Cohen & Brawer (1996), leadership will be the difference:

The successful colleges are blessed with the proper leaders: people who know how to guide their colleagues, stimulating each to put forth maximum effort toward attainable and proper goals...Effective leaders are flexible, decisive, moral, courageous, goal-directed, scholarly individuals who are willing to take risks and who have a concern for others (p. 132).

Such characteristics are embodied in the transformational leader.

**Problem to be Addressed and Purpose of the Study**

The global economy and emerging technologies demand that community colleges assume a more prominent, mainstream role in society. In order to succeed in this effort on the required scale, community colleges must improve their performance. The quality
of community colleges in the U.S. is uneven, but the best of them demonstrate how to prepare Americans for successful lives (Davis and Wessel, 1998). To respond to the increasing demands, community college leaders must guide their institutions through genuine transformation. Among the difficulties in this process will be responding to new opportunities and new demands without abandoning core values and current practices that are meeting the needs of a diverse array of constituents. Transformational leadership has been shown to lead to increased performance in industrial, military, business, and government settings. This study addresses the existence and effectiveness of community college presidents who practice transformational leadership. Does transformational leadership as demonstrated by community college presidents positively impact the performance of the colleges they lead? This is the central problem addressed by this study.

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between transformational leadership factors, transactional leadership factors, and measures of institutional performance. Both transformational and transactional leadership factors were examined with regard to their association with organizational performance. The two broad leadership constructs were compared to determine the extent to which transformational leadership predicts organizational success beyond that predicted by transactional leadership.

Measures of both presidential leadership and organizational performance were determined from the perceptions of community college faculty. This was important for at least two reasons. First of all, as previously mentioned, because of the freedom that faculty members have acquired over the years, any organizational change will require
their support (Massey and Wilger, 1995). Historically, community college faculty have been resistant to change, especially with regard to cost savings and efficiency (Guskin, 1994; O’Banion, 1997). Secondly, much of the research on higher education leadership has been done from the perspective of other administrators reporting directly to the president (Cameron, 1978; Murray, 1988; Roueche, Baker, and Rose, 1989). Input from faculty adds a new perspective to the problem.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The new leadership paradigm required for community colleges to succeed has its roots in a long history of research by leadership scholars. The historical underpinnings of leadership research is reviewed, followed by an analysis of the construct of transformational leadership. Finally, an overview of the literature on organizational effectiveness – the ultimate dependent variable in organizational studies (Cameron and Whetten, 1996) – is presented.

Historical Underpinnings of Leadership Research

Leadership is among the most researched and debated topics in organizational psychology. For many decades scholars have been debating how to define it, measure it, develop it, and recognize when it is effective. Despite the elusive nature of the concept, it is one of the most important elements in understanding organizations and what makes them successful. Bass (1990) contends that effective leadership is often regarded as the single most important factor in successful organizations. As the twenty-first century approaches, organizations in every sector are facing unprecedented challenges, brought on largely by an information-based society and a global economy. In such an
environment, the success or failure of organizations will be determined by the effectiveness of their leaders.

Bass (1990) observed that there are many different definitions of leadership used by researchers, and most of the definitions used are ambiguous. The numerous dimensions used to define leadership have led to overlapping meanings, causing considerable confusion. Therefore, the meaning of leadership may depend on the kind of institution being studied. Nevertheless, there is sufficient similarity among definitions to permit an overall classification. Leadership has been defined as the focus of group processes, as a function of personality, as a function of achieving compliance, as the exercise of influence, as particular behavior, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, as a means to achieve goals, as initiation of structure, and as many combinations of these concepts (Bass, 1990). Decades of analysis have produced more than 350 definitions of leadership. Thousands of empirical investigations have been conducted in the last 90 years alone, but no clear understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from nonleaders, and perhaps more important, what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Many views of leadership fail to recognize that it is relational and contextual and that it is not simply a matter of wielding power or occupying a certain position. Inadequate ideas about leadership often result in oversimplified advice to managers (Bolman & Deal, 1991). The definition of leadership remains elusive and controversial because it depends not only on the position, behavior, and personal traits of the leader, but also on the nature of the situation (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Yukl (1998) summarized the many definitions of the leadership construct as follows:
Most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization. The numerous definitions of leadership that have been proposed appear to have little else in common (p. 3).

The variety in the definitions shows that the concept is scattered and controversial. Yet the idea has survived for centuries, and almost everyone thinks that it is important (Bolman & Deal, 1991). The many different definitions proposed by researchers reflect a deep disagreement about how to identify and develop leaders. The field of leadership is in a state of turbulence, with many continuing controversies about conceptual and methodological issues (Yukl, 1998).

Because of the ambiguity and scholarly disagreement on leadership research, organizing the literature in a systematic way is a challenge. A chronological organization of major lines of leadership research is useful because it is somewhat reflective of the issues and challenges faced by institutions of the day. Although there is considerable overlap chronologically between lines of research, with no discrete beginning or end point for any of the approaches, this analysis provides a chronological record of leadership literature in the twentieth century.

Up until the late 1940s, the trait approach characterized the prevailing theories on leadership. This approach held that leadership ability is innate in the leader. From the late 1940s to the late 1960s, the behavior approach was predominant. Its core theme was that leadership effectiveness was determined by the behavior of the leader. Power and influence – how they are acquired and used by leaders – became an important research
topic in the late 1950s, and continues today. The situational or contingency approach, in which effective leadership is determined by and affected by the situation, was popular from the late 1960s to the early 1980s. Since the early 1980s, a new leadership approach, which includes charismatic and transformational leadership, has been predominant (Bryman, 1992). Transformational leadership represents an approach that integrates many of the traits and processes studied in prior decades. With this approach, followers are willing to put forth exceptional effort and make personal sacrifices to accomplish the goals of the group. Although some authors use charismatic and transformational leadership interchangeably, there are important distinctions between the two (Yukl, 1998). These differences are examined in this review.

Trait Approach

The trait approach was one of the earliest approaches for studying leadership. This theory assumes that the leader possesses specific qualities that set him or her apart from others. Early theories attempted to explain leadership success through intelligence, fluency of speech, insight, and other personal attributes, looking for a correlation between attributes of individual leaders and indicators of leader success. Hundreds of trait studies were conducted in the 1930s and 1940s, but this effort did not identify a discrete set of leader traits that would guarantee success. The researchers were interested in determining traits that distinguished leaders from other people, and the extent of those differences (Bass, 1990). They did not address other variables that may contribute to leader success, or look at the long-term organizational benefits that can be attributed to successful leaders. However, through improved methodologies, researchers have made
progress in determining how leader attributes are correlated with leadership behavior and effectiveness (Yukl, 1998).

Early Trait Research. Early leadership research focused on the study of traits including physical characteristics (e.g., height, appearance), aspects of personality (e.g., self-esteem, dominance, emotional stability), and personal aptitudes (general intelligence, verbal fluency, creativity). Many studies on leader traits were conducted during the first half of this century, and most of them compared leaders to nonleaders (Yukl, 1998). Stogdill (1948) reviewed 124 trait studies conducted from 1904 to 1948 and found patterns of traits that supported overall leadership success. The traits with the highest overall correlation with leadership were originality, popularity, sociability, judgment, aggressiveness, desire to excel, humor, cooperativeness, liveliness, and athletic ability (Bass, 1990).

While some traits correlated with leadership, the relative importance of each trait depended on the situation. The studies that Stogdill reviewed did not identify any specific traits that were necessary or sufficient to ensure leadership success. Following Stogdill’s (1948) review, researchers extended the list of traits to include administrative and technical skills and specific aspects of motivation. This difference in perspective led to more consistent results than were found in earlier trait studies (Lord, DeVader, & Alliger, 1986).

In 1974, Stogdill reviewed an additional 163 trait studies conducted from 1949 to 1970. Many of the same traits were again found to be related to leader effectiveness, but some additional traits were found to be relevant, such as independence and objectivity. Based on Stogdill’s reviews, the research conducted between 1904 and 1970 did not
produce a discrete set of traits required to become a successful leader. Possession of particular traits increases the likelihood that a leader will be effective, but they do not guarantee effectiveness. Stogdill’s main thesis was that both individual traits and situational context are important, as well as the interaction between them (Bass, 1990).

**Contemporary Trait Research.** In recent years, trait research has been pursued in a number of different ways. Some studies looked for traits that predict organizational advancement for the leader during his or her career, while others focused on traits leading to effective job performance in the leader’s present position.

In studying managerial motivation, McClelland (1985) developed a model that measured the needs of leaders based on three underlying needs: achievement, affiliation, and power. According to McClelland’s model, a person with a high need for achievement receives satisfaction through success in accomplishing a difficult task, attaining a standard of excellence, or developing a better process. A person with a strong need for affiliation is concerned about being liked and accepted. A person with a high need for power finds satisfaction in influencing people and arousing strong emotions, such as fear, awe, pleasure, and anger.

McClelland concluded that effective leaders had a strong socialized power orientation – the combination of a high need for power and high activity inhibition. This type of person has strong self-control and is motivated to satisfy the need for power in socially acceptable ways, such as influencing others to accomplish a worthy cause, or helping others to develop their skills (Yukl, 1998). Effective leaders also showed a relatively low need for affiliation (McClelland, 1985).
Boyatzis (1982) also found that effective managers had a strong socialized power orientation, as well as strong efficiency orientation, high self-confidence, a strong belief in self-efficacy, and were oriented toward an internal locus of control. Some of the competencies that separated effective and ineffective managers involved interpersonal skills. Effective managers had strong oral presentation skills, could develop networks and coalitions, gain cooperation from others, resolve conflicts in a constructive manner, and had the ability to manage group processes and create effective team synergy. Effective managers also had strong conceptual skills, including the ability to identify patterns or relationships. Boyatzis reached two general conclusions. First, different competencies are relevant at different organizational levels. Second, the focus and orientation at each level are different enough that new competencies are needed, and those that were useful at lower levels of the organization may actually hinder leadership performance at higher levels (Hunt, 1991).

Miner (1978) conducted more than 33 studies on the relationship between managerial motivation and advancement. Significant correlations were found between a leader's overall motivation and advancement to higher levels of management. The motivation attributes that correlated most consistently with advancement included desire to exercise power (similar to McClelland's need for power), desire to compete with peers (similar to McClelland's need for achievement), and a positive attitude toward authority figures (Yukl, 1998).
Behavior Approach

By the 1950s, many researchers had concluded that the trait approach had reached a point of diminishing returns. An attempt was made to study the behaviors rather than the traits of leaders – to describe the behavior of individuals while they performed in a leadership capacity (Bass, 1990). Behavior research generally falls into two categories: research on the nature of managerial work, and research on managerial behavior. Research on the work of managers examines how they spend their time, and describes their activities, roles, functions, and responsibilities. This research relies mostly on descriptive methods such as diaries, interviews, and direct observation. Research on managerial behavior compares the behavior of effective and ineffective leaders. The methodology most often used has been behavior description questionnaires (Yukl, 1998). Both categories of behavior research are described in this section.

The Nature of Managerial Work. One of the major objectives of the descriptive research on managerial behavior has been to identify typical patterns of managerial activities and roles common to all types of managers. The model developed by Mintzberg (1973) is an example of this approach. Mintzberg (1973) developed a taxonomy of managerial roles to use for classifying activities observed in a study of executives. The roles apply to any manager, but their importance may be different based on the manager and the situation. Mintzberg developed three categories to classify ten roles used to code the activities he observed from watching CEOs. Of the ten roles, three deal with interpersonal behavior (leader, liaison, figurehead), three deal with information processing (monitor, disseminator, spokesman), and four deal with decision-making (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, negotiator) (Yukl, 1998).
Managerial Behavior. Research on leadership behavior during the past forty years has been dominated by the influence of the early research at Ohio State University (Bass, 1990). The OSU researchers developed questionnaires for subordinates to use in describing the behavior of their leader. They compiled a list of 1,800 examples of leadership behavior, then reduced the list to 150 items that appeared to be good examples of important leadership functions. An initial questionnaire based on the 150 items was used by military and civilian personnel to describe the behavior of their supervisors. Through factor analysis, the questionnaire responses indicated that subordinates perceived their supervisor's behavior primarily in terms of two broadly defined categories. These categories were labeled "consideration" and "initiating structure." The questionnaire became known as the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), and was used widely in research for the next 25 years (Bass, 1990).

Consideration is the degree to which a leader acts in a friendly and supportive manner, shows concern for subordinates, and looks out for their welfare. Leaders use consideration to enhance their effectiveness by showing trust and confidence in followers, developing their skills and experience to further their careers, keeping them informed, and showing appreciation for their ideas and contributions. Initiating structure is the degree to which a leader defines his or her role and the role of subordinates in order to achieve the objectives of the group. Effective managers concentrate on task-oriented functions such as planning and scheduling, providing necessary resources, and coordinating subordinate activities (Bass, 1990).

Since the original Ohio State research and the subsequent studies utilizing the LBDQ, investigators have looked beyond consideration and initiating structure as the
only criterion for differentiating managerial effectiveness. Likert (1961) added participative leadership as a third factor to be considered for effective leadership. He proposed that managers make extensive use of group supervision instead of supervising each subordinate separately. Yukl (1998) added a fourth factor, change-oriented behavior. This entails actions that are primarily concerned with improving strategic decisions, adapting to change in the environment, making major changes in objectives, processes, or products/services, and gaining commitment to the changes. The two most recent factors, coupled with consideration and initiating structure, are integral links to the transformational leadership construct.

**Power Approach**

Effective leaders manage a complex network of power relationships and influence processes. These relationships are more than just superior-subordinate, but also include the manager's ability to influence his or her boss, the ability to influence peers and colleagues, and the ability to influence and motivate employees to perform at a high level (Bradford & Cohen, 1984).

Different types of power exist in organizations. French and Raven (1959) developed a taxonomy to classify five different types of power according to their source. According to their work, power can be acquired through rewards, coercion, legitimacy, expertise, and reference. Power is achieved when a manager controls rewards (reward power) or administers punishment (coercive power). Power can come from an implied obligation to comply based on agreed upon roles and responsibilities (legitimate power). Power can also be acquired when an individual has unique knowledge relevant to the task at hand.
(expert power), or is admired and others seek the individual’s approval (referent power) (Bass, 1990).

Etzioni’s (1961) analysis of power was similar to that of French and Raven’s. He saw power as being physical, material, or symbolic. Like French and Raven, he defined power as coercive (achieved through physical sanctions, applied or threatened) or remunerative (based on rewards). He added a source of power, normative power, which depends on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and sanctions (Hunt, 1991).

Bass (1960) categorized power as coming from either the individual’s position in the organization or personal traits. Leaders with positional power can recommend punishments and rewards, provide instructions to the group, and correct the job performance of group members. Position power includes influence derived from legitimate authority, control over resources and rewards, control over punishments, control over information, control over the organization of the work, and control over the physical work environment. Those with personal power can give affection, consideration, sympathy, and recognition to others. Personal power includes influence gained from expertise, friendship, and loyalty.

Pfeffer (1981) adds another element to the model: political power. Political processes involve efforts by managers to increase their power or protect existing power sources. Managers use their existing position power to increase their initial basis of power in a number of ways. Common political processes in organizations include forming coalitions, gaining control over important decision processes, co-opting rivals, and institutionalizing power.
Control over information has more recently been identified as a relevant source of power (Yukl & Falbe, 1991). As the acquisition and use of information becomes a critical success factor for 21st century organizations, this source of power will increase in importance for leaders of organizations.

**Contingency Approach**

The contingency approach to leadership research attempts to identify situational aspects that moderate the impact that leader traits and actions have on effectiveness. The assumption is that different behavior or trait patterns will be effective in different organizational situations, and that the same pattern will not be effective in all situations (Yukl, 1998). The contingency approach examines how the concepts of leader traits, leader behaviors, and situational characteristics are associated with leader effectiveness (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Two theories of contingency are path-goal theory and Fiedler’s (1967) contingency model.

**Path-Goal Theory.** The path-goal theory (House, 1996) was developed in an attempt to explain how the behavior of a leader in different situations influences the satisfaction and performance of subordinates. The theory calls for the leader to provide followers with coaching, guidance, and rewards necessary for satisfaction and success. It is based on the followers’ abilities to accomplish particular tasks and attain desired goals. The theory focuses on ways for the leader to influence subordinates’ perceptions of the clarity of paths to goals and the desirability of the goals themselves (Bass, 1990).

According to path-goal theory, the effect of leader behavior on follower satisfaction and performance is based on the situation, including task and follower
characteristics. Situational variables determine the potential for increased follower motivation and the actions required of the leader in improving motivation. The situation also influences the preferences of followers for a particular leadership behavior, which in turn impacts follower satisfaction with the leader’s actions (Yukl, 1998).

Path-goal theory includes four broadly defined leadership behaviors: supportive leadership, directive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement-oriented leadership (House, 1996). When the task is stressful, boring, or tedious, supportive leadership leads to increased effort and satisfaction. When the task is unstructured and complex, directive leadership that provides structured guidance results in higher effort and satisfaction. Participative leadership and achievement-oriented leadership are both hypothesized to increase effort and satisfaction for unstructured or complex tasks. Participative leadership provides clarity of roles when the task is ambiguous and achievement-oriented leadership increases self-confidence and develops the expectation of successfully accomplishing a challenging goal (Yukl, 1998).

Research on path-goal theory have been inconclusive. While support for directive and supportive behavior is found in the literature, the hypotheses of participative and achievement-oriented leadership have not been adequately tested (Yukl, 1998). Podsakoff, et al (1995) found little support for any of the situational assumptions of path-goal theory.

Fiedler's Contingency Model. Fiedler's (1967) contingency model has been the most widely researched model on leadership (Bass, 1990). Essentially Fiedler’s approach sought to determine which leadership style is most effective in different organizational situations. His theory of specific contingency relationships in the study of
leadership included a number of key assumptions. First of all, he believed that leadership style is determined by the leader’s motivations. Secondly, he held that group dynamics, task structure, and position power determine situational control. Finally, he concluded that the leader’s style and control of the situation greatly influence the effectiveness of the group. Fiedler’s model was unique at the time because it viewed the situation as the mechanism for leaders to satisfy personal needs as well as accomplish organizational goals. Although interest in the theory has dropped off, Fiedler’s model was one of the first that attempted to measure the impact of a leader’s situational behavior on effectiveness (Hoy and Miskel, 1996).

Making careful distinction between leadership behavior and leadership style, Fiedler (1967) developed a means of assessing leadership style called the least preferred co-worker (LPC) score. The LPC score is determined by asking a leader to think of all past and present co-workers, select the one with whom the leader could work least well, and rate this person on a dichotomous scale (e.g., friendly-unfriendly, cooperative-uncooperative, efficient-inefficient). The LPC score is the sum of the ratings on this scale. A leader who is generally critical in rating the least preferred co-worker will obtain a high LPC score. According to Rice (1978), low LPC leaders value task orientation, whereas high LPC leaders value interpersonal orientation.

Fiedler’s model considers three primary situational aspects. The extent to which the leader has the support and loyalty of subordinates, and the overall leader-member relationship, is one important indicator. The position power of the leader – the extent to which the leader has authority to evaluate subordinate performance and administer rewards and punishments – is a second key situational indicator. The third
aspect of the situation identified by Fiedler is task structure – the degree to which there are standard operating procedures to accomplish the task, a detailed description of the finished product or service, and objective indicators of task performance (Yukl, 1998).

Leader effectiveness is determined in Fiedler's model by the extent to which the group accomplishes its tasks. Objective measures such as profit, cost reductions, and sales are preferred. If reliable objective measures are not available, performance ratings from the leader's superior may be substituted (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Charismatic Leadership

German sociologist Max Weber (1947) introduced the concept of charisma as an element of leadership in the first half of this century. Since then, there has been much interest in charisma in a social, political, and historical context. However, significant research on the topic did not begin until the 1970s. Two attributes are seen to be essential for charismatic leaders: (1) the leader must be a person of strong convictions, determined, self-confident, and emotionally expressive, and (2) followers must want to identify with the leader as a person, whether or not they are in a crisis (Bass, 1990).

Weber (1947) described charismatic leadership as a form of leadership that was based on follower perceptions that the leader possesses exceptional qualities, not on formal authority of the leader. He believed that charisma occurred during crisis situations, when a leader with exceptional personal qualities emerged with a radical vision to solve an impossible problem, endearing followers to the leader who perceive him or her to be extraordinary. Since Weber's construct, researchers have disagreed as to whether charisma is primarily the result of leader attributes, situational conditions, or an
interactive process between the leader and followers. While the term continues to be defined and used in different ways by different scholars, there has been general agreement that charismatic leadership is an interactive process (Yukl, 1998). Many researchers now view charisma as the result of follower perceptions influenced by actual leader traits and behavior, by the context of the leadership situation, and by the needs of the followers (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987).

**House's Theory of Charismatic Leadership.** House (1977) based his definition of charismatic leadership on its effect on followers. The charismatic leader induces a high degree of loyalty, commitment, and devotion in followers. Followers identify with the leader and his or her mission. They emulate the leader's values, goals, and behavior, and gain a sense of self-esteem from relationships with the leader and the leader's mission. They have an exceptionally high degree of trust in the leader (Bass, 1990).

House asked eight historians to use his definition to classify ten charismatic and nine noncharismatic U.S. presidents and Canadian prime ministers. Biographies of the leaders and their cabinet members were analyzed to compare the effects of the charismatics and noncharismatics on their cabinet members. To measure the behavior of the leaders, House coded passages that indicated the leaders' display of self-confidence, how they expressed expectations of high performance, confidence in their followers' ability and performance, strong ideological goals, and individualized consideration for followers.

House concluded that charismatic leaders are likely to have a strong need for power, high self-confidence, and a strong conviction in their own beliefs and ideals.
They engage in behaviors designed to build confidence in their abilities among followers. They seek to arouse and motivate the group by articulating ideological goals relating the mission of the group to deeply rooted values, ideals, and aspirations. According to House's theory, charismatic leaders set an example in their own behavior for followers to imitate. They communicate high expectations about follower's performance while simultaneously expressing confidence in followers.

**Conger and Kanungo's Theory of Charisma.** Conger and Kanungo (1987) and Conger (1989) developed a theory of charismatic leadership based on the assumption that charisma is a quality attributed to leaders by followers. Followers attribute charisma to leaders based on traits of the leader, his or her actions, and the context of the situation. This theory holds that in addition to the personal traits of charismatic leaders identified by House (1977), a strong desire by followers to identify with the leader must also be present. Although followers endow a leader with charismatic status to fulfill their situational needs, they do not endow just anybody (Bass, 1990). According to this theory, charismatic qualities are likely to be attributed to leaders who advocate a vision that differs from the status quo, but is still within the latitude of acceptance by followers.

Charisma is more likely to be attributed to leaders who act in unconventional ways to achieve the vision. Leaders are more likely to be viewed as charismatic if they make self-sacrifices and take personal risks. Followers are more likely to attribute charisma to leaders who use visioning and persuasive appeals than to leaders who use authority or a participative decision process. According to the attribution theory, a crisis situation is an important facilitating condition for charismatic leadership.
Unconventional strategies are more effective and readily accepted when it is clear that the conventional strategies have failed (Bass, 1998).

The concept of charismatic leadership is an important step in building a comprehensive leadership theory for the challenges facing today’s leaders. Theories on charisma go beyond prior theories of traits, behavior, power, or contingency to provide an explanation of the profound influence some leaders have over followers (Yukl, 1998). Charisma also provides an important foundation for the construct of transformational leadership. Researchers maintain that it is an important factor in the transformational leader (Bass, 1985; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Tichy and Devanna, 1990).

**Transformational Leadership**

The turbulent times of the 1980s and 1990s, driven by a global and information-based economy, have caused organizations to make fundamental changes. New competitors from around the world, immediate information flow requiring much quicker decision-making, and a smarter workforce that demands challenge and growth have had a fundamental impact on organizational processes, and on the roles and responsibilities of organizational members. Perhaps the most dramatic change has been in the new and different demands placed on leaders of organizations. Tichy and Devanna (1990, p. 4) hold that such change “demands the commitment of the many, not the few. Its nature is revolutionary not evolutionary. It cries for leaders, not managers, to effect the transformations required by most organizations.” Bass and Avolio (1990) contend that in order to remain viable in the rapidly changing economy, organizations and their leaders
must continually undergo change. They propose that successful leaders must be

*transformational*.

