

THE DEMOGRAPHICS AND UTILIZATION OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP
PRACTICES BY POTENTIAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Matthew A. Cooney

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2016

Committee:

Kenneth W. Borland, Advisor

Tim Brackenbury
Graduate Faculty Representative

Patrick D. Pauken

Maureen E. Wilson

ABSTRACT

Kenneth W. Borland, Advisor

Community colleges are facing a leadership crisis due to the mass retirements and turnover of community college presidents. Senior academic affairs officers, senior student affairs officers, senior academic and student affairs officers, and senior finance and administrative officers are considered potential community college presidents to fill the position as they are often one administrative position away from the president. Community college scholars and organizations recommended the utilization of transformational leadership by individuals in the community college presidency position.

The purpose of this correlational descriptive study was to understand who are potential community college presidents, to what degree they utilized transformational leadership practices, and to determine whether potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices differed based upon personal and professional experiences. Potential community college presidents (N=656) completed a demographic questionnaire and the Leadership Practices Inventory-SELF (Kouzes & Posner, 2013) to understand their educational, personal, and professional backgrounds; and their utilization of transformational leadership practices.

Potential community college presidents' demographics and their utilization of transformational leadership practices are reported. Descriptive statistics, one-way analysis of variance tests, and independent sample t tests were employed are presented to answer the

research questions. There were statistically significant differences in the mean scores on the LPI-SELF based upon level of interest in a community college presidency, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned, and participation in leadership development programs. Conclusions and recommendations include continued exploration of potential community college presidents' preparation and utilization of transformational leadership practices.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Gary and Karyn Cooney, who provided me the love, support, and opportunities that allowed me to chase my dreams.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Kenneth W. Borland

Ken, you have taken on multiple roles in my personal, professional, and academic career these past three years including professor, mentor, sponsor, writing partner, and dissertation chair. I am grateful for the time and opportunity to work with you. I am a better scholar, a “dangerous” administrator, and most of all, a better person because of the opportunity to learn from you and with you.

Dr. Maureen E. Wilson

Maureen, you employed the perfect blend of challenge and support during this program. Your availability to ask a quick question, celebrate small dissertation victories, engage in HESA lunch discussion, and confidence in me to complete this program all contributed to my personal, professional, and educational growth.

Dr. Patrick D. Pauken

I could not ask for a better committee member than you, Pat. You encouraged me to dig deeper and advance my thinking in all aspects of this process including in the classroom during law in higher education, my preliminary exams and proposal, and all the way through to the dissertation. You are the type of faculty member and administrator I hope to emulate as I embark on the next journey in life.

Dr. Tim Brackenbury

I was very fortunate to have you serve on my dissertation committee as a graduate faculty representative. As we randomly bumped into each other on campus and around town this past year, you ensured I was gaining a strong educational experience. Thank you.

Mom and Dad

Thank you. This degree could not have been possible without your constant support, encouragement, and presence. As a child you constantly stressed the importance of going to school. Almost eleven years later I am finished with my formal education and you two are the reason why.

Greg and Katie Cooney

Greg, I owe more to you than you know. Everyone speaks about the support that Mom and Dad provided during this process, but you were the one who worked so hard at the family business so that I could continue my studies. Katie, I also thank you for being a constant source of support and encouragement as I have been away. Your endless supply of greeting cards, pictures of the girls, and Starbucks helped fuel many long nights in the library.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Changes in the Community College	1
Presidential Turnover in Community Colleges.....	2
Community College Presidents.....	3
Professional Interest.....	3
Institutional Location	4
Community College Presidents' Career Pathways	5
Leadership Development for Community College Presidents.....	6
Theoretical Framework: The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership	8
Statement of the Problem.....	9
Statement of the Purpose	10
Statement of the Question.....	10
Significance of the Study	13
Definition of Terms.....	14
Organization of the Study	16
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	17
Criteria for Literature Review.....	17
The Leadership Crisis	18
Leadership.....	21
Industrial Leadership Approaches	22
Postindustrial Leadership Approaches.....	24

Leadership in Higher Education	26
Leadership Competencies for Community College Presidents	26
Leadership Development for Community College Presidents.....	29
Interest in a Community College Presidency.....	30
Institutional Location	31
Previous Positions.....	32
Doctoral Degrees	33
Leadership Development Programs.....	35
The Community College Leadership Team.....	36
The Senior Academic Affairs Officer.....	37
The Senior Student Affairs Officer.....	38
Student Affairs Units in the Community College.....	39
The Senior Academic and Student Affairs Officer.....	41
The Senior Finance and Administrative Officer.....	42
Theoretical Framework: The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership	44
Model the Way.....	45
Inspire A Shared Vision.....	46
Challenge the Process	46
Enable Others to Act.....	47
Encourage the Heart.....	47
The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership in Higher Education.....	47
The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership and the AACC Competencies.....	49
Evaluation	50

Review of Methodologies	50
Summary of the Literature Review	51
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	55
Research Questions	55
Participants	57
Instruments	59
Leadership Practices Inventory	59
Potential Community College Presidents' Demographic Questionnaire	60
Pilot Test	61
Research Design	61
Invalidity and Minimization	62
Procedure	64
Analysis Strategy	65
Research Question 1	69
Research Question 2	69
Research Question 3	69
Research Question 4	70
Research Question 5	70
Research Question 6	70
Research Question 7	70
Research Question 8	71
Assumptions, Limitations, Delimitations	71
Limitations	72

Delimitations.....	72
Uncontrolled Factors Influencing Outcomes.....	73
Shortcomings in the Data.....	74
Resolutions of Contradictions, Inconsistencies, and Misleading Elements.....	75
Chapter Summary	76
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	77
Question 1	77
Educational Characteristics.....	77
Personal Characteristics	79
Professional Characteristics	87
Question 2	91
Question 3	92
Model the Way.....	93
Inspire a Shared Vision.....	94
Challenge the Process	94
Enable Others to Act.....	95
Encourage the Heart.....	95
Summary	96
Question 4	96
Model the Way.....	97
Inspire a Shared Vision.....	98
Challenge the Process	98
Enable Others to Act.....	99

Encourage the Heart.....	99
Summary	99
Question 5	100
Model the Way.....	100
Inspire a Shared Vision.....	101
Challenge the Process	102
Enable Others to Act.....	103
Encourage the Heart.....	103
Summary	104
Question 6	104
Model the Way.....	104
Inspire a Shared Vision.....	106
Challenge the Process	106
Enable Others to Act.....	107
Encourage the Heart.....	107
Summary	108
Question 7	108
Question 8	110
Summary of Results.....	112
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION.....	116
Implications.....	118
Theoretical Implications	118
Practical Implications.....	125

Recommendations for Future Research	128
Procedural Adjustments	129
Replication of Study	130
Conclusion	131
REFERENCES	135
APPENDIX A. PERMISSION LETTER TO USE INSTRUMENT	154
APPENDIX B. LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY-SELF SAMPLE (KOUZES & POSNER, 2013).....	156
APPENDIX C. POTENTIAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS’ DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	157
APPENDIX D. HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	160
APPENDIX E. INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE	161
APPENDIX F. REMINDER TO PARTICIPATE	162
APPENDIX G. FINAL REMINDER TO PARTICIPATE	163
APPENDIX H. INFORMED CONSENT	164

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Features of Leadership in Higher Education	27
2	Alignment of AACC Leadership Competencies and the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership	50
3	Variable List for Research Questions	63
4	Data Analysis Strategy of Research Questions.....	67
5	Participant Highest Degree Earned.....	78
6	Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned.....	80
7	SAAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned.....	81
8	SSAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned	82
9	SASAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned.....	83
10	SFAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned	84
11	Participant Personal Characteristics.....	85
12	Participant Professional Characteristics.....	88
13	Mean Scores of Transformational Leadership Practices	92
14	Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Utilization of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Level of Interest in a Community College Presidency	93
15	Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Utilization of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Community College Location	97
16	Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Utilization of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Current Position	101

17	Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Utilization of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Highest Degree Earned	105
18	Summary of t Test of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Participation Status in a Leadership Development Program Sponsored by a National Organization.....	109
19	Summary of t Test of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Participation Status in a Leadership Development Program Sponsored by a Community College or Community College District	111
20	Summary of Significant Results	115

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is an introduction to a quantitative study to investigate the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. I address the problem, the purpose, and the research questions for the study. I also provide an overview of the theoretical framework, transformational leadership. Additionally, I explain the significance of the study, define key terms, and present an overview of the remainder of the manuscript.

Changes in the Community College

The development of community colleges is one of the most important advances in U.S. higher education (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997). More than 12.3 million students, or 46% of all undergraduate students, are enrolled in one of the 924 community colleges across the United States (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2016; Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d). Students matriculate in community colleges for many purposes including developmental education, taking courses to transfer to another institution, occupational education, and most recently, to obtain a bachelor's degree (A. M. Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker, 2014).

The conferral of bachelor's degrees by community colleges is just one of many recent changes. Occupational education in community colleges is changing as stackable credentials shift occupational education from a single course or certificate into course credit for associate's and bachelor's degrees (A. M. Cohen et al., 2014; Jaschick & Lederman, 2015). Performance-based funding complicates community colleges' future finances as student performance metrics such as graduation and retention rates link to state funding (D'Amico, Friedel, Kastinas, & Thornton, 2013; Dougherty et al., 2014; Zarkesh & Beas, 2004). The conferral of bachelor's

degrees, changes in occupational education, and performance-based funding are further complicated because these changes may occur under new leadership as community college presidents retire at an alarming rate.

Presidential Turnover in Community Colleges

Shults (2001) first described the retirement of community college presidents as a “leadership crisis” (p. 1) because 45% indicated they planned to retire within six years. Additionally, advanced degrees awarded for community college leadership decreased by almost 78% from 1983 to 1997 and new community college presidents felt unprepared for the budgetary and external relations aspects of the positions. Furthermore, the impending retirements are problematic because other senior leaders including senior academic affairs officers (SAAOs), senior student affairs officers (SSAOs), senior academic and student affairs officers (SASAOs), and senior finance and administrative officers (SFAOs) are planning retirement (Shults, 2001). The leadership crisis is linked to the aging of community college presidents and administrators who began working in these colleges during the community college boom of the 1960s and 1970s (Hassan, Dellow, & Jackson, 2010).

Weisman and Vaughn (2007) reported that almost 84% of community college presidents planned to retire within 10 years, and they stated that there would be “room at the top” (p. 6) for potential community college presidents because of this impending leadership crisis. The AACC (2013b) elaborated on the retirements and reported that 75% of current community college presidents planned to retire within the next 10 years and another 15% planned to retire within the next 11 to 15 years. From January 2011 to March 2016, there were 1,026 community college presidential transitions with many institutions experiencing multiple new presidents (Smith, 2016).

Community college presidents are responsible for leading institutional transformation because “institutional transformation cannot take place without the development and continual improvement of a college’s leadership” (AACC, 2013a, p. 2); however, community college organizations are questioning the development of community college presidents. The Aspen Institute and the Achieving the Dream Foundation (2013) reported that the current hiring and training practices for community college presidents were not sufficient to meet the future needs of these colleges. To understand the significance of the problem, one must understand the role of community college presidents, their pathways into the position, and preparation practices.

Community College Presidents

The community college president serves in multiple capacities including spokesperson, fundraiser, leader, and crisis manager. The role of the institutional president in higher education is multifaceted; is complex; and lacks a standard definition, description, or expectations (Birnbaum & Eckel, 2005). Presidents of public, associate’s degree-granting institutions, the majority of which are community colleges, rated budget financial management, community relations, and personnel issues as the most time-consuming activities (American Council on Education [ACE], 2012a). As there is no standard role for community college presidents, the pathway to and preparation for the community college presidency varies based upon institutional location, professional interest in becoming a community college president, current position, attainment of educational credentials, and participation in leadership development programs presented by national organizations and community college or community college districts.

Professional Interest

There must be some professional interest in becoming a community college president before one assumes the position. For many, becoming a community college president was not

the goal of their career; but rather they fell into the position because of outside influence from mentors and professional experiences (Eddy, 2010; Jones & Warnick, 2012; McNair, 2015; Weisman & Vaughn, 2007). Although for many, professional interest in the position came by happenstance, one must consider if community college presidency is a wise career move.

The community college presidency can be a risky career move with high expectations, evolving job responsibilities, a lack of financial resources, difficult board relations, and multiple competing constituencies (Jones & Johnson, 2014). Senior administrators may view the position as undesirable (Johnson & Christensen, 2008), and even former community college presidents recommend that potential community college presidents remain cautious before considering the position (Guthrie, 2001). Community college presidents who left the position described it as undesirable due to the certainty of crisis, circumstances that require action being outside the locus of control, and difficulty interacting with the media (Floyd & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2013; Jones & Johnson, 2014; Maslin-Ostrowski & Floyd, 2012). An understanding of potential community college presidents' interest in obtaining a community college presidency is important in order to fill and prepare for the position.

Institutional Location

There are 924 public community colleges located in different areas of the United States including rural, suburban, and urban environments (Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d). The 2005 update to the Carnegie Classification was important because the report contained information on subsets of community colleges: rural, suburban, and urban institutions (Cejda, 2007). The utilization of community college subcategories allowed researchers to examine differences among the communities these colleges served based upon institutional location rather than viewing the institutions as homogeneous groups (Cejda, 2007).

The leadership pathway and preparation for the community college presidency differs depending on institutional location (Cejda, 2007; Cejda & Jolley, 2013; Eddy, 2007, 2013; Fluharty & Scaggs, 2007; Leist, 2007; Myran & Parsons, 2013; Thompson, Coopers, & Ebberts, 2012). Rural community college presidents are less likely to participate in professional development opportunities sponsored by national organizations because of their isolated location, are less likely to hold doctoral degrees as compared with their urban peers, and view learning on the job as most important for their leadership (Eddy, 2013). Rural community college presidents noted the importance of personal relationships, understanding the local community, and learning the dynamics of a small town (Eddy, 2013).

Meanwhile, urban community college presidents noted the importance of providing services and educational opportunities to local communities that are often plagued with poverty, incarceration, and social inequality (Ivery, 2013). Future urban community college presidents must be aware that “urban community colleges are quite literally the only organization offering any real hope of any long-term solutions in the form of higher education increasingly necessary to individual success and prosperity” (Woodland & Parsons, 2013, p. 33). Regardless of the institutional location, future community college presidents often learn to lead through different positions on their career pathway.

Community College Presidents’ Career Pathways

The most common career path to the community college presidency is from an academic affairs pathway (e.g., ACE, 2012a; Amey, VanDerLinden, & Brown, 2002; Bailey & Kubala, 2001; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Eddy, 2010); however, community college presidents are entering the community college presidency through more diverse paths including SSAO and SFAO positions (Welch, 2002). Community college presidents who previously served in the

SSAO role had “the strengths of interpersonal relations, program management, student orientation, shared governance participation, and budget management, all important for the move to the college presidency” (Sandoval, 2011, p. 111). Furthermore, Muzyka (2004) stated that the path to the community college presidency was changing from a less linear progression through the academic affairs pathway as community college presidents were entering their positions with a wide variety of experiences. Similarly, the wide variety of community colleges have various organizational structures including many community colleges combining academic and student affairs into one unit rather than two separate entities overseen by the SASAO (Kezar & Lester, 2009). As community college presidents focus on the administrative and financial components of the institution (ACE, 2012a), there is a growing call for SFAOs to enter the presidency (Kiley, 2012). Regardless of the pathway to the community college presidency, it is important to consider how one prepares to lead in the position.

Leadership Development for Community College Presidents

There are multiple opportunities for community college leaders to prepare for a community college presidency and to develop their leadership skills as they enter the position. The AACC (2013a) recommended that community college leaders focus on transformational leadership skills by noting the need to “develop your personal toolkit for transformational leadership skills that allow you to galvanize employees to support the mission, vision, and goals of the institution” (p. 6). Learning through previous positions, attainment of educational credentials, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by professional organizations and community colleges or community college districts are ways that community college presidents prepare to lead.

Previous professional experiences are an additional preparation for the community college presidency (AACC, 2013b; Eddy, 2010; Jones & Warnick, 2012). There is an increased importance in developing the leadership capacities of current community college administrators, because these individuals may become community college presidents because of the impending presidential turnover. The community college leadership team consists of the SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO, and these community college leaders are often one administrative position away from the presidency (Anderson, 2014). The flat, bureaucratic nature of the community college may result in the SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SFAO moving into the role of president (Birnbaum, 1991). Additionally, completing a doctoral degree and gaining advanced educational credentials may potential community college presidents

There are more than 60 doctoral degree programs focused on community college leadership (Council for the Study of Community Colleges, n.d.). Attainment of a doctoral degree aided community college presidents with obtaining an initial interview for the presidency, established academic credibility with the faculty, filled gaps in professional experience, and was personally and professionally enriching (McNair, 2015). Educationally, 85% of community college presidents have either a PhD or an EdD (ACE, 2012a).

Potential community college presidents can also develop leadership skills to advance to a community college presidency through participation in leadership development programs. National organizations such as Achieving the Dream Foundation, AACC, American Association of Community College Trustees (AACCT), Aspen Institute College Excellence Program, and League for Innovation in the Community College offer leadership development programs to prepare future community college presidents. Additionally, many community colleges are

implementing in-house programs that focus on leadership development within the institution's specific context (Hull & Keim, 2007; Reille & Kezar, 2010).

Theoretical Framework: The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership

The theoretical framework for this study is transformational leadership. This particular type of leadership is recommended for community college presidents (AACCT, 2012; AACC, 2005; A. M. Cohen et al., 2014; Eddy, 2010) because it focuses upon the dynamic relationship between leaders (community college presidents) and followers. Northouse (2016) defined transformational leadership as “a process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (p. 171). Burns (1978) conceptualized transformational leadership as he connected leadership to followership and recognized the need to empower followers as they worked together towards shared goals. The benefits of transformational leadership include an increase in productivity, morale, and commitment to the organization by both leaders and followers (Nevarez & Wood, 2010). Transformational leadership functions include influence, motivation, utilizing intellect, and considering each person in the organization as unique (Northouse, 2016).

Kouzes and Posner (2012) developed a version of transformational leadership, the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership, after conducting a mixed-methods study that examined transformational leaders at their personal best (Posner, 2015). Their research resulted in the development of five concepts related to transformational leadership: (1) *model the way*, (2) *inspire a shared vision*, (3) *challenge the process*, (4) *enable others to act*, and (5) *encourage the heart*, often referred to these as the five practices of exemplary leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Kouzes and Posner (2013) created the LPI-SELF to measure the self-perceived utilization

of these five practices. An expanded explanation of these transformational leadership practices follows in Chapter II.

Statement of the Problem

The scope of community colleges is changing through the offering of bachelor's degrees, new corporate partnerships in occupational education, the unstable fiscal climate because of performance-based funding, and questions about who will serve as community college presidents in the future. A. M. Cohen et al. (2014) noted that "successful colleges are blessed with the proper leaders: people who know how to guide their colleagues stimulating each to put forth maximum effort toward goal attainment" (p. 131). However, the current context of community college leadership is changing due to the impending retirement of a key leader in the institution: the community college president.

This leadership crisis presents problems as one considers the lack of information regarding who aspires to become community college presidents, and how these potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership as recommended by the AACC (2013a). Furthermore, there is little information on who is interested in community college presidency and whether community college presidents in different institutional locations (urban, suburban, and rural) differ in their utilization of transformational leadership practices. Preparation for community college presidency often occurs through learning in previous positions, in the attainment of a doctoral degree, and in leadership development programs. However, there is little information on whether the utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon career pathway, highest degree earned, or participation in leadership development programs. The problem is that community college stakeholders need to know who are potential community college presidents, understand to what degree potential community

college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices, and determine whether potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon personal and professional experiences.

Statement of the Purpose

An understanding of the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents and their utilization of transformational leadership practices is important because there is a paucity of information on this topic. There are multiple opportunities for potential community college presidents to develop their utilization of transformational leadership practices including learning transformational leadership practices through their current positions, attainment of doctoral degrees, and participation in leadership development programs; however, how do these professional experiences correlate with utilization of transformational leadership practices? The purpose of this correlational descriptive study was to understand who are potential community college presidents, to what degree potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices, and determine whether potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon personal and professional experiences.

Statement of the Question

The Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI)-SELF (Kouzes & Posner, 2013) and a demographic questionnaire are the instruments (described in Chapter III) I utilized to answer this research question: Who are the potential community college presidents and how do they utilize transformational leadership practices? Eight sub-questions supported this study:

1. What are the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents?

2. To what degree do potential community college presidents self-report utilizing the transformational leadership practices of the LPI-SELF?
3. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president (very interested, somewhat interested, and not interested)?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president.

4. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon institutional location (rural, suburban, and urban)?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon institutional location.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon institutional location.

5. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon current position (SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO)?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon current position.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon current position.

6. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon highest degree earned?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon highest degree earned.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon highest degree earned.

7. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization.

8. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district.

Significance of the Study

The impending retirement (AACC, 2013b) of 75% of current community college presidents presents a problem because there is a paucity of information on who aspires to become community college presidents and the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of these individuals. This study includes information on who is interested in the community college presidency and how each prepared for the position. Additionally, there is a need to understand the utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. Utilization of transformational leadership practices is useful for community college presidents (AACC, 2005, 2013b; Eddy, 2010); however, there is little information on how potential community college presidents utilize these transformational leadership practices.

There is a multitude of differences between community colleges based upon geographic location (Cejda, 2007; Cejda & Jolley, 2013; Eddy, 2007, 2013; Fluharty & Scaggs, 2007; Leist, 2007; Myran & Parsons, 2013; Thompson et al., 2012); however, there are few quantitative studies that examine whether community college president utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon institutional location. Potential community college presidents may not be interested in a community college presidency. As such, how does level of interest correlate with utilization of transformational leadership? Additionally, community college presidents enter the position from various career paths (ACE, 2012a; Amey et al., 2002; Bailey & Kubala, 2001; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Eddy, 2010); however, do potential community college presidents differ in the utilization of transformational leadership based upon their current position?

The impending vacancies in multiple community college presidencies further emphasize the need for potential community college presidents to prepare for the presidency with various professional preparation opportunities including learning to lead in their current position, attainment of a doctoral degree, and participation in leadership development programs. A. M. Cohen et al. (2014) noted that “the various training exercises conducted by associations and leadership training programs in universities have been criticized for their limited effectiveness” (p. 144). This study presents information that may assist in understanding the correlation between participation in professional development experiences and the utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents.

Definition of Terms

The definitions of major terms of the study are included below.

Potential community college president: A person who currently serves as a SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SFAO.

Community college: A higher education institution that primarily offers two-year associates of arts and sciences degrees as well as certificates. The institution often focuses on serving the local community with an open-access admission policy.

Community college leadership doctoral program: A terminal degree program that “links theory, research and practice relevant to training community college leaders” (Nevarez & Wood, 2010, p. 260). These programs may offer the degree as a doctor of philosophy (PhD) or doctor of education (EdD).

Leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district: A leadership development event or program designed to enhance the leadership

skills of community college administrators created by individual community colleges or community college districts.

Leadership development program sponsored by a national organization: An event or program designed to enhance the leadership skills of community college administrators created by national organizations dedicated to community colleges such as the American Association of Community Colleges or the Achieving the Dream foundation.

President: The official the board of trustees designates to carry out the mission of the institution and to be responsible for operations of the community college regardless of title (e.g., Chief Executive Officer or Chancellor).

Senior academic affairs officer: The official responsible for the oversight of all academic affairs of the community college (Murray, Murray, & Summar, 2000). Titles may include provost, vice president for academic affairs, vice president for instruction, dean of instruction, and/or academic dean (Anderson, 2014; Hendrickson, Lane, Harris, & Dorman, 2013).

Senior academic and student affairs officer: The official responsible for leading both academic and student affairs under one centralized division. Titles may include vice president for academic and student affairs, executive vice president, and/or vice president for instruction and student services.

