Factors Contributing to Leadership Effectiveness
Among Deans of Graduate Schools of Education

by Afnan Al-Shuaiby

B.A. 1993, King Saud University
M.A. 1995, American University

A Dissertation Submitted to

The Faculty of
The Graduate School of Education and Human Development
of The George Washington University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education

January 31, 2009

Dissertation directed by

Joel Gomez
Associate Professor of Educational Leadership

The Graduate School of Education and Human Development of The George Washington University certifies that Afnan Al-Shuaiby has passed the Final Examination for the degree of Doctor of Education as of December 15, 2008. This is the final and approved form of the dissertation.

Factors Contributing to Leadership Effectiveness
Among Deans of Graduate Schools of Education

Afnan Al-Shuaiby

Dissertation Research Committee

    Joel Gomez, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership, Dissertation Director

    Salvatore R. Paratore, Professor Emeritus of Education, Committee Member

    Lynda L. West, Professor of Special Education, Committee Member

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my lovely parents whom
I am sincerely indebted for all they have done for me to reach
this joyful stage of my educational accomplishment.

Acknowledgements

Completion of this study would have not been possible without the incredible

trust given to me by Dr. Gomez. As the dissertation committee chair, he guided me to

pursue the work needed to be done and the procedures needed to be followed for

completion of this manuscript. He devoted his time for providing constructive criticism

and helpful suggestions during the development of my dissertation.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Paratore, a distinguished

professor emeritus and a dedicated scholar, who graciously joined my dissertation

committee and provided me with his insightful suggestions in designing the research

methodology and in conducting appropriate statistical analyses for the study. I can never

forget his tireless efforts to help convene this wonderful dissertation committee.

I am grateful to Professor West for her continued professional advice as well as

for her encouragement during the period of my graduate program. Not only did I enjoy

taking a very interesting course with Dr. West, she also provided me with the honor of

accepting to be a member of my dissertation committee.

I also owe special thanks to Dr. Greenberg, a distinguished *professor emeritus*

who was my academic advisor when I first enrolled as a doctoral degree student at the

Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Just recently, I asked him to

participate in my dissertation committee, and he graciously agreed.

My sincere thanks go to Dr. Busky who generously accepted my request to join

my dissertation committee as an expert in the field of higher educational leadership.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge a great indebtedness to my parents who always

cared about my education and helped me reach my educational aspiration.

Abstract of Dissertation

Factors Contributing to Leadership Effectiveness
Among Deans of Graduate Schools of Education

This study was conducted to investigate the extent to which certain leadership styles and selected personal and professional profiles of academic deans of graduate schools of education are associated with their leadership effectiveness. The study was also designed to explore experiences of the academic deans with the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness, and the strategies they pursue to overcome such obstacles.

The data for the study was collected from 240 deans of graduate schools of education. The findings indicated that a majority of the deans were typically faced with a number of obstacles that their solutions were not within the boundary of their authority. Such obstacles included budget restrictions, imbalanced authority versus responsibility, and challenges with bureaucratic system. There was a common agreement among the participating deans regarding the importance of a number of factors contributing to their leadership effectiveness. Such factors included demonstrating honest and ethical behavior, resolving conflicts in a professional manner, taking responsibility for decisions, and creating a mutual trust atmosphere.

A number of conclusions were drawn from testing the research hypotheses. Transformational leadership style was concluded to be positively and significantly correlated with the coaching and participating approaches to leadership effectiveness. Years of experience as a dean and years of teaching experience were concluded to be positively correlated with leadership effectiveness of academic deans. Males tend to more likely favor the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to

their female counterparts. Academic deans who served private institutions tended to use different approaches to leadership as compared to their counterparts in public institutions. It was also concluded that younger academic deans were more in favor of the telling/directing approaches to their leadership effectiveness. It was further concluded that Whites and Caucasians are more likely to use the selling/coaching approaches to their leadership effectiveness.

Finally, based on the conclusions and implications drawn from the findings of the study, a number of recommendations were made to academic deans to help overcome the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness and several suggestions were made to future researchers to conduct additional studies related to the topic.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Review of the Related Literature

List of Figures

x

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

Background of the Study

One of the most significant functions of an institution of higher education relies on its leadership effectiveness in creating a pleasant teaching environment for faculty and in providing students with a quality of education they deserve. Delivering a quality of education to students is reflected in the mission statements of almost all institutions of higher education. While the educational policies and procedures play a significant role in the mission accomplishment of higher education institutions, college deans are ultimately responsible for implementation of such policies and procedures. In order to lead effectively, college deans need to work successfully with a range of interests, individuals, and groups. Several researchers have concluded that leadership role of college deans is more political and social than technical and hierarchical (Blair, 2000; Dill, 1980; Gmelch et al., 1999; Mercer, 1997). Blair (2000), for example, notes that institutions of higher education are increasingly expecting an individual dean to obtain external funding to be considered as an effective leader. Dill (1980) also notes that even though individual deans have achieved remarkable power and status, there are still many signs of their imbalanced responsibility and authority. Gmelch et al. (1999) contend that the former vision of the dean as a scholarly leader has been replaced by an executive image of the dean as "politically astute and economically savvy" (p. 77). Mercer (1997) argues that the pressure to get more involved in institutional development has shifted the traditional role of the dean from "an academic-policy setter to an entrepreneur and politician" (p. 5). He further indicates that in order to be an effective leader, a college or school dean needs to be provided with a balance of responsibility and authority.

The deanship should accurately reflect the face of the college's populace and the external environment with which it ultimately interacts. As far as the roles and challenges of college deans are concerned, Montez, Wolverton, and Gmelch (2002) contend that "demands from superiors (presidents, provosts, and boards of trustees), constituents (faculty and students), and benefactors (taxpayers, legislators, and endowers) are combined to create a turbulent environment in which college deans must thrive" (p. 2). Rhoades (2000) also argues that because the success of a higher education institution depends on the interaction of all its special interest groups, such interest groups will ultimately shape a college dean's role. Fagin (1997) similarly contends that today the academic dean is involved with the college, its external constituents, the president, the faculty, and the curriculum in many ways different from other institutional members. Paramount to a college dean's leadership effectiveness is, thus, the ability to maintain the equilibrium between his or her value system and the internal and external situations.

Statement of the Problem

Much of previous research on deans has been primarily descriptive in nature and refers to their specific tasks and challenges as well as their roles and functions. Many researchers have focused on specific topics such as the role of deans in governance and decision making (Baldridge, 1971), their position conflict (Feltner & Goodsell, 1972), their transition from research and teaching to academic management (Arter, 1981), their career paths (Moore et al., 1983), their management skills and mobility (Sagaria, 1988), and their dilemmas in leadership (Gmelch et at., 1999).

The need for research in leadership effectiveness of college deans has been widely documented. Nelms (2005), for example, has questioned the validity and reliability of the instruments being used to assess the job performance of college deans. She has developed

her own survey instrument which she claims to have a high level of validity and a

significant degree of reliability to be used for evaluation of higher education leadership

effectiveness. Rosser, Johnsrud, and Heck (2003) have referred to the necessity of

evaluating leadership effectiveness of academic deans from both individual and

institutional perspectives. They have investigated the individual roles of deans as related

to their institutional effectiveness. In her review of the literature related to leadership

effectiveness in higher education, Kezar (2000a) has referred to the lack of sufficient

hierarchical models of leadership for meeting the challenges facing higher education

institutions. She has recommended developing new models to help improve leadership in

higher education. Mercer (1997) has shown some concern about the lack of necessary

balance of responsibility and authority provided to college leaders. He has specifically

focused on the overwhelming internal and external responsibilities of academic deans as

related to their job effectiveness. A number of other researchers have also focused on the

need for research in higher education leadership (Astin & Leland, 1991; Astin &

Scherrei, 1980; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Jackson, 2004; Kezar, 2000b; McGoey,

2005; Morris, 1981; Roaden, 1970; Rosener, 1990; Smart, 2003; Tierney, 1997;

Twombly, 1992). However, only a few studies have focused on the role of leadership

style as well as certain personal and professional factors on leadership effectiveness in

higher education institutions (Al-Omari, 2005; Anderson, 2002; Madden, 2005; Pritchett,

2006). Furthermore, while some researchers have focused on the impact of certain

personal and professional factors affecting leadership effectiveness in higher education,

there are only a few studies that have collaboratively focused on the combined impact of

such factors (Madden, 2005; Nies & Walverton, 2000; Pritchett, 2006). Therefore, the

focus of this study is to determine the extent to which certain leadership styles and a

number of personal and professional factors are correlated with leadership effectiveness of graduate schools of education deans throughout the United States.