The turnover in technology and the changes in the work force throughout the remainder of this century and into the next will require leadership that is flexible, developmentally-oriented, willing to accept diverse points of view and capitalize on them, and that has the ability to challenge a better educated work force. The leadership required to address the predicted changes in organizations over the next twenty-five years is appropriately referred to as transformational leadership (p. 232).

According to Bass (1985), transformational leadership is defined in terms of the leader's effect on followers: they feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader, and they are motivated to do more than they originally expected to do. The leader transforms and motivates followers by making them understand the importance of the task at hand, and their role in completing it successfully. Transformational leaders persuade followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organization or team. Through this process, followers strive for and achieve higher-level needs on Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of self-actualization. Bass's theory goes beyond the exchange of tangible rewards for completion of tasks by inspiring followers to achieve more than they were expected to achieve, and often more than they thought was possible. The transformational leader gains a greater commitment from subordinates by serving as a coach, teacher, and mentor (Keller, 1992).
Transformational leadership is present when leaders stimulate interest among colleagues and followers to view their work from new perspectives. Such leaders generate awareness of and commitment to the mission and vision of the organization (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Transformational leaders mentor followers to take greater responsibility for their own development and that of others. They commit people to action, convert followers into leaders, and convert leaders into agents of change (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Ultimately, the organization is transformed (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Background and Description

In the last twenty years, scholars and researchers have become increasingly interested in examining the approaches of successful leaders who have transformed organizations. The foundation of much of this research is based on the theoretical model of charismatic leadership developed by House (1977) and the definitions and comparisons of transactional and transformational leadership by Burns (1978).

House (1977) concluded that leaders who have charismatic effects on followers repeatedly demonstrate three personal characteristics: extremely high levels of self-confidence, dominance, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of their beliefs. Charismatic leaders generate excitement and increase the expectations of followers through their visions of the future (Avolio and Bass, 1987). House proposed a model of charismatic leadership that differentiates the behavioral and personality characteristics of charismatic leaders and those who do not demonstrate charismatic traits. For House, the charismatic leader’s emotionally appealing goals and behaviors elevate followers’ needs for achievement and motivate them to accomplish tasks. Such
leaders also communicate high performance expectations, and believe that their followers can meet them (Hunt, 1991).

In his study of political leaders, Burns (1978) contrasted the constructs of transactional and transformational leadership. The transactional leader pursues a cost-benefit exchange, providing tangible rewards for the completion of tasks. These leaders define an agreement with their followers, in which they clarify the followers’ responsibilities, their own expectations, the tasks that must be completed, and the rewards that followers will receive for fulfilling the agreement (Bass & Avolio, 1990). But the relationship does not go further. The leader and followers have no ongoing purpose that holds them together. Although this is a form of leadership, it is not the kind that binds leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of higher purpose (Burns, 1978). Bass and Avolio (1990) maintain that transactional leadership is an essential component for effectively leading organizations, but it is does not sufficiently explain the extra effort and performance that some leaders are able to create in their followers.

According to Burns, transactional and transformational leadership are mutually exclusive.

Bass (1985) built on the work of both House (1977) and Burns (1978) to develop a theory of transformational leadership that has been used heavily by researchers. Bass expanded on House’s model in terms of how charisma fits within the transformational leadership framework. Charisma is an important component in the overall transformational process, but it is one of several components of the model. According to Bass’s theory, transformational leaders also need the ability to recognize the needs, aspirations, and values of their followers and the skill to conceive and articulate strategies and goals that will motivate followers to exert their best efforts (Avolio and Bass, 1987).
Bass’s model is based heavily on Burns’s approach, but includes an important difference. Unlike Burns, Bass allows for transactional and transformational leadership qualities to exist in the same leader, a theory that has been tested empirically (Bass and Avolio, 1990). Bass contends that, although transactional leadership can promote positive outcomes, without complementary transformational actions it will be incomplete. Compared to transactional leaders, transformational leaders are more likely to be proactive than reactive in their thinking; more creative, novel, and innovative in their ideas; and less inhibited in their search for solutions (Yukl, 1998). Transactional leaders may be equally capable, but their focus is on how to best keep the system running for which they are responsible – reacting to problems generated by disturbances. They look to modify conditions as needed, always aware of the organizational constraints within which they must operate (Tichy and Devanna, 1990). Transformational leaders, on the other hand, often force the organization to adapt to them instead of them having to adapt to the organization (Bennis and Townsend, 1995). To better understand Bass’s model of transformational leadership, it is important to examine the components that comprise both the transformational and the transactional constructs.

Transformational Factors

Transformational 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” (Burns, 1978, p. 20). Burns holds that in the transformational process, the power bases of leaders and followers are linked in a common purpose, which
transforms the attitude and actions of everyone in the organization – not just followers. He contends that transformational leadership
ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspirations of both the leader and the led, and thus has a transforming effect on both...(it) is dynamic leadership in the sense that the leaders throw themselves into a relationship with followers who will feel "elevated" by it and often become more active themselves, thereby creating new cadres of leaders (p. 20).

Researchers on transformational leadership differ somewhat on specific behaviors they associate with the construct, but all of them share the common perspective that effective leaders transform or change the basic values, beliefs, and attitudes of followers so that they are willing to perform beyond typical expectations (Podsakoff, et al, 1990). Based on the literature, there are a number of key factors associated with transformational leaders, including charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, identifying and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, and putting forth high performance expectations. A brief summary of these factors follows.

Charisma. Charismatic leadership as defined by Bass (1985) is an important component of the overall transformational leadership construct. Charisma allows leaders to be role models, setting an example for employees to follow that is consistent with the values the leader espouses (Podsakoff, et al, 1990). These leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. They are seen to have unusual capabilities, persistence, and determination,
are willing to take risks, and are consistent in their actions. They demonstrate high standards of ethical and moral conduct. They instill pride, faith, and respect, and have a unique ability for seeing what is really important (Bass, 1998). Charismatic qualities enable leaders to transmit a sense of mission. They are able to identify new opportunities for their organizations, developing, articulating, and inspiring others with the vision of the future. Bass (1985) also refers to the charismatic component as idealized influence.

Charisma enables leaders to recognize the need for revitalization, according to Tichy and Devanna (1990). In their study of CEOs of large corporations, they found that successful leaders encounter and overcome challenges when they attempt to alert the organization to growing threats from the environment. In their study, leaders saw themselves as visionary change agents who trusted their intuition, and were able to articulate a set of core values that guided their behavior. These are all charismatic traits.

Although charisma is a necessary component of transformational leadership, it is insufficient by itself to fully realize organizational transformation (Tichy and Devanna, 1990). There are discrete differences between House's (1977) charismatic model and Bass's (1985) transformational model. Transformational leaders seek to empower and elevate followers, whereas many charismatic leaders seek to keep followers weak and dependent, seeking personal loyalty rather than commitment to an organizational mission. Transformational leaders can be found in any organization at any level, whereas charismatic leaders are rare (Yukl, 1998). Unlike charisma, transformational leadership is a leadership process that can be learned and managed. It is a systematic process consisting of strategic and organized search for changes, rational analysis, and the
capacity to move resources from areas of lesser to greater productivity to bring about a purposeful transformation of the organization (Tichy and Devanna, 1990).

**Inspirational Motivation.** Bass (1985) describes inspirational motivation as a subset of charisma. However, he recognizes the fact that leaders do not have to be charismatic to be inspirational. Transformational leaders motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers' work, arousing team spirit, enthusiasm, and optimism (Yukl, 1998). The ability to build confidence in followers in their ability to accomplish group goals is an important skill for the inspirational leader (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) conducted interviews with 90 successful CEOs from both the private and public sectors. Their study focused on leaders who had “achieved fortunate mastery over present confusion” (p. 21). That is, those individuals who were successfully proactive in addressing the challenges faced by their organizations in an environment of continuous, rapid change. All ninety people had a focus on outcomes, and their intensity of vision enabled them to capture the attention of their followers to concentrate on the vision. They found that successful leaders motivate their followers to achieve a vision through inspired communication. In order to implement the vision, the leader must be able to communicate the agenda, and persuade followers that the outcomes are desirable. The ability to relate a compelling image of a future state that generates enthusiasm and commitment is a requirement for the successful leader. Bennis and Nanus hold that “an essential factor in leadership is the capacity to influence and organize meaning for the members of the organization” (p. 39). Leaders must interpret and define reality for their followers, just as they must define a vision for the future, and
inspire followers to pursue the vision enthusiastically. According to Senge (1990), this is the essence of inspirational motivation.

If any one idea about leadership has inspired organizations for thousands of years, it's the capacity to hold a shared picture of the future we seek to create...Where there is a genuine vision (as opposed to the all-too-familiar "vision statement"), people excel and learn, not because they are told to, but because they want to (p. 9).

Intellectual Stimulation. Bass (1985, p. 99) describes intellectual stimulation as "the arousal and change in followers of problem awareness and problem solving, of thought and imagination, and of beliefs and values, rather than arousal and change of immediate action." That is, by stimulating the intellect of followers, transformational leaders can cause a discrete jump in the ability of followers to understand the nature of the organization and the problems it faces. They are better able to comprehend the issues at hand, and conceptualize potential solutions. The emphasis is more on creative, well-developed ideas than on immediate action. Such behavior by the leader challenges followers to re-examine some of their assumptions about their work and rethink how it can be performed (Podsakoff, et al, 1990).

The balance of risk and trust is a key element in intellectual stimulation. Tichy and Devanna (1990) hold that transformational leaders are prudent risk takers, and foster such an environment in the organizations they lead. They create an environment that is flexible and open to learning from experience. Bennis and Nanus (1985) hold that trust is critical to fostering an environment open to innovation. According to the authors, trust is
granted to those whose positions are known; to those who are predictable, consistent, and persistent. Innovation causes resistance, and takes numerous attempts before being accepted. Trust enables the leader to prepare the organization to deal with the resulting confusion. Covey (1991) agrees that the key to an intellectually stimulating environment is trust. He maintains that if trust is present, then clear communication, empathy, synergy, and productive interdependency are likely to be present as well.

Senge (1990) holds that leaders are responsible for building organizations that enable people to grow. In a learning organization, leaders are designers and teachers. Leaders must design learning processes so that people throughout the organization can deal productively with the critical issues they face. According to Senge, leaders who are teachers help people throughout the organization develop a systemic understanding of their organization and its environment, enabling them to focus on its larger purpose rather than on day-to-day (transactional) events.

**Individualized Consideration.** Consideration for others is another important aspect of transformational leadership. It has been found to have a positive impact on subordinate satisfaction with the leaders, as well as overall productivity (Bass, 1985). Individualized support on the part of the leader indicates that he or she respects followers and is concerned about their personal feelings and needs (Podsakoff, et al, 1990). The leader delegates projects to stimulate learning experiences, provides coaching and teaching, and treats each follower as an individual, fostering the acceptance of group goals (Bass, 1998). The developmental aspect of individualized consideration is a key element. Bass (1985, p. 85) holds that “it is the transforming leader who has a developmental orientation toward his subordinates.” Transformational leaders help
subordinates to fulfill their potential both in terms of their present job as well as for future roles of increasing responsibility in the organization. Transformational leaders differ from transactional leaders in that they do not merely recognize the needs of followers, but also attempt to elevate those needs from lower to higher levels of development and maturity (Tichy & Devanna, 1990). Transformational leaders engage the “full” person with the purpose of developing followers into leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1990). They pay special attention to each follower’s needs for achievement and growth by acting as coach or mentor. Communication is viewed as a very important part of the process. Transformational leaders are recognized as effective listeners (Yukl, 1998).

Other Transformational Behaviors. Podsakoff and his colleagues (1990) identified two additional but related transformational behaviors in their review of the literature. The ability to foster the acceptance of group goals was determined to be an important skill for transformational leaders. Promoting cooperation among employees and getting them to work together toward a common goal is critical to the transformational process. Additionally, the ability of the leader to demonstrate expectations for excellence, quality, and high performance is also an important transformational behavior.

Transactional Factors

Unlike Burns, Bass (1998) contends that every leader displays both transformational and transactional styles to some extent in what he calls the “full range of leadership” (p. 7). Covey (1991) describes transactional leaders as those who focus on the efficient interaction with the changing daily realities faced by the organization.
According to Covey, transformational leadership focuses on the “top line” and is principle-centered. Transactional leadership focuses on the bottom line and is event-centered. Peters and Waterman (1982) also describe transactional leadership as a necessary, but incomplete, process in the comprehensive suite of effective leadership skills. They describe transactional leadership as follows:

Leadership is many things. It is patient, usually boring coalition building. It is the purposeful seeding of cabals that one hopes will result in the appropriate ferment in the bowels of the organization. It is meticulously shifting the attention of the institution through the mundane language of management systems. It is altering agendas so that new priorities get enough attention. It is being visible when things go awry, and invisible when they are working well. It’s building a loyal team at the top that speaks more or less with one voice. It’s listening carefully much of the time, frequently speaking with encouragement, and reinforcing words with believable action. It’s being tough when necessary, and it’s the occasional use of naked power...(These) are the necessary activities of the leader that take up most of his or her day (p. 82).

In research, transactional leadership has been operationalized into the components of contingent reward and management-by-exception.

**Contingent Reward.** Some managers provide rewards to followers who perform in accordance with agreed upon expectations or satisfactorily carry out an assignment. Contingent rewards can take on a number of forms, including praise for work well done, recommendations for pay increases, bonuses, and promotion, or commendations for
meritorious effort including public recognition and honors for outstanding service (Bass, 1985). Contingent penalization is also used when the task is not completed satisfactorily. According to Bass (1985, p. 122), this process of rewarding and penalizing employee behavior is "characteristic of transaction-oriented managers because such managers, unlike transforming leaders, are more concerned with efficient processes than with substantive ideas." This type of exchange has been found to be reasonably effective, although not as much as any of the transformational components in motivating others to achieve higher levels of development and performance (Yukl, 1998).

**Management-by-Exception.** Management-by-exception is corrective in nature. In general, the leader avoids giving directions if the old ways are working, and allows followers to continue doing their jobs in a routine way if performance goals are met (Bass, 1988). The process tends to be less effective than contingent reward or the components of transformational leadership.

Management-by-exception can be active or passive. Transactional leaders who practice active management-by-exception monitor the work of subordinates and corrective action is taken to ensure that the work is carried out effectively. The leader arranges to actively monitor deviances from standards, mistakes, and errors in the follower's assignments and to take corrective action as necessary. Managers who practice passive management-by-exception use contingent punishments and other corrective action in response to obvious deviations from acceptable performance standards. Such managers wait passively for deviances, mistakes, and errors to occur and then take corrective action. While generally ineffective, this leadership behavior may be required and effective in some situations such as when safety is of primary concern.
Leaders sometimes practice passive management-by-exception when they are supervising a large number of subordinates who report directly to them (Bass, 1985).

**Research on Transformational Leadership**

As noted earlier, while Bass (1985) views transformational and transactional leadership as conceptually distinct, he holds that both behaviors are likely to be displayed by the same individuals in different circumstances, and in different levels of intensity. The major premise of Bass's theory is that follower motivation and performance are enhanced more by transformational leadership than by transactional leadership. However, as he noted in 1990, "most experimental research, unfortunately, has focused on transactional leadership, whereas the real movers and shakers of the world are transformational" (p. 23). In recent years, Bass and his colleagues, as well as numerous other investigators, have built a body of research that supports Bass's claim of the effects of transformational leadership.

**Empirical Research.** Most of the empirical research on the theory has involved use of an instrument developed by Bass (1985) called the "Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire" (MLQ) to measure various aspects of transformational and transactional leadership. Scales measuring separate aspects of transformational and transactional leadership are based on factor analysis of the initial questionnaire and subsequent versions of it.

Researchers have generated results using the MLQ that have been encouraging for the basic propositions of Bass's transformational model. The instrument has been utilized with a wide variety of organizational settings and organizational members: a
New Zealand government agency (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb, 1987), U.S. Navy officers (Bass and Yammarino, 1991; Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino, 1990), a management game simulation with MBA students (Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein, 1988), hospital nurses (Bycio, Hackett, and Allen, 1995), a large manufacturing firm (Waldman, Bass, and Einstein, 1987), three industrial research and development organizations (Keller, 1992), an express delivery company (Hater and Bass, 1988), and a large Canadian financial institution (Howell and Avolio, 1993), among others. They found that transformational leadership is not only found in these different organizational settings, but is found at all levels of the organization. It is not limited to executives and world-class leaders (Hater & Bass, 1988). Some degree of transformational leadership was being practiced at the most senior levels down to first-level management in industrial settings, among students, and from lieutenant to lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army (Bass, 1985).

In addition, transformational leadership has been positively correlated with how effective the leader is perceived by subordinates, how much effort subordinates say they will expend for the leader, how satisfied the subordinates are with the leader, how well subordinates performed as rated by the leader, project quality and budget/schedule performance, and financial performance of a business unit (Hater & Bass, 1988; Keller, 1992; Howell & Avolio, 1993). In many of these same studies, the transactional leadership factor of contingent reward was also positively correlated with these outcomes. But in general, the relationships were considerably lower than those found for transformational leadership. These results support Bass’s original claim that
transformational leadership contributed to organizational and employee performance beyond that of transactional leadership.

Empirical studies have examined the various components of the transformational model. In their study of 190 second-year MBA students using a management game simulation, Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein (1988) found that the transformational leadership factors of charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation correlated with higher levels of organizational effectiveness. Specifically, they determined that members of successful teams attributed more transformational qualities to their leaders. The transactional factor of contingent reward also correlated positively to team performance, but to a lesser degree. Management-by-exception was not correlated with high team effectiveness.

Similarly, these same transformational factors had strong positive relationships with outcomes such as subordinates' extra effort, satisfaction with the leader, and subordinate-rated leader effectiveness in a study of 1,376 registered nurses (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995). Contingent reward was also positively related to these outcomes, but to a smaller degree. Management-by-exception correlated negatively to these measures, as expected. Greater degrees of transformational leadership were associated with reductions in intent to leave the profession, whereas management-by-exception had a significantly smaller association with this intention. As expected, organizational commitment had strong positive relationships with each of the transformational scales.

Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb (1987) examined the developmental aspects of transformational leadership in a New Zealand government agency. In this study,
transformational leadership was characterized by factors representing idealized influence (charisma), individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. The study tested the hypothesis that transformational leadership behaviors identified in first-level managers will also exist in second-level managers who report directly to them. In other words, through the use of individualized consideration and other transformational properties, leaders would mentor employees into becoming transformational themselves. This hypothesis – "the falling dominoes effect" – was confirmed by the study for all three transformational factors investigated.

Measures of Effectiveness. In most early studies, information on transformational leadership behavior and the overall effectiveness of the leader was developed from the same data source – primarily through questionnaires completed by those reporting to the leader. This design caused these studies to be potentially biased due to same source data (Avolio, Bass, and Yammarino, 1991). In their study of managers and subordinates in a large industrial organization, Waldman, Bass, and Einstein (1987) were among the first to evaluate leadership behaviors and leadership outcomes with separate measures. To determine the impact of transformational factors, they used the outcomes of the existing employee appraisal process, hypothesizing that if transformational leadership did indeed lead to higher levels of employee performance, then employees who reported to transformational leaders should show better reviews as measured by the appraisal system. In fact, the transformational factors of charisma and individualized consideration were significantly correlated with employee performance in this study. Hater and Bass (1988) also added an independent source of leader effectiveness in their study of an express delivery company. In addition to follower perceptions of leader effectiveness, they used
the leaders' superiors to evaluate the leaders and the performance outcomes of the groups they led. Their conclusions – that transformational leadership behaviors add to leader effectiveness and employee satisfaction beyond that of transactional leadership – were consistent with other studies.

Similarly, Bass and Yammarino (1991) used the performance and promotion data provided by superior officers to evaluate leadership behaviors of Navy officers. They measured leader performance in three ways. First of all, they collected questionnaire data from the officers' subordinates to gauge perceived performance. Secondly, official Navy records completed by the officers' superiors provided performance and promotion data that were used as indicators of actual performance. Finally, the officers rated themselves with regard to leadership effectiveness. In general, the transformational scales were consistent with expected results of both perceived and actual performance. However, the self-ratings tended to be inflated in comparison to perceived and actual performance, but the more successful officers were less likely to inflate their self-described leadership behavior than the less successful officers.

Other studies have taken the additional step by using quantitative outcomes to measure the impact of transformational leadership. Howell and Avolio (1993) used financial performance of specific business units over a one-year period to provide an objective measure of the impact of transformational leadership. In their study of managers in a large Canadian financial institution, the researchers collected data on business unit performance one year after collecting data on leadership behaviors of the business unit leaders. They found that the presence of higher levels of transformational qualities corresponded to stronger business unit performance. However, unlike many
other studies, the transactional factor of contingent reward was negatively correlated with performance, instead of a lower, positive correlation as had been predicted based on prior research. Similarly, Keller (1992) attempted to use objective, quantitative criteria for success in his study of transformational leadership in industrial research and development teams. As hypothesized, transformational leadership factors predicted higher on the measures of project quality and budget/schedule performance.

**Meta-Analysis.** Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) conducted a meta-analysis of results from 39 studies that used the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire. The results of this analysis confirmed the conclusion that effective leaders emphasize transformational behaviors but also use relevant transactional behaviors in certain situations. The three transformational behaviors of charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation were related to leadership effectiveness in most studies. Moderator variables suggested by the literature, including level of the leader, organizational setting, and operationalization of the outcome measure (subordinate perceptions or organizational measures of effectiveness), were empirically tested and found to have differential impacts on correlations between the leaders' style and effectiveness. The relationship was stronger for subordinate self-rated effort than for an independent criterion of leadership effectiveness (e.g., ratings of the leader by superiors, objective performance of the leader's organizational unit).

Transformational leadership behaviors correlated more strongly and consistently with leadership effectiveness than transactional leadership behaviors. The transactional behavior of contingent reward behavior was correlated with leadership effectiveness in
some studies, but passive management-by-exception did not improve leadership effectiveness.

The meta-analysis also found that transformational leadership behaviors were more commonly observed in public organizations than in private organizations. Organizational level was a moderating factor, as scores on transformational leadership scales were higher for lower level managers than for higher level managers. Additionally, relationships were found to be stronger between transformational leadership measures and subordinate perceptions of effectiveness than for organizational measures of effectiveness, such as objective business unit performance or employee appraisals.

Organizational measures, while perhaps reducing the common method bias problem, may not be especially valid measures of the effectiveness of the transformational characteristics of the leader, as they are often designed to capture primarily transactional outcomes. Avolio and Bass (1987) noted that many performance appraisal systems – an example of an organizational measure – do not emphasize performance beyond expectations, and thus the relationship with transformational leadership may be misleading. In this sense, subordinate perceptions of effectiveness may be a better indicator of the impact of transformational leadership on motivation and performance than organizational outcomes or independent performance evaluations, despite the issue of same source data (Lowe, et al, 1996).

Evaluation/Limitations of Transformational Leadership

Although transformational leadership theory has made unique contributions to leadership research, numerous questions exist regarding the nature of the construct. The
literature includes criticisms of the transformational leadership construct generally, and Bass’s (1985) model specifically (Hunt, 1991; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Yukl, 1998).

Some authors hold that charisma and transformational leadership are synonymous (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Others contend that the similarities and differences between charismatic and transformational leadership need greater clarification (Yukl, 1998). Bass (1985) holds that charisma is a necessary trait for transformational leaders, but the descriptive research suggests that most transformational leaders are not charismatic (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Hunt (1991) has questioned the use of questionnaires in this type of research. Yukl (1998) maintains that survey research such as that done with the MLQ has many limitations, including the effects of stereotypes and biases in rating the behavior of leaders who are already known to be effective. He suggests that until the survey results are confirmed by stronger research methods such as longitudinal field experiments, it will be difficult to draw any firm conclusions.