Senior finance and administrative officer: The community college official who is responsible for human resources functions, business and financial services, physical plant, and auxiliary components of the community college including managing the budget and financial portfolio (Bess & Dee, 2008).

Senior student affairs officer: The individual responsible for the co-curricular learning and student support-related components of the community college.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation contains five chapters. Chapter I has introduced the problem, purpose, and research questions for the study. Additionally, I have addressed the importance and significance of the study, the theoretical framework, and the operational definitions of terms,

The second chapter is a review of literature relevant to the study. I include a synthesis and evaluation of the literature that assists in understanding potential community college presidents' educational, professional, and personal backgrounds and their utilization of transformational leadership practices. Core themes throughout the literature include the changing functions of community colleges, the demographics of current community college presidents, the preparation of potential community college presidents, leadership theory, and the demographic and position details of SAAOs, SSAOs, SASAOs, and SFAOs. I also expand upon the theoretical framework. Chapter III contains information related to the methodology I employed. I provide an overview of the study's participants, a description of the two instruments, and the research design. This chapter also expands upon the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study.

Chapter IV provides the results from data collection that assisted in answering the research questions. I explain the statistical methods I used to answer the research questions and provide an interpretation. Chapter V discusses the broader implications of the study and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a literature review of the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. A literature review includes historical background, an overview of the current context of the problem, information on the theoretical framework, and supporting evidence of the practical problem (Ridley, 2012). I detail the synthesis and evaluation of the literature relating to the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. Subsequently, I discuss the context and current understanding of the problem. Additionally, I review leadership theories and detail how potential community college presidents attempt to increase their leadership capacity. My evaluation consists of a summary and discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the literature.

Criteria for Literature Review

Academic research is not limited to a singular type of publication and it is important to review literature from multiple sources (Ridley, 2012). In order to understand the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents most effectively, this literature review contains multiple publication types. First, I include peer-reviewed, scholarly journals related to community colleges, higher education, and leadership studies. Next, I reference doctoral dissertations on topics similar to this research. I also review a variety of books (including textbooks, edited volumes, and encyclopedias) to supplement an understanding of the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. Community college organizations such as the AACC and the Community College Resource Center also publish scholarly reports and information relevant to my understanding of the topic; therefore, these publications are in this

literature review. Finally, I integrate information from higher education periodicals including *Inside Higher Ed* and the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. These articles are not peer-reviewed; however, they provide contemporary information and insights without a publishing delay. I include a variety of sources as a way to gain a thorough understanding of the literature related to the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership by potential community college presidents.

My research addresses a contemporary research problem: who are the potential community college presidents and how do they utilize transformational leadership practices? I focus my literature review on information related to community colleges from 2000 to the present. It is important to note that I have included research conducted before 2000 in topics that provide a historical, explanatory, or theoretical component, as I consider these publications foundational for this research.

The Leadership Crisis

The impending retirement of many community college presidents is a significant challenge to current community college administrators, as they must navigate new areas including the offering of baccalaureate degrees, budget concerns because of performance-based funding, and changes in occupational education. Riggs (2009) summarized the leadership crisis by stating, “fewer and fewer well prepared individuals are entering community college administration, while seasoned administrators are retiring at a rapid rate” (para. 3). The AACC (2013b) provided the following numbers on community college presidents’ retirements: 42% of community college presidents plan to retire within 1-5 years, 33% plan to retire within 6-10 years, and 15% plan to retire within 11-15 years.

It is important to note that the retirements of community college presidents are related to the young age of community colleges (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Hassan et al., 2010; Shults, 2001). The first community college, Joliet Junior College, was established in 1901 and community colleges did not grow in large numbers until the 1960s and 1970s (Thelin, 2004). Enrollment in community colleges nearly quadrupled from 1950-1970, and approximately one community college opened per week in the 1960s (Thelin, 2004). There were more community colleges built in the 1960s than all previous decades combined (A. M. Cohen et al., 2014). Current community college presidents who began their career during the boom of community colleges are now ready for retirement (Boggs, 2003; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Hassan et al., 2010). Shults (2001) added,

With the retirement of these leaders, inestimable experience and history, as well as an intimate understanding of the community college mission, values, and culture, will disappear, leaving an enormous gap in the collective memory and the leadership of community colleges. (p. 2)

The retirements of community college presidents can offer opportunities for growth and development; however, a larger problem still exists in that community college presidents feel unprepared in key areas such as fundraising, financial management, and working with governing boards (Shults, 2001). As a result, the AACC developed six competency areas in 2005 for emerging community college presidents' leadership development: organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (AACC, 2005). These competency areas provide a framework for community college leadership development programs' curricula and assist human resources professionals in recruiting community college presidential candidates with these essential skills (AACC, 2005).

The following decade resulted in more community college organizations attempting to prepare future community college presidents.

The AACC and the AACCT promised to collaborate in order to prepare future community college presidents with leadership development through structured workshops and leadership development initiatives. Even more organizations committed to the preparation of potential community college presidents in 2013 as the Achieving the Dream Foundation, the AACC, the AACCT, the Aspen Institute, the League for Innovation in the Community College, and Student Success Initiatives at the University of Texas, Austin, pledged collaboration on preparation of future community college presidents. The leaders of these organizations committed to collaborate as the pool of community college presidents shrinks in order “to leverage the strengths and resources of each organization to address this significant transition in leadership in ways that align recruiting, selection and development practices with the goal of increasing student success” (AACCT, 2012, para. 3). The Aspen Institute and the Achieving the Dream Foundation (2013) also agreed to collaborate with each other because

[With] the rapid rate of presidential turnover and the fast-changing conditions surrounding community colleges, no single effort can meet the challenge ahead. What our nation and its community college students need is greater urgency, alignment, and collaboration to ensure that every community college is being led by a strong president. (p. 4)

Although the Aspen Institute and the Achieving the Dream Foundation (2013) called for strong community college presidents, one must also consider that many community college administrators and faculty members are also retiring (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Shults, 2001). This additional void further complicates the community college presidency career

pathway. As one examines the career paths of community college presidents, one will find that most community college presidents enter through an academic affairs pathway (ACE, 2012a; Amey et al., 2002; Bailey & Kubala, 2001; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Eddy, 2010); however, the career path into the position is changing as community college presidents are entering the position with experience outside of academic affairs (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002). Senior student affairs officers have transitioned into the community college presidency, albeit in fewer numbers (ACE, 2012a; Bullard, 2008; Humphrey, 2012). Additionally, SFAOs are regarded as being excellent candidates for community college presidencies because of their role in budgeting and administration (Harrop, 2007). Before examining in detail how potential community college presidents prepare to lead in the presidency, one must first explore the concept of leadership in greater depth.

Leadership

The development of leadership skills in community college presidents is essential for the success of the institution (AACC, 2013a; Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Amey et al., 2002; Anderson, 2014; Boggs, 2003; Shults, 2001). An understanding of the concept of leadership is necessary to discuss the utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. Leadership is a vague concept. Northouse (2016) stated that leadership “is much like the words, democracy, love, and peace. Although each of us intuitively knows what we mean by such words, the words can have different meanings for different people” (p. 2). The study of leadership as a social science started in 1904; however, the concept has been evident through myths, legends, religions, and philosophical texts for over 5,000 years (Bass & Bass, 2008).

Rost (1991) reported over 200 definitions of leadership. Dugan (2011) created a taxonomy of leadership definitions with four categories after reviewing empirical studies on leadership. First, studies did not include a definition of leadership. Second, studies defined leadership based on positions in an organization rather than on an actual behavior. Third, researchers defined leadership based upon capacity, or the subjects' enacted leadership beliefs, styles, and approaches. Fourth, leadership derives from efficacy, which is the internal belief that one has the capacity to lead an organization. A second way to categorize leadership studies is to examine the type of leadership approach used: industrial or postindustrial.

Industrial Leadership Approaches

There are multiple theories associated with industrial leadership approaches including biological, trait, behavioral, situational, and influence-based leadership theories (Dugan & Komives, 2011; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2013; Northouse, 2016). Biological theories operate under the premise that leaders are born, not developed (Bass & Bass, 2008). These biological theories transitioned into studies on leadership traits. The trait-based leadership theories attempt to identify traits associated with successful leaders such as “intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability” (Northouse, 2016, p. 23). The underlying assumptions of trait-based theories are that leaders have natural, not developed, leadership traits that differentiate them from followers (Komives et al., 2013). Criticisms of trait-based leadership theories include the lack of a definitive list of traits, the exclusion of the situation in which leadership occurs, and the subjectivity of the traits (Northouse, 2016).

Researchers later examined not only the traits of the leader, but also what the leader does. Behavioral leadership theories operate under the premise that leadership is comprised of both task and relationship behaviors that leaders match to guide followers (Northouse, 2016).

Behavioral leadership theories focus upon what the leader does rather than on the actual leader (Dugan & Komives, 2011). The principal research around leadership behaviors came from studies conducted at the Ohio State University that “helped to shift the focus of the field from a universal trait approach to a more situational, behavioral-based view” (Schriesheim & Bird, 1979, p. 135). Additionally, studies under Francis Likert at the University of Michigan further added to research on the behavioral dimensions of leadership by identifying task-oriented, relationship-oriented, and participative leadership as important components for effective leadership (Northouse, 2016).

Hersey and Blanchard (1969) expanded upon the behavioral leadership approaches by including a consideration for the situation, or the developmental levels of the followers in addition to task-based and relationship-based behaviors. Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (2012) defined task behavior as

The extent to which the leader engages in spelling out the duties and responsibilities of an individual or group. These behaviors include telling people what to do, how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and who is to do it. (p. 115)

Inversely, relationship behavior is “the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multi-party communication. The behaviors include listening, facilitating, and explaining the why’s of something while offering supportive behavior to others” (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2012, p. 115). The premise of situational leadership theory is that there is no one best way to lead a group and that leadership is context specific. Leaders must match the appropriate level of task behavior with the suitable level of relationship behavior (Hersey et al., 2012).

Influence-based leadership theories emerged in the 1970s when researchers began to focus on the motivations of followers rather than to study the leader, and this new focus included

study of the role of charisma (Northouse, 2016). House (1971) first conceptualized charismatic leadership. Followers view charismatic leaders as competent and trustworthy individuals who hold high expectations and express confidence in the followers' ability to complete a task (Yukl, 1993). Similarly, House (1996) created the path-goal theory of leadership in which he stated that "leaders, to be effective, engage in behaviors that complement subordinates' environments and abilities in a manner that compensates for deficiencies and is instrumental to subordinate satisfaction and individual and work unit performance" (p. 323). The path-goal theory requires leaders to define goals for followers, to clarify how tasks should be completed to reach the goal(s), to remove any obstacles that may inhibit task completion, and to provide support to allow them to complete the task (Northouse, 2016). The leaders may use directive, supportive, participative, or achievement-oriented leadership behaviors depending on the characteristics of the followers, tasks, and motivation. The focus on trait, behavioral, situational, and influence-based leadership theories is on task completion rather than development of the followers into a collaborative team, as is the case for postindustrial leadership approaches.

Postindustrial Leadership Approaches

Leadership in postindustrial approaches is a mutual process involving both leaders and followers working towards positive change (Northouse, 2016). There are two types of leadership theories in the postindustrial approach: chaos and transformational (Dugan & Komives, 2011). Chaos theories, also known as adaptive theories of leadership, conceptualize the leader as someone who works with followers in the organization so that the followers learn new approaches to solve difficult problems (Northouse, 2016). These theories view leadership as more than a match between leadership styles and followers' preferences (Northouse, 2016). Kezar, Carducci, and Contreras-McGavin (2006) noted that "external challenges and the

environment in organizations should be examined and taken into account to understand leadership” (p. 39).

The second type of leadership theory in the postindustrial approach is transformational leadership. Burns (1978) was the first to theorize that leadership and followership are values-based and focus on the mutual development of both leaders and followers. Prior to Burns, studies used transactional leadership approaches, where the exchanges between the leader and followers were most important and often unidirectional from the leader to the follower (Bass & Bass, 2008). Inversely, transformational leadership involves emotions, values, ethics, and often acts as an encompassing approach in which both leaders and followers work together in a transformational process (Northouse, 2016). Bass and Bass (2008) added, “transformational leadership elevates the followers’ level of maturity, ideals, and concerns for well-being of others” (p. 619).

There are two primary models of transformational leadership: Bass’s (1985) full range model of transformational leadership and Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) five practices of exemplary leadership. Bass developed a full-range model of transformational leadership that included seven leadership functions divided into three different leadership types: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. The premise behind the full-range model of transformational leadership is that transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles are not separate from each other, but rather they exist on a continuum and that leaders may use any of the three. The transformational functions include idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transactional leadership functions include utilizing contingent reward and management by exception. Finally, Bass noted that in a laissez-faire leadership approach, leadership essentially does not occur. Kouzes and

Posner developed the second model of transformational leadership, which also serves as the theoretical framework for this dissertation (I describe it later in this chapter).

Leadership in Higher Education

Potential community college presidents must understand the unique nature of leadership in higher education. Table 1 presents 13 features of leadership in higher education (Kezar, 2001). Kezar (2001) noted two core explanations for the necessity to understand these features and how ignoring them may cause leadership efforts to fail. First, “over-looking these functions may result in mistakes in analysis and strategy,” and “using concepts foreign to the values of the academy will most likely fail to engage people who must bring about the change” (p. 60).

Leadership Competencies for Community College Presidents

Members of the AACC released a report on the six leadership competencies for community college leaders in 2005 as a result of the impending leadership crisis. The AACC (2005) conducted a mixed-methods study of community college presidents; the results of the study represented “current best thinking as well as [providing] a forum for continual updating and improvement in thinking about community college leadership” (Part A, first paragraph). Six competencies emerged: organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (AACC, 2005).

Table 1

Features of Leadership in Higher Education

Feature of Leadership	Description
Interdependent organization	Through professional societies and accreditation agencies, higher education institutions are more connected than ever before.
Relatively independent of environment	The relationship between higher education institutions and outside forces changes throughout times.
Unique culture of the academy	Faculty members often use a collegium model of decision-making rather than top-down approaches.
Institutional status	Many see higher education as an institution; thus, long-standing traditions make changes more difficult.
Values driven	Multitude of different values: faculty, administration, and students may all value different components, and these values may conflict.
Multiple power and authority structures	Referent and expert power more important than coercive or legitimate powers.
Loosely coupled systems	Different aspects of higher education institutions are connected, but to a limited degree.
Organized anarchical decision-making	Ambiguous goals require leaders to be cautious of decision-making without including multiple stakeholders.
Professional and administrative values	Faculty and administrative socialization often occurs through different avenues; leadership requires knowledge of both.
Shared governance	Leaders must understand that decision-making often involves both faculty and administrative staff members.
Employee commitment and tenure	Leadership may be more difficult to enact as employees are often committed to discipline more than institution; tenure process influences personnel decisions.
Goal ambiguity	Multiple groups in the same organization have different goals, leaders must unite all into a common goal
Image and success	In order to lead in higher education, leaders must change the image of the organization through changing how members of the organization view success

Note. Adapted from Kezar (2001).

These original leadership competencies require the assumptions that leaders can learn leadership, that all community college administrators can lead, that leaders must have a vision, and that personal and professional maturity aids in learning leadership. The AACC updated its leadership competencies in 2013 and included developmental sequencing based upon years of experience. It also updated the competencies to address the leadership crisis further. The 2013 competencies were (a) organizational strategy, (b) institutional finance, research, fundraising, and resource management, (c) communication, (d) collaboration, and (e) community college advocacy.

Organizational strategy is the first leadership competency and “an effective community college leader promotes success of all students, strategically improves the quality of the institution, and sustains the community college mission based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends” (AACC, 2013a, p. 2). Emerging and new community college presidents should develop knowledge of the different employees and functional units within the community college, while experienced community college presidents should focus efforts on leading the institution towards a common goal of student success.

The second competency is focused on institutional finance, research, fundraising, and resource management (AACC, 2013a). Effective community college presidents develop teams, focus on relationships with staff members and potential donors, and hold high expectations for their teams. They model the behavior expected of their staff.

Communication is the third leadership competency. The AACC [2013a] stated that an effective community college leader uses clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community; promotes the success of all students; ensures the safety and security of students and the surrounding college community; and sustains the community college mission. (p. 7)

Effective community college presidents are able to create an environment in which all people feel comfortable expressing their ideas, and are able to communicate the mission, vision, and values of the institution.

Collaboration is the fourth leadership competency for community college presidents. The AACC (2013a) reported that “an effective community college leader develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships that nurture diversity, promotes the success of all students and sustains the community college mission” (p. 10). Collaboration is essential for potential community colleges considering the increased partnerships with K-12 schools, four-year institutions, and local workforce needs.

The final leadership competency is community college advocacy. The AACC (2013a) reported that an effective community college president “understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college on the local, state, and national level” (p. 11). Community college leaders must navigate a political environment while collaborating with multiple stakeholders to advance the mission of their college. They should use these competencies as tools to assist in leadership development for community college presidents.

Leadership Development for Community College Presidents

The impending retirements of community college presidents highlight the urgency of facilitating more professional development opportunities to prepare the next generation of community college presidents. An examination of community college personal and professional background provides information about who the next generation of community college presidents will replace. ACE (2012a) has conducted studies on the demographics of higher education presidents since 1986, and the most recent study occurred in 2012. The data collection

includes all associate's degree-granting institutions; however, it represents public community college presidents most prominently (ACE, 2012a). Eighty-seven percent of presidents at associate's degree-granting institutions are White and only 12.9% identified as people of color (ACEa, 2012). Sixty-seven percent identified as male (ACEa, 2012). Eighty-one percent of presidents at associate's degree-granting institutions hold a doctoral degree. The immediate prior position for presidents at associate's degree-granting colleges was an SAAO (44.4%), a previous higher education president (23.2%), or another senior campus executive such as an SSAO or SFAO (13.3%). Community college presidents often prepared for the presidency through learning in their previous position, attainment of doctoral degrees, and participation in leadership development programs. As potential community college presidents engage in these leadership development opportunities, one must consider whether the community college presidency is part of their desired career path.

Interest in a Community College Presidency

Motivation for pursuing a community college presidency includes the position being the next logical step for senior community college administrators. The position is often not the original goal, but rather it occurs by happenstance (Eddy, 2010; Jones & Warnick, 2012; McNair, 2015; Vaughn & Weisman, 1998). Waggoner (2016) conducted a mixed-methods study that examined senior community college leaders' aspirations to obtain a community college presidency position and determined that the desire to produce change in the community college, being tapped for the position by other senior leaders, and overall desire to help were factors that influenced the decision to become a community college president. Factors that dissuaded aspiring community college presidents from the position included age, family, work-life balance, and the political nature of the position (Waggoner, 2016).

Previous community college presidents urge caution for those who are interested in the community college presidency (Guthrie, 2001). Prospective candidates for the position further echo this reservation towards community college presidency (Jaschick, 2007; Jones & Johnson, 2014). Community college presidents who entered the position with enthusiasm left the position with angst because of the emotionally charged position and their inability to control their departures from the position (Maslin-Ostrowski & Floyd, 2012). Community college presidents also stated that others challenged their integrity, misinterpreted their comments, and constantly put them under the microscope (Floyd & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2013). Jones and Johnson (2014) studied community college presidents and determined that the position was risky because of circumstances beyond the presidents' control, multiple competing interests, a mismatch between the skills of the president and institutional needs, and a lack of skilled board of trustee members. As one considers the leadership crisis related to community college presidency, the negative portrayal of the position might be a deterrent for individuals in senior administration positions at community colleges to pursue the presidency position. Conversely, Jones and Johnson (2014) stated that the position was not risky, because community college presidents prepared themselves for the position, accepted that the position opened up different career opportunities, and stuck to their values. Community college presidents indicated that they applied for the position because of personal interest in the position, new professional challenges, the ability to make a difference, and encouragement from their mentors (Duree, 2007; Schmitz, 2008).

Institutional Location

As one considers how potential community college presidents prepare for the position, it is important to consider the leadership differences between rural and suburban/urban community college districts as a one-size-fits-all approach to leadership development for community

colleges neglects important differences between community colleges at different institutional locations (Cejda & Jolley, 2013). Eddy (2007) similarly reported that “the context of the rural environment makes leading colleges in these locations different than in larger, more urban regions” (p. 271). Furthermore, Eddy noted that the combination of a highly visible position and a small town resulted in everyone knowing the community college president and an increased importance on relationship building and learning to lead in the unique context. Similarly, Myran and Parsons (2013) noted the need for transformational leadership in urban community college presidents as they lead the urban community college in the three distinct dimensions: serving the public good, workforce development, and linking workforce development. Rural community college presidents differ from their urban and suburban peers in regards to how they prepared for the position. For example, the isolated location of a rural community college resulted in the need for community college presidents to learn on the job and they had limited participation in leadership development programs sponsored by national organizations because of the price and the distance involved (Eddy, 2013).

Previous Positions

Community college presidents have often described the importance of previous positions in preparing to lead the institution (Eddy, 2010; Jones & Warnick, 2012; McNair, 2015; Nevarez & Wood, 2010; Romano, Townsend, & Mamiseishvili, 2009). McNair (2015) noted that participants in her study “gained experience as vice presidents and achieved their goals in that position, they became ready for new professional challenges and thus began applying for presidencies” (p. 80). The career path of community college presidents has undergone extensive research and studies have found that the most common route to the community college presidency was through an academic affairs pathway (ACE, 2012a; Amey et al., 2002; Bailey &

Kubala, 2001; Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Eddy, 2010). Community college presidents who did not come from a traditional academic affairs pathway noted that it was beneficial that they arrived in the position with different experiences, as others viewed their background as a partnership (Nabasny, 2011).

Doctoral Degrees

In 2012, 85% of community college presidents had a doctoral degree (ACE, 2012a). McNair (2015) conducted a qualitative study investigating how current community college presidents prepared for the position. The community college presidents in McNair's study reported feeling they would not have been invited to an on-campus interview without holding a doctoral degree. Jones and Warnick (2012) also reported that first-time community college presidents stressed the importance of the doctoral degree as a prerequisite for the position. Nguyen (2014) conducted an analysis of community college leaders who transitioned into the position from a legal career including obtaining a Juris Doctor (JD). Participants in his study reported high ability in professionalism and communication, and they reported transferable skills such as legal expertise and business sense, but they also reported lower scores on a collaboration competency.

A specific type of doctoral degree that many community college presidents hold is one in community college leadership. The basis of the development of community college leadership doctoral programs needs to be a strong, collaborative relationship between the community college and the four-year institution (Luna, 2010). Lovell, Crittenden, Stumpf, and Davis (2003) stated that instruction in community college leadership doctoral programs should reflect the needs of the local community. Hammons and Miller (2006) surveyed current community college presidents about doctoral degrees in community college leadership. The community college

presidents reported that successful doctoral degree programs in community college leadership programs offered classes in a variety of formats (online, hybrid, on-campus), graduates gained employment in community colleges, and practitioners became involved in the education process. Hammons and Miller stated that the “single most important element of a program that responds to community college leadership development is the knowledge of faculty teaching about the community college” (p. 380).

Romano et al. (2009) surveyed students enrolled in community college doctoral degree programs to collect demographic data. The majority of students were female (63%), White (70%), and attended part time (60%). Approximately 57% of the programs conferred the PhD as a terminal degree. The most notable aspect of the study was that approximately 80% of community college doctoral students reported that they learned most from working in community colleges rather than in the classroom.

Not all research on doctoral programs in community college leadership is positive. Li, Friedel, and Rusche (2010) noted that the coursework of doctoral leadership programs lacked practical relevance and was disconnected from the practice of community college leadership. Hammons and Miller (2006) stated:

part of the issue surrounding the ability of graduate preparation programs to effectively meet the needs of future community college administrators is the apparent competing notions of what should be included in graduate preparation program curriculum and the types of experiences that can build administrative ability. (p. 374)

Preparation for community college presidencies does not occur solely in graduate programs, but also in leadership development programs.