Purpose of the Study

There are numerous studies related to leadership effectiveness of college deans in higher education institutions. The literature, however, is very limited in identifying certain factors that could be associated with leadership effectiveness of college deans. Such factors include various leadership styles as well as certain personal and professional characteristics of individuals involved in leadership of higher education institutions. Therefore, it is appropriate to examine what type of leadership style may best result in leadership effectiveness of higher education institutions. It is also appropriate to determine which personal and professional characteristics of higher education leaders contribute to their leadership effectiveness.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine to what extent certain leadership styles and selected personal and professional characteristics of academic deans of graduate schools of education are associated with their leadership effectiveness. The study was also designed to seek perceptions of the participating deans regarding: (a) the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness; (b) the strategies they pursue to overcome such hindering obstacles; and (c) the factors they perceive to be the most important contributors to their leadership effectiveness.

In order to achieve the purpose of the study, a number of parameters were identified and defined. This included the instrument for measuring leadership effectiveness of the participating deans, the instrument to determine leadership styles of the participating deans, and the identification of selected personal and professional characteristics of the participating deans.

1. The leadership effectiveness of the subjects was considered as the criterion variable and was measured by the self-report version of the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument developed by Hersey and Blanchard (2006) based on its four major components that are defined as follows: (1) telling/directing (refers to high task with low relationship behavior of an individual); (2) selling/coaching (refers to high task with high relationship behavior of an individual); (3) participating/ supporting (refers to low task with high relationship behavior of an individual); and (4) delegating/monitoring (refers to low task with low relationship behavior of an individual). This instrument was used in the study because (a) according to the LEAD Manual (2006), while it was generally developed to measure leadership effectiveness of individuals, it can be specifically applied to evaluate leadership effectiveness in institutions of higher education; and (b) it has also been used by a number of other researchers as a tool to determine leadership effectiveness in different institutions of higher education (Adrian, 2004; Astin & Scherrei, 1980; Cox, 1994; Davis, 1996; Ferentinos,1996; Hunter, 2000; Mercer, 1997; Tierney, 1997; Williams, 2004).

2. The leadership styles of the subjects were considered as one of the major predictors of leadership effectiveness and were determined by administering the short form of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) on the basis of its two major components -- transformational and transactional leadership styles. This instrument was used in the study because it has also been employed by a number of other investigators to determine leadership styles of administrators in different institutions of higher education (Barth, 2004; Bast, 2004; Dutschke, 2003; Fiedler, 1997; Greiner, 1972; Pauls, 2005; Smith, 1990; Stanley, 2004;

Temple, 2001; Williams, 2004).

  3. The professional characteristics of the subjects selected for the study included years of experience as an academic dean, years of teaching experience, and the type of institution they are currently serving (i.e., public or private). The relationship between leadership effectiveness and certain professional characteristics of higher education leaders has also been studied by a number of other researchers (Arter, 1981; Covey, 1991; Hahs-Vaughn, 2004; Smith, 1990; Temple, 2001). However, there is a lack of relevant literature on the combined impact of professional characteristics of schools of education deans on their leadership effectiveness.

  4. The personal characteristics of the subjects in this study included gender, age group, and ethnic/racial background. The relationship between leadership effectiveness and certain personal characteristics of higher education leaders has also been studied by a number of other investigators (Daugherty & Finch, 1997; Kempner, 2003; Moss & Jensrud, 1995; Stanford, Coates, & Flores, 1994). However, the literature lacks empirical studies on the combined impact of personal characteristics of colleges/school of education deans on their leadership effectiveness.

<div align="center">Need for the Study</div>

  Many researchers and change theorists acknowledge the importance of one's perception in leadership effectiveness and in implementation of the changes necessary through the use of appropriate leadership styles (Bullen, 1998; Corbin, 2000; Ducker & Senge, 2000; Harrop, 2001; Wheatley, 2001). Undoubtedly, gaining knowledge of their leadership effectiveness and leadership styles is crucial for higher education institutions in preparing their graduate students for the challenging world of work. As indicated by McNeil (1990), the success or failure of an institution's educational programs depends, at

least in part, on leadership styles of those who are in control of the system. Therefore, soliciting the attitudes and perceptions of leaders in institutions of higher education was helpful to determine the reasons for their institutional effectiveness.

While there are numerous research studies related to the issue of leadership in institutions of higher education, to date research studies have not adequately explored certain predictors of leadership effectiveness in such institutions. A number of studies have either analyzed and/or evaluated leadership effectiveness of higher education institutions in general (Cox, 1994; Mercer, 1997; Tierney, 1989). A few studies have focused on the relationship between leadership effectiveness and leadership styles of college deans in higher education institutions (Bast, 2004; Fiedler, 1997; Greiner, 1972). Several studies have explored the effects of certain professional characteristics of college deans on their leadership effectiveness (Arter, 1981; Covey, 1991; Hahs-Vaughn, 2004). Several other studies have concentrated on the role that certain personal characteristics of college deans may play in their leadership effectiveness (Kempner, 2003; Moss & Jensrud, 1995; Stanford, Coates, & Flores, 1994). However, there is a lack of research related to leadership styles, and professional and personal characteristics of college deans as predictors of their leadership effectiveness. This study specifically focused on certain predictors of leadership effectiveness of the academic deans serving graduate schools of education in the United States

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for a number of reasons. First, while there are numerous studies on leadership effectiveness, leadership style, and certain characteristics of academic and administrative leaders in various institutions of higher education; there is a lack of literature on the link between these factors collaboratively. Second, the sample for

the study is unique because it only involves the academic deans of graduate schools of education in institutions of higher education. Third, the data for the study was collected through a comprehensive questionnaire which includes a reliable inventory of the situational leadership effectiveness; another reliable inventory of leadership styles; and informative open-ended questions. Fourth, the findings of this study can help academic deans of graduate schools of education have a better understanding of the factors influencing leadership effectiveness. Fifth, the findings of this study may also help those individuals who may seek a leadership position in different institutions of higher education. Finally, a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses of data can provide a richer discussion and insight on issues related to the study.

Uniqueness of the Study

This study is unique in its scope because it is designed to achieve a number of objectives simultaneously. These objectives include (a) examining leadership effectiveness of college deans on the basis of their leadership styles as well as a number of their personal and professional characteristics, when operating jointly; (b) determining the reasons behind leadership effectiveness of academic deans in institutions of higher education; (c) identifying the obstacles facing their job performance; and (d) finding out how the participating deans manage to overcome these obstacles.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated and were examined through the use of appropriate quantitative and qualitative procedures:

Research Question 1

How do the academic deans of graduate schools of education perceive the challenging obstacles hindering their job effectiveness?

Research Question 2

How do the academic deans of graduate schools of education manage to overcome the challenging obstacles hindering their job effectiveness?

Research Question 3

What factors do the academic deans of graduate schools of education perceive to have contributed to their leadership effectiveness?