Another issue associated with the questionnaire is that Bass’s original analysis did not recognize that the factors could be interrelated, despite his contention that leaders could show both transactional and transformational tendencies (Bycio, Hackett, and Allen, 1995). Howell and Avolio (1993) structured their analysis in such a way that allowed the factors to be correlated. They were among the first to do so.

The MLQ has been criticized as being a “reincarnation” of the leadership behavior description questionnaire (LBDQ). Critics maintain that initiation of structure is synonymous with transactional leadership and consideration is synonymous with transformational leadership. Bass and Avolio (1993) contend that individualized
consideration in their model of transformational leadership is distinct from the consideration scale of the LBDQ, especially with respect to the developmental aspect of individualized consideration. They also argue that consideration and initiation of structure – the two primary factors of the LBDQ – cannot conceptually and empirically account for transformational and transactional leadership.

Transformational Leadership and Community Colleges

Can this model for leadership be successful at community colleges, even though it has been predominantly researched in business and military settings? There is evidence that it could. Cameron (1983) holds that principles of effective strategic leadership are not limited by organizational type as much as by the nature of the external environment encountered by the organization. That is, factors such as sources of funding, profit versus service orientation, and organizational size are not as important in determining the effectiveness of adaptive strategies as are the external disturbances faced by the organizations. Similar types of strategies have been found in studies of phone companies, consumer products firms, electronics, air transportation, information service companies, and universities as a result of facing similar environmental conditions despite their internal organizational differences (Treacy and Wiersema, 1995). Transformational leadership has been found to have a positive impact in organizations whose employees have a high level of education and a deep interest in the challenge of their work (Hater & Bass, 1988; Keller, 1992). This is a fitting description of community college employees.

Following closely the approaches of Bass (1985) and Bennis and Nanus (1985), Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989) examined the leadership habits of 256 community
college presidents that they determined to be transformational leaders. They asked these presidents to describe, in writing, their personal philosophies of educational leadership. They also asked the 256 presidential participants to nominate peers who they felt were exceptional transformational CEOs. Based on this nominating process, the researchers developed a list of 50 “blue chippers” – a group of nationally respected community college CEOs.

The authors then studied the 50 in depth. Personal interviews were conducted with each of the identified “blue chippers” to obtain detailed descriptions of the characteristics of transformational leadership. The open-ended interview questions were developed from the behavioral attributes and stated philosophies from the written responses supplied by the original group of 256 college presidents. The content of these questions reflected five transformational themes – vision, influence orientation, people orientation, motivational orientation, and values orientation – that were consistent with the theoretical framework established in the transformational leadership literature (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

From these interviews, an instrument was developed to determine the extent to which these CEOs and their followers could evaluate CEOs’ performance. The instrument was based on the philosophical statements provided by the presidents, the information collected in the “blue chip” interviews, and Bass’s (1985) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The instrument – the Multifactor College Leadership Questionnaire – differed from Bass’s MLQ Form 5 – Revised in that it excluded all transactional behaviors, focusing exclusively on transformational behaviors.
One version of the instrument was used to acquire the CEO's perception of his or her own leadership behavior, and a parallel version of the instrument was used to collect the perceptions of the followers of the CEO, specifically his or her leadership team. These questionnaires were sent to the 50 CEOs and a total of 373 administrative team members identified by their presidents. Two hundred ninety responses were received.

The findings of this study indicated that vision was the most significant theme identified by the "blue chippers." Both leaders and their teams regarded vision as a key to successful leadership. The CEOs and their teams were in general agreement on the other for transformational themes as well (Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989).
Organizational Effectiveness

The definition of an effective organization, and how effectiveness is determined, has been a passionate source of debate among scholars (Cameron & Whetten, 1996). A generally agreed upon definition of organizational effectiveness has proven to be elusive. Mott (1972) defines organizational effectiveness as “the ability of an organization to mobilize its centers of power for action — production and adaptation” (p. 17). Effective organizations produce more and higher-quality outputs and adapt more effectively to internal and external problems than less effective organizations. The relative quality, quantity, and efficiency of production are dimensions of organizational effectiveness (Miskel, McDonald, and Bloom, 1983).

Efficiency and effectiveness are often compared and sometimes confused in the literature. They are similar in that both incorporate the concepts of constraints and standards. They differ in that effectiveness refers to the acquisition of resources or levels of production, and efficiency adjusts those levels in reference to some cost or resource utilization unit (Pennings and Goodman, 1977). Efficiency is generally measured by computing the ratio of some output to some input (e.g., cost per student). It deals with internal processes of the organization, achieving the most output with the least input. The concern is with resource allocation or with better use of resources rather than resource generation. Effectiveness is not easily measured. There are no precise or agreed-upon indicators. It focuses as much on the relationship between the organization and the environment as on internal processes and on resource acquisition more than resource allocation (Cameron, 1983).
Issues with Organizational Effectiveness Research

Research on organizational effectiveness has proven to be ambiguous, confusing, and inconclusive. Difficulty in empirically assessing organizational effectiveness has arisen because no one ultimate criterion of effectiveness exists (Cameron, 1978). Numerous books, articles, and chapters on organizational effectiveness have been published in the last twenty years—five, many of them arguing for a particular effectiveness model. No dominant model has emerged, leading to confusion and frustration among researchers (Whetten & Cameron, 1994). Scott (1977) articulates this frustration well:

After reviewing a good deal of literature on organizational effectiveness and its determinants, I have reached the conclusion that this topic is one about which we know less and less. There is disagreement about what properties or dimensions are encompassed by the concept of effectiveness. There is disagreement about who does or should set the criteria. There is disagreement about what indicators are to be used in measuring effectiveness. And there is disagreement about what features of organizations should be examined in accounting for observed differences in effectiveness (p. 63-4).

Numerous indicators have been used by investigators as measures of effectiveness. Campbell (1977) assembled a list of thirty criterion measures that have been proposed seriously in the scholarly literature as indices of organizational effectiveness. Krakower (1985) identified 410 indicators used for assessing the
effectiveness of higher education institutions alone. Cameron (1986) has been critical of the empirical literature on organizational effectiveness. He holds that researchers have relied too much on single indicators of effectiveness, ignoring the relationships that can exist among multiple indicators. He also notes a tendency for researchers to overgeneralize conclusions to dissimilar organizations. After much debate, confusion, and controversy, many researchers agree with Cameron and Whetten (1983) who hold that “multiple viewpoints all may be equally legitimate but under different circumstances and with different types of organizations” (p. 274).

Despite the ambiguity surrounding the construct, the study of organizational effectiveness in some form is very important for a number of reasons. First of all, organizational effectiveness lies at the core of almost all models of organizations. All organizational theories involve some discussion of what makes organizations effective or ineffective. Therefore, effectiveness is “the ultimate dependent variable in organizational research. Evidence of effective performance is either assumed or required in most research on organizations” (Cameron and Whetten, 1996, p. 267). Secondly, there is a constant need to make judgments about the effectiveness of organizations. Practical choices are made on a regular basis regarding which public school should be closed, which firm will get a contract, in which company an investment will be made, and so on.

As theories of organizations have become more complex over the last 30 years, theories of organizational effectiveness have followed in complexity. According to Whetten and Cameron (1994), theories of organizational effectiveness have evolved to reflect more complex and dynamic views of goals, outcomes, stakeholders, and measurement. The authors conclude that since no model of organizations can be argued
to be better than any other, no model of effectiveness has an inherent advantage over any
other. They also hold that

the best criteria for assessing organizational effectiveness are unknown
and unknowable. Because individuals often cannot identify their own
preferences and expectations, because preferences and expectations
change over time, and because contradictory preferences and expectations
are held by different constituency groups, a stable set of effectiveness
criteria simply are not available for organizations (p. 142).

Historical Underpinnings of Organizational Effectiveness Research

Like leadership theory, current thinking of organizational effectiveness has
evolved over time. An overview of historical research on effectiveness theory includes a
number of important models. This section reviews the goal-centered model, the system
resource model, the multiple constituents model, and the paradox model. Quality, as an
important emerging element in overall organizational performance, is also discussed.

Goal-Centered Model. The goal-centered model theorizes that an organization is
successful to the extent that it achieves its goals (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). According to this
theory, the more closely the organizational outputs approximate organizational goals, the
more effective the organization is. Greater organizational effectiveness is achieved
through higher degrees of goal achievement (Bluedorn, 1980).

The goal-centered view assumes that a rational group of decision makers sets the
goals for the organization. The number of goals must be small enough to be effectively
managed. They must be defined well enough to be understood by organizational
members. With these assumptions in place, organizational effectiveness can be assessed by developing criterion measures to evaluate how well the goals are being achieved (Campbell, 1977).

In the goal-centered model, a distinction is made between types and sources of goals. Official goals are stated formally to the public. They are often abstract and inspirational. They are not time-bound and are difficult to measure. They are often not operationalized into the daily policies and procedures of the organization, and therefore do little to guide day-to-day behavior of organizational members (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Operative goals, on the other hand, designate the objectives through the actual operating policies of the organization, which tell what the organization is actually trying to do, regardless of what the official goals state as the organization’s mission (Cameron, 1978). They indicate the true intentions of the organization, reflecting the actual tasks and activities performed, regardless of public claims (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

The goal-centered model has been widely criticized for a number of reasons. Hannan and Freeman (1977) argue that organizations have multiple, nonspecific, and often unobserved goals, particularly with respect to time considerations. They also hold that goals are irrelevant in comparing different organizations to determine the properties of effectiveness. Organizational goals are often contradictory, since different units or levels within an organization each form their own distinct goals. Krakower (1985) contends that there is often a wide difference between espoused public goals and the goals that are actually pursued. He also points out that goals are often stated after the fact to justify what the organization was already doing.
Cameron (1978) states that goals are often determined by organizational leaders, but not necessarily shared by other stakeholders. He is critical of a goal-centered approach because the goals measured by the organization often change too slowly to mirror the continuous changes that organizations undergo. Such criticisms have led many researchers to conclude that the goal-centered model is inadequate for the study and evaluation of organizational effectiveness (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

System Resource Model. Since the demands placed on organizations are so dynamic and complex, Campbell (1977) concluded that it is not possible to define a finite number of organizational goals in any meaningful way. In describing the "natural systems view," he maintains that the organization's overall goal is to maintain its "viability or existence through time without depleting its environment or otherwise fouling up its nest" (p. 20). Therefore, Campbell (1977) holds, measures of organizational effectiveness would include internal consistency, efficient use of resources, and success in competing for resources.

One important model from the natural systems view is a model developed by Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) based on their analysis of 75 insurance companies. They reject the goal approach in favor of a system resource model, in which they define effectiveness as "the organization's bargaining position as reflected in the ability of the organization, in either absolute or relative terms, to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources" (p. 898). In this model, organizations are not assumed to possess goals nor is goal accomplishment a relevant consideration. The purpose of the organization is to grow through the acquisition of resources. The more successful an organization is in obtaining resources from its external environment, the
more effective it is. Inputs to the organization or achieving a competitive advantage in the marketplace replace the emphasis on outputs in the goal model (Cameron, 1981).

Criticisms of the system resource model are varied. One of the biggest criticisms is that it places too much emphasis on inputs as opposed to outputs. When an organization becomes consumed with the acquisition of resources from its environment, there is a strong tendency to neglect other functions and the performance of the organization often suffers (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985). Additionally, organizations may be effective even when resources are not being acquired at an optimal rate and when a competitive advantage in the marketplace does not exist (Cameron, 1981). Since it uses only the interests of the organizational leaders, focuses only on inputs, and assumes that the only valuable aspects of organizations are those which aid further input acquisition, Scott (1977) holds that the approach is too narrow. Finally, some contend that this model is really the same as the goal model since increasing inputs is an organizational operative goal (Kirchhoff, 1977).

Multiple Constituents Model. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, research on organizational effectiveness entered another important phase. Investigators began to focus more on the concrete expressions of stakeholders' expectations and less on the assessment of abstract criteria (Whetten & Cameron, 1994). Unlike the goal and system approaches, this new model - called the multiple constituency model - assessed organizational performance from criteria derived from the preferences of multiple stakeholders (Zammuto, 1984).

Under the multiple constituency model, effective organizations are viewed as those which have accurate information about the expectations of strategically critical
constituents, and then adapt internal organizational activities, goals, and values to match those expectations. In this model, organizations are flexible, dynamic entities influenced by stakeholder needs and expectations. Therefore, effectiveness is a function of organizational qualities like learning, responsiveness, and influence management (Whetten & Cameron, 1994).

A number of questions have been raised regarding the multiple constituency model. Individual stakeholders have difficulty articulating their personal needs and expectations from an organization, and their preferences and expectations change, sometimes dramatically, over time (Whetten & Cameron, 1994). Organizations are forced to pursue a variety of contradictory preferences simultaneously. All possible constituencies could never be assessed and served. Internal and external constituency expectations are often incompatible and both could not be satisfied at the same time (Murray, 1988). The preferences stated by an organization's strategic constituencies often are unrelated or negatively related to one another and to the actual judgments by the stakeholders of organizational performance (Cameron & Whetten, 1983). Zammuto (1984) suggests that organizations should seek to satisfy the expectations of the most powerful stakeholder first. However, Cameron (1984) points out that identifying the most powerful stakeholder is difficult, and that even if the most powerful constituency could be identified, no organization could survive long if it concentrated on one constituency to the exclusion of others.

Paradox Model. The recognition that organizations are simultaneously pulled in opposite directions by the expectations of multiple constituencies led to the paradox model. This model – also known as the competing values model – recognizes the
inherently paradoxical nature of organizational life. It acknowledges the tradeoffs
administrators must make between competing demands on resources and competing
expectations of constituents (Whetten & Cameron, 1994).

Using the list of effectiveness criteria from the literature developed by Campbell
(1977), Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) developed a model of organizational performance
that demonstrates the contradictory position of many institutions. They called it the
“competing values model” because it points out the simultaneous opposition in the
criteria that individuals use to judge effectiveness. The authors submitted Campbell’s
(1977) list to various statistical procedures, and organized the criteria around two
dimensions based on the results. One dimension emphasized decentralization and
flexibility on one end of the continuum, and ranged to centralization and stability on the
other end. The second dimension ranged from internal, individualistic elements on one
end, to external, macro-level elements on the other. Research based on the model found
that organizations do not pursue a single set of criteria. Rather, they pursue competing,
or paradoxical, criteria simultaneously (Cameron & Quinn, 1988). Based on this model,
“effective organizations are both short- and long-term focused, flexible and rigid,
centralized and decentralized, goal and resource control oriented, concerned about the
needs of members and demands of customers” (Whetten & Cameron, 1994, p.141).

The idea of effective organizations as paradoxical entities has gained the support
of both researchers and practitioners. Peters and Waterman (1982) concluded “excellent
companies have learned how to manage paradox” (p. 100). Cameron (1986) holds that
paradox is inherent in organizations and that to be effective, an organization must possess
attributes that are simultaneously contradictory, and sometimes mutually exclusive. This
creative tension can lead to dramatic advances in creativity, and highly flexible, unified, and effective organizations. The escalating chaos, complexity, and contradiction of today's organizational environment place great challenges on organizations and their leaders. Those achieving the highest levels of performance do so by balancing the conflicting demands created by the inherent paradoxes while developing, operating, and continuously transforming themselves (Price Waterhouse, 1996).

Quality. In the 1990s, the need grew for more pragmatic, tangible measures of organizational effectiveness. Organizations of all kinds have been under increasing fire in the last decade. Businesses have failed or consolidated at an increasing rate, schools are criticized as being ineffective. These trends caused the effectiveness debate to change sharply. A transition occurred from seeking a single, universal evaluation of effectiveness to the identification and assessment of multiple, even paradoxical, effectiveness dimensions (Cameron & Whetten, 1996). Organizational effectiveness, as described in the previous models, has been criticized as too intangible and theoretical. For some researchers and practitioners, the construct of quality has begun to replace effectiveness as the central organization-level variable, especially in research on higher education institutions.

The quality construct has a number of advantages over traditional views of organizational effectiveness. Whereas the traditional debates surrounding effectiveness models focused on differences among models and the superiority of one perspective over another, the quality model emphasized the integration of these perspectives under one broad approach. Because quality attributes are inputs, processes, outcomes, and
constituency preferences, they provide some integration of the models usually separated in the traditional effectiveness approaches (Cameron and Whetten, 1996).

Quality looks not only at the organizational outcomes, but on the means to achieve those outcomes. The emphasis on integrating processes and outcomes, which was seldom the case in the effectiveness literature, is an advantage for quality over effectiveness as a descriptor of desirable organizational performance. Quality also incorporates organizational culture into its assessment of performance. In doing so, it represents a broader view than what is typical of effectiveness literature. Organizational effectiveness models do not include aspects of organizational culture, in general.

However, effectiveness also has a number of advantages over quality. The quality literature takes a very prescriptive view. Whereas effectiveness research recognizes that different measures are appropriate for different kinds of organizations, the quality literature fails to do so. The quality construct does not acknowledge that different approaches to quality may be appropriate under different environmental conditions (Cameron and Whetten, 1996). Additionally, much of the quality literature views customer satisfaction as the single most important indicator of quality. However, as Cameron and Whetten (1983) point out, there are a number of important issues surrounding customer satisfaction. Customers often cannot identify their own preferences or expectations. Their expectations change, sometimes very quickly. Contradictory preferences often exist among different customers. Many times, customer preferences are unrelated to organizational performance. Finally, whereas much publication has been done on quality, little empirical work has been presented.
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Cameron and Whetten (1996) provide a thorough comparison of the elements of effectiveness and quality. They observe that organizational effectiveness is defined from the standpoint of managers, whereas quality is defined from the standpoint of customers. The effectiveness literature often overemphasizes outcomes and goal accomplishment at the expense of internal processes; the quality literature has been accused of overemphasizing internal processes and systems at the expense of outcomes. The body of research on organizational effectiveness is sometimes criticized as being too conceptual – too focused on imprecise and immeasurable constructs – for practitioners. The body of research on quality is accused of being too underdeveloped conceptually – too focused on measurement and problem solving tools and techniques.

The authors conclude that an increased understanding of overall organizational performance may occur best if the strengths of both the effectiveness and quality constructs are used together. The comprehensive and integrated nature of quality, especially the focus on both means and ends concurrently, can help expand conceptualizations of effectiveness and highlight synergy among models. Quality’s emphasis on pragmatic measurement and useful guidelines for organizational practitioners is an important contribution to the research. The conceptual complexities uncovered by effectiveness scholars, on the other hand – such as underlying dimensions and multiple models – as well as the proposed guidelines for more precise empirical research on these kinds of constructs, can help provide a more empirical framework for research on quality.
Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness

As models of organizations have become more complex over the past three decades, theories of organizational effectiveness have also grown in complexity, creating numerous issues with regard to empirical assessment of effectiveness. Cameron and Whetten (1996) point out that from the 1960s through the 1980s generalized summaries of effectiveness were predominant. In most cases, these led to subjective, simplistic results.

It is generally accepted that organizational effectiveness is made up of multiple dimensions and measures (Cameron, 1978; Hoy and Ferguson, 1985; Miskel, McDonald, and Bloom, 1983). However, identifying and measuring these dimensions has proven to be challenging for researchers. A number of factors must be considered in the design of organizational studies. First of all, the source of effectiveness information is a point of debate. Effectiveness criteria gathered from constituents always represent someone’s values and biases. Organizational records are sources in which information concerning effectiveness criteria may be obtained with no direct involvement by organizational members (e.g., archival records such as organizational histories, changes in personnel, stock price changes). Such measures provide objective information regarding performance, and can be tracked over time. Personal perceptions are criteria collected directly from organizational members (generally through questionnaires, interviews, or direct observation). Economists have generally relied on objective sources for criteria, whereas industrial and organizational psychologists have more often used perceptions (Krakower, 1985). Some studies have included both objective and perceptual measures.
Cameron and Whetten (1983) point out other considerations. Time frame is an important variable in organizational research. Short-term effects may differ from long-term effects. An organization may appear effective based on short-term results, but may not be in a position to achieve long-term success. Level of analysis and domain of activity must also be considered. Effectiveness at different organizational levels or in different organizational units may be incompatible. The purpose for judging the effectiveness of an organization may impact the results. Changing the purpose of an assessment may change the criteria being evaluated, and also the outcome. Finally, the standard against which effectiveness is being measured will impact the results. Universal standards seldom exist for complex organizations, and different standards will produce different conclusions about performance.

Performance Measures in Higher Education

When applied to institutions of higher education, organizational effectiveness measures have proven to be especially ambiguous. Cameron (1986) notes that such ambiguity exists because colleges and universities lack measurable goals, are so loosely coupled that acquired resources may have little to do with outcomes, and have the ability to ignore major constituencies and still survive. They also have a tradition of resistance to evaluations of performance that have kept any consensus on effectiveness criteria from being developed. Individual institutions view themselves as having unique characteristics and goals, and not being comparable to other institutions. Additionally,
the financial concerns of colleges and universities have led to research on efficiency rather than on effectiveness. In higher education, criteria such as costs per student, costs per faculty member, etc. have most often measured efficiency. These are not sufficient for understanding overall organizational performance (Cameron, 1978). The most powerful factors associated with effectiveness in institutions of higher education tend to be internal factors under control of campus officials (Smart & Hamm, 1993a).

Community colleges, as a subset of higher education institutions, may have more measurable results due to their more focused missions and better-defined constituent base. Objective measures of performance for community colleges might include the number of transfers who achieved subsequent success at four-year colleges, the number of students placed in jobs directly related to their career program, and percent of students who complete developmental course sequences and then succeed in college-level programs (O’Banion, 1997). In general, community college leaders have made growth their primary benchmark. Growth in budgets, staff, and students is considered good. The philosophy is that new and growing programs serve new clients. The accepted conclusion has been that the institution that grows fastest serves its community the best (Cohen and Brawer, 1996).

Like organizations in general, the 1990s brought the quality movement to higher education in the form of Total Quality Management (TQM). While hundreds of educational institutions are applying the core concepts of TQM, the results to date have been marginal. “The experimentation...at this early point in its educational application, appears to work best in changing management processes and structures rather than improving and expanding learning” (O’Banion, 1997, p. 98). This is consistent with
Cameron and Whetten's (1996) assessment that the quality model of organizational performance focuses too much on process at the expense of outcomes.

The application of TQM principles and concepts to teaching and learning has proven to be a difficult issue for higher education (Seymour, 1993). Cameron and Whetten (1996) offer an explanation of this struggle. Since the quality model is customer-driven, an organization must first determine who their customer is. This is a difficult task for institutions of higher education.

The question is, who is the customer? Are students customers, suppliers, partners, or part of the production process? Are faculty customers? Of whom? What role do state governments, benefactors, parents, and sponsors play? To what extent are they to be treated as customers? In the effectiveness literature, each of these groups is treated as a constituency with legitimate claims on the organization. In the quality literature, it is unclear if a customer satisfaction perspective can legitimately apply (p. 295).

The authors conclude that research on organizational effectiveness in higher education needs more emphasis on the integration of processes, outcomes, and effects. Attention must be paid not only to the outcomes, but how they are produced, and their consequences. In higher education, this means including the processes of educational delivery, their consequences, and the outcomes produced by the organization.
Measuring the Effectiveness of Educational Institutions

Much of the research on the effectiveness of educational institutions has been criticized on measurement, statistical, methodological, and theoretical grounds. Research on effective schools is limited by the same weaknesses as the research on effective organizations generally – the absence of both a sound theoretical framework and a consensus on the definition and measurement of the concept (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985). However, useful tools have been developed to assess the effectiveness of educational institutions with regard to both perceived organizational effectiveness as well as quantitative outcomes of organizational performance.