Leadership Development Programs

There are two main types of leadership development programs for community college leaders who aspire to the presidency. The first type is that presented by national community college organizations. Eddy, Sydow, Alfred, and Garza-Mitchell (2015) stated that these leadership development programs have been the main contributors to community college leadership preparation, but

most, if not all, of these programs focus on the acquisition of knowledge of operational skills, such as budgeting and curriculum development, which, although an important knowledge base for leaders, do not prepare individuals for the larger demands of visioning and leveraging change in a complex organization. (para. 4)

Duree (2007) reported that 56% of community college presidents participated in a leadership development program sponsored by a national organization before becoming a community college president.

Hull and Keim (2007) surveyed community college presidents regarding the participation of their staff in leadership development programs and reported that the three most popular professional development programs were the Chair Academy sponsored by the AACC, the Executive Leadership Institute sponsored by the League for Innovation in the Community College, and the Future Leaders Institute sponsored by the AACC. The researchers noted that the price of the institutes, often in excess of \$1,500 per person, was a deterrent to participation. McNair (2015) reported that community college presidents in her study participated in a variety of leadership development programs that further emphasized the wide variety and benefits of participation; however, they reported the need to find low-cost professional development opportunities as shrinking budgets limited professional development funds.

The second type is a grow your own leadership (GYOL) program. These programs often target professionals in specific community colleges or community college districts and senior staff lead them. Benefits of GYOL programs include utilizing a relevant curriculum focused on issues the institution may face, providing low-cost leadership development opportunities, filling the leadership development pipeline with additional leaders, and providing mentoring opportunities to potential leaders (Eddy, 2008; Nevarez & Wood, 2010). Reille and Kezar (2010) added that “in-house leadership training programs present considerable benefits including accessibility, flexibility, effectiveness, direct application in the context of the college, and the opportunity to solve real college issues through the training offered by the program” (p. 74). Only 14% of community college presidents participated in a GYOL program before taking the position of president (Schmitz, 2008). Many of the people responsible for the training at the GYOL programs are members of the community college leadership team.

Community colleges frequently discontinue these programs when there are fiscal shortages and a lack of prestige (Nevarez & Wood, 2010). GYOL programs risk overlooking important training needs because of biases held by managers and because of the college’s characteristics and culture; the lack of training needs assessments prior to the program’s creation; and the tendency to make decisions based on convenience and ease rather than on the literature about curricular and pedagogical effectiveness. (Reille & Kezar, 2010, p. 75)

The Community College Leadership Team

In addition to the community college president, four people comprise the community college leadership team: the SAAO, the SSAO, the SASAO, and the SFAO (Anderson, 2014). In this section, I detail the duties, demographics, and career paths of these positions.

The Senior Academic Affairs Officer

The SAAO oversees the community college's academic mission and internal affairs of the organization (Bess & Dee, 2008; Hendrickson et al., 2013). The community college SAAO may hold a variety of titles including provost, vice president for academic affairs, vice president for instruction, dean of instruction, and/or academic dean (Anderson, 2014; Hendrickson et al., 2013). The community college SAAO has multiple responsibilities including overseeing the accreditation of the institution, supervising faculty, and ensuring the academic quality of the community college.

Researchers who studied the SAAO position reported similar demographic characteristics in two different studies utilizing different samples: 44% of community college SAAOs are female and 70% hold a doctorate (Cejda, McKenney, & Fuller, 2001; Keim & Murray, 2008). In Keim and Murray's (2008) study, 66% of doctoral degree holders reported that they had a doctoral degree in education, 59% held a PhD and 39% held an EdD. ACE (2013) reported that 55% of community college SAAOs were female and 45% were male; 87% were White, 8% were Hispanic, and 5% were black.

The career pathway into the community college SAAO position is less linear than previously reported (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Amey et al., 2002). Fifty percent of all community college SAAOs had a previous position in academic affairs such as senior associate dean, assistant dean, or a director level position in academic affairs (Amey et al., 2002). Amey and VanDerLinden (2002) discovered that 10% of community college SAAOs in their study came from the continuing education pathway and that 18% arrived at the community college SAAO position through a student affairs pathway, learning resources, or institutional development. Cejda et al. (2001) examined the career paths of SAAOs at community colleges

and noted that 27% of departing community college SAAOs retired, 30% entered a presidency, and 11% became a non-academic vice president at a community college. Cejda et al. provided career suggestions for potential community college SAAOs after examining the career paths of this position. They recommended that community college SAAOs enter the community college workforce as faculty members and understand that multiple positions and years in these positions is necessary for career advancement.

The Senior Student Affairs Officer

The community college SSAO is responsible for the effective delivery of student affairs services and programs. Tull (2014) stated, “the role of the community college SSAO is ever changing as they serve multiple constituencies during difficult times” (p. 53). There are more than 90 different titles for SSAO positions in community colleges, and the most common are vice president of student services, dean of student services, and vice president of student affairs (Keim, 2008). Gender information related to SSAOs in community colleges varies; however, researchers reported that there were nearly equal numbers of males and females in the position and that most held a doctoral degree (Amey et al., 2002; Keim, 2008; Tull, 2015). Eighty-eight percent were White, 7% were African American, 3% were Hispanic, 2% were Asian American, and 1% were multiracial (ACE, 2013).

There are diverse pathways that lead to the SSAO position in community colleges (Amey et al. 2002; Biddix et al., 2012; Keim, 2008). There is still no well-defined pathway to the SSAO position (Biddix, 2011). Biddix et al. (2012) conducted a study of career pathways of female SSAOs at community colleges and discovered that there was an average of four job changes before the SSAO position and that female SSAOs placed emphasis on obtaining a doctoral degree, and they recommended gaining experience in financial management to advance in the

role. Few studies exist that examine the career path of the SSAO who moved beyond the SSAO position into a community college presidency.

There is a paucity of literature on the experiences of community college presidents who entered the position through a student affairs pathway. Many studies examined this career pathway with samples that included both two- and four-year institutions (Coveret, 2004; Humphrey, 2012; McGoey, 2015). First, college presidents who previously served as SSAO are more similar than they are different in leadership styles (Risacher, 2004). Challenges for presidents who previously served as SSAOs included gaining credibility with faculty (Covert, 2004; Humphrey, 2012) and bias because they earned experience as administrators rather than as academics (Humphrey, 2012). To mitigate these biases, presidents who previously served as SSAOs stressed the importance of detailing experience with collaborative efforts (Covert, 2004; Humphrey, 2012), surrounding themselves with positive networks of peers (Nabasny, 2011), and explaining that the experiences in the position, not the actual position, lead to an effective preparation for the presidency (Covert, 2004). To understand the multiple facets of the community college that the SSAO oversees fully, one must consider the multiple roles of student affairs units in the community college.

Student affairs units in the community college. The student affairs unit within a community college is responsible for many of the programs and services that occur outside of the formal classroom. The practice of student affairs, and the organization of student affairs units at community colleges, continues to evolve with the changing demographics and nature of the institution. This evolution presents a challenge for student affairs professionals at community colleges, as A. M. Cohen et al. (2014) questioned:

Can concepts of adolescent development be effectively applied to a student body where 40% of learners are twenty-five or older and when students' consistency in attendance is sporadic? How can student services personnel assist students, many of who are responsible for dependents, or spend the majority of non-class hours working part- or full-time jobs? (p. 213)

Student affairs units in the community college include multiple functional areas and they must align to serve the diversity of the student body. Nevarez and Wood (2010) noted three core functions of student affairs units in community colleges. First, the technical operations of student affairs include services that transition students into the community college such as admission, registration, and counseling. The second function includes the campus life operations that assist in creating a campus environment that provides an affirmative and welcoming space for students to learn. Student government, student activities, multicultural programs and services, and student media are a part of campus life. Finally, there are "nexus operations which reside in the margins of academic and student affairs" (Nevarez & Wood, 2010, p. 177). For example, academic advising and retention programs require a strong working relationship between academic affairs and student affairs to be successful.

A. M. Cohen et al. (2014) classified the scope and organization of community college student affairs units in a different manner. They noted, "recruitment, orientation, and retention strategies are an ongoing, unified process" (p. 214) and included such programs as transitional bridge programs, general orientation programs, and specific orientation for online students. The next functional unit is counseling and advising, which includes academic advising, transfer counseling, career counseling, peer advising, tutoring, and mental health counseling.

As the community college enrolls a more diverse student population than other higher education institutional types, student affairs units within colleges are also offering programs and services to meet their students' needs including child care services (A. M. Cohen et al., 2014), older adult programming (Lewis, Zamani-Gallaher, & Bonapace, 2014), and veterans' centers (Fagan & Dunklin, 2014). Regardless of the type of service offered, the SSAOs need to be aware of the perceptions students have regarding these services.

The Senior Academic and Student Affairs Officer

There are multiple models for organizing administrative units in higher education (Bess & Dee, 2008). Within community colleges, academic affairs and student affairs may be organizationally structured as one unit under the leadership of an SASAO (Kuk, 2009). A change in presidential leadership and consideration of the community college's goals were the main determinants of combining the two units (Broadie, 2014). The benefits of a combined role included increased collaboration between academic and student affairs, increased access to decision-making, and improved communication between the units (Broadie, 2014; Kuk 2009). McClellan (2004) conducted a study examining the reporting relationships of student affairs units in community colleges and reported that 40% (n = 95) of units were organizationally housed under academic affairs through a joint role of vice president for academic and student affairs.

There is limited research on SASAOs. Broadie (2014) conducted a qualitative study with 11 SASAOs in community colleges. The participants detailed the importance of collaboration and communication in this role; however, they detailed difficulty in this position as they were often overworked and had to communicate mass amounts of information to a variety of people in and outside the community college. ACE (2013) reported demographic information for the

executive vice president, a title often used by individuals in the SASAO position: 67% identified as male, 33% identified as female, and 91.3% identified as White. Regardless of the duties they performed, a key theme that emerged from the research was the need for a collaborative approach when leading.

The Senior Finance and Administrative Officer

The principal role of presidents in higher education is securing a firm, financial future (Bess & Dee, 2008). Pope and Miller (2005) noted that community college presidents resemble business and finance officers as their tasks include managing investments and budgets, public relations, and human resources. The individual on the community college campus with the most experience in these functions is often the SFAO. Kiley (2012) stated that the SFAO may be well prepared to lead the community college as “the responsibilities of the presidency have shifted away from managing an institution’s academic program to questions of strategic planning, marketing, and fundraising” (para. 15).

In a mixed-methods study about community college SFAOs’ career path, McInnis (2002) discovered that the SFAO was often the designated senior leader after the community college president. Regarding the title of the SFAO, participants in McInnis’s research indicated that the title of the position was less important than having a close personal and professional relationship with the president. Though the community college SFAO has an important role in the leadership of the institution, there is limited information on the demographics of SFAOs and how one becomes a SFAO (Carroll, 2008).

In a random sample of national community college SFAOs, Carroll (2008) reported that 71% of participants identified as male, and 29% identified as female. Eighty-one percent of all respondents were White. ACE (2013) detailed that 27% of SFAOs identified as female and 73%

identified as male, with 87% being White. Approximately 60% of community college SFAOs in Carroll's study held a master's degree as the highest degree, followed by the baccalaureate (23%), or a doctoral degree (15%). Similarly, Railey (2010) reported that most community college SFAOs held a master's degree as their highest degree earned; however, a doctoral degree was the second most held degree.

The SFAO often has experience outside of community colleges including public and government accounting and in the private business and financial industry sectors (Carroll, 2008; Railey, 2010). Challenges to entering the SFAO position included obtaining training for the position, limited opportunities to enter the position because of a lack of vacant positions, and learning about the various community college funding models (Railey, 2010). McInnis (2002) noted that additional challenges for the SFAO included working with technology, learning the operations of the community college, and acclimating to the institutional culture. Community college SFAOs in California reported that communicating effectively, conflict management, and developing partnerships were the essential professional skills for the position in addition to expertise in finance and administration (Railey, 2010). Harrop (2007) reported that the most important behaviors for SFAOs were accountability, responsibility, decision-making, fairness, collaboration, commitment, decisiveness, objectivity, communication, motivational skills, and visibility.

Baker (2012) conducted research on behalf of the National Association of College and University Business Officers that focused on the unique role of the community college SFAO. Three key findings emerged from the study. First, the main difference between community college SFAOs and SFAOs at other types of institutions was the hands-on involvement in the day-to-day operations of the college. Community colleges often have a flat administrative

structure that results in the SFAO interacting with the community college president, senior staff, and other community members about the financial status of the institution (Birnbaum, 1991). Second, similar to the flat administrative structure, is that “the CFO [SFAO] must be adept at every facet of finance and administration including risk management, emergency preparedness, and management of capital projects” (Baker, 2012, p. 4).

In a survey of community college SFAOs in California, 81% of respondents reported that their primary responsibilities included managing the community college’s budget, 80% were responsible for producing budget reports, 76% chaired the community college’s budget committee, and 68% reported producing budget reports for external constituents (McInnis, 2002). Through supervision of administrative units such as police, physical plant, and auxiliary services, the SFAO’s role may often move beyond budget and finances (Bess & Dee, 2008).

Theoretical Framework: The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership

Kouzes and Posner (2012) developed the five practices of exemplary leadership after asking leaders “What did you do when you were at your personal best as a leader?” (p. 2). The authors began their data collection in 1982 by conducting over 5,000 case studies using the Personal Best Leadership Questionnaire, a 12-page survey that contains 38 open-ended questions (Posner, 2015). Next, Kouzes and Posner conducted over 500 follow-up interviews ranging from 45 minutes to almost four hours (Posner, 2015). Kouzes and Posner updated their research for each edition of *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations*; however, the five practices of exemplary leadership remained the same: (a) *model the way*, (b) *inspire a shared vision*, (c) *challenge the process*, (d) *enable others to act*, and (e) *encourage the heart*. Each practice includes two commitments that serve as a guide for enacting the corresponding practice. A common theme across all five practices of exemplary leadership

includes the leader being “honest, forward-looking, competent, and inspiring” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 35). Leaders who employed the five practices of exemplary leadership led higher performing teams, enhanced organizational commitment, and increased motivation more than peer leaders who did not use the five practices of exemplary leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Kouzes and Posner (2012) wrote, “although the context of leadership has changed dramatically since we began our research 30 years ago, the content of leadership has not changed much at all. The five practices of exemplary leadership framework has passed the test of time” (p. 15). The foundation for the five practices of exemplary leadership is the leaders’ credibility with the followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The researchers presented two laws of leadership: first, “if you don’t believe in the messenger, you won’t believe the message” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 38) and the importance of “building a credible foundation of leadership foundation when you DWYSYWD—do what you say you will do” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 4). According to Kouzes and Posner, following these two guiding principles will impact the way that one implements the five practices of exemplary leadership.

Model the Way

The first practice is to *model the way*. Leaders discover and clarify their personal values and act in a manner that is congruent with these values. In order to clarify values, Kouzes and Posner (2012) recommended that leaders explore their inner self and act authentically by personalizing their own leadership philosophy. Leaders who *model the way* affirm the shared values of the organization to increase feelings of personal effectiveness, foster loyalty to the organization, promote ethical behavior, and facilitate teamwork (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Furthermore, leaders who *model the way* set an example for others in the organization. They

focus time and energy upon valued issues in the organization. They seek feedback from all people in the organization and tell stories about their organization's success.

Inspire a Shared Vision

Exemplary leaders “envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 100). Leaders who *inspire a shared vision* imagine the possibilities by reflecting on the past, focusing on the present, and dreaming of the future. They enlist others in the process of envisioning the future by appealing to common ideals and putting vision into action. Leaders move from a thinking stage to a doing stage by creating an image of the future and speaking genuinely of their interest in the future of the organization.

Challenge the Process

Exemplary leaders create opportunities for greatness as they *challenge the process*. Kouzes and Posner stated that exemplary leaders took the initiative to challenge the process by encouraging others to join them in the development. They use oversight because leaders need to “anticipate the disruptions and get ahead of the curve” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 172). In order to *challenge the process*, exemplary leaders celebrate small victories by breaking down complex issues into more manageable parts and use small wins to produce big results. They learn from mistakes and never stop experimenting.

An important component of this leadership practice is communication. Leaders who *challenge the process* promote both internal and external communication. Additionally, they focus upon building resilience and understand that mistakes and failures will occur. They utilize these failures as an opportunity to discuss ways to improve.

Enable Others to Act

The fourth practice is to *enable others to act*. Exemplary leaders “foster collaboration by building trust and facilitating relationships” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 215). To *enable others to act*, exemplary leaders invest in trust and invite people to share knowledge and information. Additionally, exemplary leaders focus on relationships with others. Kouzes and Posner (2012) stated that “cooperative goals and roles contribute to a sense of collective purpose, and the best incentive for people to work to achieve shared goals is the knowledge that you and others will reciprocate, helping them in return” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 239). Strengthening others is necessary to *enable others to act*. Exemplary leaders allow others to feel in control of their own work while holding them accountable. They also work to develop confidence and competence in their followers. Leaders who *enable others to act* structure jobs so people can use their judgement, find a balance between challenging and supporting employees, coach others in the organization, and ask questions of others (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Encourage the Heart

The final practice of exemplary leaders is to *encourage the heart*. Encouraging the heart requires leaders to recognize contributions by having high expectations and support for others while personalizing incentives (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Kouzes and Posner (2012) recommended that leaders hold high expectations for others, create a sense of community and become personally involved in the success of the organization. They celebrate victories, create opportunities for public celebrations of these victories, and go beyond their normal job to make celebrations important.

The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership in Higher Education

Kouzes and Posner's Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership has been researched extensively in higher education, often through utilizing the Leadership Practices Inventory assessment. Scholars have examined the five practices in the context of community colleges (Butler, 2009; Broome, 2003; Dikeman, 2007; Grafton, 2009; Holt, 2003) student affairs (Jones, 2009; Oliver, 2001; Rozeboom, 2008; Smith 2005); administrative vice presidents (Maitra, 2007; Relken 2014); and college and university presidents (Dikeman, 2007; Stevenson, 2008; Stout-Stewart, 2004).

The transformational leadership practice *enable others to act* was most utilized according to mean score by participants in various studies. Butler (2009) reported that community college presidents and senior academic affairs officers in South Carolina most frequently utilized practice was *enable others to act* ($M=8.75$) compared to other transformational leadership practices. Grafton (2009) and Dikeman (2007) also studied community college presidents and they indicated the most utilized transformational leadership practice *enable others to act* with mean scores of 8.86 and 8.83, respectively. Maitra (2007) also reported the most utilized transformational leadership practice was *enable others to act* in her dissertation on the analysis of leadership styles and practices of university women in administrative vice president positions.

Oliver (2001) conducted research on the transformational leadership practices of SSAOs in Texas and *model the way* emerged as the most utilized practice. Additionally, Relken (2014) surveyed administrators in enrollment management and *challenge the process* was the most utilized transformational leadership practice. Aaker (2003) conducted a study on women who served as senior student affairs officers or senior academic affairs officers and discovered there we no statistically significantly different mean scores on the LPI-SELF as a function of current

position for *model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart.*

There are conflicting reports on the utilization of transformational leadership practices as a function of highest degree earned. The senior administrators in Aaker's (2003) study reported no statistically significantly different mean scores on the LPI-SELF as a function of highest earned degree. Stout-Stewart (2004) reported differences in utilization of transformational leadership as a function of highest degree earned. Rozeboom (2003) reported that SSAOs with a master's degree reported statistically significantly higher mean scores on the LPI-SELF than SSAOs with a bachelor's degree.

The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership and the AACC Leadership Competencies

I propose that there are conceptual similarities between the AACC competencies and the five practices of exemplary leadership. The AACC's leadership competencies and the five practices of exemplary leadership both demonstrate that one can learn to be a leader, one needs to practice leadership in order to learn it, and leadership requires working toward a common vision (Bass & Bass, 2008; Dugan, 2011; Dugan & Komives, 2011; Kouzes & Posner, 2012; Northouse, 2016). It is important to note that the basis of both the AACC competencies and the five practices of exemplary leadership is transformational leadership. Through this common theoretical grounding, I believe the core competencies developed by the AACC (2013a) have similarities to the five practices of exemplary leadership. To demonstrate these similarities, connected the AACC competencies to the five practices of exemplary leadership in Table 2.

Table 2

Alignment of AACC Leadership Competencies and the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership

AACC Competency	Related Leadership Practice
Organizational strategy	Envision the future; inspire a shared vision; challenge the process; encourage the heart
Institutional finance, research, fundraising, and resource management	Envision the future; inspire a shared vision; challenge the process
Communication	Model the way; inspire a shared vision; challenge the process; encourage the heart
Collaboration	Model the way; inspire a shared vision; challenge the process; envision the future; encourage the heart; enable others to act
Community college advocacy	Envision the future; inspire a shared vision; challenge the process; enable others to act

Note. Sources: AACC (2013a); Kouzes and Posner (2012).

Evaluation

In this section, I provide an evaluation of the literature related to the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. I present a review of the methodologies; then I detail a summary of my review, overall weakness and strengths related to the literature on the demographics, and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents, gaps and saturation points related to the topic.

Review of Methodologies

Researchers have used numerous methodologies and documented them in the literature related to the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. To provide demographic data and information on individuals

currently serving as community college presidents, community college SAAOs, community college SSAOs, community college SASAOs, and community college SFAOs, researchers have used descriptive statistics and frequencies. Additionally, researchers have utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate the experiences of community college leaders including the president, SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO. The qualitative studies have provided information on the lived experiences of people who serve in these positions, while quantitative studies have provided statistical information.

I examined the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents and the correlation between their utilization of leadership practices and interest in a community college presidency, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned, and participation in leadership development programs. I addressed these research questions utilizing a quantitative methodology.

Summary of the Literature Review

Shults (2001) first detailed the leadership crisis in community colleges. Additionally, many community college administrators who could take over the community college presidency were planning to retire. National organizations devoted to community college success and advocacy promised to collaborate to fill the anticipated community college presidency vacancies through leadership development opportunities.

To connect leadership development for potential community college presidents, I have also presented a history of leadership including both industrial and postindustrial approaches. Leadership studies have moved from a leader-centric model into a collaborative group effort involving transformational leadership. The AACC developed leadership competencies for

potential and current community college leaders utilizing the tenets of transformational leadership.

There is a significant amount of literature that details how some see the community college presidency as undesirable and filled with crisis. Additionally, the literature details how institutional location (urban, suburban, and rural) can affect leadership for community college presidents. To prepare future community college presidents, many studies recommend learning from previous experiences, obtaining a doctoral degree, and participating in leadership development programs. Some critique doctoral degrees because they do not include practical experience and preparation for the presidency, and others critique leadership development programs because of the cost and issues surrounding the relevance of the curriculum.

The community college leadership team consists of the president, SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO. Almost 75% of community college presidents will soon retire, and the flat, bureaucratic nature of community colleges may result in one of the four members of the leadership team advancing to the community college presidency. The SAAO oversees the academic core of the community college and the SSAO is responsible for various functions of student life programs and services. In some institutions, the SAAO and SSAO are combined into one position that oversees both functional areas. Finally, the SFAO may have responsibilities in business, finance, and auxiliary services of the institution. The career paths of these positions vary, and there is a lack of information on whether people who fill these positions aspire to a community college presidency.

There are various strengths in the literature related to the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. A consistent theme is an impending leadership crisis, and numerous organizations are devoted to preparing

future community college presidents. Although community college presidents are leaving their positions, a strength in the literature is the necessary types of leadership competencies to lead as a community college president (AACC, 2013a). These competencies developed from a mixed-methods study that focused on current community college presidents and the competencies scholars felt were necessary to lead the institution.

Another strength of the literature is the description of demographics and career paths of SAAOs, SSAOs, SASAOs, and SFAOs in community colleges. Numerous studies focus on who is currently in these positions and career paths to these positions. SSAOs often hold doctoral degrees and arrive in their positions through an academic affairs pathway involving a full-time faculty position. Community college SSAOs have a more diverse pathway to their position through a variety of student affairs functions in the community college. Community college SASAOs enter the position with a variety of experiences in both academic and student affairs. Community college SFAOs often enter their position from outside of higher education.