Research Question 4

To what extent are certain leadership styles and selected personal and professional characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education correlated with their leadership effectiveness?

<div align="center">Research Hypotheses</div>

The following research hypotheses were derived from the last research question and were tested through the use of appropriate statistical procedures.

Research Hypothesis 1

Certain leadership styles of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Research Hypothesis 2

Certain professional characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Research Hypothesis 3

Certain personal characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Research Hypothesis 4

A combination of certain leadership styles and selected personal and professional

characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Conceptual Framework

A review of the literature indicates that a number of researchers have found significant relationships between leadership effectiveness and certain leadership styles (Corbin, 2000; Harrop, 2001; Wheatley, 2001). Numerous investigators have found gender to be a significant factor in leadership effectiveness (Billing & Alvesson, 1994; Daugherty & Finch, 1997; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonski, 1992; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2004; Moss & Jensrud, 1995; Rosser, Johnsrud, & Heck, 2003; Thorp, Cummins, & Townsend, 1998). Some researchers have concluded that ethnicity or racial background has a significant role in leadership effectiveness (Allen, 2004; Dabney, 2004; Germany, 2005; Kempner, 2003; Salleh-Barone, 1998; Wilking, 2004). Several other researchers have found that certain professional characteristics of the leaders (years of experience and the type of college/school) are significantly influential in their leadership effectiveness (Covey, 1991; Hahs-Vaughn, 2004; Tsend, 2000; Woods, 2004). After an extensive review of the literature, this investigator was interested in determining the extent to which leadership effectiveness of selected college deans can be predicted by a combination of variables including their leadership styles, as well as certain personal and professional characteristics.

The situational theory formulated by Hersey and Blanchard (2006) was utilized in this study in order to understand factors and strategies influencing leadership effectiveness of college deans. Based on their situational theory, Hersey and Blanchard (2006) have classified effectiveness of leaders into four different categories that could be drawn upon to deal with contrasting situations: (a) telling, which is considered as high

10

task/low relationship behavior of the subjects; (b) selling, which is considered as high task/high relationship behavior of the subjects; (c) participating, which is considered as low task/high relationship behavior of the subjects; and (d) delegating, which is considered as low task/low relationship behavior of the subjects.

Leadership styles of college deans were determined through the perspective of transformational and transactional styles of the leaders as classified by Bass and Avolio (2004). The transformational style leaders are those (a) who are typically elevating the interests of their subordinates; (b) who generate awareness and acceptance of the mission of the group; and (c) who motivate their subordinates to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of their organization (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The transactional style leaders, however, are those groups of leaders who typically exchange promises of rewards and benefits to subordinates in order to gain their confidence with the organization (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Any conclusions derived from the findings of this study should be cautiously generalized due to a number of limitations and delimitations which may affect validity of the final study results. First, this study included only a selected number of academic deans of graduate schools of education in the United States. Second, perceptions of the participating deans were limited to their responses to the instrument designed to provide answers to the research questions formulated for this study. Third, the data from the study was collected from a selected number of academic deans who are currently serving only graduate schools of education. Fourth, leadership effectiveness of the participating deans was measured by the self-report version of the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD). Fifth, factors contributing to leadership effectiveness of the

11

participating deans were limited to (a) their leadership styles as determined by the short

form of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ); (b) their selected professional

factors (i.e., years of leadership experience, years of teaching experience, and the type of

institution they are currently serving); and (c) their selected personal factors (i.e., gender,

age group, and ethnic background). Sixth, from among the higher education institutions,

the researcher decided to include only a sample of graduate schools of education for

feasibility of appropriate data analysis procedures while realizing: (a) the importance of

sample size for the statistical test requirements, and (b) the requirements of sample

representation for generalization of the study's findings. Finally, while realizing the

importance of the most recent literature, due to the lack of sufficient literature related to

the topic, the researcher had no choice but to go as far back as ten years of the review to

find a sufficient number of studies relevant to this research. However, the literature

review includes a number of older studies which are either related to the theories of

leadership styles or related to the theories of leadership effectiveness. Such studies were

included in the literature review because they were fundamental to theoretical and

conceptual frameworks for the study.

<center>Preliminary Assumptions</center>

Like many other studies involving perceptions of individuals, the scope of this

study was based on the following assumptions: (a) the survey instrument developed for

the study has a sufficient degree of content validity and appropriate level of reliability to

reflect the perceptions of the survey participants regarding the issues of interest; (b) the

primary and secondary references (including those searched in libraries and those found

through the internet) are both accurate and reliable to depend upon; and (c) being aware

<center>12</center>

of the anonymity of the survey, it can be assumed that the participating deans were not

hesitant to respond to the items of the questionnaire openly, honesty, and accurately.

<p align="center">Definition of Terms</p>

Although many of the terms used in this study are commonly understood, the

following operational and technical terms are defined and will be consistently used

throughout this dissertation:

1. Description of Operational Terms

A number of operational terms were used in this study and are defined as follows:

Leadership effectiveness. Leadership effectiveness in this study is defined as a

self-perceived situational leadership behavior of graduate schools of education deans in

the United States and measured by Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description

(LEAD) instrument developed by Hersey and Blanchard (2006) and sponsored by Center

for Leadership Studies, Inc. (See Appendix A).

Leadership style. Leadership style of each academic dean involved in this study

is defined as his or her ratings assigned to the short form of Multifactor Leadership

Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) and sponsored by Center for

Leadership Studies, Inc. (See Appendix A).

Personal factors. Personal factors include the participating deans' gender (i.e.,

males versus females); age group (Under 40, 40-50, over 50); and their ethnic/racial

classification (African-American, Caucasian/White, Hispanic, and other ethnic groups).

Professional factors. Professional factors include the participating deans' years of

leadership experience, their years of teaching experience, the type of institution they are

currently serving, the highest degree they earned, and their major fields of education.

2. Description of Technical Terms

In addition to the operational terms stated above the following technical terms are also

repeatedly used in this study and are described in this section for further clarification:

Attitude. Gorham (1988) defines attitude as the subjective experience of

individuals, including evaluative statements of judgments in regards to specific issues.

Bureaucratic system. A bureaucratic system, according to Farlex (2008), is the

administrative structure of any large organization, public or private. Ideally bureaucracy

is characterized by hierarchical authority relations, defined spheres of competence subject

to impersonal rules, recruitment by competence, and fixed salaries. Its goal is to be

rational, efficient, and professional. Max Weber described it as technically superior to all

other forms of organization and hence indispensable to large, complex enterprises.

However, because of the shortcomings that have in practice afflicted large administrative

structures, the terms *bureaucracy* and *bureaucrat* in popular usage usually carry a

suggestion of disapproval and imply incompetence, a narrow outlook, duplication of

effort, and application of a rigid rule without due consideration of specific cases.

Bureaucracy existed in imperial Rome and China and in the national monarchies, but in

modern states complex industrial and social legislation has called forth a vast growth of

administrative functions of government. The power of permanent and non-elective

officials to apply and even initiate measures of control over national administration and

economy has made the bureaucracy central to the life of the state; critics object that it is

largely impervious to control by the people or their elected representatives. The

institution of the Ombudsman has been one means adopted in an attempt to remedy this

situation. Others have been collective decision making and organizational structures that

emphasize minimize hierarchies and decentralize the power to make decisions.