Perceptual Measures. Perceived organizational effectiveness is the subjective evaluation of an organization’s productivity, adaptability, and flexibility (Miskel, McDonald, and Bloom, 1983). A number of instruments have been developed to measure perceived effectiveness of organizations. Cameron (1978) identified a core group of perceptual effectiveness criteria that are relevant to organizational members, applicable across subunits, and comparable across institutions. His study of six colleges in the northeast yielded nine effectiveness dimensions: student educational satisfaction, student academic development, student career development, student personal development, faculty and administrator employment satisfaction, professional development and quality of the faculty, systems openness and community interaction, ability to acquire resources, and organizational health. The National Center of Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) incorporated Cameron’s (1978) measures into the Institutional Performance Survey (Krakower & Niwa, 1985).
These nine dimensions fall into three main categories: academic and scholarly performance of students and faculty; satisfaction and morale of students, faculty, and administrators; and adaptability and responsiveness of the institution to external factors (Cameron and Tschirhart, 1992). These categories are similar to the three important performance outcome indicators of schools identified by Hoy and Miskel (1996): academic achievement, job satisfaction, and overall perceptions of school effectiveness.

Building on studies at ten hospitals, NASA, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mott (1972) developed the Index of Organizational Effectiveness (IOE), which integrates the effectiveness criteria of quantity and quality of products, efficiency, adaptability, and flexibility. The IOE attempts to specify things an organization must do to be effective, and it is generalizable to all organizations (Miskel, McDonald, and Bloom, 1983). In empirical studies, this instrument has been strongly correlated to the measures of effectiveness that fit well with schools, including community colleges: student achievement, efficient use of resources, adaptability to constraints, and overall stakeholder satisfaction. It is simple and inexpensive to administer, making it an attractive instrument for use in further studies (Hoy and Ferguson, 1985).

Quantitative Measures. Quantitative information is also an important element in assessing the performance of colleges and universities. In Cameron’s (1978) analysis, he identified objective measures that include the number of student terminations, the number of faculty members leaving, the number of administrators leaving, the percentage of faculty on policy-making boards or committees, the percentage of budget for professional development, and the amount of general funds raised.
Taylor, Meyerson, and Massy (1993) make the case for evaluating the effectiveness of institutions of higher education by similar criteria used for assessing the performance of a corporation. They maintain that as the public demands more accountability from educational institutions, they will look for measures that can be tracked and compared over time, in the same way they evaluate publicly held corporations. "In higher education, pressure to restructure and reform is being applied not by stockholders but by public opinion and a climate of economic uncertainty and decline that is unlikely to moderate very much in the foreseeable future." (p. ix). The authors collected data from over 700 institutions of higher education, and analyzed over 90 key indicators. They sought quantitative values that would allow an institution to compare its position in key strategic areas to peers, to past performance, or to previously set goals. They concluded that four fundamental strategic assets combine to determine an institution's success: financial capital (revenue and reserves, investments, and endowment), physical capital (buildings, land, equipment), information capital (library and computer resources), and human capital (students, faculty and staff). The size and quality of these assets - and the relationships among them - drive an institution's strategic condition.
Hypotheses

The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership factors and organizational effectiveness is of substantial interest. While Bass (1985) holds that the two constructs are conceptually distinct, he believes that both behaviors are displayed by the same individuals in different circumstances, and in different levels of intensity. The literature suggests that transformational leadership factors among community college presidents might lead to higher levels of college performance. If this is true, the specific factors that make up the construct will be of interest, especially as it relates to perceptions of faculty members. The first hypothesis will examine the association of each transformational scale with the measures of organizational effectiveness, as determined by community college faculty.

Hypothesis 1. Transformational leadership factors, as demonstrated by community college presidents, will positively predict organizational performance in community colleges.

Transactional leadership factors have generally defined the leadership approach of many past and present community college presidents. The focus on efficient, bureaucratic processes has often been of primary concern, with less attention to future vision or broad strategic community involvement. This approach is unlikely to achieve the kind of performance required for community colleges to rise to the level required of them by today’s society. Although transactional factors have shown a positive
correlation with organizational effectiveness in some studies, transactional leadership is hypothesized here to correlate negatively with community college performance. The second hypothesis evaluates the association of transactional factors with organizational effectiveness.

_Hypothesis 2._ Transactional leadership factors, as demonstrated by community college presidents, will negatively predict organizational performance in community colleges.

The methodology to evaluate these hypotheses is described in the following section.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Data on presidential leadership and institutional effectiveness were collected from faculty from a sample of U.S. community colleges. Factor analysis was utilized to define the measures of the independent and dependent variables. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the association between leadership behavior and organizational effectiveness. A small sample of presidents was interviewed to provide an anecdotal complement to the quantitative analysis.

Sample

This study used a convenience sample of community college presidents to determine how their leadership approach affects the perceived performance of their institutions. The participants were drawn from a number of community college organizations, including the League for Innovation in the Community College, the National Council of Occupational Education, Community Colleges for International Development, as well as personal contacts of the researcher.
Participants

Faculty members from each participating college served as the source of data for both the independent and dependent variables. A minimum of five faculty from each institution rated the leadership style and behaviors of their president. A different set of five or more faculty from each college described their perception of the institution’s overall performance. Five or more raters are recommended for this type of research to ensure representative input and to protect the anonymity of the participants (Halpin, 1959; Bass and Avolio, 1997).

The use of a convenience sample clearly limits the external validity of this study. Steps were taken to ensure that the sample was reasonably representative demographically. Although not ideal, most studies use nonprobability samples – usually convenience samples (Krathwohl, 1998).

Power Analysis

In order to determine a minimally acceptable sample size, a power analysis was appropriate. Any statistical test is a complex relationship between the power of the test, the region of rejection (α level), the sample size, and the magnitude of the effect in the population (Cohen and Cohen, 1983).

Cohen and Cohen state that the effect size of an independent variable on a dependent variable found in similar studies can be used to direct subsequent research. Three studies using the MLQ to measure organizational effectiveness provided guidance with respect to effect size. Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein (1988) reported a multiple $R$ of 0.56 in their study of transformational leadership in a management game simulation.
In his study of research and development groups, Keller (1992) reported an $R^2$ of 0.43 between transformational leadership and group performance. Howell and Avolio (1993) reported standardized path coefficients of 0.65 for individualized consideration, 0.26 for intellectual stimulation, and 0.38 for charisma in evaluating the association between these transformational factors and business unit performance in their study of a large Canadian financial institution.

Based on this range of estimates for the proportion of variance explained in organizational performance by transformational leadership factors, an estimate of effect size was determined for the present study. Cohen and Cohen (1983) advise that an effect size of 0.10 would be considered small, 0.30 would be a medium effect, and 0.50 would be considered a large effect. From the range in effect size from previous studies, which would indicate an above average effect, and based on Cohen and Cohen’s guidelines, an effect size of 0.40 was used in this power analysis.

Using an effect size of 0.40, an $\alpha$ value of 0.05, and power of 0.80, a sample size of forty-six was suggested by the appropriate table in Cohen and Cohen (1983, p. 530). Based on this result, a minimum of forty-six community colleges were sought as the sample for the present study. With data collected from at least ten faculty at each college, a minimum of 460 participants were targeted to submit data.

**Data Collection**

Community college organizations and personal contacts of the researcher were used to identify a group of community colleges to participate in the study. The data
collection process was initiated by a letter to the president of each college requesting their permission for their faculty to participate.

**Institutional Liaison**

Once a president agreed to participate, an institutional liaison was identified at each college. This individual served as the point of contact for soliciting participation from their colleagues and for distributing materials. Packets of information and data collection instruments were mailed by the researcher to the liaison at each college. A personal letter from the investigator was sent, thanking them for their participation and introducing the materials and purpose of the study. The materials included packets for each participating faculty member, to be distributed by the liaison. The packet included specific instructions for the liaison and the faculty members, instruments for collecting leadership data, and instruments for collecting organizational performance data. Stamped return envelopes addressed to the investigator were also included.

The institutional liaisons were instructed to distribute the leadership instrument, instructions, and return envelope to ten faculty members, and to distribute the performance instrument, instructions, and return envelope to ten different faculty members. They were encouraged to select a group of faculty that was representative of their institution. That the request to participate came to the faculty from someone other than their president is an important design consideration. Research shows that if the raters were selected and contacted by the leader rather than by an independent party, the ratings would likely be inflated (Seltzer and Bass, 1990). This process assumed at least a 50% response rate from faculty participants.
Anonymity of Raters

Anonymity of raters was ensured and protected. The data collection process was designed such that only the institutional liaison at each college knew the identity of the respondents. Twenty respondent packets — ten for the leadership survey and ten for the effectiveness survey — were mailed to each liaison. Each packet was numbered sequentially. As the liaison distributed the packets to faculty respondents, the numeric code was noted with the name of the faculty member by the liaison on a form provided by the researcher. In the packet distributed to the respondents, a post card addressed to the researcher was also included. The post card was coded with the same number as the code on each respondent packet. The raters were asked to mail the post card to the researcher after they had completed and mailed the survey in a separate envelope. This method enabled the researcher to track which faculty had responded, without knowledge of the identity of the respondent.

Periodically during the data collection period, the researcher notified the liaison which post cards — by number — had been received. The liaison used the numeric code of the post cards received to determine which respondents had not yet responded, and reminded them to do so.

The cards were coded so that the researcher knew which institution they were from, but the identity of the individual respondents remained anonymous. In order to ensure that ratings remain anonymous, aggregate data from individual colleges will not be distributed. This process followed the procedure approved by the Human Subjects Committee at Ohio State University.
Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were versions of original instruments developed by Bass (1985) for leadership scales and Cameron (1978) for effectiveness scales. The independent variable – leadership behavior – was measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1997) and the dependent variable – organizational effectiveness – was measured by one section of the Institutional Performance Survey from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to be used in this study is the MLQ (5X) (Revised). A number of versions of the MLQ have been used by researchers for more than a decade. The original version was developed by Bass (1985).

The initial item pool of the MLQ was based on a review of the theoretical literature and on the results of an open-ended survey of 70 executives who were asked to describe attributes of transformational and transactional leaders. The resulting 142 items were reviewed by eleven graduate students who were given a definition of transformational and transactional leadership. Each student sorted the items into the categories of transformational, transactional, or “can’t say.” Based on the agreement of the student judges, 73 items were retained for inclusion in a questionnaire.

This questionnaire was used to collect data from a sample of 176 military officers by Bass (1985). A factor analysis of the 73 items yielded four leadership factors that
were transformational (charisma/idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation) and two that were transactional (contingent reward and management-by-exception). Hater and Bass (1988) extracted essentially the same factor structure, but obtained two factors for management-by-exception – one active and one passive.

The MLQ (5X) (Revised) was developed to address some of the criticisms of earlier versions of the instrument. Specifically, the MLQ had been criticized for failing to distinguish between charismatic leadership that was behaviorally based and charismatic leadership that was attributed by followers. Therefore, the latest version of the MLQ includes items that distinguish between the two (Bass and Avolio, 1997). This version includes four items that assess nine leadership scales as well as three outcome scales. For the purposes of this study, only items that address transformational and transactional leadership factors were included, omitting scales that measure laissez-faire leadership. Additionally, the outcome measures of extra effort, satisfaction, and perceived effectiveness were also excluded. Outcomes data will be collected with a different instrument and a different sample in order to address the problem of same-source bias (Avolio, Bass, and Yammarino, 1991).

The MLQ (5X) (Revised) is included in Appendix A. Faculty were asked to rate how frequently their president engages in specific behaviors. Each behavior is rated on a 5-point scale ranging from “not at all” (0) to “frequently, if not always” (4). Sample items for each factor to be included in the present study are presented in Table 3.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributed Charisma</td>
<td>My leader instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>My leader specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>My leader articulates a compelling vision of the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>My leader seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>My leader spends time teaching and coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>My leader makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)</td>
<td>My leader focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Passive)</td>
<td>My leader shows that he/she is a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Sample items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire


In their analysis of the MLQ (5X) constructs, Bass and Avolio (1997) found that reliabilities for each leadership factor ranged from .74 to .94, exceeding the standard cut-off of .70 for internal consistency recommended in the literature (Fornell and Larcker, 1991). The authors also examined the construct validity of the MLQ (5X) using confirmatory factor analysis, comparing the full nine-factor leadership model of this version of the instrument with one-, two-, three-, and five-factor models. All indicators
loading on each construct were significant, and the nine-factor model had the strongest indicators of fit. Similar reliability and validity findings have been reported in other studies (Howell and Avolio, 1993; Keller, 1992; Bycio, Hackett, and Allen, 1995).

Institutional Performance Survey

Cameron (1978) developed an instrument to evaluate organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education, which served as the basis for the Institutional Performance Survey (Krakower & Niwa, 1985). His work focused on the organizational level, since he believed that this area had been the most neglected in higher education research, and because it would allow for comparisons among institutions. Cameron limited his original study to six smaller undergraduate institutions, and sought feedback from the “dominant coalition” at these schools – key administrators and department heads. He used 130 effectiveness items from the literature as a framework for interviews. Interview participants were asked to identify characteristics that are typical of effective institutions with which they are familiar. From the long list that resulted, nine separate groupings of effectiveness criteria emerged. These criteria are summarized in Table 3.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Educational Satisfaction (SES)</td>
<td>The degree of satisfaction of students with their educational experiences at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Development (SAD)</td>
<td>The extent of academic attainment, growth, and progress of students at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Career Development (SCD)</td>
<td>The extent of occupational development of students, and the emphasis on career development and the opportunities for career development provided by the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personal Development (SPD)</td>
<td>Student development in nonacademic, noncareer oriented areas, e.g., socially or culturally, and the opportunities provided by the institution for personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (FAES)</td>
<td>Satisfaction of faculty members and administrators with jobs and employment at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty (PDQF)</td>
<td>The extent of professional attainment and development of the faculty and the amount of stimulation toward professional development provided by the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Openness and Community Interaction (SOCI)</td>
<td>The emphasis placed on interaction with, adaptation to, and service in the external environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Acquire Resources (AAR)</td>
<td>The ability of the institution to acquire resources from the external environment including finances, high-quality students and faculty, and political legitimacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Health (OH)</td>
<td>Criteria indicating benevolence, vitality, and viability in the internal processes and practices at the institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Description of effectiveness dimensions from Cameron's (1978) analysis.  
Note. From Smart and Hamm (1993a).
Questionnaire items were constructed around each of the nine dimensions identified from the interviews. Items on the questionnaire asked individuals to provide descriptive information regarding the extent to which their institution possessed certain characteristics. The emphasis was on description, not evaluation, in order to reduce the likelihood that respondents would purposely bias evaluations of their own organization's effectiveness in a positive direction (Cameron, 1986).

The questionnaire asks respondents to describe their institution on a 7-point scale. Sample questionnaire items for each of the nine effectiveness dimensions are presented in Table 3.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>There seems to be a feeling that dissatisfaction is high among students in general at this institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>This college has the reputation of possessing a stimulating intellectual environment with high concern for student academic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>What proportion of the students who graduated from this college last year and entered the labor market would you estimate obtained employment in their major field of study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>One of the outstanding features of this college is the opportunity it provides students for personal development in addition to academic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAES</td>
<td>If given the chance of taking a similar job at another school of his/her choice, how many faculty members do you think would opt for leaving this school rather than staying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>How many faculty members at this college are actively engaged now in professional development activities – i.e., doing research, getting and advanced degree, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>This college is highly responsive and adaptive to meeting the changing needs of the external college community or environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>This college has a very high ability to obtain needed financial resources in order to provide a high quality educational program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>The general social environment at this college is cooperative, supportive, and shows mutual concern for others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Sample items from the Institutional Performance Survey.

*Note:* From Krakower & Niwa (1985).

Over 330 administrators and faculty members at the six participating institutions completed the original questionnaire. Factor analytic procedures on the resulting data
confirmed the existence of the nine dimensions. The results of this initial study confirmed that the dimensions were composed of items with high internal consistency and that they were distinguishable from one another (Cameron, 1978). The items developed by Cameron were incorporated into the section of the Institutional Performance Survey entitled “Performance and Actions of the Institution” (Krakower & Niwa, 1985). A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Similar psychometric results have been reported in subsequent studies using this instrument. In his study of 29 colleges and universities assessing the impact of managerial strategies, organizational structure, demographics, and finances on institutional effectiveness, Cameron (1986) reported internal consistency reliabilities for the nine dimensions ranging from .72 to .92 with a mean reliability coefficient of .82. Factor analysis of the 57 questionnaire items resulted in the items for each dimension loading on their own factors. Average intercorrelation among the nine dimensions in this study was .42, indicating that the dimensions are conceptually distinct, but some of the dimensions do vary together in ratings of effectiveness. The factor structure, reliability, and discriminant validity of the instrument has also been demonstrated when used to measure effectiveness specifically at community colleges (Smart and Hamm, 1993a, 1993b).

Data Analysis

Factor Analysis

Confirmatory Factor Analysis. In order to test the factor structure of both instruments against the data in this sample, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted.
Confirmatory factor analysis is a widely used technique for testing the psychometric properties of measurement instruments because it tests a prespecified factor structure and provides goodness of fit indices for the resulting solution (Bass and Avolio, 1997). In confirmatory factor analysis, the investigator has a specific prior hypothesis about the number and nature of the factors, and that hypothesis is incorporated explicitly into model specification and estimation. It requires additional assumptions concerning the positions of zero loadings to reflect the prior hypotheses.

Confirmatory factor analysis was appropriate for this study because the instruments used to measure both the independent and the dependent variables have been widely used in research, making the required prior hypothesis of factor structure readily available. As presented in Chapter 4, the expected factor structure did not hold for either the MLQ or the IPS for these data.

The RAMONA function in the statistical package SYSTAT for Windows was used to conduct the confirmatory factor analysis. RAMONA's main advantage is that it can correctly analyze a correlation matrix, whereas many other packages are intended for covariance matrices.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis.** Since the factor structure was not totally confirmed for either the independent or dependent variable measures, exploratory factor analysis was conducted. Using this technique, no preconceived model of the factor structure is used for comparison. The underlying factors are allowed to emerge, or a specific factor model may be tested and analyzed using this statistical technique (Kerlinger, 1986).
Exploratory factor analysis was used to define the independent variable and dependent variable measures for this analysis.

**Data Reduction**

Both instruments – the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Institutional Performance Survey – presented the possibility of yielding a large number of measures for the independent and dependent variables. Therefore, managing the number of variables was a concern as the data were analyzed. Steps were taken to limit the number of variables addressed in the study. These steps provided a number of benefits. First of all, the analysis and interpretation of data was simplified. Secondly, the possibility of a multicollinearity problem was reduced. Multicollinearity is the effect of high correlations among independent variables, leading to a high redundancy of predictors. Multicollinearity is to be avoided because it means instability of regression coefficients and other statistical difficulties (Kerlinger, 1986).

Finally, data reduction techniques strengthen the predictive power of the independent variables by getting closer to the recommended ratio of 15 subjects per predictor (Stevens, 1986). This last point is important. According to Stevens, “the incremental validity of new variables, after a certain point, is usually very low” (1986, p. 66). Tests tend to overlap in content, therefore, anything beyond the fourth or fifth variable may add little new value to the prediction of the criterion. The factors that emerged from the data reduction process were used as the predictors in the multiple regression analyses to test the hypotheses. Therefore, judgments were made during the factor analysis process to ensure that the number of independent variable measures
provided an appropriate ratio of subjects per predictor, and limited the risk of multicollinearity.

A data reduction technique was utilized for the dependent variable as well. If a large number of factors emerge, there is a good possibility that they are correlated. Second order factor analysis is "a method of finding the factors behind the factors" (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 583). Some pattern, although often complex, emerges from the first factor analysis. By calculating the correlations between factors and factor analyzing again, a smaller number of factors may emerge (Kerlinger, 1986). Second order factor analysis was employed for the measures of effectiveness that emerged from the original factor analysis process, leading to a single measure of organizational performance. This process will be discussed in the following chapter.

Average Leadership Style

The present research and analysis will be based on the average leadership style (ALS) approach to studying leadership and its effects. The ALS model focuses on a leader's average or typical behavior toward followers, treating deviations in average follower perceptions as error variance (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). The ALS model is appropriate in this study as a basis for analyzing leadership because group measures at the college level, rather than individual performance, serve as the dependent variables of interest. Dienesch & Liden (1986) suggest that it is appropriate to combine leadership ratings by followers when attempting to predict group performance versus individual performance. Based on these reasons, scale scores for faculty at each college will be summed for each leader and divided by the number of faculty, providing an average
leadership rating for each president. This approach has been used successfully in similar studies (Howell and Avolio, 1993; Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein, 1988; Hater and Bass, 1988).

Test of Hypotheses 1 and 2

Hypotheses 1 and 2 are restated below:

Hypothesis 1. Transformational leadership factors, as demonstrated by community college presidents, will positively predict organizational performance in community colleges.

Hypothesis 2. Transactional leadership factors, as demonstrated by community college presidents, will negatively predict organizational performance in community colleges.

Multiple regression analysis was used in both Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 to determine the effects and magnitudes of the effects of the independent variables (the transformational leadership factors and the transactional leadership factors) on each of the dependent variables (measures of effectiveness).

Multiple regression analysis facilitates the prediction of a dependent variable from knowledge of two or more independent variables using principles of correlation. The overall effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable is expressed by the square of a correlation coefficient called the coefficient of multiple correlation, or $R^2$. It is the proportion of the variance of the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variables (Kerlinger, 1986).
Factors that emerged from the data reduction process were used as the variables in multiple regression. Each of the effectiveness measures was regressed on each of the leadership factors for both hypotheses. An $F$ test was used to determine if each subsequent leadership scale adds significantly to the prediction of the organizational effectiveness measures. Through this test, the variance due to regression of effectiveness on transformational factors and transactional factors was evaluated against variance presumably due to error or chance (Kerlinger, 1986).

The statistical package SPSS for Windows, release 9.0, was used for the exploratory factor analyses, the second order factor analysis, and the multiple regression analyses reported in Chapter 4.

**Qualitative Analysis**

Leadership is a complex construct with many dimensions. In order to supplement the findings of the quantitative analysis, a series of interviews was conducted. Six community college presidents were interviewed, each with different leadership profiles representing colleges that varied with respect to effectiveness. According to Kerlinger, “the personal interview far overshadows (other methods) as perhaps the most powerful and useful tool of social scientific survey research” (1986, p. 379). Interviews are used by researchers to describe complex personal and interpersonal phenomena, such as the leader-follower exchange, that would be impossible to portray with single dimensional scales (Krathwohl, 1998). Since leader success is based largely on relationships, personal insights added substantially to the contribution of this study. These interviews served to “humanize” and confirm the conclusions from the quantitative analysis.
The approach used was a partially structured interview (Krathwohl, 1998). Questions were formulated in advance, but the order was determined based on the discussion. Questions were added during the interview based on the responses of the subjects. Questions were open-ended, and the interviews were taped in order to transcribe the responses verbatim.

The interviews provided additional meaning to the quantitative analysis by highlighting specific examples of leadership that tie to the statistical results. Research questions were formulated to address the underlying factors of the transformational and transactional leadership constructs. Common themes and key differences were assessed from the interview records. Anecdotal linkages to transformational and transactional factor were noted. The research questions are investigated in Chapter 5.

Limitations of the Study

There are a number of factors that limit this study. The nonprobability sample employed will limit the ability to generalize the results to other populations. Steps were taken to ensure that the sample was as representative demographically as possible with respect to both the president and the faculty raters.

The potential exists for a multicollinearity condition. Other studies using the MLQ have reported correlation among the independent variables. This will be managed in the present study through data reduction techniques.

Should the data reduction process yield more than three or four predictors, the predictive power of the model might be compromised. Stevens (1986) suggests 15
participants per predictor. Based on three predictors, the sample size in this study would be sufficient. More than three would weaken the power of the model.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of the data analysis for this study. The sample is described, with demographic and descriptive information regarding the college presidents and the faculty respondents in the study. The factor analytic approach used to determine the independent and dependent variables is presented, along with the statistical testing of the hypotheses using multiple regression analysis.

Sample

Forty-six community colleges located throughout North America participated in this study. Twenty-one states and Canada were represented in the sample. Eleven of the forty-six (24%) college presidents were female. The average size of the colleges based on headcount enrollment was 9,970; the median size was 7,783. The size of college ranged from 607 to 55,170 students.