The largest gap in the literature concerns who aspires to become a community college president. There is literature related to the career paths of SAAOs, SSAOs, SASAOs, and SFAOs; however, there is limited information on whether or not individuals in these positions plan to become community college presidents. Considering that many community college presidents previously served in one of these four positions, it is important to investigate the personal, professional, and educational information of potential community college presidents who currently hold one of these positions.

Current literature on leadership in the community college presidency included the importance of a transformational leadership approach to lead the community college; however, there is limited information on how often potential community college presidents currently use

leadership practices grounded in transformational leadership. Furthermore, there is a significant amount of literature related to how current community college presidents prepared for their position including learning through previous positions, obtaining a doctoral degree, and participating in leadership development programs at the national/regional/local levels; more information is necessary. First, there is limited information on whether potential community college presidents from different positions (SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO) vary in their utilization of transformational leadership practices. Second, does the utilization of transformational leadership positively correlate with attainment of a doctoral degree? Benefits of doctoral degree attainment focused upon credibility with faculty, filling skills in professional development, personal fulfillment, and mobility in career advancement. Finally, a leadership development opportunity involves participation in a leadership development program. Participants in leadership development programs discussed many of the benefits of participation; however, there was little information on whether potential community college presidents who participated in these leadership development programs reported higher levels of utilization of transformational leadership practices.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains detailed information on the methodology I employed to examine the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. First, I restate the research questions; then I present information on the participants including who comprised the research population and how each underwent a selective process for inclusion in the study. Then, I describe the instruments I used to examine the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents including the LPI-SELF and a researcher-designed demographic, questionnaire. I describe the research design including the rationale, invalidity and minimization, procedure, and analysis strategy. Finally, I detail the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study.

Research Questions

The purpose of this correlational descriptive study was to understand who are potential community college presidents, to what degree these potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices, and if potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon personal and professional experiences. I researched this overarching research question: who are the potential community college presidents and how do they utilize transformational leadership? Eight sub-questions supported this study:

1. What are the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents?
2. To what degree do potential community college presidents self-report utilizing the transformational leadership practices of the LPI-SELF?

3. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president (very interested, somewhat interested, and not interested).

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president.

4. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon institutional location (rural, suburban, and urban)?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon institutional location.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon institutional location.

5. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon current position (SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO)?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon current position.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon current position.

6. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon highest degree earned?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon highest degree earned.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon highest degree earned.

7. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization.

8. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district?

H_0 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will not differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district.

H_1 = Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF will differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district.

Participants

I examined the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents; therefore, it was important to define the research

population for this study. Creswell (2012) defined a population as “a group of individuals who have the same characteristic” (p. 140). The research population was comprised of individuals who currently serve as SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SAFO in a community college. Although many individuals may aspire to become community college presidents, I only included those who currently serve in one of the four previously listed positions as a way to limit the study.

I utilized nonprobability sampling to examine the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. Nonprobability sampling involves sampling participants because they are accessible and convenient (Creswell, 2012). To obtain my research sample, I surveyed SAAOs, SSAOs, SASAOs, and SFAOs currently employed at two-year associate’s degree-granting institutions listed in the 2016 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education in the United States. Institutions are associate’s colleges if the associate’s degree is the highest degree conferred or bachelor’s degrees conferred by the institution account for less than 10% of total degrees (Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, n.d.). There were 924 institutions in this category.

I utilized the online *Higher Education Directory* to obtain the name, title, and e-mail address of each SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO. If there was no information in the directory for these positions, then I searched the institution’s website to obtain the information. If these methods were unsuccessful, I called the community college directly to obtain the information. When these methods were unsuccessful, I omitted the position from the sample. I identified each SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO based on the job position titles indicated in previous studies that corresponded to one of the four positions. There are a wide variety of organizational structures within higher education institutions; thus, not all institutions in my sample have each position.

Instruments

I utilized two instruments to understand the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents: the LPI-SELF and a demographic survey.

Leadership Practices Inventory

Kouzes and Posner developed the LPI after triangulating their qualitative and quantitative data on leaders at their personal best (Posner, 2015). Over 2.5 million people completed the assessment from 2007-2014 in a variety of organizational contexts, countries, and languages. The conceptual basis of the LPI is Kouzes and Posner's (2012) five practices of exemplary leadership. They developed these five practices of exemplary leadership from the Personal-Best Leadership Questionnaire, which utilized 38 open-ended questions to discover the practices of leaders when they were at their personal best. Additionally, Kouzes and Posner completed interviews to provide an in-depth perspective on the utilization of the transformational leadership practices. Kouzes and Posner developed statements and utilized phrases that operationalized the practices and worked with their research team and colleagues to refine the statements (Posner, 2015). The statements were originally on a five-point, Likert scale; however, they began to utilize a 10-point, Likert scale after 1999.

The LPI contains two sections: the LPI-Other and the LPI-SELF. Those associated with the leader complete the LPI-Other and they present their perceptions of the leader's utilization of the five practices of exemplary leadership. As I examined the self-perceived utilization of the five leadership practices, I used the LPI-SELF for this study. John Wiley and Sons owns the copyright to the LPI; thus, I obtained permission to utilize the survey in this research (Appendix A). A sample of questions from the LPI-SELF is in Appendix B.

The LPI-SELF contains 30 statements, and respondents report how often they engage in a particular behavior using a 10-point, Likert scale (1 – *almost never*, 2 – *rarely*, 3 – *seldom*, 4 – *once in a while*, 5 – *occasionally*, 6 – *sometimes*, 7 – *fairly often*, 8 – *usually*, 9 – *very frequently*, and 10 – *almost always*). Six statements correspond with each of the five practices of exemplary leadership: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. Each practice represents its own scale. Scores on each scale can range from 6 to 60. A higher score on the LPI-SELF indicates that the leader more frequently uses the corresponding transformational leadership practice. Internal reliability for each scale ranges from .814 to .900 (Posner, 2015). When discussing the validity of the LPI-SELF, Posner (2015) wrote that the LPI had “excellent face validity” (p. 11) because of its roots in qualitative research on personal best leadership scenarios. A function analysis also indicated that the five functions were distinct and independent (Posner & Kouzes, 1993).

Potential Community College Presidents’ Demographic Questionnaire

I utilized a demographic questionnaire (Appendix C) to solicit information on the personal, professional, and educational backgrounds potential community college presidents. The demographic questionnaire included age, race, gender, and years of professional experience in higher education. The professional information I solicited included interest in becoming a community college president, current position, highest degree earned, concentration of highest degree earned, and participation in leadership development programs. The information on the demographic questionnaire came from the literature review on leadership studies and community colleges. I combined the two instruments using Qualtrics survey software.

Pilot Test

Three senior higher education administrators pilot tested the survey. I provided them the LPI-SELF and the demographic questionnaire and asked for feedback about the clarity of directions, the appearance and clarity of the survey, and suggestions for improvement as recommended by Johnson and Christensen (2008). The first person who pilot tested the survey was an SSAO with over 30 years of experience in higher education. This person holds a doctoral degree in higher education administration and teaches courses in a higher education administration graduate program. This person provided positive feedback about the survey, stated that the survey took approximately four minutes to complete, and found no issues with the survey. The second person is a current SFAO in higher education. This person has worked in higher education for over 20 years and has a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree. This person also highlighted the short amount of time to complete the survey. The third person was a senior administrator in higher education who currently holds the title of assistant vice provost and has worked in higher education for the past 15 years. This person detailed confusion regarding the use of “rural, town, suburban, and urban” as institution locations. After reviewing this feedback and soliciting feedback from the dissertation committee, I elected to use “urban, suburban, and rural” to be more consistent with the previous literature and to alleviate possible confusion.

Research Design

In this research project, I examined the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by questioning potential community college presidents and worked to determine if the utilization of transformational leadership practices varied based upon professional development participation. I used a quantitative research design because I am

“measuring the degree of association between two or more variables using the statistical procedure of correlational analysis” (Creswell, 2012, p. 21). Research Questions 1 (What are the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents?) and 2 (To what degree do potential community college presidents self-report utilizing the leadership practices of the LPI?) utilize descriptive statistics. The independent and dependent variables of Research Questions 3 through 8 are in Table 3. In the next section, I provide more information regarding the invalidity and minimization of errors in quantitative research, and the procedures I used to collect and analyze data.

Invalidity and Minimization

This study utilized a cross-sectional design because I collected data at a single point in time (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). L. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) noted that cross-sectional designs were quick to conduct and less expensive to administer, had a stronger likelihood of participation as they only involved a single occurrence, and large samples enabled the use of inferential statistics. Conversely, cross-sectional designs do not allow for analysis of causal relationships, an omission of a single variable can undermine the results, and they only permit analysis of change at the macro level (L. Cohen et al., 2007). Additionally, a cross-sectional approach is unable to establish time order related to variables (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Due to the cross sectional approach, I am unable to demonstrate cause and effect relationships between the independent variables and the five scales of the LPI-SELF. Though there are limitations to a cross-sectional approach, this approach is most effective for this study because participants in this study participated in a myriad of educational, personal, and professional experiences at different times rather than participating in experiences as part of a cohort model simultaneously.

Table 3

Variable List for Research Questions

Research Question	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
3. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president?	Level of interest in community college presidency (very interested, somewhat interested, not interested)	LPI-SELF scores
4. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon institutional location?	Institutional location (rural, suburban, urban)	LPI-SELF scores
5. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI differ based upon current position?	Current Position (SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, SFAO)	LPI-SELF scores
6. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI differ based upon highest degree earned?	Highest degree earned (associate's, bachelor's, master's [Except MBA], MBA, PhD, EdD, other)	LPI-SELF scores
7. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization?	Participation in leadership development program	LPI-SELF scores
8. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district?	Participation in leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district	LPI-SELF scores

The ecological validity of the LPI-SELF is unavailable. Ecological validity is the degree to which research findings would generalize to typical settings of the population (Wegener & Blankenship, 2007). The LPI-SELF was created by using leadership information from private sector leaders, not community college leaders, thus the ecological validity of the LPI-SELF may limit the generalizability of the transformational leadership practices directly to a community college setting. Although not designed for community college leaders, various researchers (Aaker, 2003; Broome, 2003; Dikeman, 2007; Grafton, 2009; Stout 2005) have used the LPI-SELF to measure self-perceived utilization of transformational leadership by community college leaders.

I conducted this quantitative study using the Internet. Advantages to collecting data online include reductions in costs to the researcher; reductions in time to distribute, collect, and analyze the survey; respondents can complete the survey at their convenience; and there is less human error in coding data (L. Cohen et al., 2007). However, there are issues with web-based surveys including technical considerations, and survey drop out (L. Cohen et al., 2007). To minimize technical issues, I avoided the use of graphics and provided clear instructions for completion (L. Cohen et al., 2007). Finally, to minimize survey drop out, I indicated the length of the survey in the e-mail, detailed how much more of the survey remained, kept the survey as short as possible while maintaining rigor, and utilized reminders for survey completion (L. Cohen et al., 2007).

Procedure

I received approval to conduct my study from the Human Subjects Review Board at Bowling Green State University (Appendix D) on May 5, 2016. The participants completed the survey electronically. It took less than 10 minutes for pilot testers to complete the survey. The

survey was anonymous, and it was not possible to trace responses back to individual participants. I stored the responses electronically in a password-protected database. Additionally, I stored files related to the data collection on a password-protected computer that only I could access.

I e-mailed the survey on May 25, 2016, to 2,711 potential community college presidents (Appendix E). One hundred and two surveys were returned due to incorrect e-mail addresses or because the e-mail addresses were no longer valid. I reviewed the returned e-mails and was able to identify an alternate e-mail or a new administrator in the position for 84 participants. I sent a second reminder e-mail on June 7, 2016 (Appendix F) and I sent a final reminder on June 13, 2016 (Appendix G). The survey closed on June 15, 2016, at 11:59 pm. I included the informed consent document (Appendix H) in all survey invitations.

Six hundred and seventy-six potential community college presidents completed the survey. I excluded 11 participants from the sample because they did not complete more than 85% of the survey (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). Additionally, I omitted an additional nine participants because they did not fit within the study's parameters, as four participants reported they were midlevel practitioners, one participant had returned to a faculty career and no longer served as a senior administrator, one participant was currently serving as an acting president, one worked in continuing education, and one worked in alumni relations. My final number of useable responses was 656 participants for a response rate of 24%.

Analysis Strategy

I screened surveys for missing data, outliers, and adequacy of fit before conducting analysis (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). This process is important because inaccurate data may lead to false conclusions (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). I used listwise deletion when missing data was present, as many methods for dealing with missing data are ineffective (Allison, 2001). Outliers

can distort the results of statistical tests and I identified them using histograms and boxplots (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). I winsorized outliers. This is a process whereby one changes outliers to the next largest number that is not an outlier (Reifman & Keyton, 2011). A summary of each analysis is in Table 4. Reifman and Keyton (2011) stated that an advantage of winsorizing is that “it preserves the information that a case had among the highest (or lowest) values in a distribution but protects against some of the harmful effects of outliers” (p. 1637).

I conducted testing on Questions 3 through 8. Hypothesis testing involves testing predictions regarding the sample and utilizing significance tests to verify that “the difference between means is substantial enough to rule out sampling error as an explanation for the difference” (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013, p. 10). I set my alpha level at .05 as it “represents an acceptably small risk of Type 1 error in most situations” (Warner, 2013, p. 89). I also reported effect size, as large sample sizes can result in statistically significant findings, yet lack practical significance as measured by the effect size (Coe, 2002). I utilized eta-squared for effect size when there were more than two categories in the independent variable. A small effect size using eta-squared is .01, a medium effect size is .06, and a large effect size is .14 (J. Cohen, 1988). I utilized J. Cohen’s *d* to measure effect size when there were two dichotomous categories in the independent variable. J. Cohen (1998) determined the following guidelines for interpreting effect size while using J. Cohen’s *d*: .2 is small, .5 is medium, and .8 is large.

I also verified the data met the assumptions of the corresponding statistical tests. The first independent assumption of the one-way ANOVAs and independent samples *t* tests is independence of observation. I met the assumption of independence of observation because participants were only able to select one answer per question on the independent variable, thus preventing participants from entering more than one category of the independent variable.

Table 4

Data Analysis Strategy of Research Questions

Research Question	Source of Data	Type of Statistical Analysis
1. What are the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents?	Demographic variables from the survey	Means and Standard Deviations
2. To what degree do potential community college presidents self-report utilizing the leadership practices of the LPI?	Demographic variables from the survey; LPI-SELF responses	Means and Standard Deviations
3. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president?	Demographic variables from the survey; LPI-SELF responses	One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)
4. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon institutional location?	Demographic variables from the survey; LPI-SELF responses	One-way ANOVA
5. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI differ based upon current position?	Demographic variables from the survey; LPI-SELF responses	One-way ANOVA
6. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI differ based upon highest degree earned?	Demographic variables from the survey; LPI-SELF responses	One-way ANOVA

Table 4 continues

Table 4 continued

Data Analysis Strategy of Research Questions

Research Question	Source of Data	Type of Statistical Analysis
7. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization?	Demographic variables from the survey; LPI-SELF responses	Independent samples <i>t</i> test
8. Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district?	Demographic variables from the survey; LPI-SELF responses	Independent samples <i>t</i> test

The second assumption for both the one-way ANOVAs and independent samples *t* tests is normality, which requires an equal distribution of the dependent variable in each group of the independent variable. I determined that the assumptions of normality for all group combinations of all dependent and independent variables were satisfied after I conducted a visual inspection of both histograms and normal Q-Q plots.

The final assumption for both the one-way ANOVAs and independent samples *t* tests is that the data show homogeneity of variance. Homogeneity of variances that indicates there is similar variance between groups. In Questions 3 through 6, I used Levene's test for equality of variance and accepted the homogeneity of variance when Levene's test was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). If Levene's test for equality of variances was statistically significant, I

utilized a Welch ANOVA. A Welch ANOVA is appropriate when the assumption of homogeneity of variance is violated (Mickey, Dunn, & Clark, 2004; Myers, Well, & Lorch, 2010). Even when the assumption of homogeneity of variance is violated with the t test, conducting the t test with unequal variances is a better option than nonparametric tests (Ruxton, 2006).

Research Question 1. I used descriptive statistical analysis to answer the first research question: What are the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents? I presented the data related to the highest degree earned, field of study of highest degree earned, level of interest in a community college president, institutional location, current position, years in higher education and demographic data related to race, gender, and age.

Research Question 2. I also conducted descriptive statistical analysis to answer Research Question 2: To what degree do potential community college presidents self-report utilizing the leadership practices of the LPI-SELF? I report the mean score for each of the five leadership scales (*model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart*).

Research Question 3. I utilized a one-way ANOVA to answer Research Question 3: Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president? This test procedure was appropriate as ANOVAs test the mean differences on two or more categorical, independent variables and a single quantitative, dependent variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). The dependent variable is each of the five scales on the LPI-SELF. The independent variable is level of interest in becoming a community college president (very interested, somewhat interested, and not interested). A one-way ANOVA details if there is a significant difference between the mean

scores, but not which mean scores are different. I utilized post hoc tests to discover which variables differed in a statistically significant manner.

Research Question 4. I utilized a one-way ANOVA to determine if potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differed based upon institutional location (urban, suburban, and rural). This test was appropriate as I examined the mean differences between a single dependent variable (each scale on the LPI-SELF) and three categorical, independent variables (rural, suburban, and urban). I utilized post hoc tests to determine which variables were different by statistical significance.

Research Question 5. I conducted a one-way ANOVA on Research Question 5: Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon current position? The independent variable is the respondents' current position: SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SFAO. The dependent variable is each of five mean score scales from the LPI-SELF. I conducted the one-way ANOVA multiple times using each of the five leadership scales on the LPI-SELF. Once again, I utilized post hoc tests to determine which variables were different by statistical significance.

Research Question 6. I employed a one-way ANOVA to answer Research Question 6: Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon highest degree earned? The independent variable is the potential community college president's highest degree earned. The dependent variable is each of the five mean score scales from the LPI-SELF. Similar to Research Question 3, I conducted post hoc tests to discover any significant differences between the variables' mean scores.

Research Question 7. I utilized an independent-samples t test to answer whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF were different based on

participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a national organization. The independent samples t test is appropriate when there are two independent variables that are categorical values and one dependent variable that is quantitative (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). The independent variable is potential community college president participation in a community college leadership development program. The dependent variable is each of the five mean score scales from the LPI-SELF. I conducted the t test multiple times for each of the five leadership scales on the LPI-SELF.

Research Question 8. I applied an independent samples t test to answer Research Question 8: Do potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district? This test is appropriate because I have a dichotomous, categorical independent variable (participation in leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district vs. nonparticipation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district) and one quantitative dependent variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013).

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

I utilized a postpositive research paradigm while conducting this study. The postpositive approach “believes in generalization, but admits that knowledge is the result of social conditioning” (Wahyuni, 2012). Additionally, postpositivism assumes that absolute truth is nonexistent (Sharma, 2010). The epistemological view of postpositive research involves observable phenomena; however, the focus of the researcher is on explaining the phenomena within the context in which it occurs (Wahyuni, 2012). Fox (2008) noted a methodological consideration for conducting research through a postpositive approach and wrote that the

scientific method of value-free research is too simplistic, as researchers must consider the subject to be part of a larger phenomenon. During my study, I examined the mean-scores on the LPI-SELF; however, I also considered the overall context of community college leadership.

Limitations

A limitation of this study was that there is no current list of potential community college presidents who currently serve as SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, and SFAO. I utilized multiple methods to gain contact information for these senior administrators in associate's degree-granting, two-year colleges in the United States including the *Higher Education Directory*, reviewing institutional websites and directories, and contacting human resources at particular institutions. Even with multiple methods of locating the senior administrators, there were still senior administrators who I could not include in the study.

The second limitation was related to the content and curricular components of the leadership development experiences such as graduate education and leadership development programs. Participants indicated their highest degree earned and participation in leadership development programs; however, there are great variety in formats and learning outcomes for these programs that these differences were unaccounted for in the present study.

The final limitation was related to the small sample size for various demographic data which may impact the statistical power in the analysis. For example, only 24 potential community college administrators held a bachelor's degree as highest degree earned. A small sample may result in a Type II error (Acheson, 2010).

Delimitations

I am seeking to understand the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. The first delimitation is that I

only included community colleges in this study. I bound this study to community colleges because they are facing a potential leadership crisis as more community colleges presidents are retiring than are available to fill the position (Aspen Institute & Achieving the Dream Foundation, 2013; Shults, 2001).

I examined current community college administrators who aspire to be community college presidents who currently serve as SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SFAO. Community college presidents enter the presidency from a myriad of career paths; however, I limited my study to these four administrative positions, as they are most commonly one administrative position away from the community college presidency.

Uncontrolled Factors Influencing Outcomes

There are always factors outside of the researcher's scope of control that influence the outcomes (Creswell, 2012; Johnson & Christensen, 2008). One uncontrolled factor was the necessity to gain HSRB approval at the participants' institution as well as Bowling Green State University. I was notified that participants at one community college could not participate in the study because all studies sent to faculty, staff, and students at the institution must be approved by their HSRB. I decided to not include these three participants in the sample, as the survey timeline would pass before I could gain approval from that board.

As I mentioned previously, there is no exhaustive list of potential community college presidents who currently serve as SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SFAO. I utilized multiple ways to collect the contact information for the potential community college presidents in two-year associate's degree-granting institutions including the online *Higher Education Directory*, searching institutional websites, and calling the community college; however, there was no way

to control for potential community college presidents who switched positions, or planned to switch positions, during my study.

Shortcomings in the Data

In the present study, I explored the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents using a quantitative research design. As I reflect on the research project, I acknowledge shortcomings in the data collection that may have additional information on the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. In hindsight, I would have collected closed and open response questions regarding why potential community college presidents are or are not interested in a community college president position. When I sent the survey to my sample, I received feedback from participants regarding their reasons for not being interested in a community college presidency. Similarly, I would have collected more information about why participants did or did not attend national leadership development seminars. There are multiple organizations conducting national leadership development seminars; however, my study did not account for the differences in the programs presented by national organizations. This information would have been beneficial for descriptive purposes.

Next, there are multiple ways that potential community college presidents may prepare for the community college presidency including obtaining educational credentials, participating in leadership development programs sponsored by national organizations and community colleges or community college districts, and mentorship from current community college presidents. I did not collect information on mentorship during this research study; however, I feel this data would provide information on the potential relationship between potential community college presidents' mentorship and utilization of transformational leadership practices.

An additional shortcoming in the data is related to the inability to distinguish between types of education fields in Question 7 of the demographic questionnaire. For example, when participants responded they had a PhD in education, I was unable to determine if they had studied higher education administration, community college leadership, secondary education, or multiple other options. Given the importance scholars placed on community college leadership doctoral programs, this information would have been beneficial.

Finally, this study lacks an important comparison group: current community college presidents. I was able to compare the results of the current study of potential community college presidents with previous studies on community college presidents; however, obtaining a sample from community college presidents from institutions listed in the Carnegie Classification could have provided a direct comparison.

Resolution of Contradictions, Inconsistencies, and Misleading Elements

One uncontrolled factor during this process was related to question wording and participant responses regarding Question 6: “What is your highest degree earned?” and Question 7: “What is the area of study for your highest degree earned?” in the demographic questionnaire section of this study. I utilized Question 6 from the demographic questionnaire to answer my sixth research question: “Do potential community college presidents’ utilization of transformational leadership practices differ based upon highest degree earned?”