Administrative bureaucracies in private organizations and corporations have also grown

rapidly, as has criticism of unresponsive bureaucracies in education, health care, insurance, labor unions, and other areas. Bureaucracy in professional corporations of officials is organized in a pyramidal hierarchy and functioning under impersonal, uniform rules and procedures. Its characteristics were first formulated systematically by Max Weber, who saw in the bureaucratic organization a highly developed division of labor, authority based on administrative rules rather than personal allegiance or social custom, and a rational and impersonal institution whose members function more as offices than as individuals. For Weber, bureaucracy was a form of legalistic domination inevitable under capitalism. Later writers saw in bureaucracy a tendency to concentrate power at the top and become dictatorial, as occurred in the Soviet Union. Robert Merton emphasized its red tape and inefficiency due to blind conformity to procedures. More recent theories have stressed the role of managerial cliques, occupational interest groups, or individual power-seekers in creating politicized organizations characterized by internal conflict.

Communication. Communication is defined by Schlosser (1994) as "The process of imparting or interchanging thoughts, opinions, ideas, or information by means of speech or writing" (p. 45).

Curriculum effectiveness. Curriculum effectiveness is defined as the extent to which a curriculum is effective in preparation of future career accomplishment of students (Walsh, 2003, p. 9).

Evaluation. Evaluation, according to Slavin (1992), is defined as a systematic collection of evidence to determine whether certain desired changes are taking place in the learner (p. 238).

Educational evaluation. The term educational evaluation has been defined by Stufflebeam, Foley, and Merriman (1997) as the process of delineating, obtaining, and

providing necessary and useful information for making decision in education.

Leadership. Roberts (1990) defines leadership as "the privilege to have the responsibility to direct the actions of others in carrying out the purposes of the organization, at varying levels of authority and with accountability for both successful and failed endeavors" (p. 5).

Leadership effectiveness. Leadership effectiveness, according to Addison (1985), is the ability to influence the activities of an individual or group toward the achievement of a goal. The definition has evolved from the idea of a leader being a born leader or simply one who leads to a more complex view of how a person exerts influence. She further indicates that leaders can be influential as task-oriented leaders or relationship-oriented leaders. The task-oriented leader excels at establishing well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting tasks accomplished. The relationship-oriented leader, on the other hand, leads by maintaining personal relationships between members of the group by opening up communication, providing emotional support and using facilitating behaviors. Both task-oriented and relationship-oriented leaders are necessary for effective group functioning, but the leadership abilities of either one of these leaders may go unnoticed if the definition of leadership used by the colleges and universities is too one-dimensional.

Organizational development. Organizational development is defined by Hartness (1997) as "A process of planned intervention directed toward the total culture of an organization for the broad purpose of enhancing the organization's inherent problem-solving capability by means of application of knowledge and technology drawn from the behavioral sciences" (p. 47).

Perception. Glover, Bruning, and Filbeck (1993) have defined perception as the process of determining the meaning of what is sensed by an individual on a particular process of issue or any other issues of concern.

Reliability of a Survey Instrument. Reliability of a survey instrument is defined by Glover, Bruning, and Filbeck (1993) as the extent to which it is capable of measuring what it is supposed to measure accurately and consistently.

Survey instrument. A survey instrument, according to Walsh (1993), is a self reporting questionnaire used to gather information from subjects about a particular phenomenon (p. 18).

Survey research. Survey research is defined by McMillan and Schumacher (1998) as the assessment of the current status of opinions, beliefs, and attitudes by questionnaires from a known population.

Validity of a Survey Instrument. Validity a survey instrument is defined by Glover, Bruning, and Filbeck (1993) as the degree to which it is capable of measuring what it is supposed to measure.

Research Outline

The following outline will briefly describe a summary of the methods and procedures used for collection and analyses the data for the study:

1. A review of the literature pertinent to the research topic was conducted using a variety of the sources including books, journals, periodicals, dissertations, as well as a number of website database references related to the topic.

2. Permission to conduct the study and to administer the survey instrument was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) through The George Washington University Office of Human Research.

3. Subjects for the study included a sample of academic deans who are currently serving graduate schools of education in the United States.

4. Data collection for the study was achieved through distribution of a survey instrument to the selected academic deans.

5. The data collected for the study was analyzed using certain qualitative and quantitative methodological procedures.

6. A profile of the participating academic deans was provided by analyzing their personal and professional factors included in the survey instrument.

7. General conclusions were drawn from analyses and interpretation of the significant findings of the study.

8. A discussion of the results was included to compare the study's findings with other studies reviewed in the literature.

9. A number of recommendations were made to higher education institutions based on the significant findings of the study.

10. A number of research studies were suggested to future researchers who might be interested in conducting studies related to the topic of leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters including (1) introduction, (2) review of the related literature, (3) methods and procedures, (4) presentation of the findings, and (5) summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

Chapter 1 presents an introduction to the study, to include a background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, need for the study, significance of the study, uniqueness of the study, research questions, research hypotheses, conceptual

framework, limitations of the study, preliminary assumptions, description of operational and technical terms used in the study, research outline, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature related to the study's problems and includes the parameters involved in formulation of the research questions. The chapter is organized into six major parts to include the literature on (a) leadership effectiveness in higher education; (b) leadership styles in higher education; (c) literature related to theories of leadership; (d) personal predictors of higher education effective leaders; (e) professional predictors of higher education effective leaders; and (f) combined personal and professional predictors of higher education effective leaders. The chapter is concluded by providing a summary of the literature related to the topic.

Chapter 3 describes the methods and procedures used in the study including subjects for the study, development of the research instrument, research design, data collection procedures, ethical considerations, description of dependent and independent variables, qualitative and quantitative methods for treatment of the data. A summary of the methods and procedures is included at the end.

Chapter 4 presents the quantitative and qualitative findings of the data collected for the study. Qualitative analyses of the data include providing answers to the first two research questions. The quantitative analyses of the data include examining the third research question as well as testing the research hypotheses. A summary of the significant findings is included at the end.

Chapter 5 describes a summary of the study, conclusions and implications, recommendations based on the findings, as well as suggestions for future research. The researcher's concluding remarks are presented at the end of this final chapter.

Chapter 2

Review of the Related Literature

The literature in this chapter includes the parameters involved in formulation of the research hypotheses. The chapter is organized into six major parts including the literature related to (a) leadership effectiveness in higher education, (b) leadership styles in higher education, (c) theories of leadership, (d) personal predictors of higher education effective leaders, (e) professional predictors of higher education effective leaders, and (f) combined personal and professional predictors of higher education effective leaders. The chapter will be concluded with a summary of the literature review.

Leadership Effectiveness in Higher Education

In this era of ever-expanding education, every group activity requires some sort of leadership to organize and direct the group's effort toward some previously decided goals. Although, management and leadership are different from each other, they are remarkably close too, especially in the dimension of human relationship. Leadership is the process whereby one individual influences other members of the group towards the attainment of defined group or organizational goals. Success of different organizations, especially educational institutions depend on effective and efficient leaders. As a result, many institutions of higher education have responded with a variety of data about student enrollment trends, student retention and graduation rates, career placement, and faculty workload studies. Numerous studies have also been conducted by a variety of researchers on a number of issues related to leadership effectiveness in higher education.

In the process of evaluating any human performances, the most important issue is to identify a set of appropriate criteria. In order to identify the criteria for measuring

20

leadership effectiveness of university presidents, McGoey (2005) conducted a survey of academic deans, senior-level institutional officers, faculty senate chairpersons, and student leaders. The study was conducted at 36 public and private universities to ascertain whether there was a relationship between perceptions of the aforementioned groups towards leadership effectiveness of their university presidents. Years of leadership experience, knowledge of higher education, influence in acquiring resources, and maintenance of healthy relationships were included in the survey as the four indicators of presidential effectiveness and the areas associated with each. Based on the analyses of the collected data a vast majority of the survey participants agreed that the four indicators and the factors associated with each could be considered as the appropriate criteria for evaluating the presidential effectiveness. Although there were no hypotheses involved in the study and thus no inferential analyses to help prove the extent of agreement between the survey participants regarding the above-mentioned four criteria, the methodological approaches used in the study still promise a number of strong procedures to rely upon. First, the descriptive analyses of the perceptions of a large number of survey participants from a relatively large number of public and private universities (n=36) are sufficient enough to make any appropriate interpretation. Secondly, the idea of establishing the criteria for presidential effectiveness through exploring the opinions of institutional stakeholders is appropriate since these are all possible subordinates who are dealing with the daily operation of their institutions. Therefore, they deserve to be involved in the process of evaluating their leaders' job performance. Finally, a number of important implications of the study are delineated by the investigator which appears to be consistent with the findings of the study. They include: (a) establishing appropriate criteria for assessment of presidential effectiveness by involving the institutional stakeholders in the

process; (b) enforcing strong oversight on the part of governing boards to ensure integrity of the process, respect for individuals and the office of the president, and support for his or her professional development; and (c) encouraging future researchers to replicate the study in other institutions of higher education, coupled with a combined quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches.