A minimum of ten faculty members from each college completed surveys for either the independent variable (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – MLQ) or the dependent variable (Institutional Performance Survey – IPS). For the colleges included in this sample, at least five faculty completed and returned the MLQ and at least five additional faculty completed and returned the IPS, following Halpin’s (1959) guideline.
A total of 624 faculty responses are included in the sample – 301 for the MLQ and 323 for the IPS. Twenty surveys – 10 for the MLQ and 10 for the IPS – were sent to the colleges for a total of 920 surveys. Therefore, the total response rate was 67.8%. The response rate for the MLQ was 65.4% and the response rate for the IPS was 70.2%.

Descriptive information on the respondent sample is included in Table 4.1. The average age, average years of service to the institution, and educational background of the respondents is very similar for both the MLQ and the IPS. Almost 50% of the MLQ respondents were female, while 44.9% of the IPS respondents were female. Male respondents made up 48.5% of the MLQ sample and 51.7% of the IPS sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>IPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents (N)</strong></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Age</strong></td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Years of Service</strong></td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (%)</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D.)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist (Ed.S.)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Medicine, Law)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Description of respondent sample.
* Does not equal 100%. 5 respondents did not disclose for MLQ. 11 respondents did not disclose for IPS.
** Does not equal 100%. 6 respondents did not disclose for MLQ. 13 respondents did not disclose for IPS.
Independent and Dependent Variables

To determine the variables to utilize in analyzing the data in this study, a series of factor analysis procedures were conducted. For both the independent and dependent variables, confirmatory factor analysis was followed by exploratory factor analysis. These procedures led to two measures of leadership and five measures of effectiveness. A second order factor analysis procedure resulted in a single measure of overall organizational performance.

Independent Variables

Leadership data were collected for this study using thirty-two items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)(Revised) (Bass and Avolio, 1997). This version of the MLQ was revised to measure a total of eight leadership factors: five transformational factors (Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration) and three transactional factors (Contingent Reward, Active Management-by-Exception, and Passive Management-by-Exception).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis. In order to determine whether or not the factor structure predicted by Bass and Avolio’s (1997) instrument was replicated by the data in this study, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted. In confirmatory factor analysis, firm prior hypotheses concerning the number of factors are required. The inherent factor structure of the data is compared to the prior hypotheses. Bad fit means the model is of no use; good fit means the model might be useful (MacCallum, 1998).
The fit of a model can be evaluated using RMSEA, or the root mean square error of approximation (Bollen, 1990). Since RMSEA is a measure of lack of fit, smaller results indicate better fit of the model. As a general guideline, an RMSEA of less than .05 indicates close fit, .05 – .08 indicates reasonable fit, .08 – .10 indicates mediocre fit, and a result greater than .10 indicates unacceptable fit (MacCallum, 1998).

When compared to the eight-factor model suggested by Bass and Avolio (1997), the data from this study produced an RMSEA of .169, which is unacceptable fit. Therefore, a factor structure other than the eight-factor model was implied.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis.** Exploratory factor analysis was then conducted. The results suggested a five-factor solution. However, thirteen of the 32 items loaded .40 or greater on more than one factor. Intellectual Stimulation, Idealized Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Contingent Reward, Idealized Attributes, and Passive Management-by-Exception were dispersed over two or more factors. Only Individualized Consideration and Active Management-by-Exception loaded squarely on only one factor. This model was rejected on both analytical and conceptual grounds.

Next, two-factor, three-factor, and four-factor solutions were tested for this data set. Each of these models has a conceptual basis in the literature. The two-factor model was expected to yield a transformational factor and a transactional factor. This is similar to the structure of Bass's early work. The three-factor model was expected to result in two transformational and one transactional factor, with one of the transformational factors representing charismatic attributes and behaviors. The four-factor model was expected to add a transactional factor, possibly distinguishing between Contingent Reward and Management-by-Exception.
The results of the two-factor model were as expected, with one exception. Contingent Reward loaded on the transformational factor instead of the transactional factor. This was true for all of the models tested. Instead of the expected two transformational factors, two transactional factors emerged from the three-factor model. While a relatively clean analytical structure, this solution did not represent a particularly useful conceptual model. The four-factor solution produced two transformational and two transactional factors, as expected. Conceptually, this solution had merit. However, the model was not strong from an analytical standpoint with 9 of the 32 items loading .40 or greater on more than one factor. Additionally, the predictive power of the model would be compromised with the use of four predictors based on the sample size of this study. The likelihood of a multicollinearity problem would also increase with four predictors and a relatively small sample size.

Based on these results, the two-factor model was chosen. Conceptually, this model links back to early research at Ohio State University based on the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ measured the factors of consideration and initiating structure, which have been compared to transformational leadership and transactional leadership. The two-factor model has a strong analytical basis as well. The intercorrelations among the transformational components in Bass’s model have been widely reported in the literature. This has been one of the leading criticisms of the MLQ. Bass and Avolio (1997) conducted a cross-validation study in which they tested one-, two, three, five, and nine-factor solutions based on MLQ data. Intercorrelations among the five transformational scales were high, ranging from .49 and .65, which would provide a rationale for a single transformational factor. The RMSEA
for the two-factor solution in the cross-validation study was .07, which indicates reasonable fit. The use of two predictors of leadership in the current study has the added benefit of simplifying the analysis and interpretation of data, and reducing the possibility of multicollinearity.

The four items associated with Contingent Reward (MLQ1, MLQ9, MLQ14, and MLQ31) remained in alignment with the transformational factor, which was unexpected but not totally surprising. While a transactional factor, Contingent Reward is described as constructive leadership and "active transactional leadership" versus the Management-by-Exception scales, which are corrective in nature (Podsakoff, et. al., 1990). In research, Contingent Reward has correlated as high or higher with performance as the transformational factors of Individualized Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation, and Idealized Influence (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Since the use of Contingent Reward as a transformational factor does not align with an acceptable conceptual model, these items were dropped from the analysis.

**Definition of Independent Variables.** Factor analysis was run once again for the revised two-factor model. The two factors account for 62% of the total variance in the model. Factor 1 includes the items on the MLQ (5X)(Revised) that relate to Bass's postulated factors of Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized Consideration (IC). Since these are all considered transformational factors, factor 1 is called *transformational* (TFORM) in this analysis.

Similarly, factor 2 encompasses the items that make up the transactional leadership factors of Management-by-Exception (Active) (MBEA) and Management-by-
Exception (Passive) (MBEP) in Bass’s theory. For this reason, factor 2 is called 
transactional (TACT) in this study. The alpha coefficients for factor 1 and factor 2 were 
.97 and .84, respectively. The MLQ items, a cross-reference to Bass’s factors, and the 
factor loadings for the two-factor model used in this study are presented in Table 4.2.

Two transactional items – MLQ10 and MLQ18 – showed a relatively high 
loading on both factors. In fact, MLQ10 ("Waits for things to go wrong before taking 
action") loaded higher on the transformational factor than on the transactional factor. 
However, this item is associated with active management-by-exception, which is a 
transactional factor. Similarly, MLQ18 is associated with passive management-by-
exception. For conceptual reasons, both items were included in the transactional factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ2</td>
<td>Re-examines critical assumptions to question appropriateness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ5</td>
<td>Talks about important values and beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ6</td>
<td>Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ7</td>
<td>Talks optimistically about the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ8</td>
<td>Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ11</td>
<td>Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ12</td>
<td>Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ13</td>
<td>Spends time teaching and coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ16</td>
<td>Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ17</td>
<td>Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ19</td>
<td>Acts in ways that build my respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ21</td>
<td>Considers moral and ethical consequences of decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ23</td>
<td>Displays a sense of power and confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ24</td>
<td>Articulates a compelling vision of the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ26</td>
<td>Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ27</td>
<td>Gets me to look at problems from many different angles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ28</td>
<td>Helps to develop my strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ29</td>
<td>Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ30</td>
<td>Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ32</td>
<td>Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Bass</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Factor structure for leadership variables (Continued).
Table 4.2 (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLQ3</th>
<th>Fails to interfere until problems are serious.</th>
<th>TACT</th>
<th>MBEP</th>
<th>.12</th>
<th>.56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ4</td>
<td>Focuses attention on mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.</td>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ10</td>
<td>Waits for things to go wrong before taking action.</td>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ15</td>
<td>Shows that he/she is a firm believer in &quot;if it ain't broke, don't fix it.&quot;</td>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ18</td>
<td>Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.</td>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ20</td>
<td>Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes and complaints.</td>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ22</td>
<td>Keeps track of all mistakes.</td>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ25</td>
<td>Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.</td>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependent Variables

Organizational effectiveness data were collected using one section of the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS) from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). This section, entitled “Performance and Actions of the Institution,” contains 31 items that evaluate respondent perceptions of an organization’s performance against the nine dimensions identified by Cameron (1978): Student Educational Satisfaction, Student Academic Development, Student Career Development, Student Personal Development, Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction, Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty, System Openness and Community Interaction, Ability to Acquire Resources, and Organizational Health.

The IPS is the product of a national research study whose intent was to assess how various institutional conditions were related to external environment, strategic competence, and effectiveness (Krakower & Niwa, 1985). The instrument is the most recent version of the survey initially developed by Cameron (1978).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis. The data collected using the IPS for this study were analyzed using the confirmatory factor analysis technique described previously and compared with Cameron’s nine-factor model. This analysis resulted in an RMSEA of .144, which indicates unacceptable fit for the nine-factor model.

Exploratory Factor Analysis. As a result of the lack of fit of the confirmatory model, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to identify the number and nature of latent variables inherent in the data. Seven factors emerged from this analysis. A review of these factors showed promising alignment with seven of the nine factors of the expected IPS model. The three items associated with Ability to Acquire Resources
(IPS3, IPS4, and IPS24) were dispersed, with IPS3 loading .40 or greater on factor 1 and factor 6, IPS4 loading on factor 2, and IPS24 failing to load more than .40 on any factor. The two items associated with Student Academic Development (IPS12R, and IPS13) were dispersed over two different factors. These items are listed in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expected Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPS3</td>
<td>Ability to Acquire Resources</td>
<td>This institution has a very high ability to obtain financial resources in order to provide a high quality educational program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS4</td>
<td>Ability to Acquire Resources</td>
<td>When hiring new faculty members, this institution can attract highly competent people in their respective fields to take a job here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS24</td>
<td>Ability to Acquire Resources</td>
<td>In relation to other colleges with which it competes, what proportion of the top students attend this institution rather than the competition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS12R</td>
<td>Student Academic Development</td>
<td>Estimate what percent of the graduates from this institution go on to obtain degrees from four-year colleges and universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS13</td>
<td>Student Academic Development</td>
<td>How many students would you say engage in extra academic work over and above what is specifically assigned in the classroom?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: IPS items with inconsistent loadings.

Closer examination of these items reveals why they may be problematic as indicators of effectiveness for the population in this study. Faculty perceptions in their college’s ability to obtain financial resources (IPS3) can be influenced by a number of factors. These factors include the college’s track record of funding attainment, the perception of the college’s prospects for funding in the future, and the perception of the
college's ability – or inability – to control its financial future, to name a few. The colleges in this study span a broad continuum with respect to their success in acquiring financial resources, as well as their ability to control funding levels. Funding models vary greatly from state to state, which would clearly impact the responses to this item. Items IPS4 and IPS24 address the “drawing power” of a college in attracting top-tier students and faculty. Many community colleges have an open-door policy, providing access to all students regardless of academic background or ability. Most community colleges recruit and hire faculty primarily from a local or regional pool of candidates. Unlike universities, it is fairly rare for faculty members to be recruited nationally.

Faculty responses to items IPS12R and IPS13 would be heavily influenced by the focus of their college and the particular students the individual faculty respondents serve. Colleges that have transfer as a primary mission would see stronger responses to both items than colleges who have technical training, developmental studies, or workforce development as their primary concern. Many colleges focus on all of these areas, which makes it even more difficult to include these items as indicators of effectiveness. For these reasons, the items associated with the Ability to Acquire Resources factor and the Student Academic Development factor (Table 4.3) were deemed poor measures of performance for this sample, and were removed from the analysis.

Factor analysis was re-run with these items removed, resulting in six factors. However, factor 6 contained only one item, IPS25R. This item asks respondents to evaluate student/faculty relationships on a continuum from unusual closeness with lots of informal interaction to no closeness with little informal interaction. This item is also problematic as a measure of community college effectiveness. In many community
colleges, a high percentage (50% or more) of course sections are taught by part-time faculty. Many of these part-time faculty teach one or two evenings a week, do not keep office hours, and are rarely on campus other than to teach. However, full-time faculty at community colleges are there almost exclusively to teach, versus the research responsibilities for faculty at many universities. Therefore, even though many community college faculty enjoy close relationships with their students, because of the abundant use of part-time faculty, the college as a whole may not have a close, interactive culture with regard to student/faculty relationships. For this reason, item IPS25R was removed.

Factor analysis was run once more, resulting in a five-factor model. This model proved to have close alignment with the remaining IPS factors. The four items associated with Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction (FAES) and the six items associated with Organizational Health (OH) loaded together on factor 1. Similarly, the three items associated with Student Personal Development (SPD) and the three items associated with System Openness and Community Interaction (SOCI) loaded together on factor 2. The items associated with Student Educational Satisfaction (SES), Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty (PDQF), and Student Career Development (SCD) each loaded on a unique factor – factors 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The five factors combined to explain 74% of the total variance.

For comparison purposes and on conceptual grounds, three-factor and four-factor models were also tested. Neither the three-factor or four-factor solutions were as strong analytically as the five-factor model. Student Career Development, an important indicator for community colleges, was not a strong factor in the three-factor solution.
Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty was weaker in the four-factor model.

Definition of Dependent Variables. In addition to being a promising analytical model, the five-factor solution has a strong conceptual basis as well. FAES and OH combine in factor 1 to create a factor called Organizational Health and Satisfaction (OHS) for the purposes of this study. This dimension ties to a number of models in the literature including Cameron and Tschirhart's (1992) concept of satisfaction and morale, Hoy and Miskel's (1996) measure of job satisfaction, Mott's (1972) dimension of stakeholder satisfaction, and Parsons's (1967) notion of integration.

SPD and SOCI combine in factor 2 to create a factor called Community Presence (CP). The items that comprise SPD relate to student experiences outside the classroom. At the community college, the majority of these experiences result from opportunities in the community, either through employment or service. These experiences are made possible by a strong presence of the college in the community it serves. The items that make up SOCI measure the connectedness of the college as a whole with community needs. The Community Presence dimension measures the ability of a college to connect its students and services to community needs. It links strongly to constructs such as responsiveness to external factors (Cameron & Tschirhart, 1992) and perceptions of school effectiveness (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Student Educational Satisfaction (SES) as a stand-alone factor ties directly to the concept of academic achievement (Cameron & Tschirhart, 1992; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Mott, 1972). Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty (PDQF) is growing in importance as a measure of community college performance. As more and more colleges
seek to integrate the notions of the learning organization (Senge, 1990) into the Learning College (O’Banion, 1997), this measure will grow in importance. *Student Career Development* (SCD) is uniquely important as a conceptual dimension of community college effectiveness. While not all community college students are there to transfer to a university or get a degree, the overwhelming majority has the goal of improving their skills and knowledge for the purpose of career advancement in some form. Indeed, workforce development is becoming one of the primary responsibilities of community colleges in the eyes of employers, legislators, and other key stakeholders (Alfred, et. al., 1999).

The rotated factor loadings for the five-factor model used in this analysis are reported in Table 4.4. The alpha coefficient was .94 for factor 1, .87 for factor 2, .93 for factor 3, .80 for factor 4, and .73 for factor 5. Two items, IPS1 and IPS7R had relatively high loadings on more than one factor. Although IPS1 (“One of the outstanding features of this institution is the opportunity it provides students for personal development in addition to academic development”) loaded slightly higher on factor 1, it aligns with the Student Personal Development factor from the IPS model, which is a better conceptual fit with the Community Presence factor. Similarly, IPS7R (“I am aware of a large number of student complaints regarding their educational experience here”) was included as part of the Student Educational Satisfaction factor, although it also had a relatively high loading on Organizational Health and Satisfaction.
Overall Effectiveness Measure. The correlation matrix for the two independent variables and the five dependent variables is reported in Table 4.5. The five effectiveness measures are intercorrelated, ranging from .25 to .70, with especially strong correlational relationships existing between Organizational Health and Satisfaction, Community Presence, and Student Educational Satisfaction. This relationship among dependent variables raised the possibility of a single measure of organizational effectiveness. In
order to test this possibility, a second order factor analysis was performed on the five effectiveness factors. According to Kerlinger (1986), second order factor analysis is a method of finding a simpler factor model when a large number of factors – and often a complex pattern of factors – emerges from the first factor analysis. By calculating the correlations between factors and factor analyzing again, a smaller number of factors may emerge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TFORM</th>
<th>TACT</th>
<th>OHS</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>PDQF</th>
<th>SCD</th>
<th>PERF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>- .41**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHS</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Correlation matrix for independent and dependent variables.
Note: Alpha coefficients are reported on the diagonal.  
* p<.05  
** p<.01
The result of the second order factor analysis procedure was a single factor solution, explaining 59% of the total variance. On this basis, the five effectiveness factors were combined to form a single measure called Organizational Performance (PERF). The resulting factor matrix is presented in Table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OHS</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Factor matrix for second order factor analysis.
Data Analysis

Hypotheses

The hypotheses presented in Chapter 2 are restated below:

*Hypothesis 1.* Transformational leadership factors, as demonstrated by community college presidents, will positively predict organizational performance in community colleges.

*Hypothesis 2.* Transactional leadership factors, as demonstrated by community college presidents, will negatively predict organizational performance in community colleges.

Based on the preceding analysis of independent and dependent variables, the hypotheses were tested using a single factor for transformational leadership, a single factor for transactional leadership, five factors measuring different elements of organizational effectiveness, and one overall measure of organizational performance.

To further investigate the relationship between leadership and organizational effectiveness, it was informative to consider other factors that may influence the predictive power of different leadership models. Gender of the president and size of the college are two factors that might affect the strength of the predictors. The role of gender in leadership behavior and effectiveness has been a topic of great interest in recent years. Sex discrimination and prejudicial stereotypes have favored men in leadership roles for many years. These stereotypes are disappearing in some sectors of society, as increasing numbers of women have risen to important leadership positions. In fact, some researchers in recent years have proposed that women are more qualified to lead modern organizations than men (Yukl, 1998).
Institutional size, as measured by headcount enrollment, is another factor of interest in understanding leadership behaviors of community college presidents. Community colleges in North America range in size from fewer that 1,000 to more than 60,000 students per year. Different leadership challenges exist for presidents of smaller colleges than for those of larger colleges. A number of researchers have found that the effectiveness of colleges and universities is negatively related to their size (Cameron and Tschirhart, 1992; Smart and Hamm, 1993a; Smart and Hamm, 1993b).

Therefore, it was useful to control for the factors of gender of the president and size of the college in this analysis to determine their influence, if any, on college effectiveness. Gender of the president and size of the institution were included as independent variables in the analysis.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple Regression Analysis was performed for the predictors of transformational (TFORM) and transactional (TACT) leadership against each of the five measures of effectiveness: Organizational Health and Satisfaction (OHS), Community Presence (CP), Student Educational Satisfaction (SES), Student Career Development (SCD), and Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty (PQDF).

The results of these analyses are included in Table 4.7. The overall $F$-test is significant for three of the five regression models. Therefore, the combination of transformational and transactional leadership factors is useful in predicting organizational performance for all effectiveness criteria except SCD and PDQF. The transformational/transactional model predicted 19.7% of the variance for the
organizational health and satisfaction criterion, 14.2% of the variance for community presence, and 22.3% of the variance for student educational satisfaction. The model predicted only 8.7% of the variance for student career development and only 9.6% of the variance for professional development and quality of the faculty.

Transformational leadership, as an individual predictor, explained a significant proportion of the variance in the effectiveness measures of OHS and CP. Transactional leadership was a negative predictor of SES. That is, as transactional leadership behaviors increase, student educational satisfaction will decrease based on this model. No individual predictors explained a significant proportion of the variance for either SCD or PDQF. Therefore, both hypotheses were partially supported. The transformational leadership factor positively predicted community college effectiveness based on the measures of organizational health and satisfaction and community presence. The transactional leadership factor negatively predicted community college effectiveness as measured by student educational satisfaction. However, no predictive relationship was found between either leadership factor and student career development or professional development and quality of the faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable and Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Health and Satisfaction</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>5.28**</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.348*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presence</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>3.55*</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Educational Satisfaction</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>6.16**</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.367*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Career Development</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Quality of the Faculty</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Summary of multiple regression analyses.
* p < .05
** p < .01
To test the potential impact of college size and gender of the president on these models, the multiple regression analyses described were run again with these independent variables added. The results were almost identical. There were no significant relationships between either size or gender with any of the measures of effectiveness, indicating that they are not influential predictors. The only difference was that the addition of these two factors caused the regression model for community presence to no longer be statistically significant. However, as an individual predictor, transformational leadership remained significant. These results are presented in Table 4.8. The overall correlation matrix for all variables including size and gender is included in Table 4.9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable and Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Health and Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.376*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of College</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of President</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Presence</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.336*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of College</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of President</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Educational Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>4.15**</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-0.334*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of College</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of President</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Career Development</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-0.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of College</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of President</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Quality of the Faculty</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of College</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of President</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Summary of multiple regression analyses, including size and gender.
* p < .05
** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TFORM</th>
<th>TACT</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>GDR</th>
<th>OHS</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>PDQF</th>
<th>SCD</th>
<th>PERF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFORM</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. Correlation matrix for independent and dependent variables, including size of college and gender of president.

Note: Alpha coefficients are reported on the diagonal.

* p<.05
** p<.01
Multiple regression was then run for the leadership factors and the overall measure of organizational performance (PERF). Results are included in Table 4.10. The combination of transformational and transactional leadership factors accounted for 22.6% of the variance in the overall measure of organizational performance. The overall $F$-statistic for the model indicated that the transformational/transactional model is useful in predicting organizational performance. The individual predictor of transformational leadership explained a significant proportion of the variance in the overall performance measure. As before, size and gender were then added to the model. The statistical results were unchanged, indicating that neither size of college nor gender of the president add to the regression model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable and Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>6.28**</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orginizational Performance</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>3.16*</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.346*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of College</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of President</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Summary of multiple regression analyses, including size and gender, for overall performance measure.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$
CHAPTER 5

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

The quantitative analysis in the preceding chapter provides a conceptual framework for understanding the relationship between the elements of presidential leadership and organizational performance. For a better understanding of the social complexities associated with the day-to-day events of leadership, personal interviews were conducted with six college presidents, who differ in the frequency of use of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors, and whose colleges differ with respect to perceived organizational effectiveness. This chapter provides an overview of qualitative analysis as a research method, comparing and contrasting this approach with quantitative methods, and making a case for the use of both methods for this study.

Following this overview, six cases of presidential leadership are presented as examples of the leadership and effectiveness profiles examined quantitatively in the preceding chapter. The profiles are compared, with a discussion of the similarities, differences, and results of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors demonstrated by the interview subjects.
Overview of Qualitative Analysis

A Continuum of Research Methods

Quantitative research – the use of numbers to describe phenomena – is the standard practice of advanced fields of science that can predict and control. The use of numbers has proven to be effective and efficient in describing scientific events and observations. Some experts, however, believe that because certain characteristics have not yet been measured adequately, narrative descriptions are a more appropriate method of analyzing information and developing conclusions (Krathwohl, 1998). Qualitative data, in the form of words rather than numbers, have always been a standard of the social sciences. In recent years, more and more researchers in fields with a traditional quantitative emphasis, such as psychology, organizational studies, and educational research, have begun to include qualitative methods in their work (Miles and Huberman, 1984). At the current level of development of the social sciences, both the quantitative and qualitative approaches have merit.

Distinct differences exist between quantitative and qualitative methods. Although both can be used in exploratory studies, quantitative methods are more often used to test a possible explanation. Qualitative methods are more useful in developing explanations. Qualitative researchers construct an understanding based on observed natural behavior, whereas quantitative researchers gather data to support a hypothesized relationship. The quantitative researcher is concerned with an objective reality that can be discovered. The qualitative researcher is interested in how people perceive their situation. Quantitative
research emphasizes a cause-and-effect relationship between variables, while qualitative research focuses on the description of the development of a process (Krathwohl, 1998).