I reviewed the responses to these questions and noticed that there were more potential community college presidents who reported highest degree earned being the associate’s degree than I anticipated. I further investigated, and eight participants reported their highest degree earned as multiple combinations of responses including “the college offers degrees in multiple fields” and “[the community college] is authorized to grant multiple associate’s degrees.” Seven

participants reported a response indicating a variation of a transfer degree such as “transfer pathways.” I concluded that participants responded to Questions 6 and 7 on the demographic questionnaire with the highest degree offered by the institution rather than their personal highest degree earned. I kept these participants in the sample and removed their responses for Questions 7 and 8 on the demographic questionnaire. Their missing responses did not affect other research questions, as the one-way ANOVA does not include multiple independent variables in the analysis (H. Ro, personal communication, August 8, 2016).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I have detailed information on the methodology I used to discover how potential community college presidents utilized transformational leadership practices and whether their utilization of transformational leadership practices differed based upon personal and professional characteristics. I provided information on the research sample and the two instruments I utilized to understand the leadership practices of potential community college presidents: the LPI-SELF and a demographic questionnaire. I also discussed validity, reliability, and information related to the development of these instruments. Finally, I discussed the research design including procedures and analysis strategies.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

In this chapter, I provide a detailed description of the statistical analysis I used to understand the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. I present the results of my data analysis. I utilized descriptive statistics to answer Research Questions 1 and 2. I employed one-way ANOVA tests to answer Research Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6. Finally, I applied independent samples *t* tests to answer Research Questions 7 and 8. I conclude with a summary of the results.

Question 1

I utilized descriptive statistics to answer my first research question: What are the educational, professional, and personal backgrounds of potential community college presidents? As not all participants completed the entire demographic questionnaire, some response totals do not equal 656 participants.

Educational Characteristics

Potential community college presidents have a variety of educational backgrounds and I present their backgrounds in Table 5. Sixteen percent of potential community college presidents hold the associate's as highest degree earned, 4% hold a bachelor's degree as highest degree earned, 20% hold a master's degree (not MBA) as highest degree earned, 9% hold an MBA as highest degree earned, 25% of the sample hold the PhD as the highest degree earned, 20% hold the EdD as highest degree earned, and 6% of the sample selected other as highest degree earned. Potential community college presidents with other as highest degree earned included five potential community college presidents with a Certified Personal Accountant license, three with multiple degrees, two with educational specialist degrees, two with Doctor of Management degrees (DM), one with a Doctor of Business Administration degree (DBA), and one with a

Table 5

Participant Highest Degree Earned

	SAAO		SSAO		SASAO		SFAO		All	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Associate's	26	14%	35	15%	17	22%	24	16%	102	16%
Bachelor's	1	1%	3	1%	0	0%	20	13%	24	4%
Master's (Except MBA)	23	13%	71	31%	14	18%	22	15%	130	20%
MBA	4	2%	8	3%	1	1%	42	28%	55	9%
PhD	75	41%	51	22%	25	32%	12	8%	163	25%
EdD	43	24%	51	22%	18	23%	16	11%	128	20%
Other	9	5%	11	5%	3	4%	15	10%	38	6%
TOTAL	181	100%	230	99%	78	100%	151	101%	640	100%

Doctor of Law and Policy (LPD), one listed certificates, one listed a certificate of advanced study, one listed a specialist in psychology degree, and one listed the highest degree earned as a registered nurse. I provide further information regarding potential community college presidents' highest degree earned later in the chapter.

The major field of study for the highest degree earned is in Table 6. Almost half of all associate's (48%) degrees are in education or higher education. Eighty-three percent of potential community college presidents with a bachelor's degree as highest degree earned studied business. Forty-eight percent of potential community college presidents with a non-MBA master's degree studied education. Sixty-six percent of community college presidents with a PhD studied education or higher education and 11% studied social sciences. Almost all (97%) of potential community college presidents with an EdD studied education or higher education. Approximately 8% of the participants indicated other as the major field of study for highest degree earned and their most studied major field of study was organizational leadership/leadership studies ($N = 12$), public administration ($N = 9$), communication ($N = 3$), and 23 other unique programs. Thirty-seven percent of potential community college presidents with other as highest degree earned studied education or higher education and 32% studied business. Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10 contain information on the major field of study for highest degree earned of SAAOs, SSAOs, SASAOs, and SFAOs, respectively.

Personal Characteristics

Table 11 contains the participants' personal demographics. Fifty-two percent of the participants identified as female, 48% of the participants identified as male, and .2% participant identified as trans. Racially, 81.4% of the population identified as White, 8.4% identified a

Table 6

Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned

	Associate's		Bachelor's		Master's		MBA		PhD		EdD		Other		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Agricultural/natural resources	1	1%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%
Biological sciences	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	8	1%
Business	16	16%	20	83%	12	9%	55	100%	2	1%	1	1%	12	32%	118	18%
Computer science	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%
Education/higher education	48	48%	2	8%	62	48%	0	0%	107	66%	124	97%	14	37%	357	56%
Engineering	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0%
Humanities/fine arts	7	7%	1	4%	3	2%	0	0%	13	8%	0	0%	1	3%	25	4%
Law	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	16%	6	1%
Mathematics	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	0%
Health professions	13	13%	0	0%	3	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	3%	18	3%
Physical/natural sciences	1	1%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	8	1%
Social sciences	3	3%	0	0%	14	11%	0	0%	18	11%	0	0%	1	3%	36	6%
Other	8	8%	1	4%	26	20%	0	0%	8	5%	3	2%	3	8%	49	8%
TOTAL	100	100%	24	100%	130	100%	55	100%	163	100%	128	100%	38	100%	638	100%

Table 7

SAAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned

	Associate's		Bachelor's		Master's		MBA		PhD		EdD		Other	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Agricultural/natural resources	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Biological sciences	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Business	3	12%	0	0%	2	9%	4	100%	1	1%	0	0%	2	22%
Computer science	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%
Education/higher education	12	46%	1	100%	9	39%	0	0%	38	51%	43	100%	4	44%
Humanities/fine arts	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	9	12%	0	0%	1	11%
Mathematics	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Health professions	1	4%	0	0%	3	13%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	11%
Physical/natural sciences	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Social sciences	1	4%	0	0%	2	9%	0	0%	11	15%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	4	15%	0	0%	2	9%	0	0%	5	7%	0	0%	1	11%
Total	26	100%	1	100%	23	100%	4	100%	75	100%	43	100%	9	100%

Table 8

SSAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned

	Associate's		Bachelor's		Master's		MBA		PhD		EdD		Other	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Agricultural/natural resources	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Business	4	11%	0	0%	3	4%	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
Computer science	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Education/higher education	18	51%	1	33%	43	61%	0	0%	44	86%	50	98%	6	67%
Engineering	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Humanities/fine arts	3	9%	1	33%	1	1%	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Law	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
Mathematics	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Health professions	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical/natural sciences	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Social sciences	1	3%	0	0%	10	14%	0	0%	4	8%	0	0%	1	11%
Other	2	6%	1	33%	10	14%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%
TOTAL	35	100%	3	100%	71	100%	8	100%	51	100%	51	100%	9	100%

Table 9

SASAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned

	Associate's		Bachelor's		Master's		MBA		PhD		EdD		Other	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Agricultural/natural resources	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Biological sciences	1	6%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Business	1	6%	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Computer science	0	0%	0	0	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Education/higher education	11	69%	0	0	5	36%	0	0%	18	72%	17	94%	2	67%
Humanities/fine arts	0	0%	0	0	1	7%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Law	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
Health professions	2	13%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Social sciences	0	0%	0	0	2	14%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	6%	0	0	5	36%	0	0%	1	4%	1	6%	0	0%
TOTAL	16	100%	0	0	14	100%	1	100%	25	100%	18	100%	3	100%

Table 10

SFAO Field of Study for Highest Degree Earned

	Associate's		Bachelor's		Master's		MBA		PhD		EdD		Other	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Business	8	35%	20	100%	7	32%	42	100%	1	8%	1	6%	9	60%
Education/higher education	7	30%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	7	58%	14	88%	2	13%
Engineering	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Humanities/fine arts	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Law	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	27%
Health professions	5	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Physical/natural sciences	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%
Social sciences	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	1	4%	0	0%	9	41%	0	0%	1	8%	1	6%	0	0%
TOTAL	23	100%	20	100%	22	100%	42	100%	12	100%	16	100%	15	100%

Table 11

Participant Personal Characteristics

	SAAO		SSAO		SASAO		SFAO		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender Identity										
Male	90	49.5	99	42.7	41	51.9	83	52.2	313	48
Female	92	50.5	132	56.9	38	48.1	76	47.8	338	51.8
Trans*	0	0	1	0.4	0	0	0	0	1	0.2
Race										
African American/Black	7	3.8	33	14.2	8	10.1	7	4.4	55	8.4
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	0.5	4	1.7	0	0	0	0	5	0.8
Asian	3	1.6	3	1.3	0	0	4	2.5	10	1.5
Latino/Hispanic	5	2.7	25	10.8	2	2.5	5	3.1	37	5.6
White	167	90.3	159	68.5	69	87.3	139	87.4	534	81.4
Other	2	1.1	9	3.9	0	0	4	2.5	15	2.3

Table 11 continues

Table 11 continued

Participant Personal Characteristics

	SAAO		SSAO		SASAO		SFAO		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age										
40 or younger	9	4.9	30	12.9	2	2.5	19	11.9	60	9.1
41-45	18	9.8	45	19.4	8	10.1	14	8.8	85	13
46-50	36	19.7	44	19.0	19	24.1	27	17	126	19.2
51-55	35	19.1	39	16.8	14	17.7	31	19.5	119	18.1
56-60	52	28.4	38	16.4	22	27.8	35	22	147	22.4
61-65	25	13.7	28	12.1	11	13.9	25	15.7	89	13.6
66-70	7	3.8	7	3.0	3	3.8	7	4.4	24	3.7
70 or older	1	0.5	1	0.4	0	0	1	0.6	3	0.5

Black/African American, 5.6% as Latino/latina, 2.3% as other, 1.5% as Asian, and .8% as American Indian/Alaskan Native. Approximately 9.1% of participants were 40 years old or younger, 13% were 41-45 years old, 19.2% were between 46 and 50 years old, 18.1% were 51-55 years old, 22% were between 56-60 years old, 13.6% were 61-65 years old, 3.7% were 66-70 years old, and .5% were 70 or older.

Professional Characteristics

Table 12 contains the information regarding the participants' professional characteristics. Approximately 68% of potential community college presidents were interested in a community college presidency, as 35.1% indicated they are somewhat interested and 33.1% were very interested. Approximately 32% were not interested in the position. There was a near equal split in participation in national community college leadership development programs, as 50.1% of potential community college presidents in my study participated and 49.9% of participants did not. Similarly, 45.5% of potential community college presidents in this study reported that they participated in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district and 54.5% of participants did not participate in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district.

Potential community college presidents were mostly located in rural communities as 50.8% worked in a rural institution, while 28.4% worked at a suburban institution, and 20.8% worked in a community college in an urban setting. Only 4.1% of potential community college presidents in my study worked at an institution that serves fewer than 500 students. Twenty two percent of the participants worked at an institution that served between 500 and 1,999 students, 35% worked at an institution that served between 2,000 and 4,999, 21.1% worked at an

Table 12

Participant Professional Characteristics

	SAAO		SSAO		SASAO		SFAO		All	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Interest in becoming a community college president										
Not interested	44	23.8	68	29.2	18	22.8	79	49.7	209	31.9
Somewhat interested	62	33.5	94	40.3	24	30.4	50	31.4	230	35.1
Very interested	79	42.7	71	30.5	37	46.8	30	18.9	217	33.1
Institutional location										
Urban	39	21.2	52	22.3	15	19.2	30	19	136	20.8
Suburban	54	29.2	67	28.8	20	25.6	45	28.5	186	28.4
Rural	92	49.7	114	48.9	43	55.1	83	52.5	332	50.8
Full-time students Fall 2015										
Fewer than 500	11	5.9	6	2.6	3	3.8	7	4.5	27	4.1
500-1,999	37	20	54	23.3	16	20.3	38	24.2	145	22.2
2,000-4,999	67	36.2	77	33.2	32	40.5	53	33.8	229	35.1

Table 12 continues

Table 12 continued

Participant Professional Characteristics

	SAAO		SSAO		SASAO		SFAO		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
5,000-9,999	40	21.6	4	23.3	16	20.3	28	17.8	138	21.1
10,000 or more students	30	16.2	41	17.7	12	15.2	31	19.7	114	17.5
Years of work experience in higher education										
0-5	2	1.1	1	0.4	3	3.8	19	11.9	25	3.8
6-10	9	4.9	13	5.6	2	2.5	32	20.1	56	8.5
11-15	25	13.5	32	13.7	3	3.8	32	20.1	95	14
16-20	38	20.5	58	24.9	16	20.3	27	17	139	21.2
21-25	40	21.6	52	22.3	26	32.9	17	10.7	135	20.6
25 or more	71	38.4	77	33	29	36.7	32	20.1	209	31.9

Table 12 continues

Table 12 continued

Participant Professional Characteristics

	SAAO		SSAO		SASAO		SFAO		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Participation in national leadership development program										
Yes	94	50.8	124	53.4	40	50.6	69	43.9	327	50.1
No	91	49.2	108	46.6	39	49.4	88	56.1	326	49.9
Participation in a GYOL Program										
Yes	84	45.4	118	50.9	31	39.2	65	40.5	298	45.5
No	101	54.6	114	49.1	48	60.8	94	59.1	357	54.5

institution that served between 5,000 and 9,999 students, and 17.5% worked at an institution that served more than 10,000 students. Almost 74% of potential community college presidents in my sample have 16 or more years of experience in higher education (31.9% with 25 or more years' experience, 21.2% with 16-20 years of experience, 20.6% with 21-25 years of experience). Approximately 26% of the sample had less than 16 years of experience in higher education.

Question 2

My second research question was “To what degree do potential community college presidents self-report utilizing the transformational leadership practices of the LPI-SELF?” In Table 13, I present the mean scores for each of the five practices of the LPI-SELF. The transformational leadership practice with the highest mean score (9.12) is *enable others to act* (e.g., “I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with”; “I treat others with dignity and respect”). The second highest transformational leadership practice based on mean score (8.71) is *model the way* (e.g., “I set a personal example of what I expect of others”; “I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on”). The third highest transformational leadership practice according to mean score (8.55) is *encourage the heart* (e.g., “I praise people for a job well done”; “I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects”). The fourth highest transformational leadership practice according to mean score (8.43) is *challenge the process* (e.g., “I seek out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities”; “I ask ‘What can we learn?’ when things don’t go as expected”). The lowest transformational leadership practice according to mean score (8.37) is *inspire a shared vision* (8.37) (e.g., “I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like”; “I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future”).

Table 13

Mean Scores of Transformational Leadership Practices

Practices	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Model	653	8.71	0.777
Inspire	650	8.37	1.094
Challenge	651	8.43	0.972
Enable	655	9.12	0.574
Encourage	652	8.55	1.005

Question 3

I conducted five one-way ANOVA tests to determine whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon professional interest in becoming a community college president (very interested, somewhat interested, not interested). The full results are in Table 14. I utilized a Welch ANOVA to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in self-reported utilization of transformational leadership as a function of level of interest in a community college presidency for *inspire a shared vision* and *challenge the process*, as the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p < .05$). I conducted post hoc tests when there were statistically significant differences to discover which variables were statistically significantly different. There were statistically significant differences in the mean scores of five scales (*model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, *enable others to act*, and *encourage the heart*) of the LPI-SELF based upon level of interest in a community college presidency; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Table 14

Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Utilization of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Level of Interest in a Community College Presidency

Variables and Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Model						
Between Groups	2	4.07	2.03	3.58	.028*	0.01
Within Groups	650.0	369.0	0.568			
Inspire ^a						
Between Groups	2	57.6	28.8	10.18	.001*	0.08
Within Groups	419.9	626.7	0.097			
Challenge ^a						
Between Groups	2	36.1	18.1	23.21	.001*	0.06
Within Groups	420.3	532.0	0.821			
Enable						
Between Groups	2	1.99	0.954	3.12	.045*	0.01
Within Groups	652.0	199.9	0.306			
Encourage						
Between Groups	2	7.44	3.72	3.90	.021*	0.01
Within Groups	649.0	619.2	0.954			

Note. a = Welch's ANOVA utilized, * = $p < .05$.

Model the Way

The one-way ANOVA indicated statistically significant differences in potential community college presidents' mean scores for the self-reported utilization of the transformational leadership practice *model the way* as a function of level of interest, $F(2,650.0) = 3.58, p = .028, \eta^2 = 0.01$. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. Potential community college presidents' mean scores for the self-reported utilization of the transformational leadership practice *model the way* were statistically significantly higher ($p = .028$) for potential community

college presidents who are very interested in a community college presidency ($M = 8.82$, $SD = .712$) than for potential community college presidents who are not interested in a community college presidency ($M = 8.63$, $SD = .056$).

Inspire a Shared Vision

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for the one-way ANOVA on *inspire a shared vision* as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .001$); thus, I utilized the Welch ANOVA to understand whether there were any differences on the *inspire a shared vision* scale as function of level of interest in a community college presidency. Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the *inspire a shared vision* scale were statistically significantly different among the three levels of interest in a community college presidency, Welch's $F(2, 419.9) = 10.176$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .08$. Eta squared indicates a medium effect size. I conducted a Games-Howell post hoc test and discovered that potential community college presidents who are very interested in a community college presidency ($M = 8.76$, $SD = .055$) reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .001$) mean scores on *inspire a shared vision* than potential community college presidents who are not interested in the position ($M = 8.02$, $SD = 1.13$).

Challenge the Process

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was also violated for the one-way ANOVA on the transformational leadership practice *challenge the process* as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .001$). Once again, I utilized the Welch ANOVA to discover if potential community college presidents' mean scores were statistically significantly different on the self-reported utilization of the transformational leadership practice *challenge the process* as function of level of interest in a community college presidency. Potential community college

presidents' mean scores on *challenge the process* were statistically significantly different among the three levels of interest in a community college presidency, Welch's $F(2,420.3) = 23.21, p = .001, \eta^2 = .06$. Eta squared indicates a medium effect size. I utilized a Games-Howell post hoc test and determined that potential community college presidents who are very interested ($M = 8.73, SD = .737$) in a community college presidency reported statistically significantly higher mean scores ($p = .001$) on the *challenge the process* scale than potential community college presidents who are somewhat interested in the position ($M = 8.44, SD = .933$) and those who are not interested in the position ($M = 8.12, SD = 1.03$).

Enable Others to Act

I utilized a one-way ANOVA and determined that potential community college presidents' self-reported statistically significantly different mean scores for utilization of the transformational leadership practice *enable others to act*, $F(2,652.0) = 3.12, p = .045, \eta^2 = .009$ as a function of level of interest in a community college presidency. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I conducted a Tukey post hoc test to examine the difference and discovered that potential community college presidents' mean scores on the transformational leadership practice *enable others to act* were statistically significantly higher ($p = .045$) for potential community college presidents who are very interested in a community college presidency ($M = 9.20, SD = .547$) than potential community college presidents who are not interested in a community college presidency ($M = 8.43, SD = 1.04$).

Encourage the Heart

I also conducted a one-way ANOVA and determined that potential community college presidents' self-reported statistically significantly different mean scores for utilization of the transformational leadership practice *encourage the heart*, $F(2,649.0) = 3.90, p = .021, \eta^2 = 0.01$,

as a function of level of interest in a community college presidency. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I utilized the Tukey post hoc test, and the potential community college presidents' mean scores of the transformational leadership practice *encourage the heart* were statistically significantly higher ($p = .021$) for potential community college presidents who are very interested in a community college presidency ($M = 8.70, SD = .929$) than potential community college presidents who are not interested in a community college presidency ($M = 8.43, SD = 1.04$).

Summary

In conclusion, there were statistically significant differences in the mean scores of five scales (*model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart*) of the LPI-SELF based upon level of interest in a community college presidency; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Question 4

In Research Question 4, I explored whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon institutional location (rural, suburban, urban). I conducted five one-way ANOVAs to determine if there were statistically significant differences in utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents as a function of institutional location. The full results are in Table 15. I utilized a post hoc test to examine which variables were statistically significantly different when there were statistically significant differences as indicated by the one-way ANOVA. There were statistically significant differences in potential community college presidents' mean scores of three scales (*inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, and encourage the heart*) of the LPI-SELF based upon institutional location; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Table 15

Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Community College Location

Variables and Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Model						
Between Groups	2	2.76	1.38	2.40	0.092	0.007
Within Groups	648	372.6	0.56			
Inspire						
Between Groups	2	18.5	9.26	9.17	0.001*	0.028
Within Groups	645	651.7	1.01			
Challenge						
Between Groups	2	12.2	6.09	7.33	0.001*	0.020
Within Groups	646	536.4	0.83			
Enable						
Between Groups	2	0.60	0.30	0.99	0.374	0.001
Within Groups	650	198.0	0.30			
Encourage						
Between Groups	2	13.34	6.67	7.18	0.001*	0.001
Within Groups	646	600.5	0.93			

Note: * = $p < 0.05$.

Model the Way

I determined that there were no statistically significant differences in potential community college presidents' mean scores on the utilization of transformational leadership practices as a function of institutional location on the transformational leadership practice of *model the way*, $F(2,648) = 2.40$, $p = .092$, $\eta^2 = .007$ after conducting a one-way ANOVA.. There were no statistically significant differences ($p = .092$) between the mean scores of utilization of the transformational leadership practice *model the way* between potential community college

presidents in urban locations ($M = 8.80$, $SD = .797$), suburban locations ($M = 8.78$, $SD = .719$), and rural locations ($M = 8.66$, $SD = .763$).

Inspire a Shared Vision

I conducted a one-way ANOVA and determined that there were statistically significant differences ($p = .001$) in potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores on the transformational leadership practice *inspire a shared vision*, $F(2,645) = 9.17$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .028$ as a function of institutional location. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I utilized a Tukey post hoc test and concluded that potential community college presidents in urban locations ($M = 8.66$, $SD = .886$) and suburban locations ($M = 8.47$, $SD = 1.03$) self-reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .001$) mean scores for the transformational leadership practice *inspire a shared vision* than for potential community college presidents in rural locations ($M = 8.24$, $SD = 1.03$).

Challenge the Process

I conducted a one-way ANOVA and I determined that there were statistically significant differences in potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores on the transformational leadership practice *challenge the process*, $F(2,645) = 7.33$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .020$ as a function of institutional location. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I conducted a Tukey post hoc test and discovered that potential community college presidents in urban locations ($M = 8.65$, $SD = .869$) and suburban locations ($M = 8.53$, $SD = .918$) self-reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .001$) mean scores on the transformational leadership practice *challenge the process* than potential community college presidents in rural locations ($M = 8.32$, $SD = .923$).

Enable Others to Act

I employed a one-way ANOVA and determined that there were no statistically significant differences in potential community college presidents' mean scores of the transformational leadership practice *enable others to act*, $F(2,650) = 0.99$, $p = .374$ $\eta^2 = .001$ as a function of institutional location of potential community college presidents. There were no statistically significant differences ($p = .373$) between the mean scores of utilization of the transformational leadership practice *enable others to act* between potential community college presidents in urban locations ($M = 9.16$, $SD = .593$), suburban locations ($M = 9.17$, $SD = .040$), and rural locations ($M = 9.10$, $SD = .537$).

Encourage the Heart

Finally, I utilized a one-way ANOVA and determined that there were statistically significant differences in potential community college presidents' mean scores for the self-reported utilization of the transformational leadership practice *encourage the heart*, $F(2,646) = 7.18$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .005$ as a function of institutional location. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. After conducting a Tukey post hoc test I discovered that potential community college presidents in urban locations ($M = 8.64$, $SD = .900$) and suburban locations ($M = 8.52$, $SD = .998$) self-reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .001$) mean scores on the utilization of the transformational leadership practice *encourage the heart* than potential community college presidents who are in rural locations ($M = 8.30$, $SD = .998$).