Undoubtedly, the most important characteristics of any measuring instrument deals with the issues of validity and reliability. Considering these issues, Nelms (2005) conducted a study to test validity and reliability of an administrative effectiveness instrument for academic deans at selected institutions of higher education. Content validity of the instrument was partially secured through a panel of two experts. Revisions to the original instrument were then made by reviewing and incorporating the comments and suggestions of the panel of experts. The instrument was also administered to the faculty members at four colleges and universities across the country for a factor analysis to further secure its content validity. The instrument contained five components including (a) planning and goal setting, (b) leadership style and skills, (c) values and standards, (d) academic stewardship, and (e) resource stewardship. The resulting factor analysis revealed leadership to be the most important factor followed in order by academic stewardship, values and standards, resource stewardship, and planning and goal setting. The Cronbach's Alpha procedure was used to test the reliability of the instrument and resulted in a reliability coefficient of 0.98 indicating a statistically strong degree of reliability. However, while the procedures used for securing content validity and reliability of the instrument were appropriately followed, and whereas the statistical test revealed a strong degree of the instrument's reliability, there are still a number of issues that should be taken into consideration if one would like to use the instrument for future

studies. First, with regard to the sampling procedures, obviously faculty members of four colleges and universities across the nation cannot be considered as a fair representation of the population of the faculty throughout the nation. Second, only 26% of the faculty members from the four institutions participated in the study which raises another question of fair representation of the faculty population. Third, a panel of two experts does not seem to be sufficient enough for securing the content validity of the instrument; especially since the study failed to clarify the qualifications of these experts as they relate to leadership effectiveness. Fourth, while the literature reveals many factors pertinent to administrative effectiveness, the final version of the instrument developed for the study was limited to only five factors related to administrative effectiveness. Finally, while the instrument was originally developed to assess the administrative effectiveness of the subjects, its validity and reliability have been secured by collecting data from a group of faculty members rather than gathering data from both faculty members and their prospective academic administrators.

A study was undertaken by Katundano (2005) to explore the experiences of a woman in a leadership position at a private coeducational institution in the Midwest. The study focused on the experience and insights of a woman associate dean in an effort to correct the omission of studies on women occupying the position of dean. The researcher was interested to see what supports and challenges a woman associate dean encounters in her leadership position at a private coeducational university. Initially, the exploration of the experience in the deanship focused on several factors including life background, career path, role conflict and ambiguity, stress and job satisfaction and career future aspirations. The data for the study was collected using three different strategies (a) participant observation of the participant's natural setting; (b) open-ended interviews; and

(c) document analysis. Data analysis included a constant comparative strategy, along with open and axial coding. The findings indicated that (a) immediate family, school and work supports emerged as important factors for a woman's personal growth, career choice and success in her administrative role; and (b) a series of family, school and work challenges emerged to limit a woman's opportunities in attaining both tenure and promotion. Based on these findings, it was concluded that it is important to engage in additional qualitative studies to set out an agenda for future research about the role of women in leadership positions. The following implications were also derived from the findings of the study: (a) there is a need to conduct more case studies in different university settings in both private and public large institutions; and (b) fieldwork is necessary in different disciplinary areas such as business, law, education, engineering and dental schools to fully capture the complexities of women working in specific contexts in higher education.

Smart (2003) examined the perceptions of faculty and administrators regarding: (a) the leadership and organizational effectiveness of their institutions; (b) the cognitive and behavioral complexity of their organizational cultures; and (c) the leadership roles performed by senior campus officials of their institutions. The findings revealed a strong relationship between perceptions of the organizational effectiveness of the institutions and (a) the level of complexity in their campus cultures, and (b) the leadership behaviors of senior campus officials. These findings are important because they have significant implications for improving the organizational effectiveness of higher education institutions as well as for setting up appropriate policies and practices necessary to enhance performance of these institutions.

In her review of the literature on higher education leadership, Kezar (2000a) has referred to various studies that have revealed the inability of hierarchical models of

leadership for meeting the challenges facing higher education institutions. Such models

include top-level decision making, chain of command and control which have been

studied by Bensimon and Neumann (1993). Kezar (2000a) has also referred to the

findings of Rosener (1990) which indicates that currently many challenges in higher

education institutions require more participatory models of leadership than have existed

in the past. Such challenges include accountability to the public, cost containment,

integrating technology, globalization, and measuring of student outcomes. The literature

review also indicates that as institutions of higher education have realized these

challenges and have reconsidered leadership to include more individuals, there have been

few attempts to assess how leadership might be interpreted differently by groups and

individuals in higher education institutions (Rosener, 1990). The literature review further

indicates that participatory leadership models should be employed in a way that all

campus participants feel they have been included in the leadership process (Astin &

Leland, 1991; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Rosener, 1990; Tierney, 1997). Kezar

(2000a) concludes that like hierarchical leadership models, participatory models assume a

common leadership reality for all members of the institution. Since the current literature

provides different views of hierarchical and participatory leadership models, future

empirical studies would be appropriate to compare the extent to which each model is

effective in higher education leadership.

Kezar (2000b) also conducted an in-depth case study to explore power conditions

and leadership models in a higher education institution. She utilized a multiple

methodological approach for data collection and analytical procedures. By conducting a

combination of campus observations, document analyses, and personal interviews with

faculty members, Kezar (2000b) classified the institution's leadership into three groups --

servant leaders, servants to the central administration, and paper pushers. Servant leaders were identified as those who believed the servant leadership model should be operated in practice throughout the whole campus as collective or shared. Servants to the central administration were described as those who believed campus leadership in practice as remaining hierarchical, position-based, with a command and control orientation. Paper pushers were described as those who are pushing paper but not leading. The study concluded that leadership models should be expanded in order to acknowledge multiple and diverse perspectives of leadership. Future research was, therefore, recommended (by Kezar, 2000b) to focus on other conditions that may serve to position individuals within institutions of higher education (e.g., social class, discipline, or sexual orientation). It is hoped that certain hypotheses involved in the present study can serve such a purpose.

A qualitative study was designed by Jackson (2004) to compare workdays of four college of education deans and those of business executives by analyzing activities performed during a traditional five-day work week. The findings indicated that deans of education demonstrated behaviors comparable to those of business executives. The finding also suggested a possible transformation of administrative work in higher education toward that of business executives. These findings are questionable for two reasons. First, the sample for the study was too small (with only four college deans) to draw a general conclusion. Second, the study has failed to include a number of personal and professional factors related to the survey participants to determine the extent to which such factors might be influential in their leadership behaviors.