The concept of a quantitative-qualitative continuum has emerged in much of the social science literature. The inclusion of qualitative inquiry has been adopted by researchers who originally took "hard-nosed," quantitative approaches to problems in which valid knowledge was to be generated (Miles and Huberman, 1984). Newman and Benz (1998) contend that "all behavioral research is made up of a combination of qualitative and quantitative constructs" (p. 9). They maintain that viewing quantitative and qualitative analysis as a dichotomy is inconsistent with the philosophy of science, and that "the notion of a continuum is the only construct that fits what we know in a scientific sense." The concept of a continuum provides a comprehensive approach to evaluating complex problems, with each approach adding to the results achieved by the other. Because of this, more and more researchers are combining the elements of methods in any way that makes the best sense for the study they want to do (Krathwohl, 1998).

The Use of Multiple Methods in Leadership Research

Yukl (1998) describes the controversy surrounding whether the future of leadership research should continue the emphasis on quantitative, hypothesis-testing research, or place more emphasis on descriptive, quantitative research. Critics of the quantitative approach point to the inherent bias they think exists toward exaggerating the importance of individual leaders. Another criticism is the fact that most quantitative research on leadership is done through questionnaires, as is the present study. Yukl
points out that doubts have been raised regarding the utility of such instruments in leadership research, and holds the position that questionnaires make it difficult to study leadership as a dynamic process within complex social environments.

Critics of quantitative research advocate the use of more descriptive methods such as interviews and case studies, contending that such methods are better suited for studying leadership from a systems perspective. However, others argue that the application, evaluation, and interpretation of qualitative methods are less explicit than a quantitative approach, and can lead very subjective conclusions. Based on the limitations of both methods, Yukl (1998) concludes that it is desirable to use multiple methods in research on leadership.

The Qualitative Approach

Qualitative data are a source of well-grounded explanations of processes occurring in local contexts. With qualitative data, chronological flow is preserved and local conditions can be assessed. Qualitative data help researchers go beyond initial preconceptions and frameworks to develop a more meaningful conclusion than tables of numbers can do alone (Miles and Huberman, 1984). Qualitative research focuses on the "thick description" of social settings. It does not attempt to be representative, but concentrates instead on explaining social processes in great detail, providing a strong potential for revealing complexity (Slavin, 1992). One major feature of qualitative data is that they focus on ordinary events in natural settings. With their emphasis on people's real-life experience, they are fundamentally well suited for locating the meanings people place on the events, processes, and structures of their situation. Qualitative research
focuses on their perceptions, assumptions, and opinions, and how these connect to their world (Miles and Huberman, 1984).

**Interviews**

One of the primary data collection tools in the qualitative approach is the personal interview. It is a major means of tapping thought processes – of gaining knowledge of a person’s perceptions, feelings, or emotions, or to study a complex personal construct (Krathwohl, 1998). The interviews in this study were particularly useful to determine what was especially significant about each president’s approach to leadership. The interviews helped to determine how they perceived their situation, what was significant about leadership that led to effective organizations, and what they saw as the biggest challenges for community colleges in the future.

The interviews conducted in this study were partially structured interviews. In a partially structured interview, a general area to probe is chosen and questions are formulated but the order is up to the interviewer. The interviewer may add questions or modify them as appropriate. Questions are open-ended, and responses are recorded nearly verbatim, possibly taped (Krathwohl, 1998). The interview protocol for these interviews is included in Appendix C. Each president was asked the same general questions. However, based on their responses and the flow of the dialogue, other areas and questions were pursued as appropriate.

The six presidents interviewed were selected purposefully based on their leadership orientation (transactional, transformational, or both) and the overall effectiveness measure for the college (PERF) based on the results in Chapter 4.
Judgments were made based on the relative scores of the sample in this study. For example, a college whose PERF score was higher than the average of the sample was considered "effective" for the purpose of selecting interview subjects.

The presidents were contacted via a personal letter from the researcher, thanking them for their participation in the survey, and requesting a personal interview. Five interviews were done via telephone and one was conducted personally. All interviews were taped, and later transcribed for analysis. Each president supplied biographical information, and descriptive information of their institutions was provided by the colleges via the World Wide Web.

Anonymity of the presidents and their colleges was assured at the time the interview was scheduled. This was very important so that the presidents could speak freely, and so that documentation, analysis, and dissemination of the interviews would not have a damaging effect. In order to ensure anonymity, descriptive information on the presidents and colleges in the case examples that follow are fictitious. Names of the presidents, gender of the presidents, and names of the colleges are fictional. The paraphrases, direct quotes, and analyses of the interviews in the cases are factual and derived directly from the transcripted interviews. Among the actual subjects, one is Caucasian female, one is African-American male, and four are Caucasian males. One president demonstrated high levels of both transformational and transactional qualities, two only transformational qualities, and three only transactional qualities. Three of the colleges represented in the interviews were considered more effective, and three were considered less effective based on the criteria described previously. A summary of the
leadership and effectiveness profiles of the subjects and their colleges, using the fictitious names of the case studies, is included in Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Transformational Tendencies?</th>
<th>Transactional Tendencies?</th>
<th>Above Avg. Organizational Performance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Leadership and effectiveness profiles of interview subjects.

Each interview was transcribed verbatim for analysis purposes. Since only six subjects were interviewed, a straightforward coding method was used to analyze the data. Initially, the questions from the interview protocol provided the coding structure. Interview responses to each of the questions were grouped and analyzed for consistencies and contradictions. Secondly, key leadership constructs from the literature were used as a coding structure to organize and analyze the interviews. Specific emphasis was placed on the factors that underlie the transformational and transactional leadership constructs. These two approaches to coding enabled the researcher to synthesize the interview data and draw conclusions based on the six interviews.

Research Questions

The purpose of the interviews was to provide additional meaning to the quantitative analysis by linking the numbers to examples, events, assumptions, and opinions described by some of the presidents who experience the effects of leadership
every day. Additionally, the interviews enabled the researcher to probe in areas that were not considered by the survey research. Specifically, since the independent variables were reduced to a transformational and a transactional factor, the interviews provided an opportunity to pursue the underlying constructs of transformational and transactional leadership from Bass's (1985) original model. Questions were formulated to address the transformational factors of attributed charisma, idealized influence, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. Questions were also designed to address active and passive management-by-exception, the transactional leadership qualities addressed in the survey research. And although it was excluded from the quantitative analysis, a line of questioning on rewards was included to probe Bass's transactional construct of contingent reward.

This interview framework provided input into addressing the following research questions:

1. Does the conceptual model of transformational and transactional leadership hold based on the qualitative data acquired? Are the individual constructs that make up Bass's (1985) model of transformational and transactional leadership apparent?

2. What key differences are inherent in the leadership approaches of transformational presidents and transactional presidents?

The six cases examples developed from the presidential interviews are presented next, followed by an analysis and integration of the key interview points.
President Wilson – Eastern Community College

Eastern Community College is located in a rural/suburban area of a state whose economy relies on agriculture and light industry. The college is comprised of multiple campuses serving parts of five counties. Students come from both urban and rural communities. The college was created in the early 1990's as the result of a merger between two established colleges. The college provides vocational, technical, academic, and lifelong educational opportunities for its students. It states as its purpose to promote economic growth and to enhance the quality of life for the citizens in its service area. The college serves approximately 1800 students annually, with 70 full-time and 160 part-time faculty. There is no faculty union at Eastern.

Eastern’s president, Dr. Wilson, is a former college football player and was a successful high school coach before entering higher education. He has been president since 1987 after 10 years of experience in student services. He openly loves his job, stating “I’m still as excited to come in the morning as I was the first day.” Based on the survey research at this college, President Wilson demonstrates high levels of both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. His college is an effective institution as perceived by his faculty as measured by the above average organizational performance score in this sample.

In describing his approach to leadership, Dr. Wilson uses words like loyalty, honesty, trust, and enthusiasm. His primary focus is on serving students, and his leadership style revolves around that premise. He believes that the best thing he can do
to help students is to provide strong support for faculty, saying "Good strong faculty is the backbone of the institution because what goes on in the classroom’s what’s most important." Demonstrating transformational leadership qualities, he applies his coaching experience to his relationship with faculty, spending much of his time coaching, mentoring, and listening to faculty concerns.

He is very active in the community, and sits on numerous boards. He sees it as his role to translate the needs of the community into actions for the college, defining reality in the way that Bennis and Nanus (1985) describe transformational leaders. He sees a reciprocal relationship between the college and the community. “If you're President at a college, you’re gonna have to have people in the community that help you, and you’ve gotta be able to help them. So, my philosophy’s always been to give something first, and then maybe something will come back to you in the future.”

Dr. Wilson demonstrates the transformational behavior of individualized consideration in the way he communicates with faculty. He shuns traditional faculty meetings, but chooses instead to host faculty lunches, meeting with groups of ten at a time. “I always tell them to talk about anything, but not anybody,” he says. He believes that this process enables him to maintain an open-door policy with his faculty, a policy that faculty take advantage of and that facilitates open, honest communication. He believes that this creates an environment that influences faculty-student relationships in a positive way.

When discussing his approach to implementing change, he described behaviors that were transactional in nature. “I’m a follow-up type person. I give somebody responsibility, and then I want to follow up. And then if I continue following up, and I
don’t see anything happening, then I’ll make it happen myself. I’ll step in.” He indicated that he tries to give everyone the opportunity to do his or her job, and tries to delegate as much as possible, but in the end he feels that it’s his responsibility to make sure tasks are accomplished as planned. “If they’re not doing their job, then I’m either gonna know why, or I’m going to assign that job to somebody else. I’m gonna get somebody else in that position.”

In the discussion of rewards, he did not mention tangible rewards such as pay incentives, travel opportunities, or additional resources, indicating the absence of contingent reward behaviors. He thinks individualized recognition is important for those who do outstanding work, emphasizing non-material rewards. He takes every opportunity to call someone who has performed well or stop by their office, or “sometimes just meeting them in the hall and saying ‘I appreciate what you did.’” However, he did demonstrate contingent punishment tendencies, indicating that expectations were high, and he did not support providing extra, tangible incentives for specific tasks. When asked what kinds of rewards people might get for a job well done, he replied, “Well, they know they’re gonna get to keep their jobs.”

Dr. Wilson believes that the biggest challenges facing community colleges are technology-related. The ability to help faculty utilize technology to reach new and different students, and the ability of students to grasp new technologies in both learning and workplace environments are important emerging keys to community college success. He believes that this challenge is especially daunting in a distance education medium. He has told his faculty that one of their biggest challenges is to ensure high quality learning experiences using media such as video and the Internet.
Western Community College is a small college located in a mountainous region. It is a comprehensive community college, which serves residents of five rural counties. It operates under a state board for community colleges. Its stated mission is to ensure that the individuals it serves have the opportunity to extend their skills and knowledge through quality programs that are accessible both financially and geographically. The college emphasizes its important role in the broader community, with specific emphasis on its relationships with employers as well as with other educational institutions. The college serves approximately 2500 students each year and has 50 full-time faculty.

Dr. Smith has been at Western for over 20 years, working her way up through various faculty and administrative positions. She has been president since 1985. The survey research found Western to be perceived as an effective institution. Dr. Smith’s leadership style was perceived as primarily transactional in nature based on the faculty respondents.

When asked about her vision for Western, and how she developed it, she spoke of the college’s “vision statement.” She believes that an effective president is committed to the mission of the college, and sensitive to the needs of the people who work to accomplish that mission. “As far as my vision, I don’t have a separate vision from the college’s vision. My role is to accomplish the mission of the college.” This approach is consistent with the nature of transactionally oriented leaders, whose focus is to keep the system running within the constraints of the organization (Tichy and Devanna, 1990).
When asked about how she articulates the vision, she indicated that the college’s vision statement was printed and displayed at various locations around campus.

Dr. Smith talked about her process for initiating and managing change using formal, structured language. She described the key to successful change initiatives is to get the critical players involved to design “both the change and its instrumentation.” She said a typical change process at her college involves “a lot of time in study groups and various types of teams” to evaluate problems and potential solutions. “And then when it’s done we distribute it widely” through channels such as the president’s staff and the president’s executive team. She said that this is to ensure that everyone who is impacted understands the need for the change and the implementation process.

When asked what she does when something does not go as planned, she replied that her response depended on the situation. She felt compelled to step in immediately if a process was proceeding based on non-factual information or on dishonesty. In other situations, she is more passive, even if the outcome might cause contention among institutional members. “Sometimes, I simply just have to ride it out, convinced that the proper decision’s been made, and there be some controversy about it, and it’s the right thing to do. Sometimes you have to ride it out and time usually will take care of it.” This approach is reflective of passive management-by-exception (Bass, 1985).

Like many transactional leaders, contingent reward is part of President Smith’s leadership approach. Merit pay and special funding were mentioned as important rewards at her college. She oversees a number of formal, annual awards that recognize outstanding teaching and outstanding service. This type of approach to rewards has been found reasonably effective in the literature (Bass, 1985). But she also emphasized the
importance of more personal, informal rewards, saying, “I think the important thing is that I write a note to someone or I give them a call or I stop by to see them when they’ve accomplished something really noteworthy.”

Dr. Smith demonstrates individualized consideration – a transformational factor – in her relationships with faculty. She tries to maintain a personal relationship with each of the faculty members at her college. She believes that this is easier for her to do since she has been there for a long period of time, and has had other roles on campus prior to her presidency. She spends half her time on external activities, and believes that it is a very important part of her job.

President Smith believes that the biggest challenge facing community colleges today is “not to be diverted from the mission.” She also believes that a college’s ability to serve students with different learning styles will be an important indicator of success. She believes that technology can help serve students with different needs, but the implementation of such technology will provide other challenges with respect to funding and professional development.

President Patrick – Hillside Community College

Hillside Community College is one of four community colleges in a large urban district in a growing region of the United States. It employs 250 people, including 50 full time faculty, to serve approximately 2,000 students. Dr. Patrick has been president at Hillside for over eight years. In the survey research, his leadership style was perceived to be transactional by the faculty who responded, and the effectiveness of the college was viewed as below average based on the survey sample.
When asked what makes a college president effective, Dr. Patrick talked about a genuine commitment to the mission of the college, a commitment to its purpose. He believes that this commitment must focus on student success. He said that effective presidents work hard to learn the details of the college operation, such as student services and the bookstore, so that they will be in a position to better serve students.

When asked about his vision for the college, Dr. Patrick described the process they followed to develop the college’s mission statement. He is the second president in the college’s history. When he arrived, Hillside was 18 months from its first accreditation visit as an independent college. Dr. Patrick led a very structured process to develop the mission statement, engaging many people from the outside community and from the college. This process led to what he described as “a real traditional mission statement,” with a few specific emphases on things like diversity and customer service. He believes that the president can influence the vision – not necessarily create it – and that it must be developed “over time with input from a lot of the players.”

Dr. Patrick believes that culture is more important than vision, and that a president’s success is directly related to the overall “fit” between the president and the culture of the college. “You step into an existing culture...You can go (all the way) back to the selection process. I believe that the presidents and colleges that are successful together oftentimes are colleges and presidents who have done a good job of choosing one another.” He believes the president can influence the culture, but only with a sense of the organization and it’s tolerance for change, saying “If you move too fast or try to change too harshly, it’ll break.”
Dr. Patrick’s approach to initiating change relies on Bass’s concept of contingent reward, or what President Patrick refers to as “carrot-and-stick.” In order to encourage individuals to try new things or move in certain directions, he provides specific, tangible rewards such as technology resources (new computers, etc.), reduced teaching loads, or additional travel money.

When asked when he feels compelled to intervene in a process that is not going as planned, he laughed and replied “more often than I should.” But he feels that his primary responsibility in such cases is to intervene “in a way that helps people not lose face, or crash and burn in a way that might be personally damaging to them.”

He spends about half of his time on off-campus activities, and gets great enjoyment from participating in the Chamber of Commerce, rotary clubs, and hospital boards. It is one of the real joys of his job to “tell the community college story.”

President Gerard – Suburban Community College

Suburban Community College is located on the outskirts of a large metropolitan area. It’s 50 full-time faculty serve approximately 800 students. The faculty are unionized. The state in which suburban is located has recently merged the technical colleges, community colleges, and universities from three independent entities into one governance structure. With its roots as a technical college, it is a period of adjustment for Suburban.

Dr. Gerard has been President at Suburban for less than two years. This is his first presidency, having come from an administrative position at a college in a different state. The survey research indicated that Dr. Gerard’s faculty view him as demonstrating
high transformational leadership qualities. Their perception of the overall effectiveness of their college was below average based on the sample in this study.

When describing what he thought made an effective president, Dr. Gerard used terms like passion, vision, core values, and honesty. In describing the motivation of his faculty, he used phrases like "pretty noble ideas" and "they want to change lives." He said that a successful president needs "a good set of personal values, and a strong passion for what you’re doing...a strong belief that what you’re doing is the most important thing you could be doing in your life because if you don’t really have that passion, then a lot of other stuff will distract you from it."

His vision for the college grew out of his own experiences, his beliefs regarding the role community colleges should play in society, and the needs of the local community as he came to understand them. Of articulating his vision for the college, he said the president must "translate it into terms that will move other people and that’ll create consensus and excitement about what you’re all about and what you’re doing.” He spends over 60% of his time on internal activities to help build energy around a common vision. This sentiment displays the transformational quality of inspirational motivation. Bennis and Nanus (1985) maintain that the ability to influence and organize meaning for the members of the organization, and generate enthusiasm and commitment around the ensuing vision is a requirement for a successful leader.

President Gerard described the situation at Suburban upon his arrival as "chaos." Before announcing or even developing a plan of action, he took time to learn more about the circumstances of the college and its people, stating
The first thing I needed to do when I got here was walk around for about the first month with my hands in my pockets and not really try to go in with any kind of grand, earth-shaking scheme. But just to understand the culture of the place, how it got to be where it is, and how that culture plays itself out in the way people think and what they value, how they feel about the work and the work environment.

This approach is consistent with the transformational leader's emphasis on creative, well-developed ideas rather than on immediate action (Podsakoff, et al, 1990). The focused attention on listening to the needs and concerns of others is also an important component of transformational leadership (Yukl, 1998).

Dr. Gerard places a great deal of emphasis on shared decision-making and shared-governance. He believes that it is critical that faculty "have a voice in where this thing is going. And then that voice finds expression in the strategies that we use to get where we all wanna go. I find that all grows out of core values." He believes that it is important that faculty not only sit in meetings or participate in discussions, but that it is also important for them to lead.

As an example of his approach to shared governance, Dr. Gerard described his Leadership Team process. The Leadership Team is a group of fourteen people made up of the vice presidents, deans of the college, chair of the support staff group, president of the faculty union, and others around campus. The agenda for each Monday afternoon meeting is built collaboratively by the group during the preceding week, and e-mailed to everyone on campus on Monday morning. Dr. Gerard encourages everyone to participate, stating "if you see on that agenda something of importance to you, you just
show up. And you're accorded the same voice as anyone else that shows up. It doesn't matter if they're the VP or head janitor.” This approach – based on trust and mutual respect – is reflective of the intellectual stimulation factor of transformational leadership. Covey (1991) maintains that if trust is present, then clear communication, empathy, synergy, and productive interdependency are likely to be present as well, as in Suburban’s Leadership Team process.

In discussing his process for initiating change, Dr. Gerard described the unique nature of institutions of higher education. Keller (1992) found that transformational leadership had a positive impact on organizations in which the work force was highly educated. Dr. Gerard described the same phenomenon. In traditional organizations, he said, “the higher you went in the organization, the more educated the people were and the more informed and the broader their area of expertise. Now, you look at a college, and that’s turned on its head, because your faculty, more often than not, are as educated, and sometimes more educated, than your leadership.” Dr. Gerard believes strongly that organizational members in colleges have their own views, and they want to learn, so an important element of the change process is education. The education process involves everyone, he maintains. As the president, he learns along with faculty what work needs to be done and the best way to accomplish it. This approach ties directly to one of Burns’s (1978) original premises of transformational leadership, in which leaders and followers elevate each other’s levels of understanding and motivation.

Dr. Gerard occasionally uses the power of his position when something does not go as planned, stating
I think you have to, as President, recognize that you got there because you have your own level of expertise in certain areas, and that's important...Good stewardship for a president involves knowing what you know...It doesn't give you the right to run over anybody. It gives you the right to express your opinion and then expect that, also, to be questioned.

This method relates to the notion of personal power. Bass (1960) held that leaders can develop personal power through expertise, consideration for others, and friendship. Personal power was an early element in transformational leadership research.

Dr. Gerard believes that the one of the biggest challenges facing community colleges is the growing emphasis on accountability. Community colleges must prove that they are a good investment. A second major challenge is what he refers to as “mission-creep.” “Inherent in our set of values is a pre-disposition to want to be all things to all people, and given dwindling resources, that's not as possible as it used to be.” This led to a third challenge, which is reduced resources. Community colleges are going to have to be even more innovative about funding, and providing cost effective alternatives to delivering educational services. Distance delivery represents an opportunity for community colleges to do business differently, but it also represents a threat in the form of increased competition. “We have to refine our market even more rigorously, and be very, very good at a reduced set of functions.”

Dr. Jones – Metropolitan Community College

Metro Community College is a large, urban comprehensive community college located in a medium sized industrial city. A number of large employers have left the city
in recent years, and the city leaders have been working to save and create jobs for its citizens. Metro has 180 full-time faculty and serves 12,000 students each quarter. The faculty are unionized, and there are four other labor unions represented on campus.

Dr. Jones arrived at Metro as President seven years ago. Starting as a faculty member, he held a number of progressively more responsible administrative jobs at various institutions before his presidency. Based on the survey research, the faculty at Metro see it as below average with regard to organizational performance. They perceive Dr. Jones as demonstrating transactional leadership behaviors with high frequency.

President Jones came into a difficult situation at Metro, one that he describes as "chaos." In his words, "Nothing in the whole place worked." With five unions on campus, communication was poor and morale was low. He felt the need to act quickly. Working with the board, he focused on two especially troubled areas. These actions would set the tone for his presidency. His focus on immediate action is reflective of transactional qualities (Podsakoff, et al, 1990). Dr. Jones admits that the environment may have dictated a different leadership style than he might have otherwise employed. Yukl (1998) held that directive leadership that provides structured guidance can be effective when the task is unstructured and complex. Some leaders revert to transactional leadership behaviors in times of uncertainty (Bass, 1985).

In describing his leadership philosophy, Dr. Jones uses military metaphors such as "battle scars," "turf," "border skirmishes." When asked what it takes to be an effective president, he says, "a good president knows it's more important to win the war and not individual battles." Like other transactional leaders, there is a bottom-line focus to his
approach (Covey, 1991) when he says an effective president “is not involved in process, but is involved in results.”

He relied heavily on substantial community input to shape his vision for the college. When asked how he developed his vision for the college, he stated, “I don’t think I had a vision… I worked on creating institutional values and then brought the community in to work with the faculty and the college community to develop the institutional vision.”

He sought to use experts and stakeholders from outside of the college to create the need for change and a vision of the future state of the organization. He believed that in this public arena, faculty would be reluctant to articulate opposing — and at times irrational, in his judgment — points of view. Based on these public forums, specific college objectives would be developed to meet the defined needs of the community. And since all college parties were represented at these forums, there would be acceptance of the direction, according to his methodology. “The alliance with the community itself can be the means for driving the new mindset,” he says. He then attempted to use the externally defined vision and enabling processes to mitigate peace on campus. “A broadly communicated vision is a wonderful tool for resolving conflict. Without a common vision, a range of small border skirmishes over turf, based on individual egos, may occur.”

Transactional leaders react to problems generated by system disturbances, and are always aware of organizational constraints (Tichy and Devanna, 1990). By engaging the public in this manner, Dr. Jones sought to create a disturbance to the system — the need to
do things differently to meet community needs. In doing so, his hope was to overcome organizational constraints, such as a reluctance to change processes or add new programs.