Summary

In conclusion, potential community college presidents reported statistically significantly different mean scores on three scales (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and

encourage the heart) of the LPI-SELF based upon institutional location; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Question 5

To investigate whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon current position (SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, SFAO), I conducted five one-way ANOVA. The full results are in Table 16. The transformational leadership practices of *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, *enable others to act*, and *encourage the heart* violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance as $p < .05$; thus, I utilized the Welch ANOVA to determine if potential community college presidents self-reported mean scores statistically significantly differed on these transformational leadership practices as a function of current position. I conducted post hoc tests when there were statistically significant differences to understand how the variables were statistically significantly different. Potential community college presidents self-reported statistically significantly different mean scores on three scales (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*) of the LPI-SELF based upon current position; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Model the Way

I utilized a one-way ANOVA to examine whether potential community college presidents self-reported statistically significantly different mean scores on the transformational leadership practice of *model the way* on the LPI-SELF as a function of current position. There were no statistically significant differences between potential community college presidents' mean scores on the transformational leadership practice of *model the way* as a function of current position, $F(3,649.0) = .856, p = .464, \eta^2 = .559$. There were no statistically

Table 16

Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Current Position

Variables and Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Model						
Between Groups	3	1.46	0.485	0.856	.464	0.559
Within Groups	649.0	367.9	0.567			
Inspire ^a						
Between Groups	3	22.19	7.40	7.66	.001 [*]	0.032
Within Groups	290.0	677.8	1.05			
Challenge ^a						
Between Groups	3	9.31	3.11	7.66	.002 [*]	0.017
Within Groups	278.2	545.4	0.843			
Enable ^a						
Between Groups	3	2.82	0.941	2.87	.047 [*]	0.014
Within Groups	286.1	201.2	0.309			
Encourage ^a						
Between Groups	3	8.40	2.8	2.47	.062	0.013
Within Groups	272.9	617.4	0.953			

Note. a = Welch's ANOVA utilized, * = $p < .05$

significant differences ($p = .464$) between the mean scores of utilization of the transformational leadership practice *model the way* between potential community college presidents who currently serve as a SAAO ($M = 8.76$, $SD = .784$), SSAO ($M = 8.76$, $SD = .661$), SASAO ($M = 8.71$, $SD = .661$), and SFAO ($M = 8.64$, $SD = .823$).

Inspire a Shared Vision

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for the one-way ANOVA on *inspire a shared vision*, as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .001$); thus, I

utilized the Welch ANOVA to understand whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the transformational leadership practice *inspire a shared vision* were statistically significantly different as a function of current position. Potential community college presidents' mean scores on *inspire a shared vision* were statistically significantly different among the four current positions of potential presidents, Welch's $F(3,290.0) = 7.66, p < .001, \eta^2 = .032$. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I conducted the Games Howell post hoc test and concluded that potential community college presidents who currently serve as SASAOs ($M = 8.69, SD = .747$) reported statistically significantly higher ($p < .001$) mean scores than potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs ($M = 8.64, SD = 1.16$).

Challenge the Process

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for the one-way ANOVA on the transformational leadership scale of *challenge the process*, as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .001$). I utilized the Welch ANOVA to understand whether potential community college presidents' mean scores statistically significantly differed on the transformational leadership practice of *inspire a shared vision* as a function of current position. Potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores on the utilization of the transformational leadership practice *challenge the process* statistically significantly differed between the four current positions of potential community college presidents, Welch's $F(3,278.2) = 7.66, p < .002, \eta^2 = .017$. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I utilized the Games Howell post hoc test and discovered potential community college presidents who currently serve as SASAOs ($M = 8.69, SD = .747$) reported statistically significantly higher mean scores ($p < .002$) than potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs ($M = 8.25, SD = 1.06$).

Enable Others to Act

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was also violated for the one-way ANOVA on *enable others to act*, as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .028$). I utilized the Welch ANOVA to understand whether potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores on the transformational leadership practice of *enable others to act* statistically significantly differed as a function of current position. Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the *enable others to act* scale were statistically significantly different among the four current positions of potential presidents, Welch's $F(3,286.1) = 2.87, p < .047, \eta^2 = .014$. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. After conducting the Games-Howell post hoc test, I determined that potential community college presidents who currently serve as SAAOs ($M = 9.15, SD = .554$) reported statistically significantly higher ($p < .047$) mean scores than potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs ($M = 9.02, SD = .615$).

Encourage the Heart

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for the one-way ANOVA on *encourage the heart* as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .001$); thus, I utilized the Welch ANOVA to understand whether potential community college presidents' mean scores were statistically significantly different on the *encourage the heart* scale as function of current position. The utilization of *encourage the heart* was not statistically significantly different among the four current positions of potential presidents, Welch's $F(3,272.9) = 2.47, p < .062$. There were no statistically significant differences ($p = .062$) between potential community college presidents' mean scores of utilization of the transformational leadership practice *encourage the heart* between potential community college presidents who currently serve as

SAAO ($M = 8.60$, $SD = .92$), SSAO ($M = 8.66$, $SD = .91$), SASAO ($M = 8.51$, $SD = .88$), or SFAO ($M = 8.33$, $SD = 1.77$).

Summary

In conclusion, potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores were statistically significantly different on three scales (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*) of the LPI-SELF based upon current position; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Question 6

In the sixth research question, I examined whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon highest degree earned. The full results are in Table 17. Three of the five dependent variables (*inspire a shared vision*, *enable others to act*, and *encourage the heart*) violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance; thus, I utilized the Welch ANOVA with for these dependent variables. Potential community college presidents statistically significantly differed on the mean scores of three scales (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*) of the LPI-SELF based upon highest degree earned; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Model the Way

I conducted a one-way ANOVA and determined that there were no statistically significant differences between potential community college presidents' mean scores on the utilization of transformational leadership practices as a function of highest degree earned for *model the way*, $F(6,630) = 2.02$, $p = .061$, $\eta^2 = .017$. Potential community college presidents with an associate's degree ($M = 8.60$, $SD = .787$), potential community college presidents with a bachelor's degree ($M = 8.37$, $SD = .850$), potential community college presidents with a non-MBA master's degree

Table 17

Summary of One-Way ANOVA of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Highest Degree Earned

Variables and Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Model						
Between Groups	6	6.65	1.12	2.02	0.061	0.017
Within Groups	630.0	346.2	0.55			
Inspire ^a						
Between Groups	6	28.5	4.77	2.56	0.001 [*]	0.042
Within Groups	158.2	657.0	1.05			
Challenge						
Between Groups	6	21.1	3.51	4.23	0.001 [*]	0.039
Within Groups	628.0	521.5	0.83			
Enable ^a						
Between Groups	6	5.86	0.98	3.15	0.006 [*]	0.030
Within Groups	158.8	189.8	0.30			
Encourage ^a						
Between Groups	6	9.52	1.59	2.05	0.062	0.016
Within Groups	164.6	601.6	0.96			

Note. a = Welch's ANOVA utilized, * = $p < .05$

($M = 8.72$, $SD = .703$), potential community college presidents with an MBA ($M = 8.72$, $SD = .788$), potential community college presidents with a PhD ($M = 8.79$, $SD = .747$), potential community college presidents with an EdD ($M = 8.75$, $SD = .734$), and potential community college presidents with other degrees ($M = 8.90$, $SD = .537$) reported no statistically significantly different mean scores on *model the way* as a function of highest degree earned.

Inspire a Shared Vision

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for the one-way ANOVA on *inspire a shared vision* as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p < .05$); thus, I utilized the Welch ANOVA to understand whether potential community college presidents' mean scores statistically significantly differed on the *inspire a shared vision* scale as function of highest degree earned. The mean scores of *inspire a shared vision* were statistically significantly different among the degree categories, Welch's $F(6,158.2) = 2.56, p = .001, \eta^2 = .042$. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I conducted the Games-Howell post hoc test and discovered that potential community college presidents with the PhD as the highest degree earned ($M = 8.54, SD = .967$) and potential community college presidents with other reported as the highest degree earned ($M = 8.56, SD = .901$) reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .026$) mean scores than potential community college presidents who have a bachelor's degree as the highest degree earned ($M = 7.42, SD = 1.56$).

Challenge the Process

I employed a one-way ANOVA and the test indicated statistically significant differences in ratings for the self-reported utilization of the transformational leadership practice *challenge the process* based on potential community college presidents' highest degree earned, $F(6,628) = 4.23, p = .001, \eta^2 = .039$. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I conducted the Tukey post hoc test and determined potential community college presidents who hold the PhD as the highest degree earned ($M = 8.61, SD = .851$), EdD as the highest degree earned ($M = 8.56, SD = .893$), and those in the other category for highest degree earned ($M = 8.54, SD = .767$) also reported statistically significantly higher mean scores ($p = .001$) than potential community college presidents who hold the bachelor's degree as the highest degree earned ($M = 7.76, SD = 1.40$).

Enable Others to Act

The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for the one-way ANOVA on *enable others to act* as indicated by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .048$); thus, I utilized the Welch ANOVA to understand whether there were any statistically significant differences on the *enable others to act* scale as a function of highest degree earned. The utilization of *enable others to act* was statistically significantly different among the degree categories, Welch's $F(6,158.8) = 3.15, p = .006, \eta^2 = .030$. Eta squared indicates a small effect size. I utilized the Games-Howell post hoc test and determined that potential community college presidents with the PhD as the highest degree earned ($M = 9.24, SD = .502$) reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .006$) mean scores than potential community college presidents who have a non-MBA master's degree as the highest degree earned ($M = 9.03, SD = .606$).

Encourage the Heart

I utilized a Welch ANOVA and discovered that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores on the utilization of transformational leadership practices as a function of highest degree earned for *encourage the heart*, Welch $F(6,164.6) = 2.05, p = .062, \eta^2 = .016$. There were no statistically significantly different mean scores on the LPI-SELF between potential community college presidents with an associate's degree ($M = 8.3, SD = 1.13$), bachelor's degree ($M = 8.32, SD = 1.11$), potential community non-MBA master's degree ($M = 8.53, SD = .966$), MBA ($M = 8.55, SD = 1.08$), PhD ($M = 8.58, SD = .974$), EdD ($M = 8.66, SD = .507$), and other ($M = 8.77, SD = .508$).

Summary

In conclusion, there were statistically significant differences in the mean scores of three scales (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*) of the LPI-SELF based upon highest degree earned; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Question 7

I investigated whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization using an independent samples t test. The full results are located in Table 18. Potential community college presidents reported statistically significantly different mean scores on the five scales (*model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, *enable others to act*, and *encourage the heart*) of the LPI-SELF based upon participation in a leadership development seminar sponsored by a professional organization; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis

There was a statistically significant ($p = .005$) difference in potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores on *model the way* for participants ($M = 8.81$, $SD = .747$) and nonparticipants ($M = 8.64$, $SD = .742$); $t(648) = 2.835$, $p = .005$, $d = .22$. Cohen's d indicates a small effect size. There was also a statistically significant ($p = .001$) difference in potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores on *inspire a shared vision* for participants ($M = 8.58$, $SD = .924$) and nonparticipants ($M = 8.20$, $SD = 1.12$); $t(623) = 4.799$, $p = .001$, $d = .37$. Cohen's d indicates a small effect size. Potential community college presidents' mean scores statistically significantly differed ($p = .001$) in self-reported mean scores on *challenge the process* for participants ($M = 8.60$, $SD = .859$) and nonparticipants ($M = 8.29$, $SD = .983$); $t(634) = 4.420$, $p = .001$, $d = .33$. Cohen's d indicates a small effect size. Potential

Table 18

Summary of t Test of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Participation Status in a Leadership Development Program Sponsored by a National Organization

Practice	Participant			Nonparticipant			<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Model	327	8.81	0.747	326	8.64	0.742	648	2.835	0.050*	0.22
Inspire	323	8.58	0.924	324	8.20	1.120	623	4.799	0.001*	0.37
Challenge	324	8.60	0.859	324	8.29	0.983	634	4.420	0.001*	0.33
Enable	326	9.18	0.530	326	9.06	0.593	650	2.718	0.007*	0.21
Encourage	325	8.65	0.934	324	8.49	0.958	647	2.390	0.017*	0.16

Note. * = $p < .05$

community college presidents' mean scores statistically significantly ($p = .007$) differed on the *enable others to act* scale for participants ($M = 9.18$, $SD = .53$) and non-participants ($M = 9.06$, $SD = .593$); $t(650) = 2.718$, $p = .007$, $d = .21$. Cohen's d indicates a small effect size. Finally, potential community college presidents' mean scores statistically significantly differed ($p = .017$) on the *encourage the heart* scale as participants ($M = 8.65$, $SD = .934$) reported higher mean scores than non-participants ($M = 8.49$, $SD = .958$); $t(647) = 2.390$, $p = .017$, $d = .16$. Cohen's d indicates a small effect size.

In summary, potential community college presidents' mean scores on all five scales (*model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, *enable others to act*, and *encourage the heart*) of the LPI-SELF statistically significantly differed based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Question 8

To examine whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differ based upon participation in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district, I utilized an independent samples *t* test. The full results are in Table 19. Potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF were statistically significantly different on four scales (*model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*) of the LPI-SELF based upon participation in a leadership development seminar sponsored by a community college or community college district; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Potential community college presidents who participated in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district self-reported statistically significant lower mean ($M = 8.23$, $SD = .734$) scores on the *model the way* scale of the LPI-SELF than potential community college presidents who did not participate in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district ($M = 8.64$, $SD = .762$); $t(650) = 3.101$, $p = .002$, $d = .54$. Cohen's *d* indicates a medium effect size. Potential community college presidents who participated in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district self-reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .002$) mean scores ($M = 8.53$, $SD = .986$) on *inspire a shared vision* than potential community college presidents who did not participate in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district ($M = 8.28$, $SD = 1.037$); $t(657) = 3.135$, $p = .002$, $d = .25$. Cohen's *d* indicates a small effect size. Potential community college presidents who participated in a leadership development program presented by a community

Table 19

Summary of t Test of Transformational Leadership Practices as a Function of Participation Status in a Leadership Development Program Sponsored by a Community College or Community College District

Practice	Participant			Nonparticipant			df	t	p	d
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD				
Model	296	8.23	0.734	356	8.64	0.762	650	3.101	0.002*	0.54
Inspire	294	8.53	0.986	355	8.28	1.037	657	3.135	0.002*	0.25
Challenge	294	8.55	0.869	356	8.35	0.978	644	2.784	0.006*	0.21
Enable	297	9.20	0.526	357	9.08	0.555	652	2.627	0.009*	0.22
Encourage	294	8.62	0.969	357	8.50	0.959	649	1.620	0.106	0.12

Note. * = $p < .05$

college or community college district self-reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .006$) mean scores ($M = 8.55$, $SD = .869$) on the *challenge the process* scale than potential community college presidents who did not participate in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district ($M = 8.35$, $SD = .978$); $t(644) = 2.784$, $p = .006$, $d = .21$. Cohen's d indicates a small effect size. Potential community college presidents who participated in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district also self-reported statistically significantly higher ($p = .009$) mean scores ($M = 9.20$, $SD = .526$) on the *enable others to act* scale than potential community college presidents who did not participate in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district ($M = 9.08$, $SD = .555$); $t(652) = 2.627$, $p =$

.009, $d = .22$. Cohen's d indicates a small effect size. Finally, potential community college presidents who participated in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district did not statistically significantly differ ($p = .106$) in self-reported mean score of *encourage the heart* ($M = 8.62$, $SD = .969$) from potential community college presidents who did not participate in a leadership development program presented by a community college or community college district ($M = 8.50$, $SD = .959$); $t(649) = 1.62$, $p = .106$, $d = .12$ on the scale of *encourage the heart*.

In conclusion, potential community college presidents self-reported statistically significantly different mean scores on four scales (*model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*) of the LPI-SELF based upon participation in a leadership development seminar sponsored by a community college or community college district; thus, I rejected the null hypothesis.

Summary of Results

I conducted a descriptive, correlational, quantitative study that examined the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices of potential community college presidents including whether utilization of transformational leadership practices differ based upon personal and professional demographic characteristics. I answered eight research questions. The first research question examined the demographics of my sample. The total number of participants in my sample was 656 participants. First, I described the educational characteristics. The full results are located in Tables 5 and 6. Twenty-five percent of the sample holds a PhD as the highest degree earned. Approximately 56% of the sample reported that the field of study for the potential community college presidents' highest degree earned is in education.

The personal demographics of potential community college presidents in my study are in Table 11. Briefly, there was a near equal split between males (48%) and females (51.8%). One participant identified as trans*. Racially, 81% of potential community college presidents in the sample identified as White. Finally, 58% of potential community college presidents in the sample were over the age of 51.

The full results of the professional demographics are in Table 12. In summary, 68.2% of potential community college presidents in my sample are interested in a community college presidency. Approximately half of the sample work at a rural institution, and 82% of potential community college presidents in the sample work at a community college with less than 9,999 students. Potential community college presidents in my sample also have many years of experience, as 73.7% have more than 16 years of experience in higher education. Additionally, 50.1% of potential community college presidents in my sample participated in a leadership development program sponsored by a national community college organization and 45.5% participated in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college organization

In Table 20, I provide a summary of significant results. I include the areas that potential community college presidents self-reported as statistically significantly ($p < .05$) different mean scores on the LPI-SELF based upon personal and professional experiences. Additionally, I include the areas of significance. Potential community college presidents self-reported statistically significantly different mean scores for *model the way* as a function of level of interest, participation in national leadership development programs, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by a community college or community college district. Potential community college presidents self-reported statistically significantly different

mean scores for *inspire a shared vision* and *challenge the process* as a function of level of interest, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned, participation in national leadership development programs, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by a community college or community college district. Potential community college presidents self-reported statistically significant differences for *enable others to act* as a function of level of interest, current position, highest degree earned, participation in national leadership development programs, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by a community college or community college district. Finally, there were statistically significant differences on the *encourage the heart* scale as a function of level of interest, institutional location, and participation in national leadership development program.

Table 20

Summary of Significant Results

Practice	Independent Variables	Area of Significance
Model the Way	Level of interest	Very interested > Not interested
	Participation in national leadership development	Participant > Nonparticipant
	Participation in GYOL	Participant < Nonparticipant
Inspire a Shared Vision	Level of interest	Very interested > Not interested
	Institutional location	Urban & Suburban > Rural
	Current position	SASAO > SFAO
	Highest degree earned	PhD & Other > Bachelor's
	Participation in national leadership development	Participant > Nonparticipant
	Participation in GYOL	Participant > Nonparticipant
Challenge the Process	Level of interest	Very interested > Somewhat interested, Not interested
	Institutional location	Urban & Suburban > Rural
	Current position	SASAO > SFAO
	Highest degree earned	PhD, EdD, & Other > Bachelor's;
	Participation in national leadership development	Participant > Nonparticipant
	Participation in GYOL	Participant > Nonparticipant
Enable Others to Act	Level of interest	Very interested > Not interested
	Current position	SAAO > SFAO
	Highest degree earned	PhD > Bachelor's
	Participation in national leadership development	Participant > Nonparticipant
	Participation in GYOL	Participant > Nonparticipant
Encourage the Heart	Level of interest	Very interested > Not interested
	Institutional location	Urban & Suburban > Rural
	Participation in national leadership development	Participant > Nonparticipant

CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

There is an abundance of deficit-based research on community college leadership that focuses upon the shortcomings related to the dearth of qualified potential community college presidents (AACC, 2013b; Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughn, 2007). Harrison and Mather (2016) wrote, “there is a near obsession with higher education’s shortcomings that permeates the narrative, creating a heavily skewed perception of an institution that has stood the test of time in ways few organizations can claim” (p. xi). The focus on the perceived shortcomings of potential community college presidents inaccurately portrays potential community college presidents.

There are potential community college presidents in my study who have many years of experience in higher education, are interested in pursuing the position, have the desired educational credentials, and have participated in leadership development seminars at the national and local level. Cook (2012) stated the leadership crisis offers “a unique opportunity to diversify the leadership of American higher education.” (American Council on Education, 2012b, para 6). Potential community college presidents in this study are more diverse in race and gender than the current generation of community college presidents. ACE (2012a) reported that approximately 12.9% of community college presidents were part of a racial minority group and 33% identified as female. In my study, 19% of respondents indicated they were part of a racial minority and 51% of participants identified as female. Potential community college presidents in this study, if they obtain a community college presidency, can diversify the position.

Potential community college presidents also utilize a high degree of transformational leadership. The importance of transformational leadership by community college presidents is well documented in the research (AACCT, 2012; AACC, 2005; A. M. Cohen, et al., 2014; Eddy, 2010). The results from my study indicate that potential community college presidents are

utilizing transformational leadership practices as measured by the LPI-SELF. The most utilized transformational leadership practice by potential community college presidents in my sample was *enable others to act* ($M=9.12$). The utilization of *enable others to act* was also found to be the most utilized transformational leadership practice in other studies of senior higher education administrators (Butler, 2009; Dikeman, 2007; Grafton, 2009; Maitra, 2007). Leaders who *enable others to act* foster collaboration amongst team members by creating a climate of trust and sharing information (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Additionally, they purposely work to enhance relationships and develop the competence and confidence of others (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). As community college presidents have many responsibilities including spokesperson, fundraiser, and community leader, it is promising that potential community college presidents in this study are already utilizing a transformational leadership, *enable others to act*, which will enhance these responsibilities.

I investigated the utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents including whether that utilization differs based on personal and professional characteristics by utilizing the LPI-SELF. There were statistically significant differences in mean scores on the LPI-SELF based upon the level of interest in a community college presidency (*model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *encourage the heart*), institutional location (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, *enable others to act*, and *encourage the heart*), current position (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*), highest degree earned (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*), participation in leadership development programs presented by national organizations (*model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, *enable others to act*, and *encourage the heart*), and participation in leadership development programs

presented by community college or community college districts (*model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, and enable others to act*).

It is important that community college administrators, scholars, and consumers focus upon the vast professional and personal experiences of potential community college presidents. As searches occur to fill community college president vacancies, it is important to consider the many benefits that potential community college presidents from the present study including the utilization of transformational leadership and a myriad of personal and professional experiences including interest in a community college presidency, work experience in different geographical locations, learning in their current position, earning advanced degree credentials, and participating in community college leadership development programs sponsored by professional organizations and community colleges or community college districts.

Implications

Theoretical and practical implications are important in higher education research. In this section, I discuss how my study on the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents can inform future scholarship related to the topic, as well as how community college stakeholders can utilize the results of this study in the practical application of its findings.

Theoretical Implications

Literature surrounding the community college presidency focuses on a deficit-based approach related to the lack of potential community college presidents to fill the leadership crisis (AACC, 2013b; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Hassan et al., 2010; Shults, 2001; Smith, 2016; Riggs, 2009). After conducting this study, I disagree with previous notions regarding the lack of qualified potential community college presidents.

Many community college scholars (Boggs, 2003; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Hassan et al., 2010; Riggs, 2009; Shults, 2001) and organizations including the Achieving the Dream Foundation, the AACC, the ACCT, the Aspen Institute, and the League for Innovation in the Community College reported a lack of potential community college presidents to fill the vacancies left by retiring community college presidents. Furthermore, community college scholars portray the community college presidency as undesirable (Johnson & Christensen, 2008), a risky career move (Jones & Johnson, 2014), and a position with a certainty of crisis and circumstances outside of the community college presidents' sphere of influence (Floyd & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2013; Jones & Johnson, 2014; Maslin-Ostrowski & Floyd, 2012); however, there still remains potential community college presidents interested in the position.

Approximately 68% of the senior administrators who participated in my study are interested in a community college presidency. They bring many years of experience in higher education, have a variety of personal and professional backgrounds, and utilize transformational leadership. Community college organizations often recommend these factors as ideal characteristics and experiences for future community college presidents. Additionally, many community college presidents often enter their positions without the presidency being one of the original goals of their career path (Eddy, 2008; Jones & Warnick, 2012; McNair, 2015; Weisman & Vaughn, 2007). There may be additional potential community college presidents who have yet to consider the role. Perhaps there should be less of a focus on the lack of qualified individuals for the position and more of a focus on succession planning to assist those who are interested to apply for, obtain, and excel in the community college president role. Calareso (2013) detailed the importance of succession planning in higher education as "the key is that the process of

leadership formation is not random and serendipitous, but rather intentional and well planned” (p. 28).