Rosser, Johnsrud, and Heck (2003) evaluated leadership effectiveness of academic deans and directors from individual and institutional perspectives. Their evaluation was based on a survey instrument which was developed to measure seven

domains of leadership responsibilities. These domains included (a) vision and goal setting, (b) management of the unit, (c) interpersonal relationships, (d) communication skills, (e) quality of the unit's education, (f) support for institutional diversity, and (g) research, professional, and community endeavors. The study's findings indicated that academic deans and directors should be aware of the ability (a) to be effective in their interpersonal relationships, (b) to ensure individual and group support, (c) to strategize a clear direction for the unit, (d) to pull and conceptualize ideas together, (e) to demonstrate fairness and good judgment, and (f) to effectively perform the various functions, tasks, and responsibilities in a manner that would be reflective of the institution's goals and mission. The investigators recommend universities to invest in formally training their academic leaders and in conducting fair and accurate evaluation approaches to ensure their leadership effectiveness. Such recommendations are highly appropriate if universities are interested in securing a sound and productive leadership within their schools and/or colleges.

A study was designed by Beck-Frazier (2005) to determine whether significant differences exist among the perceptions of leadership behaviors by deans and department chairpersons. Subjects for the study included deans and their respective department chairpersons from 35 colleges and schools of education within a national consortium of colleges and universities that have a major commitment to the preparation of educational professionals. The results indicated that (a) the participating deans perceived their primary leadership behavior as exhibiting characteristics of the human resource frame followed by characteristics of the structural, political and symbolic frames; (b) the participating department chairs perceived their dean's primary leadership behavior as exhibiting characteristics of the structural frame, followed by characteristics of the human

resource, political and symbolic frames; and (c) collectively deans did not exhibit

characteristics of multiple frame perspectives in their leadership behaviors. In a

comparison between the deans and their respective department chairpersons, deans

perceived that they exhibit characteristics of the human resource frame much more

frequently than perceived by their department chairpersons. Several conclusions and

implications were derived from the findings of this study: (a) deans may benefit from

leadership development programs that enhance the concepts of leadership frames and

multiple frame use; (b) these leadership programs could increase the dean's knowledge of

leadership frames and their personal capabilities as leaders in higher education by

providing opportunities for deans to think more intensely and analytically about

leadership; and (c) a leadership development center that capitalizes on the findings of this

study may provide experiences for deans to refine their leadership abilities.

Yasin (2005) designed a descriptive study to determine whether significant

relationships exist between the leaders' use of strategic leadership actions and their

success as perceived by their followers, and mediated by environmental contexts, and

demographics. The subjects for the study were 124 university professors and 22 academic

deans from Florida Atlantic University, University of Putra Malaysia, and University of

Teknologi Malaysia. The subjects were selected based on a stratified random sampling.

They responded to 77 items of the Strategic Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), which was

developed based on the theory of Strategic leadership. The data collected was analyzed

through the use of multiple regression and correlation techniques to ascertain the

hypothesized relationships. The criterion variable involved in this analysis was leader

success as interpreted by the professors. The predictor variables were the adaptive actions

employed by the deans as interpreted by the professors. Environmental context and

demographic variables served as control variables. The results of the study confirmed the reliability of the Strategic Leadership Questionnaire. However, the construct validity of this instrument was not supported. The instrument is strongly recommended for use in measuring theory of strategic leadership. The study also found that successful leaders use a wider variety of leadership strategies than less successful leaders. A significant difference was also found between the array of action sets used by successful deans in Malaysian and American Universities and the array of action sets used by less successful deans in Malaysian and American Universities. It was therefore concluded that these findings are supportive of the proposition that leaders often fail because they are trained in and rely upon a linearity of thinking mindset, which does not work in situations characterized by ambiguity and complexity that requires them to be flexible.

A paper presented by Gmelch and Wolverton (2002) provides an overview of leadership by college deans, proposes a definition of academic leadership, and assesses the extent to which deans exhibit the behaviors embedded in academic leadership. As a result of a literature review, they constructed a definition of academic leadership which is stated as the act of building a community of scholars to set direction and achieve common purposes through the empowerment of faculty and staff. Based on this definition, they recommend three activities that a dean must perform to lead effectively: (a) building a community of scholars; (b) setting direction; and (c) empowering others. They also refer to the study of the National Survey of Deans in Higher Education which was conducted to use the responses of a large sample of deans to build a database of opinions, beliefs, and reported activities. The deans were asked to indicate behaviors that characterized their practice. Overall, deans were found to be balanced in their approaches to leadership effectiveness. However, deans in comprehensive universities were found to

be more community builders than deans in research universities. In addition, it appears

that years in the position take a toll on deans. In fact, it was found that after ten years in

the position, they tend to disengage in direction-setting behavior. Such a finding may,

therefore, have implications for institutional development.

Academic deans and directors serve a critical institutional role. As academic

leaders, they have the authority to chart where a college and its programs are headed

(Mercer, 1997). By selecting which goals they choose to pursue (and which to forego)

deans and directors have the potential to exert a tremendous influence on the direction of

the unit (Twombly, 1992). They have the ability to control information, accumulate and

allocate resources, and assess the performance and productivity of their faculty and staff.

Deans serve as academic facilitators between presidential initiatives, faculty governance,

and student needs (Astin & Scherrei, 1980). By virtue of their midlevel placement within

the higher education organizational structure (Morris, 1981; Roaden, 1970), they are in

the center of controversy, conflict, and debate; they play the role of coalition builder,

negotiator, and facilitator. More empirical studies are therefore needed to determine the

extent to which certain personal and professional factors play significant roles in

leadership effectiveness of college deans throughout the nation.

Leadership Styles in Higher Education

A sample of higher education technology program directors were selected by

Aaron (2005) to examine (a) their responsibilities and their satisfaction with their

leadership skills in relation to the responsibilities; and (b) the extent to which their

leadership styles were correlated with the responsibilities and their satisfaction with their

leadership skills. The quantitative data for the study was collected by administering the

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to the program directors in order to

determine their leadership styles. The qualitative data was collected by conducting interviews with a sample of 13 program directors who had also participated in the quantitative portion of the study. The findings identified budget and resources and faculty affairs as two major responsibilities of program directors for their professional development. The findings revealed significant relationships between (a) program directors' ratings of the level of importance of the responsibilities and their leadership styles, the type of institution, and the type of program; and (b) program directors' level of satisfaction with their leadership skills in relation to the responsibilities and leadership style, years of experience, and highest degree earned. The three major strengths of this study are (a) the combined qualitative and quantitative methodological approaches for data collection; (b) the large number of program directors who participated in the study and, thus, provided sufficient size of data for appropriate statistical analyses; and (c) the use of regression analysis for multivariate analyses of the data to determine the extent to which each variable is correlated with program directors' job satisfaction. However, the survey instrument developed for the study narrows the program directors' responsibilities into only two categories (a) faculty affairs, and (b) budget and resources. Realizing the fact that program directors are usually in charge of both academic and administrative affairs, the question remains why the instrument does not include other important responsibilities of the program directors such as administrative affairs, student affairs, as well as curriculum development.

A quantitative study was designed by Temple (2001) to investigate the perceptions of technical-vocational deans of community colleges and their faculty regarding the transformational and transactional leadership styles of the deans. The data for the study was collected from 132 community colleges through a survey instrument

that included the short form of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). From the data, for each community college, a model for technical-vocational dean's self-perceived leadership style and a model for the faculty's perception of the dean's leadership style were generated in order to determine the extent to which a dean and his or her faculty agreed upon leadership style of the dean. While the findings to some extent supported this proposition, there were still some differences between the perception of faculty toward their dean's leadership style and the perception of dean's leadership style by himself. In order to ensure the generalization of these findings, however, future studies are recommended to include all types of academic deans serving different public and private institutions of higher education.