Instead of vision, Dr. Jones relied heavily on politics. By forming coalitions with outside groups, he sought to define a desired objective, and put public pressure on organizational members to pursue the objective. Coalition building is a common political process in organizations (Pfeffer, 1981).

This process caused Dr. Jones to spend over 75% of his time in the community, leaving little time to spend with campus constituents. “The VPs were expected to run the place. The role of the president is to make connections,” he held. He relied on his vice presidents to notify him of problems, or of anything “political.” The transactional leader often follows a management-by-exception process, not giving directions unless the routine methods produce undesired results (Bass, 1998).

President Jones admits that his leadership approach is unusual. When asked how he responded when things did not go as planned, he replied “Nothing ever didn’t go as planned, because I didn’t have any plans...you’re only building piece by piece. You don’t have any plans at all.” He admitted that this approach was complex and cumbersome. By forming the strategy based on a reaction to each event, it is impossible to engage others in the decision-making process. The leader in such a process must determine every subsequent action on an incremental basis. “You have to be able to dance well,” he concludes. A reactive versus a proactive posture is typical of the transactional leader. This approach does not allow the leader/follower relationship to go beyond the completion of incremental tasks. There is no ongoing purpose that holds them together (Bass and Avolio, 1990).
When asked to discuss the challenges faced by college presidents, Dr. Jones said that presidential leadership at the community college was very different when colleges were growing as a general rule. "It's really very different when things just keep growing. Growth determines how successful you are," he said. Presidents are continually torn between the needs of the community and the needs of the faculty. He concludes that the successful president must manage the diverse needs of stakeholder groups: "Presidents can fall into the pattern of responding positively to industry and falling short in terms of communicating to faculty, or being executive secretary to the faculty and keeping the community college from in any way meeting the needs of business. The ability to balance is critical."

Dr. Porter – County Community College

County Community College is located in a mid-sized urban industrial city. The college is a large, single-campus entity serving over 20,000 students each year. There are 400 non-unionized faculty members at County. The college has been a presence in the downtown area for more than a century. Although it conferred associates degrees much earlier, it became sanctioned by the state as a community college in 1965. As a comprehensive community college, it serves a variety of community needs, including short-term technical training, developmental studies, and baccalaureate transfer. During the past 20 years, this college has played an important role in economic and workforce development. The physical plant, inventory of programs, and student body has grown in response to specific economic development needs.
Dr. Porter has been at County for 35 years, beginning as a faculty member. He was named President two years ago. The survey research indicates that his faculty view him as a transformational leader, and they see their college as effective relative to the other schools in the sample.

When asked what makes a president effective, Dr. Porter’s simple reply was “vision.” His vision comes from within, and from his deep understanding of the college and the community. He thinks that it is critical that a president be able to make connections for people among things that might not seem connected initially. This links directly to a transformational president’s ability to define reality for organizational members. Bass (1998) holds that charismatic leaders have a unique ability for seeing what is really important. Instead of relying on outsiders to form his vision, Dr. Porter trusts his intuition. This is characteristic of the transformational leader (Tichy and Devanna, 1990).

A second important factor for successful presidents, Dr. Porter believes, is open, honest communication. An environment of trust is essential. “It’s impossible to be a great president without having good positive relationships with not only the employees of the institution but with the community. And that’s something you have to work very hard at because people often find it difficult to come to you because you are the president.” Dr. Porter believes that the trait that damages presidents most is being “secretive.” Covey (1991) said that the key to an intellectually stimulating environment is trust. He maintains that if trust is present, then clear communication, empathy, synergy, and productive interdependency are likely to be present as well. Intellectual stimulation is an important component of transformational leadership.
Although external needs play an important role in the substance of the vision, the president must shape it conceptually and provide a context for the institution, according to Dr. Porter. Bennis and Nanus (1985) agree, maintaining that leaders must interpret and define reality for their followers. With regard to articulating the vision, Dr. Porter concedes that this is very difficult, stating:

You can’t call a meeting and give them the vision and count on the fact that they’ve bought in. You dribble it out a little at a time. Many times you don’t have the whole picture painted. You want employees to help you paint the picture. But you gotta have a sense of direction. Then people give you ideas and enrich it and probably end up making it better than you originally thought it could be.

This is consistent with the spirit of Burns’s (1978) view that transformational leadership creates an environment that elevates the capacity of both the leader and the led. In a transformational environment, the leader is not looked upon for – nor does he or she expect to provide – all the answers.

President Porter works hard to maintain personal relationships with those at the college. He concedes that this is difficult in a large organization, but it starts with being yourself. He warns against being too “high brow,” advising that “there’s a balance between being presidential and being human.” He sends birthday cards to every employee in the institution – more than one thousand each year. In writing the message on each card, he reviews the employee’s most recent performance evaluation in order to reinforce personal goals and accomplishments. Additionally, he tries to spend time walking around campus. “People think you’re going from one place to another, but
you’re really not. You have no destination except to talk to people.” These actions tie
directly to the transformational behavior of individualized consideration.
Transformational leaders pay special attention to each follower’s needs for achievement
and growth. To accomplish this, Dr. Porter spends only 35 to 40% of her time on
external activities. “But I could spend 80%. They (the community) would eat you alive
if you let them.”

When it comes to initiating change, President Porter emphasizes well thought-out
ideas rather than immediate action, consistent with research on intellectual stimulation
(Podsakoff, et al, 1990). “I’m a believer that you don’t create the change, you create the
environment for the people of the institution to carry out the change.” But, he concedes
that this approach is time consuming. “When you do things that way, you do not change
quickly.” However, Dr. Porter is quick to point out that this approach will not be
successful in times of crisis, stating

If you’re in a poor organization, then you can’t use those strategies. If
you’re in an organization that needs dramatic change immediately, you
gotta have a leader that says “these are the ten things we’re going to do,
and we gotta implement them,” and you put a few people around you that
are going to help you implement and you plow ahead and you just put up
with all the (negativity) that you know is going to be associated with it
because time is not on your side.

This is consistent with Yukl (1998), who maintained that directive leadership is
sometimes required to provide structure and clarity to a complex situation.
President Porter believes that the greatest challenge facing community colleges lies in the need to provide education to more students with more diverse needs to prepare them for the new world of work of the 21st century. It's a "massive thing" for colleges to develop a nurturing environment for more fragile students, and for students with specific needs. He believes that emerging technologies can help to create new learning environments that can meet individualized needs of students. However, the technology itself creates other challenges. First of all, the effective use of new learning technologies requires substantial and on-going professional development. Secondly, technology creates cost structures that are much different than colleges generally see. The capital expenditures up front are large, but ongoing operating costs can be reduced based on effective implementation. And thirdly, technology – especially information technology and the Internet – has opened the door for more and more competition in higher education. Much of this competition comes from private companies, with more money, more market savvy, and much less bureaucracy than community colleges. College presidents in this environment must be much more aware of the opportunities and threats posed by technology, and must have a clear vision of how to take advantage of such an environment.
Evaluation of Research Questions

Bass and Avolio (1997) held that transformational and transactional leadership factors combine to create a model they call the “full range of leadership.” They maintain that effective leaders utilize both transactional and transformational behaviors, but the most effective leaders are those who are predominantly transformational. It is these leaders who engage followers in working toward excellence, who provide an environment of growth and creativity, and who achieve better results in terms of employee satisfaction and organizational performance. Based on the analysis of the six interviews conducted in this study, this model holds. The differences between presidents that are primarily transformational and those that are primarily transactional are not always dramatic, but are often subtle, and may be situational. An evaluation of each research question follows.

Evaluation of Research Question 1

The first research question is restated below:

1. Does the conceptual model of transformational and transactional leadership hold based on the qualitative data acquired? Are the individual constructs that make up Bass’s (1985) model of transformational and transactional leadership apparent?

A basic premise of Bass’s (1985) model is that transformational and transactional qualities can exist in the same leader. This concept was evident in the interviews. Each president interviewed described behaviors of both factors, regardless of their quantitative profile from the survey research. Each of the components in Bass’s model are evaluated.
Attributed Charisma/Idealized Influence/Inspirational Motivation. Each of the transformational presidents (Wilson, Gerard, and Porter) displayed these components of charisma to varying degrees. They each approached their jobs with strong personal convictions and deeply rooted values. Their ideals, coupled with their emphasis on consistent, open communication enabled them to generate an exceptionally high degree of trust. These qualities are consistent with the charisma-related factors of transformational leadership (House, 1977; Bass, 1990). The transactional presidents interviewed (Smith, Jones, and Patrick) relied more on external factors than on internal convictions as the source of their vision.

Individualized Consideration. The transformational presidents each demonstrated the importance of listening, coaching, and mentoring in their leadership approach. In their own way, they tried to maintain personal relationships with each of the members of their organizations, through means such as cards, phone calls, and personal visits. Most of the transactional presidents interviewed demonstrated this quality as well.

Intellectual Stimulation. Organizational trust is a requirement for an environment to be intellectually stimulating. Only when trust is present can there be clear communication, true synergy, and interdependency – important elements in developing a climate of free-flowing dialogue and ideas (Covey, 1991). The transformational presidents worked to establish such an environment at their institutions. They accomplished this through things like participative leadership such as Wilson's faculty lunches or Gerard's Leadership Team. Trust was less evident in the discussions with the transactional presidents.
Management-by-Exception. The transactional presidents displayed both active and passive management-by-exception tendencies when asked about processes not going as planned. Although all of the presidents interviewed indicated that they would insert themselves into a process under certain situations, the transactional presidents were quicker to do so.

Contingent Reward. Although all of the presidents interviewed used rewards to achieve certain ends, the transactional presidents demonstrated more contingent reward behaviors, offering tangible dividends for specific tasks. Although not addressed in the quantitative analysis of this study, contingent reward is a transactional leadership factor in Bass’s (1985) model. The transformational presidents interviewed favored less formal, more personal rewards for their employees – rewards not necessarily associated with a “carrot-and-stick” model.

Evaluation of Research Question 2

The second research question is restated below:

2. What key differences are inherent in the leadership approaches of transformational presidents and transactional presidents?

Aside from the individual elements of transformational and transactional leadership discussed in relation to the first research question, the presidents differed consistently with respect to two broad integrating themes of leadership: their approach to developing and articulating their vision and their approach to communication.

Vision. In the most significant study to date on transformational leadership and community college presidents, vision was the most significant theme that emerged
(Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989). So it is appropriate to evaluate the transformational and transactional presidents based on their approach to vision. The transactional presidents interviewed were generally reactive to outside stakeholders, enabling community "experts" to define their vision for them. The transformational presidents get outside input as well, but they use this input to create their own vision, or in many cases to validate their vision. They are proactive in defining their vision, using stakeholders to influence it, but also selling it to stakeholders based on an inherent set of core values. It is significant, and somewhat surprising, that the transactional presidents spend more time outside the college working with external constituencies than transformational presidents. Transactional presidents learn from the community, and try to implement an external vision. Conversely, the community – broadly defined – learns from transformational presidents. Transactional leaders implement the vision of others. Transformational leaders work with stakeholders to develop a shared vision guided by their personal convictions.

Transactional leaders are reluctant to trust their intuition, and rely on outsiders to define their vision. They spend more time outside determining the vision and less time inside selling it. Transformational leaders, on the other hand, trust their understanding of the external environment, and rely on their own intuition and personal convictions to guide the college. They spend the bulk of their time communicating, teaching, and coaching, which ensures that followers share the vision.

Another important distinction with regard to vision is the language used by the presidents in discussing vision. The transformational presidents discussed their vision in broad terms, with an emphasis on linking their vision back to a set of core, personal
values and convictions. The vision described by these presidents was not so much spoken or written, but “felt” – generally understood by those in the organization. Each of the transactional presidents, on the other hand, used the terms “vision” and “mission” interchangeably. Their focus was on mission “statements” that hang on a wall or appear on a Web site. Senge (1990) holds that “where there is genuine vision (as opposed to the all-too-familiar ‘vision statement’), people excel and learn, not because they are told to, but because they want to” (p. 9).

Communication. One of the first noticeable differences between presidents when analyzing the interviews was the language used. The choice of words and phrases to describe their thoughts on leadership and their personal experiences were reflective of their dominant leadership profile. The transformational presidents used terms like loyalty, honesty, enthusiasm, passion, core values, inspiration, and trust. The transactional presidents chose terms such as mission, politics, turf, and carrot-and-stick. The distinct difference in the tone of the language used by each of the groups of presidents is worth noting.

The methods employed to communicate with organizational members also differed substantially based on the predominant leadership style of the president. The transformational presidents preferred informal communication methods to formal ones. They seek out opportunities to interact with faculty on a personal level. They articulate their vision in personal ways. They go out of their way to coach and mentor individuals and small groups. They are purposeful listeners, ensuring that everyone has an
opportunity to provide input. This approach to communication enables these leaders to establish an environment of trust, which provides the basis for higher levels of dialogue.

The transactional presidents were also interested in personal relationships and maintaining an effective dialogue with individuals in the organization. However, they were more controlled in their group interactions. They used teams to solve problems, but were less inclusive of the entire organization in the problem-solving process. In some cases, they manipulated the communication process by using people outside the organization to develop or articulate a position. The communication process employed by the transactional presidents did not always lead to an environment of trust, and in some cases led to an environment of mistrust.

Other Considerations. Clearly, the transformational and transactional leadership factors are not the only variables involved in determining the success of a president or the effectiveness of a community college. Individual traits of leaders, the context of the situation, and the interaction between traits and context are all important in the leadership/effectiveness profile (Bass, 1990). The colleges of the presidents who were interviewed differ on many levels besides the leadership approach of their presidents. The presence of other factors could influence not only the perceived effectiveness of the college, but could also influence the leadership behaviors exhibited by the president.

Size is an obvious variable. In Chapter 4, size as a function of enrollment was considered. Size as a function of the number of faculty is also a consideration. The presence of a faculty and/or staff union might also influence the president's ability to employ certain leadership strategies. The conditions under which a president assumes the
presidency was mentioned by more than half of the presidents interviewed, and must be considered an important factor. A president entering a chaotic situation faced with difficult decisions would have a different set of constraints and would be perceived differently than a long-standing president or one promoted from within. These and other factors are relevant in the discussion of leadership styles and their impact on the effectiveness of the organization.
The results of the study in the context of leadership theory and research are discussed in this chapter. A summary of the findings of the study is presented, followed by a discussion of the findings relative to the body of knowledge found in the literature. Limitations of the study are also discussed. Conclusions drawn by the researcher based on the quantitative and qualitative results are then presented. Other research questions suggested by this study are offered. The chapter concludes with an assessment of the theoretical and practical significance of this work.

**Summary of Findings**

The quantitative and qualitative analyses of the impact of transformational leadership on community college effectiveness led to several important findings, which are summarized below:

1. The combination of transformational leadership and transactional leadership factors is useful in predicting organizational effectiveness as measured by the factors of organizational health and satisfaction, community presence, and student educational satisfaction. The model predicted 19.7% of the variance for OHS, 14.2% for CP, and 22.3% for SES.
2. Transformational leadership as an individual predictor explained a significant proportion of the variance in OHS and CP. Transactional leadership was a significant negative predictor of SES.

3. The combination of transformational and transactional leadership factors was statistically significant in predicting effectiveness as measured by the overall measure of organizational performance (PERF). The model accounted for 22.6% of the variance in overall organizational performance. Transformational leadership was a significant individual predictor for the overall performance measure.

4. No significant relationships were found between size of the college, as measured by student enrollment, and any of the effectiveness measures. No significant relationships were found between gender of the president and any of the effectiveness measures.

5. Based on the interviews, transformational presidents rely on strong personal convictions and deeply rooted values to establish their vision. They place a strong emphasis on consistent, open communication with all constituencies. Trust is an important enabler for such an environment.

6. Based on the interviews, transactional presidents spend more time working with outside constituencies than do transformational presidents. Methods of developing and communicating an overall vision differ between transactional and transformational college presidents.

7. The leadership behaviors of the president predict only a portion of the overall performance of a college. Many other factors contribute to college performance,
including the college culture and the conditions under which a leader assumes the presidency.

**Discussion of Results Relative to Prior Research**

The quantitative component of this study provided partial validation of the overall conceptual model of transformational leadership established by Bass (1985). The statistically significant results in Chapter 4 were consistent with the idea that transformational leadership behaviors predict higher levels of organizational performance than transactional leadership behaviors. However, the factor structure of the underlying elements of transformational and transactional leadership did not hold with the sample in this study (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1997). The qualitative component provided a richness of examples and experiences that enabled the analysis of specific components of the transformational leadership and transactional leadership constructs. Although only a limited number of presidents were interviewed, the analysis of the interviews allowed comparisons with the body of knowledge accumulated in leadership theory and research.

This approach and the results are in agreement with Roueche, Baker, and Rose in their 1989 study of presidential leadership at community colleges. Their survey research identified five transformational themes: vision, influence orientation, people orientation, motivational orientation, and values orientation. After in-depth interviews with the most successful presidents in the survey, they concluded that vision was the most important theme of successful presidents. The development and articulation of the president's vision was an important distinction between transformational and transactional college leaders interviewed for this study.
Quantitative Analysis

The results reported in Chapter 4 indicated that transformational leadership was a useful predictor of organizational effectiveness using three different measures of effectiveness (OHS, CP, and PERF). Transactional leadership correlated negatively with the student educational satisfaction measure of organizational effectiveness. These results are consistent with other empirical studies on transformational leadership. Transformational leadership has been positively correlated with organizational performance in numerous studies, including a study of teams of MBA students (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988), a study of registered nurses (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995), a study of a financial services firm (Howell & Avolio, 1993), and a study of a research and development organization (Keller, 1992), to name a few. In each of these studies, transactional leadership qualities were correlated negatively with measures of organizational performance, as in the current study.

Leadership Measures. In the most recent model of transformational leadership, eight factors are taken into account (Bass & Avolio, 1997). The five transformational factors include idealized attributes, idealized behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Idealized attributes, idealized behavior, and inspirational motivation are measures of various aspects of charisma. The three transactional factors of the latest model include contingent reward, active management-by-exception, and passive management-by-exception. This factor structure was not inherent in the current study. While a five-factor structure showed initial promise, it was not considered because the factor structure was not strong analytically.
Additionally, the sample size was too small to support five predictors. The likelihood of a multicollinearity problem would have been high with this many predictors. The two-factor model chosen for this study was appropriate. Based on a sample size of 46 community colleges, two dependent variables provided the basis for a strong predictive relationship, and mitigated the possibility of multicollinearity. However, these statistical constraints forced a compromise. In creating a stronger predictive model, important conceptual components of the transformational and transactional leadership constructs were unexamined quantitatively.

Additionally, the transactional factor of contingent reward was excluded from the analysis. While a transactional factor conceptually, the items associated with contingent reward loaded consistently with transformational factors in each factor analysis model examined in this study. The nature of contingent reward has been mixed in empirical research. In some cases, contingent reward as a transactional leadership factor has had a positive correlation with measures of performance, but a lower positive correlation than transformational factors (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995). In other cases, it has correlated negatively with performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993). While not surprising, the lack of fit of contingent reward with the model prevented the quantitative analysis of the use of rewards, an important leadership behavior.

Effectiveness Measures. The five measures of effectiveness provided a reasonable representation of Cameron's (1978) original nine-factor model, which was the basis for the Institutional Performance Survey (Krakower & Niwa, 1985). The organizational health and satisfaction measure employed in this study included items
associated with the original dimensions of organizational health and faculty and administrator employment satisfaction. The community presence factor included items associated with student personal development and system openness and community interaction. The measures of student educational satisfaction, professional development and quality of the faculty, and student career development were used intact in the current study. Two of the original dimensions — ability to acquire resources and student academic development — were a poor analytical fit with the effectiveness models considered. However, these are important conceptual measures of community college effectiveness, and should be considered in future studies.

An overall measure of organizational performance was developed based on a second order factor analysis of the five effectiveness constructs previously described. Since some researchers believe that perceived measures of effectiveness, such as this measure, are more appropriate for determining the impact of transformational leadership than more objective organizational measures, such as financial performance or growth, indicators like this may be useful in other studies (Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

Qualitative Analysis

With the quantitative results providing conceptual validation of the relationship between transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and community college effectiveness, the interview analyses were used to draw comparisons between the actions and behaviors of presidents observed in this study and leadership theory and research. In the qualitative analysis, the complex, dynamic nature of daily leadership emerged in a
way that was not possible with the quantitative study alone. However, since only six interviews were conducted, conclusions drawn from this analysis must be considered tentative. The analysis that follows provides suggested relationships between the limited number of cases in this study and current leadership theory.

The construct of transformational leadership – a relatively new concept in leadership research – represents an approach that integrates many of the traits and processes identified by researchers in prior decades. Transformational leadership has multiple components, which reflect the complexities of leading modern organizations. Yet, the construct is rooted in concepts that have been constructed over most of this century. Leadership is relational and contextual. It is not simply a matter of exerting power. It is not a function of job title or organizational position (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Effective leadership takes advantage of personal traits, the context of the situation, and the interaction between the two (Bass, 1990). The defining elements of transformational leadership and transactional leadership, as well as the foundational constructs that preceded them, were evident in the qualitative element of this study. An analysis of these elements follows.

Traits. An important distinguishing factor between the transformational and transactional presidents in the case studies was in the relationships they had with both the college employees and the outside community. The ability to communicate openly and establish productive, healthy relationships – both internally and externally – were key elements of the profiles of the transformational presidents. This ability stems largely from the interpersonal skills of the individual leader. In his work on leadership traits, Boyatsis (1982) identified that among the competencies that separated effective and
ineffective leaders were interpersonal skills. Effective leaders had strong oral presentation skills, could develop networks and coalitions, gain cooperation from others, and resolve conflicts constructively. They had the ability to manage group processes and create synergy among teams. They also had strong conceptual skills, including the ability to identify patterns or relationships that were not always obvious. These personal traits were found among the transformational presidents interviewed for this study.

**Power.** Although rarely mentioned explicitly in the interviews, each of the presidents influenced those around them in numerous ways. These methods of influence reflect different orientations to power. The transactional presidents utilized rewards and coercion more readily than their transformational counterparts. They achieved power by controlling rewards or administering punishment. Transformational presidents, on the other hand, relied on expertise and reference – admiration from those around them – as means of influence. These different types of power are included in the taxonomy developed by French and Raven (1959). Bass (1960) referred to the combination of expertise and reference as personal power. All of the presidents interviewed utilized the implied responsibility of their position as a source of influence. This is called legitimate power by French and Raven (1959) and positional power by Bass (1960). By forming external coalitions and controlling decision-making processes, some of the transactional presidents utilized political power (Pfeffer, 1981).

**Contingency.** The contingency approach to leadership identifies situational aspects that impact a leader’s influence on group effectiveness. Fiedler (1967) identified group dynamics – defined by support and loyalty of subordinates – as an important situational variable. The transformational leaders in this study strove to cultivate support
and loyalty by communicating openly and actively, by paying attention to the needs of individuals, and by creating a climate of trust. In some cases, the transactional presidents had difficulty gaining support from their faculty. This was often the result of the particular leadership situation.

Transformational Leadership. The transformational presidents in this study lead by example. They expect a great deal from those around them, but expect even more from themselves. They develop their vision based on their own convictions and core values, and build consensus around the vision in an open but persistent way. This is consistent with the theory of charisma and inspirational motivation. House (1977) maintains that followers of transformational leaders identify with the leader and his or her vision. They emulate the leader’s values, goals, and behavior, and gain a sense of self-esteem from relationships with the leader and the leader’s vision. While establishing a culture of high expectations, transformational leaders express confidence in followers, causing followers to be confident in themselves. Followers are more likely to attribute charismatic and transformational qualities to leaders who use visioning and persuasive appeals than to leaders who use authority or power. Bass (1998) calls this inspirational motivation.