Next, potential community college presidents in rural locations self-reported statistically significantly lower mean scores on the transformational leadership factors of *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *encourage the heart* than potential community college presidents in urban and suburban locations. Research on rural community college presidents detailed the importance of a transformative, people-focused approach to leading (Cejda, 2007; Cejda & Jolley, 2013; Eddy, 2007, 2013; Fluharty & Scaggs, 2007; Leist, 2007; Myran & Parsons, 2013; Thompson et al., 2012); as such, I anticipated potential community college presidents in rural environments would report higher self-reported mean scores on utilization of transformational leadership practices on the LPI-SELF.

I believe there are conceptual similarities between the transformational leadership practices of the LPI and scholarship describing how rural community college presidents lead. For example, rural community college presidents noted the importance of understanding the culture of rural community colleges and the importance of relationships to making decisions (Cejda & Jolley, 2013; Eddy, 2007, 2013, Leist, 2007). The LPI-SELF measures of *model the way*, *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act* are closely connected to these necessary skills described by rural community college presidents. To illustrate, leaders who *model the way* look for shared values amongst a group and align actions with these groups (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Leaders who *inspire a shared vision* collaborate with others to create a common vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Potential community college presidents who *challenge the process* work with others to search for opportunities to improve (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Finally, leaders who *enable others to act* create a culture of trust and

build relationships (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). These four practices closely align to the studies related to community college leadership in rural environments.

I anticipated that these similarities would result in potential rural community college presidents utilizing a higher degree of transformational leadership than urban and suburban potential community college presidents, but the results contradicted my hypothesis. Perhaps, the close-knit community of rural environments requires potential community college presidents to utilize transformational leadership; however, they may be unable to apply the transformational leadership practices because of the deep cultural ties. Additionally, potential community college presidents who enter a position in a rural community college may be unable to navigate the connections and relationships amongst people in the community college and local community. A theoretical implication from this study is that community college scholars and administrators continue to examine differences in utilization of transformational leadership as a function of institutional location.

Participants in this study currently serve as a SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SFAO in a community college. Potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership statistically significantly differed based upon current position for *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*. Potential community college presidents in my study who serve as SASAOs reported statistically significantly higher mean scores than potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs on *inspire a shared vision* and *challenge the process*. This result was not surprising as the SASAO role requires a high degree of collaboration between academic and student affairs and to understand the unique cultures of the two administrative units (Broadie, 2014). Collaboration and understanding of the administrative cultures are conceptually related to *inspire a shared vision* and *challenge the*

process scales of the LPI-SELF, thus I expected the SASAO to report a higher-mean score on these two scales.

Potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs self-reported statistically significantly lower utilization of the transformational leadership practices on three out of five transformational leadership practices (*inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*). SFAOs are considered to be excellent candidates for the community college presidency position; however, there are grounds for caution concerning this claim as SFAOs self-reported statistically significantly lower scores on utilization of transformational leadership practices than other positions did. McInnis (2002) detailed that 81% of community college SFAOs in California primary responsibility was dedicated to managing the budget, and 80% were responsible for producing budget reports. These job responsibilities are more aligned with a transactional approach rather than a transformational approach as there is a finite amount of budget monies that need to be distributed. I believe SFAOs can bring many budgeting and financing skills to the community college presidency; however, they may not utilize transformational leadership practices as much as potential community college presidents who enter with a different career path. A theoretical implication from this study is that SFAOs still be considered for a community college presidency; however, one must understand that they may need more opportunities to develop their transformational leadership skills.

There were no statistically significantly different mean scores related to potential community college presidents who currently serve as SSAOs. Qualitative literature on the experiences of community college presidents who previously served as SSAOs portrayed the position as an excellent pathway to the community college presidency because of the myriad of skills developed in the role including budgeting, crisis management, collaboration, and strategic

planning (Bullard, 2008; Humphrey, 2012, McNair, 2015). The results from this present study indicate that SSAOs lead in a similar manner to SAAOs, SASAOs, and SFAOs. As community colleges seek to fill their next presidency I recommend they consider candidates with experience as a SSAO because they utilize a high degree of transformational leadership practices which is integral for the advancement of the community college (A.M Cohen et al., 2012; AACC, 2013b).

ACE (2012a) conducted a national study of community college presidents and indicated that 82% of community college presidents held a PhD or EdD as highest degree earned. In my study, 45% of potential community college presidents held a doctoral degree, as 25% held a PhD and 20% held an EdD. Potential community college presidents who held the PhD and other degree as highest degree earned self-reported statistically significantly higher mean scores for *inspire a shared vision* compared to potential community college presidents who held a bachelor's degree as highest degree earned. Additionally, potential community college presidents who held a PhD, EdD, or other degree as their highest degree earned reported statistically significantly higher mean scores for *challenge the process* compared to those who hold a bachelor's degree as highest degree earned. Finally, potential community college presidents who hold the PhD as the highest degree earned reported statistically significantly higher mean scores on the *enable others to act* scale than potential community college presidents who hold a bachelor's degree.

As this was a non-experimental study, I cannot state that obtaining a higher degree credential results in higher self-reported utilization of transformational leadership practices, but it is important to note the relationship. Community college presidents reported the benefits of the doctoral degree as more related to credibility and filling gaps, rather than necessarily as a leadership development opportunity (Eddy, 2010; Nevarez & Wood, 2010). Although community

college presidents may have considered a doctoral program as a way to gain credibility and filling professional gaps, these findings demonstrate a relationship between attainment of a PhD and a self-reported utilization of the transformational leadership practices of *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*. Leadership development may not have been the purpose for attaining a doctoral degree; however, this study demonstrates the relationship between holding a doctorate and utilizing transformational leadership practices.

Approximately half of the participants in my study indicated that they attended a leadership development seminar sponsored by a national organization and they reported statistically significantly higher mean scores on the LPI-SELF than potential community college presidents who did not participate in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college organization. This percentage is slightly lower than Duree's (2007) results, where 56% of community college presidents participated in a leadership development program sponsored by a national organization before becoming a community college president. Eddy et al. (2015) reported that leadership development programs sponsored by community college organizations focused upon skill development rather than the transformational leadership needed in community colleges; however, participants in my study who participated in leadership development seminars reported statistically significantly higher mean scores on all five transformational leadership practices of the LPI-SELF. Although the development of transformational leadership skills may not be the intended learning outcome, this study demonstrates that potential community college presidents who attended these seminars do report higher mean scores on the LPI-SELF.

A professional development opportunity for potential community college presidents is a leadership seminar developed by a community college or community college district and these

programs are important professional development opportunities at a low cost for institutional specific issues (Eddy, 2008; Nevarez & Wood, 2010; Reille & Kezar, 2010). Forty-seven percent of potential community college presidents in this study participated in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district. This number is much higher than Duree's (2007) study, where only 12% of community college presidents participated in a leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district. Participants reported statistically significantly higher mean scores on *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act* than nonparticipants. Hull and Keim (2007) stated that the leadership development programs sponsored by community college or community college districts focused upon topics such as institutional mission, institutional culture, and governance. I believe these institutional focused topics are conceptually related to transformational leadership practices. For example, leaders who *inspire a shared vision* reflect on the common purpose for the organization which is often the institutional mission. Next, one must have an understanding of the institutional culture to effectively *challenge the process* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Finally, leaders who *enable others to act* focus upon the organizational dynamics to build a supportive environment to empower others (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The knowledge of the organizational dynamics, especially the governance structures of the community college, is essential to *enable others to act*.

Practical Implications

There were statistically significant differences in potential community college presidents' self-reported mean scores of the LPI-SELF as a function of level of interest in a community college presidency, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned, participation in leadership development programs sponsored by a professional organization, and participation in

leadership development programs sponsored by a community college or community college district. Though there was statistical significance, there were small effect sizes, which indicates that potential community college presidents may be more similar than they are different.

As boards of trustees, higher education search consultants, and current community college presidents conduct searches for future community college presidents, I recommend that they focus on a candidate from senior leadership positions within community colleges as potential community college presidents. As 68.2% of potential community college presidents in this study detailed interest in a community college presidency, there needs to be targeted outreach to those who are interested in the position in order to offer intentional professional development opportunities to assist in filling this position.

Additionally, those who are more interested in a community college presidency position reported statistically significantly higher mean scores on the LPI-SELF than potential community college presidents who are not interested in a community college presidency. The utilization of transformational leadership is recommended for community college presidents, therefore, it may be best to ensure that candidates for the community college presidency are genuinely interested in the position. Furthermore, many community college presidents were not interested in the position; however, they were encouraged by others to apply for the position (Eddy, 2008; Jones & Warnick, 2012; McNair, 2015; Weisman & Vaughn, 2007). Current community college presidents and boards of trustees should assess their current institutional leadership and determine their interest in assuming a community college presidency, and encourage those who have the experience to be successful in the role to apply.

Level of interest in pursuing a community college presidency correlates with utilization of transformational leadership practices as does institutional location. There were statistically

significant differences between the utilization of transformational leadership practices of potential community college presidents in rural and non-rural locations for *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*. The rural location may limit the opportunities for potential community college presidents in rural locations to participate in leadership development seminars presented by national organizations (Eddy, 2013). In relation to learning leadership in previous positions, many rural community college presidents are promoted from within the institution, which further emphasizes the need to learn in prior positions before becoming president (Eddy, 2013). Related to obtaining doctoral degrees, potential rural community college presidents face issues such as distance, technology issues, and faculty members who do not understand the unique nature of rural community colleges, which can complicate the enrollment in a doctoral program for rural students (Williams, Pennington, Couch, & Dougherty, 2007). Finally, funding leadership development opportunities is an important issue for rural community college presidents; thus, participation in national leadership development programs may be more difficult due to the high cost (Hull & Keim, 2007; McNair, 2015). An implication for practice is specifically to target potential rural community college presidents and provide professional development that meets their unique needs including access to professional development, cost of professional development, and a focus on how rural community colleges have different organizational strengths and challenges than their non-rural peers.

Potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs scored statistically significantly lower on the transformational leadership practices of *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act* as measured by the LPI-SELF. As SFAOs are excellent candidates for the position because of their expertise in finance and administration,

potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs should look for leadership development programs and opportunities that will assist in their leadership development as they prepare for a community college presidency. Public relations, fundraising, and community engagement are key components of the community college presidency (ACE, 2012a; Birnbaum & Eckel, 2005; Eddy, 2013), and a transformational leadership approach can complement these job components. An implication for practice is that potential community college presidents who currently serve as SFAOs should seek intentional opportunities to develop transformational leadership skills, which could assist in the position. Additionally, it is important to note that 47% of SFAOs are not interested in a community college presidency. The SFAO is often the lead administrator who works closely with the community college president (McInnis, 2002); thus, one must ponder why more than half of the sample is uninterested in the position.

Approximately 80% of community college presidents held a doctorate. In my study, less than half of participants reported they had a doctoral degree. The degree assisted in credibility with faculty, filling gaps in professional practice, and in advancement to the position (McNair, 2015). Additionally, the present study showed a correlation between holding a PhD and utilization of the transformational leadership practices of *inspire a shared vision*, *challenge the process*, and *enable others to act*. An implication for practice is that potential community college presidents should obtain a PhD if they aspire to the position.

Recommendations for Future Research

Through this quantitative study, I gained insight into the educational, personal, and professional backgrounds of potential community college presidents and their utilization of transformational leadership practices. This research can be complemented by future qualitative

studies that provide stories about and rich, thick descriptions of the experiences that aided in their development and utilization of transformational leadership practices.

In this study, I reported that almost 68.2% of potential community college presidents are interested in a community college presidency. Additional quantitative and qualitative studies can provide more context and information regarding why potential community college presidents are interested in the position. An understanding of why potential community college presidents are interested in the position may assist in the recruitment and consideration of other senior administrators to consider the presidency.

Further research should also explore how community college presidents who do not have a doctoral degree navigate the community college presidency. As almost 60% of the sample does not have a doctoral degree, it is important to know how community college presidents without the terminal degree navigate their careers. Additionally, as there was little practical significance between the possession of higher degrees and the utilization of transformational leadership, how does the degree factor into the job search process?

Procedural Adjustments

I conducted this study using a cross-sectional design as I surveyed potential community college presidents at a single point in time. As a result of the cross-sectional design, I am unable to compare potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices before obtaining their current position, highest degree earned, participation in leadership development programs sponsored by professional organizations, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by community colleges or community college districts. Future studies utilizing experimental designs can further assist in understanding if and

how these professional experiences contributed to utilization of transformational leadership practices.

I utilized one-way ANOVAs and examined the relationships between categorical independent variables (level of interest, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned, participation in leadership development programs sponsored by professional organization, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by a community college or community college district) and the dependent variables of self-reported utilization of transformational leadership practices (*model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart*). Additionally, I utilized independent samples *t* tests to understand whether potential community college presidents' mean scores on the LPI-SELF differed based upon participation in leadership development programs sponsored by national organizations and by community colleges or community college districts. Advanced statistical analysis such as a multiple, linear regression and a factorial ANOVA could examine the impact of the independent variables simultaneously on the utilization of transformational leadership practices. These analyses can be particularly beneficial, as presidents in McNair's (2015) study stated that their leadership styles were a result of multiple experiences over the course of their careers that prepared them for the presidency, not just a single experience.

Replication of Study

In this study, I defined potential community college presidents as individuals who currently serve as SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, or SFAO at public, two-year, associate's degree-granting institutions, because they are often part of the community college leadership and one administrative position away from the community college presidency. Researchers can replicate

this study in the future using an expanded sample including multiple potential pathways into the community college presidency.

Previous studies on community college presidents examined national demographics (ACE, 2012a; AACC, 2013b) but not utilization of transformational leadership, or utilization of transformational leadership practices by community college presidents limited to certain regions, states, or categories. Others can replicate this study examining the educational, personal, and professional backgrounds of current community college presidents and their utilization of transformational leadership factors as measured by the LPI-SELF on a national level. This study can provide a national portrait of community college presidents and their educational, personal, and professional backgrounds along with their utilization of transformational leadership factors. Additionally, such a replication study can provide a comparison group for the potential community college presidents in my study.

Conclusion

The purpose of this correlational descriptive study was to understand who potential community college presidents are, to determine to what degree potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices, and to determine whether potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices differ based upon personal and professional experiences.

Potential community college presidents are mostly White (81%), and there is a near equal split between female and male (51.8% female, 48% male). Almost half are located in rural locations. They use transformational leadership practices as measured by the LPI-SELF. Their utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon level of interest in a community college presidency, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned,

participation in leadership development programs presented by national organizations, and participation in leadership development programs presented by community colleges and community college districts. There were statistically significant differences in utilization of transformational leadership practices as a function of level of interest in a community college presidency, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned participation in leadership development programs sponsored by a professional organization, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by a community college or community college district. Though there was statistical significance, the effect sizes were small, which indicates that

A theoretical implication from this study relates to the conceptualization that community colleges are facing a leadership crisis. The results from this study indicated that 68.2% of senior community college administrators are interested in pursuing a community college presidency, that these administrators utilize transformational leadership, and that 80% of the participants have at least a master's degree. Additionally, approximately 51% participated in a community college leadership seminar presented by a national organization and 45% participated in a leadership development seminar presented by a community college or community college district. Community college scholars and practitioners can utilize an appreciative approach in discussing potential community college presidents' experiences and backgrounds.

A practical implication from this study is that boards of trustees, community college executive search firms, and sitting community college presidents should seek out potential community college presidents who are interested in the position and not accepting the position reluctantly, as there is a correlation between level of interest in a position and higher self-reported utilization of transformational leadership measured by the LPI-SELF. An additional

practical implication is that potential community college presidents should also obtain advanced degree credentials including a doctorate and participate in leadership development seminars presented by both national organizations and local community college or community college districts. Finally, there needs to be an increased focus on rural community college presidents, as they self-reported statistically significantly lower mean scores on utilization of transformational leadership practices than their non-rural peers.

Implications for future research include qualitative studies on potential community college presidents' decisions to pursue or not to pursue a presidency. Advanced statistical methods can also help to promote understanding of the impact of multiple, simultaneous independent variables on the five leadership scales of the LPI-SELF.

Community college boards of trustees, administrators and scholars should consider the ascension of potential community college presidents to the presidency position as an opportunity for growth and development of the institution. Community college presidents of the past and present have lead community colleges through constant change and growth as the community colleges became pillars of the community. The next generation of community college presidents will do the same. Potential community college presidents need to engage in succession planning in two ways.

Likewise, potential community college presidents should consider who will fill their current position (SAAO, SSAO, SASAO, SFAO) when they enter the presidency in order to transition community college administrators into a senior role. Additionally, they should immediately consider who and how they are preparing the next generation of community college presidents to lead using a transformational approach including understanding their level of interest in the presidency, providing professional development opportunities regardless of

institutional location, applying transformational leadership their current position, pursuing higher levels of formal education, and participating in leadership development programs.

This research study explored potential community college presidents' demographics and preparation for a community college presidency. It also detailed how their utilization of transformational leadership differed based upon level of interest in a community college presidency, institutional location, current position, highest degree earned, participation in leadership development programs sponsored by both national organizations, and participation in leadership development programs sponsored by community colleges or community college districts. There is much scholarship and professional development work to be done to prepare potential community college presidents to lead using a transformational approach. This study provides a constructive contribution to that end for the good of community college presidents, as well as their institutions, students, and communities.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, S. (2003). *Leadership styles of executive female administrators in Tennessee community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3116144)
- Acheson, A. (2010). Sample size. In N. J. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of research design* (pp. 1300-1301). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Allison, P. D. (2001). *Missing data: Quantitative applications in the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- American Association of Community College Trustees. (2012). *Community college associations join forces to prepare future CEOs*. Retrieved from <http://www.acct.org/news/community-college-associations-join-forces-prepare-future-ceos>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). *Competencies for community college leaders* (1st ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2013a). *Competencies for community college leaders*. (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2013b). *Data points: Pending C.E.O. retirements*. Retrieved from American Association of Community Colleges web site: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Publications/datapoints/Documents/PendingCEO_9%2011%2013.pdf
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2016). *Fast Facts*. Retrieved from American Association of Community Colleges website: <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/AACCFactSheetsR2.pdf>

American Council on Education. (2012a). *The American college president 2012*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education. (2012b). *Leading demographic portrait of college presidents reveals ongoing challenges in diversity, aging* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://blog.apastyle.org/apastyle/2010/09/how-to-cite-a-press-release-in-apa-style.html>

American Council on Education. (2013). *On the pathway to the presidency: Characteristics of higher education senior leadership*. Washington, DC: Author.

Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *Career paths for community college leaders* (Research Brief Leadership Series No. 2). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Amey, M. J., VanDerLinden, K. E., & Brown, D. (2002). Perspectives on community college leadership: Twenty years in the making. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 26, 573-589.

Anderson, M. O. (2014). Cosmopolitans or locals: Who will lead the next generation of community colleges? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38, 1168-1179.

Aspen Institute & Achieving the Dream Foundation. (2013). *Crisis and opportunity: Aligning community college presidents with student success*. Retrieved from Aspen Institute web site: <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/crisis-opportunity-aligning-community-college-presidency-student-success/>

Bailey, T. K., & Kubala, G. M. (2001). A new perspective on community college presidents: Results of a national study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 793-804.

- Baker, A. (2012). *The community college: C.F.O. perspectives*. Retrieved from the National Association of College and University Business Officers' web site:
<http://www.nacubo.org/Documents/products/CFOPerspectivesBaker.pdf>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice: Volume I—The state of the system*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Biddix, J. P. (2011). Stepping stones: Career paths to the SSAO for men and women at four-year institutions. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48, 443-461.
- Biddix, J. P., Giddens, B. M., Darsey, J., Fricks, J. B., Tucker, B. D., & Roberston, J. W. (2012). Pathways leading to the SSAO for women at community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36, 713-732.
- Birnbaum, R. (1991). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R., & Eckel, P. D. (2005). The dilemma of presidential leadership. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 340-368). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Birnbaum, R., & Umbach, P. D. (2001). Scholar, steward, spanner, stranger: The four career paths of college presidents. *Review of Higher Education*, 24, 203-217.

- Boggs, G. (2003). Leadership context for the twenty-first century. In W. E. Piland & D. B. Wolf (Eds.), *Help wanted: Preparing community college leaders in a new century* (New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 123, pp. 15-25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Broadie, P. (2014). *An exploration of the experiences and perceptions of community college leaders in the joint role of vice president for academic and student affairs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3635584)
- Broome, P. H. (2003). *The relationship between perceptions of presidential leadership practices and organizational effectiveness in southern community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3116144)
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities* (4th ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Bullard, R. N., Jr. (2008). *The preparation, search, and acceptance experiences of community college presidents with chief student affairs officer experience* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 304607327)
- Butler, S. L. (2009). *Ethical perspectives and leadership practices in the two-year colleges of South Carolina* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3369246)
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Calareso, J. P. (2013). Succession planning: The key to ensuring leadership. *Planning for Higher Education*, 41(3), 27-33.

Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (n.d). *About Carnegie classification*.

Retrieved from <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/>

Carroll, J. P. (2008). *Gender comparisons of community college chief business officers' career mobility, leadership style, adaptability and commitment*. (Doctoral dissertation).

Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3343281)

Cejda, B. D. (2007). Introduction to the special edition on rural community colleges in America.

Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 31, 257-259.

Cejda, B. D., & Jolley, M. R. (2013). Developing leadership competencies in the heartland.

Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37, 160-167.

Cejda, B. D., McKenney, C. B., & Fuller, C. W. (2001). Leaving office: Position changes of chief academic officers. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 137-146.

Coe, R. (2002). *It's the effect size, stupid: What effect size is and why it is important*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Conference, Exeter, UK.

Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., & Kisker, C. B. (2014). *The American community college* (6th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Covert, M. D. (2004). *Charting an alternative pathway to the presidency. Reflections of senior student affairs officers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 305177764)

- Council for the Study of Community Colleges. (n.d.). *Grad programs*. Retrieved from <http://www.cscconline.org/home/graduate-programs/#DegGrantProgs>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- D'Amico, M. M., Friedel, J. N., Katsinas, S. G., & Thornton, Z. M. (2013). Current developments in community college performance funding. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38, 231-241.
- Dikeman, R. (2007). *Leadership practices and leadership ethics of North Carolina community college presidents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3280917)
- Dougherty, K. J., Jones, S. M., Lahr, H., Natow, R. S., Pheatt, L., & Reddy, V. (2014). *Implementing performance-based funding in three leading states: Instruments, outcomes, obstacles, and unintended impacts* (Working paper no. 74). New York, NY: Community College Resource Center.
- Dugan, J. P. (2011). Research on college student leadership. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, W. Wagner, C. Slack, & Associates (Eds.), *Handbook for student leadership development* (pp. 59-84). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2011). Leadership theories. In S. R. Komives, J. P. Dugan, J. E. Owen, W. Wagner, C. Slack, & Associates (Eds.), *Handbook for student leadership development* (pp. 35-57). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Duree, C. A. (2007). *The challenges of the community college presidency in the new millennium: Pathways, preparation, competencies, and leadership programs needed to survive*

- (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
(UMI No. 3289420)
- Eddy, P. L. (2007). Grocery store politics: Leading the rural community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 1-20.
- Eddy, P. L. (2010). *Community college leadership: A multidimensional model for leading change*. Herndon, VA: Stylus.
- Eddy, P. L. (2013). Developing leaders: The role of competencies in rural community colleges. *Community College Review*, 41, 20-43.
- Eddy, P. L., & Rao, M. (2009). Leadership development in higher education programs. *Community College Enterprise*, 15, 7-26.
- Eddy, P. L., Sydow, D. L., Alfred, R. L., & Garza-Mitchell, R. L. (2015). *Developing tomorrow's leaders: Context, challenges, and capabilities: The futures series on community colleges* [Kindle edition]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>
- Fagan, T., & Dunklin, S. (2014). Two- and four-year college contexts for student veterans. In L. S. Kelsay & E. M. Zamani-Gallaher (Eds.), *Working with students in community colleges* (pp. 129-142). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Floyd, D. L., & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2013). Leaving a community college presidency: The inevitable career transition. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37, 242-247.
- Fox, N. (2008). Postpositivism. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 660-664). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Fluharty, C., & Scaggs, B. (2007). The rural differential: Bridging the resource gap. In P. L. Eddy & J. P. Murray (Eds.), *Rural community colleges: Teaching, learning, and leading in the*

- heartland* (New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 137, pp. 19-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Fulton-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2005). Community college leadership: An art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 233-250.
- Grafton, K. S. (2009). *Presidential transformational leadership practices: Analysis of self-perceptions and observers at community colleges in Oklahoma* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3357441)
- Guthrie, J. (2001). Been there; done that: Life after the presidency. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 243-250.
- Hammons, J. O., & Miller, M. T. (2006). Presidential perceptions about graduate-preparation programs for community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30, 373-381.
- Harrison, L. M., & Mather, P. C. (2016). *Alternative solutions to higher education's challenges: An appreciative approach to reform*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harrop, M. (2007). *A study of the leadership traits, behaviors, and characteristics of public two-year college chief financial officers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3023687)
- Hassan, A. M., Dellow, D. A., & Jackson, J. (2010). The AACCC leadership competencies: Parallel views from the top. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 34, 180-198.
- Hendrickson, R. M., Lane, J. E., Harris, J. T., & Dorman, R. (2013). *Academic leadership and governance of higher education: A guide for trustees, leaders, and aspiring leaders of two and four year institutions*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23(2), 26-34.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. (2012). *Management of organizational behavior* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holt, D. J. (2003). *Administrator behavioral leadership practices: A comparative assessment of administrators and observers at selected community colleges in Texas* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3088147)
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-339.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- Hull, J. R., & Keim, M. C. (2007). Nature and status of community college leadership development programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 689-702.
- Humphrey, M. (2012). *Experiences of African-American female community college presidents using a student affairs pathway: A phenomenological study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3551624)
- Ivery, C. L. (2013). The urban crisis and pathways to a multiracial democracy. In G. Myran, C. L. Ivery, M. H. Parsons, & C. Kinsley (Eds.), *The future of the urban community college: Shaping the pathways to a multiracial society* (New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 162, pp. 19-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Jaschick, S. (2007, August 13). *Why differences in community colleges matter*. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/08/13/classify>
- Jaschick, S. & Lederman, D. (2015). *The 2015 Inside Higher Ed survey of college and university presidents*. Retrieved from Inside Higher Ed's Website: https://www.insidehighered.com/system/files/media/2015%20IHE_PresidentsSurvey.pdf
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2008) *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jones, S. D. (2009). *A study of the relationship between leadership practices and organizational effectiveness in student affairs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3384700)
- Jones, S. J., & Johnson, B. (2014). Are community college presidencies wise career moves? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38, 300-310.
- Jones, S. J., & Warnick, E. M. (2012). Attaining the first community college presidency: A case study of new presidents in Texas. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36, 229-232.
- Keim, M. C., (2008). Chief student affairs officers in 2-year colleges: Their demographics and educational backgrounds. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32, 435-442.
- Keim, M. C., & Murray, J. P. (2008). Chief academic officers' demographics and educational backgrounds. *Community College Review*, 36, 116-132.
- Kiley, K. (2012, July 31). *Meet the new boss*. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from <http://insidehighered.com>

- Kezar, A. J. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century*. ASHE Higher Education Report, 28(4). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). *Rethinking the “L” word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership*. ASHE Higher Education Report, 31(6). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kezar, A. J., & Lester, J. (2009). *Organizing higher education for collaboration: A guide for campus leaders* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2013). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership practices inventory: Theory and evidence behind the five practices of exemplary leaders*. Retrieved from http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/userfiles/lc_jb_appendix.pdf
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2013). *Leadership practices inventory: Self report*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuk, L. (2009). The dynamics of organizational models within student affairs. In G. McClellan and J. Springer (Eds.), *Handbook of student affairs administration* (3rd ed., pp. 313-332). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Leist, J. (2007). “Ruralizing” presidential job advertisements. In P. L. Eddy & J. P. Murray (Eds.), *Rural community colleges: Teaching, learning, and leading in the heartland* (New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 137, pp. 35-46). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Lewis, R. M., Zamani-Gallaher, E. M., & Bonapace, C. (2014). Older and adult learning in community colleges: A new wave of adult learners. In L. S. Kelsay & E. M. Zamani-Gallaher (Eds.), *Working with students in community colleges* (113-129). Sterling, VA: Styles Publishing
- Li, J., Friedel, J., & Rusche, P. (2010). Examining practical relevance of the coursework of doctoral leadership programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35, 3-17.
- Lovell, N., Crittenden, L., Stumpf, D., & Davis, M. (2003). The road less traveled: Atypical doctoral preparation of leaders in rural community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 1-14.
- Luna, G. (2010). Succession planning: A doctoral program partnership for emerging community college leaders. *Community College Journal of Research*, 34, 977-990.
- Maitra, A. (2007). *An analysis of leadership styles and practices of university women in administrative vice presidencies* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Ohiolink Dissertation and Theses database.
- Maslin-Ostrowski, P., & Floyd, D. L. (2012). When the time comes for the community college president to step aside: Daunting realities of leading. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36(4), 291-300.
- McClellan, D. (2004). *The influence of organizational structure on the degree of adherence to the principles of a learning oriented student affairs division* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3152271)
- McGoey, Shane (2004). Student affairs professionals: Path to the presidency. *The Vermont Connection*. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.uvm.edu/tvc/vol25/iss1/2>.

- McInnis, W. D. (2002). *The managerial roles of North Carolina community college chief business officers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 305567523)
- McNair, D. E. (2015). Deliberate disequilibrium: Preparing for a community college presidency. *Community College Review*, 43(1), 72-88.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2013). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: practical application and interpretation* (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.
- Mickey, R. M., Dunn, O. J., & Clark, V. (2004). *Applied statistics: Analysis of variance and regression* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Interscience.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murray, J. P., Murray, J. I., & Summar, C. (2000). The propensity of community college chief academic officers to leave an institution. *Community College Review*, 28(3), 22-35.
- Muzyka, D. M. (2004). *An ethnography of community college presidents from continuing education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3160212)
- Myers, J. L., Well, A., & Lorch, R. F. (2010). *Research design and statistical analysis* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Myran, G., & Parsons, M. H. (2013). Overview: The future of the urban community college. In G. Myran, C. L. Ivery, M. H. Parsons, & C. Kinsley (Eds.), *The future of the urban community college: Shaping the pathways to a multiracial society* (New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 162, pp. 7-18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Nabasny, N. P. (2011). Alternative ladders through the glass ceiling: Female college presidents who pursued administrative career paths. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 869529117)
- Nevarez, C., & Wood, J. L. (2010). *Community college leadership and administration: Theory, practice, and change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Nguyen, T. T. (2014). *Perceptions of lawyers on career transition, transferable skills, and preparation for community college leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3584896)
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oliver, S. W. (2001). *The leadership practices of chief student affairs officers in Texas: A comparative analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3011772)
- Pope, M. L., & Miller, M. T. (2005). Leading from the inside out: Learned respect for academic culture through shared governance. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 745-757.
- Posner, B. Z. (2015). *Bringing the rigor of research to the art of leadership: Research behind the five practices of exemplary leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/UserFiles/Bringing%20the%20Rigor%20of%20Research%20to%20the%20Art%20of%20Leadership.pdf>
- Posner, B. Z., & Kouzes, J. M. (1993). Psychometric properties of the leadership practices inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53(1), 191-199.
- Railey, G. A. (2010). *Characteristics & perceived skills of California community college chief financial officers: A profile of characteristics & perceived skills and responsibilities*

- (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
(UMI No. 3551624)
- Reifman, A., & Keyton, K. (2011). Winsorize. In N. J. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of research design* (p. 1637). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reille, A., & Kezar, A. J (2010). Balancing the pros and cons of community college “grow-your-own” leadership programs. *Community College Review*, 38, 59-81.
- Relken, N. A. (2014). *Examining emotional intelligence and perceived leadership practices among college enrollment services administrators: A descriptive study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3624336)
- Rishacher, J. (2001). A study of the characteristics of four-year college and university presidents who have served as senior affairs officers (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3015177)
- Ridley, D. (2012). *The literature review: A step-by-step guide for students* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Riggs, J. (2009). Leadership for tomorrow’s community colleges. *Community College Enterprise*, 15(2), 27-38.
- Romano, R. M., Townsend, B., & Mamiseishvili, K. (2009). Leaders in the making: Profile and perceptions of students in community college doctoral programs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33, 309-320.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Prager.

- Rozeboom, D. J. (2008). *Self-report and direct observer's perceived leadership practices of chief student affairs officers in selected institutions of higher education in the United States* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3333760)
- Rumberger, R. W., & Palardy, G. (2004). Multilevel models for school effectiveness research. In D. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of quantitative methodology for the social sciences* (Vol. 1, pp. 235-258). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ruxton, G. D. (2006). The unequal variance *t*-test is an underused alternative to student's *t*-test and the Mann-Whitney *U* test. *Behavioral Ecology*, 17, 688-690.
- Sandeen, A. (2001). Organizing student affairs divisions. In R. B. Winston, Jr., T. K. Miller & Associates (Eds.), *The professional student affairs administrator: Educator, leader, and manager* (pp. 181-209). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Sandoval, G. R. (2011). *Exploring the path from student services professional to community college president* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.
- Schmitz, G. R. (2008). *Leadership preparation and career pathways of community college presidents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3307078)
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Bird, B. J. (1979). Contributions of the Ohio state studies to the field of leadership. *Journal of Management*, 5(2), 135-145.
- Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership* (Research Brief Leadership Series, no. 1). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

- Skyers, A. G. (2006). *Transformational leadership practices of New England community college presidents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3243095)
- Smith, A. A. (2016, May 20). Tension at the top. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://insidehighered.com>
- Smith, M. A. (2013). *Senior-level student affairs' administrators' self-reported leadership practices, behaviors, and strategies* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI No. 3564020)
- Stephenson, S. (2002). *Promoting teamwork: Leadership, attitudes, and other characteristics of a community college chief financial officer* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (3055346)
- Stout-Stewart, S. (2005). Female community-college presidents: Effective leadership patterns and behaviors. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 303-316.
- Thelin, J. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thompson, M., Coopers, R., & Ebbers, L. (2012). Presidential transition: The experiences of two community college interim presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 36, 300-309.
- Tull, A. (2014). An examination of community college senior student affairs officers' role perception, job satisfaction, and propensity to leave their institutions. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 32, 53-65.

- Tull, A. (2015). Introduction to student affairs in the community college. In A. Tull, L. Kuk, & P. Dalpes (Eds.), *Handbook for student affairs in community college* (pp. 3-18). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Vaughan, G. B., & Weisman, I. M. (1998). *The community college presidency at the millennium*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Warner, R. M. (2013). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Waggoner, R. (2016). *Pipelines to leadership: Aspirations of executive-level community college leaders to ascend to the presidency* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10109833)
- Wahyuni, D. (2012). The research design maze: understanding paradigms, cases, methods and methodologies. *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, 1, 69-80.
- Wegener, D. T., & Blankenship, K. L. (2007). Ecological validity. In R. Baumeister & K. Vohs (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (pp. 275-277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Williams, M. (2006). Positivism. In V. Jupp (Eds), *The sage dictionary of social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Williams, M. R., Pennington, K. L., Couch, G., & Dougherty, M. A. (2007). Preparing rural community college professionals. *Community College Enterprise*, 13(1), 23-35.
- Weisman, I. M., & Vaughn, G. B. (2007). *The community college presidency 2006* (Report No. AACC-RB-07-1). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Welch, M. C. (2002). *Leadership frames of female presidents of American research universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 305554000)

- Woodland, C., & Parsons, M. H. (2013). A new leadership paradigm for the 21st century. In G. Myran, C. L. Ivery, M. H. Parsons, & C. Kinsley (Eds.), *The future of the urban community college: Shaping the pathways to a multiracial society* (New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 162, pp. 27-35). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Yukl, G. A. (1993). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zarkesh, M., & Beas, A. M. (2004). Performance indicators and performance-based funding in community colleges. *Community College Review*, 31(4), 62-76.

APPENDIX A. PERMISSION LETTER TO USE INSTRUMENT

January 28, 2016

Matthew Cooney
1743 Limerick Court
Bowling Green, OH 43402

Dear Matthew:

Thank you for your request to use the LPI®: Leadership Practices Inventory® in your dissertation. This letter grants you permission to use either the print or electronic LPI [Self/Observer/Self and Observer] instrument[s] in your research. You may **reproduce** the instrument in printed form at no charge beyond the discounted one-time cost of purchasing a single copy; however, you may not distribute any photocopies except for specific research purposes. If you prefer to use the electronic distribution of the LPI you will need to separately contact Eli Becker (ebecker@wiley.com) directly for further details regarding product access and payment. Please be sure to review the product information resources before reaching out with pricing questions.

Permission to use either the written or electronic versions is contingent upon the following:

- (1) The LPI may be used only for research purposes and may not be sold or used in conjunction with any compensated activities;
- (2) Copyright in the LPI, and all derivative works based on the LPI, is retained by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. The following copyright statement must be included on all reproduced copies of the instrument(s); “Copyright © 2013 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved. Used with permission”;
- (3) One (1) **electronic** copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data must be sent **promptly** to my attention at the address below; and,
- (4) We have the right to include the results of your research in publication, promotion, distribution and sale of the LPI and all related products.

Permission is limited to the rights granted in this letter and does not include the right to grant others permission to reproduce the instrument(s) except for versions made by nonprofit organizations for visually or physically handicapped persons. No additions or changes may be made without our prior written consent. You understand that your use of the LPI shall in no way place the LPI in the public domain or in any way compromise our copyright in the LPI. This license is nontransferable. We reserve the right to revoke this permission at any time, effective upon written notice to you, in the event we conclude, in our reasonable judgment, that your use of the LPI is compromising our proprietary rights in the LPI.

Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ellen Peterson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor
Epeter4@gmail.com

APPENDIX B. LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY-SELF SAMPLE (KOUZES &
POSNER, 2013)

Please indicate to what extent do you typically engage in the following behaviors? For each of the following statements, please select the response that best describes how often you engage in the practice.

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

1. I set a personal example of what I expect of others.
2. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
3. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.
4. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.
5. I praise people for a job well done.

APPENDIX C. POTENTIAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS DEMOGRAPHIC

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill out the questionnaire below that best describe your personal and professional demographics.

1. How interested are you in becoming a community college president?
1 = Very interested 2 = Somewhat interested 3 = Not interested
2. Current position title: (Fill in the blank)
3. How would you describe the administrative role of your position?
 - a. Senior Academic Affairs Officer
 - b. Senior Student Affairs Officer
 - c. Senior Academic and Student Affairs Officer
 - d. Senior Finance and Administrative Officer
 - e. I am not the lead administrator for my functional area
 - f. Other (please specify): _____
4. In what area is your institution located?
 - a. Urban
 - b. Suburban
 - c. Rural
5. Approximately how many full-time students attended your institution in Fall 2015?
 - a. Fewer than 500 students
 - b. 500-1,999 students
 - c. 2,000-4,999 students
 - d. 5,000-9,999 students
 - e. 10,000 or more students
6. What is your highest degree earned?
 - a. Associate's
 - b. Bachelor's
 - c. Master's (Except MBA)
 - d. MBA
 - e. PhD
 - f. EdD
 - g. MD
 - h. Other health related degree (e.g., DDS, DVM)
 - i. Law (e.g., JD, LLB)

- j. Other (please specify): _____
7. Please indicate the major field of study for your highest earned degree:
- a. Agricultural/natural resources
 - b. Biological sciences
 - c. Business
 - d. Computer science
 - e. Education or higher education
 - f. Engineering
 - g. Humanities/fine arts
 - h. Law
 - i. Mathematics
 - j. Health professions
 - k. Medicine
 - l. Physical/natural sciences
 - m. Religion/theology
 - n. Social sciences
 - o. Other (please specify): _____
8. Have you participated in community college leadership development program sponsored by a professional organization?
- a. No
 - b. Yes
9. Have you participated in community college leadership development program sponsored by a community college or community college district?
- a. No
 - b. Yes
10. How many years have you worked in higher education?
- a. 0-5 years
 - b. 6-10 years
 - c. 11-15 years
 - d. 16-20 years
 - e. 21-24 years
 - f. 25 or more years
11. Gender
- a. Female
 - b. Male
 - c. Trans*
12. Age
- a. Under 40
 - b. 41-45
 - c. 46-50

- d. 51-55
- e. 56-60
- f. 61-65
- g. 66-70
- h. 70 and older

13. What is your race (Check all that apply)?

- a. African American
- b. American Indian/Alaskan Native
- c. Asian
- d. Latino/Hispanic
- e. Pacific Islander
- f. White
- g. Other (please specify): _____

APPENDIX D. HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



DATE: May 6, 2016

TO: Matthew Cooney

FROM: Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board

PROJECT TITLE: [853581-2] The Demographics and Utilization of Transformational Leadership Practices by Potential Community College Presidents

SUBMISSION TYPE: Revision

ACTION: APPROVED

APPROVAL DATE: May 6, 2016

EXPIRATION DATE: May 2, 2017

REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review

REVIEW CATEGORY: Expedited review category # 7

Thank you for your submission of Revision materials for this project. The Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is available as a published Board Document in the Review Details page. You must use the approved version of the consent document when obtaining consent from participants. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that you are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures, those modifications must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the modification request form for this procedure.

You have been approved to enroll 3,000 participants. If you wish to enroll additional participants you must seek approval from the HSRB.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must also be reported promptly to this office.

This approval expires on May 2, 2017. You will receive a continuing review notice before your project expires. If you wish to continue your work after the expiration date, your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Good luck with your work. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence regarding this project.

APPENDIX E. INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

Subject: Potential Community College Presidents Dissertation Study

Wednesday, May 25, 2016

Dear <Insert Name>,

My name is Matthew Cooney and I am a doctoral student in the higher education administration program at Bowling Green State University. I am completing my dissertation under the guidance of Dr. Kenneth W. Borland, professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs. I am asking for your participation in my dissertation research study about the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. It is estimated that participation in this study will take less than ten minutes of your time.

There is an impending leadership crisis as many community college presidents plan to retire and there is limited information on (a) who are potential community college presidents to fill the leadership gap, and (b) to what degree potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices. The purpose of this correlational descriptive study is to understand who are potential community college presidents, to what degree potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices, and whether potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon personal aspiration, institutional characteristics, and professional experiences.

As a senior administrator in a community college, you may be part of the next generation of community college presidents. Participation in this study should take no more than ten minutes.

Information regarding your potential participation in the study is located below.

Thank you,

Matthew A. Cooney
PhD Candidate, Higher Education Administration
Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University
MCooney@bgsu.edu

APPENDIX F. REMINDER TO PARTICIPATE

Subject: Potential Community College Presidents Dissertation Study

Tuesday, June 07, 2016

Dear <Insert Name>,

I hope this e-mail finds you well within your day. Recently I sent an e-mail invitation to participate in my dissertation study about the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. There is an expected mass retirement of current community college presidents. As a result of the impending retirements, it is important to understand who are the potential community college presidents to fill this leadership void and to what degree these potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices. As a senior administrator in a community college, you may be part of the next generation of community college presidents. Participation in this quantitative study should take no more than ten minutes.

If you have already taken the survey or if you would like to opt out from participating in this study and unsubscribe from future e-mails, please click [here](#). You can also copy and paste this link into your browser: https://bgsu.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3qmL6NnH9q13elt

I hope that you consider participating in my study. Listed below is additional information about my study, the informed consent document, and a link to participate.

Thank you,

Matthew A. Cooney
PhD Candidate, Higher Education Administration
Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University
MCooney@bgsu.edu

APPENDIX G. FINAL REMINDER TO PARTICIPATE

Subject: Potential Community College Presidents Dissertation Study

Monday, June 13, 2016

Dear <Insert Name>,

I hope this e-mail finds you well. This e-mail is a final reminder to ask for your participation in my dissertation research about potential community college presidents and their utilization of transformational leadership practices. If you have already participated in this study, I appreciate your time and apologize for sending a reminder e-mail.

There is an expected mass retirement of current community college presidents. As a result of the impending retirements, it is important to understand who aspires to be a community college president, and to what degree these potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices. As a senior administrator in a community college, you may be part of the next generation of community college presidents. Participation in this quantitative study should take no more than ten minutes. I hope that you consider participating in my study. Listed below is additional information about my study and a link to participate.

Thank you,
Matthew A. Cooney
PhD Candidate, Higher Education Administration
Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
Bowling Green State University
MCooney@bgsu.edu

APPENDIX H. INFORMED CONSENT



Informed Consent Form for the "Demographics and Utilization of Transformational Leadership Practices by Potential Community College Presidents"

Bowling Green State University

Introduction: My name is Matthew Cooney and I am a doctoral student in the higher education administration program at Bowling Green State University. I am completing my dissertation under the guidance of Dr. Kenneth W. Borland, professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs. The research topic concerns the demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents. You have been identified for participation in this study because you are listed as a senior academic affairs officer, senior student affairs officer, senior academic and student affairs officer, or senior finance and administrative officer in the Higher Education Directory. All senior academic affairs officers, senior student affairs officers, senior academic and student affairs officers, and senior finance and administrative officers in two-year, associate's granting, public institutions were sent invitations to participate.

Purpose: There is an impending leadership crisis as many community college presidents plan to retire and there is limited information on (1) who are potential community college presidents to fill the leadership gap, and (2) how potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices. The purpose of this correlational descriptive study is to understand who are potential community college presidents, to what degree potential community college presidents utilize transformational leadership practices, and if potential community college presidents' utilization of transformational leadership practices differs based upon personal aspiration, institutional characteristics, and professional experiences

Procedure: If you agree to take part in this research project, you will be asked to fill out an online survey that should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

Voluntary nature: Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Deciding to participate or not will not affect you, your position, or your relationship with Bowling Green State University.

Confidentiality Protection: Please note that all of your responses will be kept completely confidential. All data will be stored on a secure server. All resulting data will only be reported in the aggregate; no names or institutions will be listed. Because this survey will be administered electronically, please note that some employers may use tracking software, so you may want to complete your survey on a personal computer. Please do not leave the survey open if you are using a public computer or a computer others may have access to and clear your browser cache and page history after completing the survey.

Risks: The risk of participating is no greater than experienced in everyday life. Please note the

330 Education Building
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0244

Phone: 419-372-7382
Fax: 419-372-9382

E-mail: l
Web: ht

BGSU HSREB - APPROVED FOR USE
IRBNet ID # 853581
EFFECTIVE 05/06/2016
EXPIRES 05/02/2017

precautions taken in the previous confidentiality protection section.

Contact: If you have any questions or concerns about the research or participation in the research, please feel to contact me at (419) 372-7382 or MCooney@bgsu.edu. My advisor for this research project is Dr. Kenneth W. Borland and he can be reached at (419) 372-7382 or kborlan@bgsu.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research.

Consent: By taking the survey, you are indicating your consent to participate in this research and that you have been informed of the purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits of this study, that you had the opportunity to have all your questions answered, that you are at least 18 years of age, and that you have been informed that participation is completely voluntary.

Survey Link:

To access the survey please click here. If the survey does not open automatically, please copy and paste the following link to your Internet browser's address bar:

INSERT LINK WHEN APPROVED

BGSU HSRB - APPROVED FOR USE
IRBNet ID # 853581
EFFECTIVE 05/06/2016
EXPIRES 05/02/2017