As attested by Rath (2005), college student government organizations have the important responsibility for achievement of purposes that serve students and the college community. They are also the student voice in higher education governance. Effective student leadership is vital to effective fulfillment of these purposes, as is the role of the student government advisor in ensuring the success of student leadership and leadership development. Rath (2005) examined the extent to which community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student governments. Several research questions were formulated to help a better understanding of this examination. The subjects for the study included Florida community college student government executive board members and their respective student government advisors. The data for the study was collected through (a) a survey instrument to measure effectiveness of reaching organizational outcomes; and (b) the short version of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (2000). The

findings indicated that increased levels of organizational outcomes in those community college student government organizations in which advisors exhibit greater levels of transformational leadership qualities. The findings also indicated that advisor and student government member demographics are contributors of a strong level of fulfillment of organizational outcomes. The findings further revealed statistically significant positive correlations between students reported transformational leadership qualities of advisors and student ratings of achievement and importance of organizational outcomes. Furthermore, a statistically significant correlation was found between student ratings of importance of organizational outcomes and student ratings of the achievement of organizational outcomes. These findings indicate the existence of a relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of college student government advisors and the perceived importance and achievement of student government organizational outcomes. Secondary results were also given. These findings also suggest that college student government advisors who exhibited higher levels of transformational leadership qualities engendered higher levels of organizational outcomes in Florida community college student governments. An implication of these findings is that a collaborative effort by both college student executive board and their respective student government advisors will significantly contribute to the well-being of the college environment.

Hite (2005) conducted a quantitative study of gender-congruency to determine if a significant relationship exists between leadership style scores and personality scores of a sample of department chairs. Utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Avolio and Bass (1991), faculty members rated the transformational and transactional leadership of their respective department chairs. The findings indicated significant relational strength between (a) transformational leadership scores and

femininity scores; and (b) transactional leadership scores and masculinity scores. However, contrary to expectations, the findings revealed no significant relationship between each department chair's interpretation of his or her personality characteristics and faculty members' perception of their department chairs' leadership style.

An empirical study conducted by Williams (2004) has concentrated to determine the relationship between perceived leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness of college deans in selected higher education institutions in Jamaica. The short form of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) was used to determine leadership style of college deans through their self-report perceptions and their subordinates' perceptions. The results demonstrated that, while there were few differences between the perceptions of the two groups, subordinates view their leaders as having transformational leadership and this type of leadership results in effectiveness of their respective organizations.

A study was conducted by Coates (1992) to determine the self-perceived leadership styles of deans of students at selected liberal arts colleges in the State of Michigan. The major objective of the study was to determine whether or not deans of students at liberal arts colleges define themselves as situational leaders. The findings indicated that the participating deans preferred a high supportive/low directive leadership style and demonstrated a below average willingness to change their leadership style from one situation to another; and thus they considered themselves as situational leaders. However, since the study has only focused on academic deans serving selected liberal arts colleges in a particular state, further studies are recommended to include academic deans serving all types of colleges in different states to draw appropriate conclusions.

Matijevic (2006) conducted a qualitative study to examine the career paths, career decisions, opportunities and challenges of senior-level women administrators from Illinois colleges and universities to ascertain the factors that have contributed to or impeded professional advancement. Fifteen senior-level women administrators who agreed to participate in this study were interviewed to explore the complexities of professional environment and personal experience which contributed to career success. The findings indicated that institutional culture is an important factor contributing to vocational persistence and advancement. The findings also indicated that supportive supervisors, institutions with women presidents, and colleges that encouraged professional development were especially beneficial to career progress. The findings further revealed that institutions with a male-dominated hierarchy were noted for their lack of sensitivity to females and were sometimes perceived as reluctant to promote women. Furthermore, relationships of many types were found to be influential to the ongoing achievement of the women who participated in this study. Affiliations in the place of work stemmed from their leadership style and were characterized by collaboration and community building. The participants recommended a number of career strategies to aspiring women administrators that emphasized the importance of proactively seeking out opportunities for professional growth. Other significant findings and recommendations included (a) obtaining the doctorate as a credential that signals ability and persistence; (b) performing beyond job standards to gain recognition; (c) developing a career plan early in life to ensure continued upward mobility; and (d) maintaining a positive outlook and recognizing the occasional need to relocate in order to promote career development. A number of conclusions and implications were made based on these findings of the study: (a) there is no single career route which can

guarantee success; (b) women continue to face subtle discriminatory practices and institutional culture plays a key role in supporting or hindering women's advancement; (c) a relationship-centered leadership style was inherent and contributed to building workplace community; (d) a variety of strategies were utilized to overcome professional challenges; (e) aspiring women administrators must become politically astute about institutional culture, higher education institutions need to promote and implement diversity on campus; and (f) future qualitative and quantitative studies should continue to study cohorts of women in higher education.

The roles of academic deans in higher education are challenging and complex, yet the literature indicates that longevity in these positions is relatively short (Quell, 2005). Since the nation faces a massive nursing shortage, creative and visionary leaders need to provide exemplary leadership in schools of nursing in order to recruit and educate the next generation of health care providers. Taking this issue into consideration, Quell (2005) decided to conduct a study to ascertain whether the position of the academic dean in schools of nursing contains core characteristics associated with job satisfaction. The data collection for the study was achieved by mailing the Hackman and Oldham Job Diagnostic Survey (1980) to the academic deans of 559 American Associate of Colleges of Nursing schools throughout the nation. Of the total 559 surveys mailed to the target colleges, 216 nursing deans decided to respond resulting in a return rate of a little over 46 percent. The findings indicated that all five core job characteristics as proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1980) were present to a moderately high degree in their roles. The academic deans reported more skill variety, task significance, and autonomy with a similar amount of task identity and feedback in their job compared to any other job category reported by Hackman and Oldham. A higher motivating potential score

indicated higher job satisfaction than any other comparison group. These findings also

indicated that job satisfaction among academic nursing deans is high, and there is no need

to consider restructuring of the job. It was, therefore, concluded that frequent turnover

and limited longevity in the position may not be caused by the role itself, but may be the

result of other factors indicating the need for further study.

Reid (2005) investigated the relationship between strategic management and

presidential leadership in selected institutions of higher education in Colorado. The study

has also compared strategic management and presidential leadership by analyzing the

selected institutions' strategic plans and the presidents' statements. The individual

components of strategic management and presidential leadership types were also

compared, and then explored the relationship between the two. In order to provide a

range of types of academic institutions, the sample included both public and private four-

year institutions of higher education. The strategic plans of the institutions were also

examined to determine utilization of the types of strategic management. The presidents

and vice presidents at these institutions were interviewed to determine the types of

presidential leadership styles. The conceptual framework established for the study links

one type of strategic management to a corresponding type of presidential leadership style.

Leadership styles of the presidents were determined from among the four types of

strategic management developed by Neumann and Bensimon (1990). They include

initiates (type A), connects (type B), reacts (type C), and distances (type D). For each

type of strategic management, the corresponding type of presidential leadership style was

identified. The evaluation of and types of presidential leadership were found to be

congruent with the theoretical constructs of Neumann and Bensimon (1990). The findings

indicated that several types of presidential leadership are statistically related to strategic

management types. Finally, the author recommended further studies to understand how these two constructs can be operationally better and inter-related, and to confirm that the constructs are statistically significant.

A case study was conducted by Hunter (2000) to analyze community college administrators' leadership styles and the readiness level of their staff. The subjects for the study included the community college's president, vice president and deans. The Staff Member Rating Scale (SMRS) instrument was used to determine (a) the perceived readiness level of staff members to perform a specific task or responsibility, and (b) the most appropriate leadership style to use with a specific employee. The Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument was used to measure self-perception of four approaches to leader behavior (a) primary style, (b) secondary style, (c) style range, and (d) style adaptability. The findings indicated that leadership style of the community college president, vice-presidents, and deans fell into two categories -- selling and participating. Adaptability, which was defined as the ability to alter style to adapt to varying readiness levels of followers, had three ranges -- high, moderate, and low. The majority of presidents were found to be in the moderate adaptability range. A major strength of this study is due to inclusion of different levels of leadership in selected institutions of higher education. Another major strength of this study is based on utilizing two reliable instruments commonly used in studies related to leadership styles and leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions.