An important distinguishing characteristic between the transformational presidents and the transactional presidents was in their use of outside agents to influence their vision. The transactional presidents essentially allowed outside stakeholders to define the college’s vision for them. Transformational presidents sought outside input, but integrated it with their own values and beliefs. They were able to sort through the needs and wants of various stakeholders, which may be frivolous or outside the realm of
the college's responsibilities, to establish a vision that was meaningful and truly shared. They translated the conditions of the external environment into terms and actions that were meaningful to college constituents. An important component of the idealized influence element of transformational leadership is the ability to see what is really important (Bass, 1998). Transformational leaders trust their intuition (Tichy & Devanna, 1990). Successful leaders can relate a compelling image of the future that generates enthusiasm and commitment. They can "influence and organize meaning for the members of the organization" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 39).

The transformational presidents worked to create a nurturing environment for their employees. They delegated more readily than their transactional counterparts, and used coaching or mentoring techniques quite often. Again, this is compatible with the literature. Transformational leaders have a developmental orientation toward their subordinates (Bass, 1985). They are good listeners and they spend time coaching. They believe that they are responsible for the growth and well being of their people (Yukl, 1998).

Transactional Leadership. Bass and Avolio (1990) maintain that transactional leadership is an essential component for effectively leading organizations, but it does not sufficiently explain the extra effort and performance that some leaders are able to create in their followers. Bass (1998) contends that every effective leader displays both transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles to some extent in what he calls the "full range of leadership." The coexistence of transformational and transactional qualities in the same leader is evident in this research. The presidents who are primarily transformational insert themselves into processes that go awry. They sometimes use
tangible rewards to encourage a particular outcome. These are both transactional behaviors. The presidents who are primarily transactional demonstrate a concern for individuals, and use a variety of methods to maintain personal relationships with employees at their colleges – a transformational quality. However, it is the degree to which each approach is employed that determines the extra effort exerted by organizational members or the level of communication and trust in an organization.

In general, the transactional presidents were focused on managing to the college’s mission. They were more limited than their transformational counterparts in their approach to solving problems, relying on either outside experts or on established processes. In many cases they were reactive to outside demands without a broader context to help guide the college’s actions. These observations are in accord with Covey (1991), who holds that transactional leaders are event-centered, whereas transformational leaders are principle-centered. Transactional leaders are more likely to be reactive than proactive. They are less creative and innovative in their ideas, and tend to be more inhibited in their search for solutions (Yukl, 1998). They are more concerned with efficient processes than with dramatic ideas (Bass, 1985).

The transactional presidents were more reliant on the use of tangible rewards, such as travel, budget resources, or direct compensation than the transformational presidents as a means of promoting certain actions. They pursued a cost-benefit exchange. This approach can be problematic in that leaders and followers have no ongoing purpose that binds them together beyond the rewards (Burns, 1978). The transformational presidents favored less tangible rewards, and sought to establish a climate in which individuals felt rewarded for the accomplishment of group goals.
The management approach of transactional presidents interviewed tended to corrective in nature. As long as a given process was not causing problems, it was generally left alone. Routines and procedures were not questioned unless they led to undesirable or unanticipated results. Transactional leaders employ these management-by-exception practices to a much greater degree than transformational leaders (Bass, 1998).

Conclusions

Both the quantitative and qualitative portions of this study include limitations that must be considered. The two-factor leadership model, while analytically sound, did not address important underlying elements of transformational and transactional leadership. The interviews conducted provided the opportunity to probe into areas unexamined by the quantitative process. But because only six presidents were interviewed, the results and conclusions from this analysis must be considered speculative. However, the conceptual framework of the impact of leadership on organizational performance provided by the quantitative analysis, coupled with the anecdotes and experiences captured in the interviews, led to a number of important – albeit tentative – conclusions regarding the distinctions between transformational and transactional leaders. The interviews indicate that transformational presidents strive to create a certain environment – a climate of open communication, shared vision, trust, and empowerment. Transactional presidents are more focused on outcomes, whether they are specific results such as a new building, or simply to abide by and implement the mission statement of the college. The statistical analysis indicates that, in general, transformational behaviors
correlate more strongly with positive organizational performance than do transactional behaviors.

The statistical analysis presented in Chapter 4 was a critical element in understanding the relationship between leadership and effectiveness. The significant findings provided a basis for deeper probes into specific areas in the interviews. However, statistical constraints limited the ability to fully understand the profile of transformational and transactional presidents. Individual factors of the transformational leadership and transactional leadership constructs were not considered. The qualitative analysis informed the quantitative analysis by providing examples of individual elements of transformational and transactional leadership that were not considered in the quantitative analysis.

Analysis of Results. In Chapter 4, transformational leadership was found to have a significant relationship with effectiveness as measured by organizational health and satisfaction and community presence. Upon consideration of the individual elements of these two effectiveness constructs, one begins to picture the kind of organization that is possible under transformational leadership. The data analysis implies that in an organization led by a transformational leader, faculty and administrators are happy with their jobs and are unlikely to leave. People are treated fairly, the organization runs smoothly, and there are high levels of trust, security, and openness. The climate is friendly and collaborative, people feel well informed, and they believe they are adequately rewarded for success. In addition, such an environment promotes substantial opportunities for personal development for students through relationships with external constituencies. There is a high emphasis on community linkages through student projects.
and college-wide programs and workshops. Students and faculty are provided the opportunity for personal and professional growth through such activities.

Conversely, transactional leadership was not significantly related to these effectiveness measures. The presence of transactional qualities did not lead to an open, communicative climate of trust. Instead, transactional behaviors were negatively related to student educational satisfaction.

Organizational Needs and Outcomes. Although the underlying factors of Bass's transformational leadership construct were not addressed analytically, the individual items that make up these factors were included in the leadership survey. A review of these items (Table 4.2 and Appendix A) reveals the kinds of behavior exhibited by transformational leaders. Many of these behaviors were confirmed in the interviews with the three transformational presidents. Items such as “Re-examines critical assumptions,” “Talks about important values and beliefs,” “Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished,” “Spends time teaching and coaching,” and “Articulates a compelling vision of the future,” were used by respondents to describe the transformational presidents. When these items are integrated with the limited number of case studies in this analysis, the kind of organization that can result from effective leadership can begin to be understood.

Transformational leaders work to create an open environment of creativity, compassion, trust, and interdependence. They do not directly provide answers or solutions; they facilitate a climate such that the solutions emerge naturally from organizational members. The problems addressed are those of the community, not those of the institution. The college led by a transformational leader strives to solve the
community’s problems, not its own. The question becomes “how can we work together
to address a community need?” instead of “how can the college meet individual needs?”

A paradox emerges: although transformational leaders spend more time inside
the college than transactional leaders, their colleges are more responsive to outside needs.
Colleges led by transactional presidents are more focused on addressing inside issues,
even though their president spends more of his or her time on the outside.

An organization led by a transformational leader has leaders throughout. An
organization led by a transactional leader may have a number of managers running day-
to-day activities, but is likely to have only one “owner” of the vision and the decisions
that accompany it. This is due in large part to the fact that the vision may change on an
incremental basis depending on the outcome of specific events.

In a world of advancing technology, telecommuting, global networks, and
multinational coalitions, the interpersonal relationships between the leaders and the led
become even more important. The ability to translate the needs of the rapidly changing
world in terms that are not threatening, but provide a climate of opportunity and growth,
is among the most important jobs of the transformational leader.

Community college faculty, the source of respondents for this study, feel
particularly threatened in this environment. Their access to tenure, the perception of
living in an “ivory tower,” and a general public misunderstanding of what they do
combine to create an environment that can be quite threatening. They need to know that
they are still important, even more so, in these turbulent times. For every student who
takes an Internet course with no interaction with a faculty member, there will be many
who need the nurturing environment provided by excellent teachers – not just for their
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expertise in a discipline, but for the life experiences that create a truly healthy learning environment in which students are able to fulfill their potential and achieve their goals. Perhaps transformational leaders understand this tension, and are able to communicate these challenges as opportunities as opposed to threats.

The community college work force is highly educated, creative, and autonomous. The results of this study, like others before it, indicate that transformational leadership provides a productive environment for organizations whose employees have a high level of education and a deep interest in the challenge of their work (Hater & Bass, 1988; Keller, 1992).

Questions for Further Research

While addressing the broad relationship between leadership and effectiveness, this study stimulated ideas for further research in light of the challenges facing community colleges and their leaders.

Different Populations. While informative, the results of this study are difficult to generalize. Cameron (1986) warns against overgeneralizing conclusions to dissimilar organizations. Although these are all community colleges, organizationally they differ. Similar studies conducted using more homogeneous community college samples would be informative to better understand the differences between colleges of different sizes, governance structures, union orientation, and other variables of interest. Focusing on a population of small, single campus schools might lead to different conclusions than a population of large, multi-campus districts.
Further Analysis of Communication. The differences in communication style and technique were found in the interviews to be an important distinguishing characteristic between transformational and transactional presidents. Further research into the relationship between communication approaches of college presidents and organizational outcomes would be of interest. Unlike other aspects of charisma, communication methods can be learned and improved upon. Depending on the findings, it could lead to an important developmental objective for aspiring and current leaders.

Conditions of the Presidency. An important variable that was evident from the interviews is the situation of the college when a leader assumes the presidency. A president entering a chaotic or unhealthy situation faced with difficult decisions has a different set of constraints, and might be perceived differently, than a long-standing president or one promoted from within. There is some question as to whether or not a president forced to make tough, unpopular decisions early in his or her presidency would be able to achieve a healthy, open relationship over time. Are some leaders better suited for “fixing” problem organizations, and others better suited for running organizations at steady-state? Can the same leader accomplish both at the same institution? Answers to these questions would be of interest to sitting and aspiring presidents, boards of trustees, and consultants involved in presidential searches.

The “Falling Dominoes Effect.” The relationship between college presidents and faculty members is an important element in understanding the challenges and opportunities of community colleges, so the design of the present study was highly appropriate. However, in larger colleges, faculty have little direct interaction with their president. Although written comments were not solicited from faculty in the survey
research of this study, one anonymous respondent included the following observation in the response materials:

This survey seems to assume that the President works with the members of the college. As a faculty member, I do not see that. She seems to work with people outside the college, county commissioners, corporate leaders, etc. It was rumored that she served at one time on almost 30 boards, both private and public. She seems to be balancing the needs of the college with the demands of the community; as such, she seems to spend a great (deal) of time in the community.

In such a case, there would be considerable interest in the transformational leadership qualities displayed by vice presidents and deans who work for transformational presidents. A study addressing the extent to which transformational presidents encourage their direct reports to practice the same approach would go straight to the developmental nature of transformational leadership. This phenomenon has been called the “falling dominoes effect” in prior research (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb, 1987).

**Further Analysis of Bass’s Constructs.** As previously noted, both the quantitative and qualitative portions of this study included conditions that limited the scope of the investigation. Future studies might build on the framework established in this study to probe more deeply into both the quantitative and qualitative analyses. Specifically, a larger sample size might provide the opportunity to utilize a more robust set of predictors and consider the individual transformational elements of idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual
stimulation. Similarly, interviewing a larger number of presidents might provide results and conclusions that are less speculative and more generalizable.

**Other Dependent Variables.** More focused dependent variables would be of interest in understanding the role transformational leadership might play in strengthening community colleges. The successful presidents interviewed in this study sought to create an organizational climate that enabled the college to respond to constituent needs in a proactive way. Contributing factors of such a climate are open communication and organizational trust. Although these variables were not specifically measured in this study, they emerged as important enablers. Research investigating the relationship between leadership behaviors and organizational climate and trust in the organization would be informative to understand if a true predictive relationship exists.

Recent studies have indicated a positive relationship between transformational leadership and innovation in an organization (Bass & Avolio, 1997). As the presidents in the interviews indicated, the ability of colleges to take advantage of new technologies and accompanying processes is a primary concern. Research into whether or not transformational leadership leads to higher levels of innovation at the community college would be of interest.

**Significance of the Research**

The findings of this study have both theoretical and practical significance. From a theoretical standpoint, the results partially reinforce the conceptual model of transformational leadership proposed by Bass (1985). As predicted, transformational leadership leads to higher levels of performance than transactional leadership. Unlike
prior studies of presidential leadership at community colleges, the present study used
faculty perceptions as the data source. The faculty perspective is important as
community colleges redefine organizational roles and adopt new technologies and
processes. This study provided a measure of organizational performance that indicates
perceived effectiveness while avoiding the possibility of common methods bias. A
conceptual basis for the importance of vision and communication as underlying
constructs to effective leadership was also put forth.

In terms of practical significance, the study of the community college presidency
is timely. According to a recent survey published in the Community College Times, over
the next ten years, two-thirds of all community college presidents — more than 900 in all
— are expected to retire. At the same time, leadership development programs that
produced many of the leaders when community colleges came into prominence in the
1960s and 1970s have diminished. This comes at a time when the job of community
college president is more difficult than ever, according to experts in the field. “Now that
community colleges have matured, they have become very difficult organizations to lead
and manage” according to Terry O’Banion, President of the League for Innovation in the
Community College (Lazarick, 1999).

New leaders must have a sophisticated and diverse set of skills that includes an in-
depth understanding of technology, a competence in fund-raising, and the ability to
manage processes in a business-like manner. However, as this study demonstrates, they
must also have the interpersonal skills and personal convictions required to inspire people
and move them to higher levels of performance. As a leading consultant in presidential
searches put it, “We fall in love with strong personalities. But what we need are good
listeners, people who care about other people” (Lazarick, 1999).

The ability to provide an environment of creativity, trust, and collaboration is an
important aspect in leading organizations that respond to community needs collectively
and with enthusiasm. The internal climate is key to a college’s ability to respond to
external needs. This sentiment is evident in this quote from one of the presidents
interviewed:

While part of leadership is stimulating a sense of pride and the importance
of the mission and the inherent nobility of the task, part also is building an
atmosphere of joy. Joy in the work; joy in the companionship of the
workplace. Humor, fun – the paradox of treating your task and mission
with high seriousness, but not taking yourself too seriously.

In the end, leaders appear to be successful when they provide the opportunity for
those in their organization to do good work, grow personally and professionally,
and enjoy what they are doing. Based on the results of this study,
transformational leaders seem to have an advantage in this regard.
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APPENDIX A:

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form (5x-Short)

Name of President: __________________________ Date: __________

Name of College: __________________________

This questionnaire is to describe the leadership style of the president of your college as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Thirty-two descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing, and circle the appropriate number.

Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE PERSON I AM RATING...

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.............. 0 1 2 3 4
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious.......................... 0 1 2 3 4
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.............................................. 0 1 2 3 4
5. Talks about their most important values and beliefs.......................... 0 1 2 3 4
6. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems........................... 0 1 2 3 4
7. Talks optimistically about the future................................................ 0 1 2 3 4
8. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her..................... 0 1 2 3 4
9. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
10. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action............................ 0 1 2 3 4
11. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished............. 0 1 2 3 4
12. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose........... 0 1 2 3 4
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE PERSON I AM RATING...**

13. Spends time teaching and coaching............................................ 0 1 2 3 4
14. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved......................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
15. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." ................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
16. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.................. 0 1 2 3 4
17. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group........................................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
18. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action........................................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
19. Acts in ways that builds my respect........................................... 0 1 2 3 4
20. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
21. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions........ 0 1 2 3 4
22. Keeps track of all mistakes.......................................................... 0 1 2 3 4
23. Displays a sense of power and confidence.................................... 0 1 2 3 4
24. Articulates a compelling vision of the future............................... 0 1 2 3 4
25. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards................ 0 1 2 3 4
26. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
27. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles.............. 0 1 2 3 4
28. Helps me to develop my strengths.................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
29. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments... 0 1 2 3 4
30. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.................................................................................. 0 1 2 3 4
31. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations......................... 0 1 2 3 4
32. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.......................... 0 1 2 3 4
Respondent Demographics

These items ask for personal background information. This information will be reported in aggregate form only. This information is optional, but will be helpful for the study.

1. What is your gender? Male
   Female

2. What is your age? ______

3. How do you describe yourself? American Indian or Alaskan Native
   Asian, Pacific Islander, or Filipino
   Black or African American
   Hispanic, Chicano, or Spanish-speaking American
   White or Caucasian
   Other

4. How many years have you been affiliated with this institution? ______

5. What is your current rank? (Check only one of the following)
   Full Professor
   Associate Professor
   Assistant Professor
   Instructor/Lecturer
   Not applicable at my institution

6. Are you (Check only one of the following) Tenured
   Not yet tenured, but on tenure track
   Not on tenure track
   Not Applicable at my institution

7. Are you (Check only one of the following) Full-time
   Part-time

8. What is your highest academic degree earned? (Check only one of the following)
   Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D.)
   Specialists (Ed.S.)
   Masters
   Professional Degree (Medicine, Law)
   Bachelors
   Associate
   Certificate
   High School Diploma
APPENDIX B:

Institutional Performance Survey
SECTION 5: Performance and Actions of the Institution

The items in this section ask about the performance and actions of your institution. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the items by circling the number to the right of each statement.

To what extent are the following characteristics typical of our institution?

1. One of the outstanding features of this institution is the opportunity it provides students for personal development in addition to academic development.

2. This institution is highly responsive and adaptive to meeting the changing needs of its external constituencies.

3. This institution has a very high ability to obtain financial resources in order to provide a high quality educational program.

4. When hiring new faculty members, this institution can attract highly competent people in their respective fields to take a job here.

5. There seems to be a feeling that dissatisfaction is high among students at this institution.

6. Relatively large numbers of students do not return because of dissatisfaction with their educational experiences here.

7. I am aware of a large number of student complaints regarding their educational experience here as reflected in the campus newspaper, meetings with faculty members and administrators, or other public forums.

8. There is a very high emphasis on activities outside the classroom designed specifically to enhance students' personal, non-academic development.

9. There is a very high emphasis on institution-community or institution-environment activities.

10. Students develop and mature in non-academic areas (e.g., socially, emotionally, culturally) to a very large degree directly as a result of their experiences at this institution.

11. A very large number of community-oriented programs, workshops, projects, or activities were sponsored by this institution last year.
12. Estimate what percent of the graduates from this institution go on to obtain degrees in four-year colleges and universities (check only one of the following)

- 1) From 91% to 100% of the students here go on for baccalaureate degrees.
- 2) From 61% to 90% go on.
- 3) From 46% to 60% go on.
- 4) From 16% to 45% go on.
- 5) From 0 to 15% go on.

Please use the following scale in responding to questions 13-24

1 - A small minority 2 - Less than half 3 - About half 4 - More than half 5 - A large majority 6 - Don't know

13. ___ How many students would you say engage in extra academic work (e.g., reading, writing, studying) over and above what is specifically assigned in the classroom?

14. ___ What proportion of the students who completed academic or vocational programs from this institution last year and entered the labor market obtained employment in their major field of study?

15. ___ How many students would you say attend this institution to fulfill definite career or occupational goals as opposed to attending for social, athletic, financial, or other reasons?

16. ___ Of those students who obtained employment after completing their course of study from this institution, for how many of them was career training received at this institution important in helping them obtain their jobs?

17. ___ If given the chance of taking a similar job at another school of his or her choice, how many faculty members do you think would opt for leaving this school?

18. ___ If given the chance of taking a similar job at another school of his or her choice, how many administrators do you think would opt for leaving this school?

19. ___ Estimate how many faculty members at this institution are personally satisfied with their employment.

20. ___ Estimate how many administrators at this institution are personally satisfied with their employment.

21. ___ How many faculty members at this institution were engaged in some type of public service activity, donated their expertise to the community, acted as a consultant to business firms or social agencies, published a book or an article in a professional journal, or displayed a work of art in a show last year?

22. ___ What proportion of the faculty members would you estimate teach at the 'cutting edge' of their field—i.e., require current journal articles as reading, revise syllabi at least yearly, discuss current issues in the field, etc.?

23. ___ How many faculty members at this institution are now actively engaged in professional development activities—e.g., doing research, getting an advanced degree, consulting, etc?

24. ___ Institutions may be rated on the basis of their relative 'drawing power' in attracting top high school students. In relation to other colleges with which it competes, what proportion of the top students attend this institution rather than the competition?
In the following questions you are asked to rate your perceptions of the general day-to-day functioning of the overall institution. Please respond by circling the number that best represents your perceptions of each item. If you strongly agree with either description, circle the number closest to that end of the scale. If you feel neutral about the item, circle a number near the middle of the scale.

How do you perceive the following?

25. Student/faculty relationships
unusual closeness, lots of informal interaction, mutual personal concern 1 2 3 4 5
no closeness, little informal interaction

26. Equity of treatment and rewards
people treated fairly and rewarded equitably 1 2 3 4 5
favoritism and inequity present; unfair treatment exists

27. Organizational health of the institution
institution runs smoothly, healthy organization, productive internal functioning 1 2 3 4 5
institution runs poorly, unhealthy organization, unproductive internal functioning

28. General levels of trust among people here
high suspicion, fear, distrust, insecurity 1 2 3 4 5
high trust, security, openness

29. Conflicts and friction in the institution
large amount of conflict, disagreements, anxiety, friction 1 2 3 4 5
no friction or conflicts, friendly, collaborative

30. Recognition and rewards received for good work from superiors
recognition received for good work, rewarded for success 1 2 3 4 5
no rewards for good work, no one recognizes success

31. The amount of information or feedback you receive
feel informed, in-the-know, information is always available 1 2 3 4 5
feel isolated, out-of-it, information is never available
Respondent Demographics

These items ask for personal background information. This information will be reported in aggregate form only. This information is optional, but will be helpful for the study.

1. What is your gender? Male  Female

2. What is your age?  

3. How do you describe yourself? American Indian or Alaskan Native  Asian, Pacific Islander, or Filipino  Black or African American  Hispanic, Chicano, or Spanish-speaking American  White or Caucasian  Other

4. How many years have you been affiliated with this institution?  

5. What is your current rank? (Check only one of the following)
   Full Professor  Associate Professor  Assistant Professor  Instructor/Lecturer  Not applicable at my institution

6. Are you (Check only one of the following)  
   Tenured  Not yet tenured, but on tenure track  Not on tenure track  Not applicable at my institution

7. Are you (Check only one of the following)  
   Full-time  Part-time

8. What is your highest academic degree earned? (Check only one of the following)
   Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D.)  Specialists (Ed.S.)  Masters  Professional Degree (Medicine, Law)  Bachelors  Associate  Certificate  High School Diploma
APPENDIX C:

Interview Protocol
Interview Protocol

Preliminary Discussion

• Introduce interviewer. Thank subject for participation.
• Notify the subject that the interview will be taped and that a transcription will be made of the tape. Indicate that confidentiality will be maintained.
• Tell the subject that they may halt the interview or redirect questioning at any time, as they deem appropriate.
• State the general purpose of the interview:
  ➢ To learn more about their particular approach to leadership, including specific strategies or techniques that they think best define their approach.

Introduction

I have surveyed 46 community colleges throughout the U.S. to determine the leadership profiles of college presidents and the relationship to perceived effectiveness of the colleges. I have asked five presidents for a personal interview to bring these leadership behaviors to life — to take a look at specific examples of leadership in action and the day-to-day applications of leadership in community colleges. I'm trying to get past the buzzwords to determine what it really takes to be a successful community college president.

I have some specific questions that I want to ask, but beyond that I'd like to go where the conversation takes us. My main objective is to get your thoughts on what it takes to be an effective community college leader. Where appropriate, I might ask for some specific examples. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Sample First Probe

What makes a college president effective?

Sample Probes

1. How did you develop your vision for your college? How do you articulate your vision to your faculty? How do you know if they buy in?
2. In such a large organization, how do you reach individuals? How do you make a connection with individuals?
3. Compare and contrast your relationship with faculty with your relationship with your executive team.
4. How well do you think faculty understand what you do?
5. What percent of your time do you spend on internal vs. external activities?
6. How do you initiate change? How do you manage a change process once it has been initiated?
7. What do you do when something does not go as planned? At what point do you feel compelled to step in?
8. How do you reward people? Do they know in advance what the rewards will be for successful completion of tasks?
9. Differences in a small vs. large college.
10. What leadership qualities do you think are the most important for today's community college president?
11. What are some of the biggest challenges facing community colleges today?