<div align="center">Literature Related to Theories of Leadership</div>

Throughout the generations, many scholars have postulated a great number of theories in leadership. As indicated by Maurik (2001), while each theory has its own properties and limitations, it is important to recognize that none of the generations is

<div align="center">38</div>

mutually exclusive or totally time-bound. Maurik (2001) notes that although it is true that the progression of thinking tends to follow a sequential path, it is quite possible for elements of one generation to appear much later in the writings of someone who would not normally think of himself or herself as being of that school. Consequently, it is fair to say that each generation has added something to the overall debate on leadership and that the debate continues (Maurik, 2001).

The literature is rich on the earlier approaches to studying the notions of major classical models of leadership theories. Such classical models include situational, transformational, transactional, behavioral, authoritative, and trait theories. In their article related to leadership theories, Doyle and Smith (2001) explain some of the classical models of leadership. In particular, they look at earlier approaches to studying the notions of behavioral, authoritative, traits theories, and to what have became known as contingency theory. From there they turn to more recent, transformational theories and some issues of practice. The following provides a brief description of major theories of leadership from different viewpoints.

Situational Theory

Hersey and Blanchard (2006) have identified four different components of the situational leadership: (a) telling, which is considered as high task/low relationship behavior; (b) selling, which is considered as high task/high relationship behavior; (c) participating, which is considered as low task/high relationship behavior; and (d) delegating, which is considered as low task/low relationship behavior. In his critique concerning the limitations of situational theory, Fisher (1986) asserts that: "Although the situational perspective reveals the obvious complexity of the leadership phenomenon, it fails to provide us with more than a superficial insight into that complexity. The

situational approach exposes the oversimplification of the trait and style approaches, and forces us to acknowledge the enormous complexity of the leadership process" (p. 203). Regardless of such criticism, however, the situational leadership theory of Hersey and Blanchard (2006) has been used in numerous studies related to leadership styles of administrators within a variety of higher education institutions.

Transformational Theory

Bass and Avolio (2004) refer to transformational leaders as those (a) who are typically elevating the interests of their subordinates; (b) who generate awareness and acceptance of the mission of the group; and (c) who motivate their subordinates to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of their organization. Transformational leadership, according to Burns (1978), goes beyond traditional leadership's focus on fulfillment of higher level human needs such as self-actualization. The focus of transformational theory is primarily based on the leader's level of creativity, interaction, passion, empowerment, and vision, rather than elucidating how leaders should behave in given situations (Burns, 1978). Transformational theory, according to Bolman and Deal (1997), is on the basis of a visionary approach where leaders appeal to their followers' better nature and move them toward higher universal goals and objectives. Wright (1996) characterized the leaders who use the transformational style to possess a number of qualifications including: (a) raising their followers' level of awareness; (b) altering their followers' need level; (c) expanding their followers' range of needs and desires; (d) having their followers compromise their own self-interest for the sake of the team; and (e) improving level of consciousness among their followers about the importance of designated outcomes. A number of studies have also focused on the various approaches to the transformational leadership of academic administrators within a variety of the

higher education institutions (Barth, 2004; Bast, 2004; Dutschke, 2003; Pauls, 2005; Stanley, 2004; Williams, 2004).

Transactional Theory

The transactional leadership style is referred by Bass and Avolio (2004) to those leaders who typically exchange promises of rewards and benefits to subordinates to gain their confidence with the organization. In their study of leadership effectiveness, Bass and Avolio (2004) reached an interesting conclusion that the transformational behavior of idealized influence-attributed and the transactional leadership behavior of contingent reward were significant predictors of leadership effectiveness and level of satisfaction with the leader. A number of the studies conducted within institutions of higher education have also focused on the transactional leadership style of academic administrators (Baumeister, 2005; Greiner, 1972; Smith, 1990; Stanley, 2004; Temple, 2001).

Authoritative Theory

According to (Heifetz, 1994), this theory is often seen as the possession of powers based on formal role. However, Doyle and Smith (2001) categorized this theory to formal and informal authority. Having *formal authority* is both a resource and a constraint. On the one hand, formal authority can bring access to systems and resources. On the other hand, it may carry a set of expectations that can be quite unrealistic in times of crisis. Being outside the formal power structure, but within an organization, can be an advantage. Having this type of *informal authority*, a leader can have more freedom of movement, the chance of focusing on what he or she sees as the issue, and there is a stronger chance of being in touch with what other people are feeling at the frontline.

Behavioral Theory

This theory is based on different patterns of behaviors demonstrated by different

leaders (Doyle & Smith, 2001). In other words, the theory is premised on the general

belief that leaders demonstrate different behavioral patterns in exercising leadership,

which, in turn, have a direct impact on group outcomes (White & Lippitt, 1960).

Throughout the years, different patterns of behavior were grouped together and labeled as

styles. This became a very popular activity within management training -- perhaps the

best known being Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid (1978). Various schemes

appeared, designed to diagnose and develop people's style of working. Despite different

names, the basic ideas were very similar. The four main styles that appear are: (a)

concern for task, (b) concern for people, (c) directive leadership, and (d) participative

leadership. Barge and Hirokawa (1998) state that the style approach to leadership

research suffers from several limitations: "(a) the concept of style theory is difficult to

translate into distinct and unique behavioral patterns and tendencies; (b) because various

leadership styles are difficult to be categorized into unique sets of behaviors, the causal

link between style and group performance is difficult to establish; and (c) the style

approach neglects the influence of contingency factors" (p. 169).

Trait Theory

        According to Stogdill (1981), the trait theory is based on the general assumption

that leaders possess inherent personal characteristics which allow them to exercise

leadership in an organization. In a critique of different leadership theories, Barge and

Hirokawa (1998) indicate that "although the trait approach to group leadership possesses

a certain amount of common sense, it fails to provide us with a suitable theoretical

mechanism for linking leadership behaviors to group performance outcomes" (p. 169).

Gardner (1989) studied a large number of North American organizations and leaders and

came to the conclusion that there were some qualities or attributes that did appear to

mean that a leader in one situation could lead in another. These included: (a) physical vitality and stamina, (b) intelligence and action-oriented judgment, (c) eagerness to accept responsibility, (d) task competence, (e) understanding of followers and their needs, (f) skill in dealing with people, (g) need for achievement, (h) capacity to motivate people, (i) courage and resolution, (j) trustworthiness, (k) decisiveness, (l) self-confidence, (m) assertiveness, (n) adaptability, and (o) flexibility.

Personal Predictors of Higher Education Effective Leaders

According to the literature review, certain personal characteristics of higher education leaders have been proven to have significant roles in their leadership effectiveness. The following provides studies related to two of the personal characteristics that are also related to the present study.

Gender and Leadership Effectiveness

In the review of the literature, gender has been found to be the focus of many studies related to the higher education leadership effectiveness. The following provides a summary of the studies related to the present study.

A number of research studies demonstrated a common understanding of the critical issues facing leadership challenges in various organizations. A growing body of scholars provides evidence that women enact and interpret leadership differently from traditional models than their male counterparts (Astin & Leland, 1991; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Rosener, 1990). The research on women's leadership effectiveness provides a foundation for evaluating other fundamental aspects of an individual's identity that might be related to the way they interpret leadership (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993).

In a study of leadership effectiveness, Moss and Jensrud (1995) have found that while female department heads were rated slightly more effective than their male

counterparts, there were no statistically significant differences between leadership effectiveness of the two groups. A study by Thorp, Cummins, and Townsend (1998), indicated that males were rated highly in the evolution toward transformational leadership, whereas females were rated highly in their behavioral leadership. In their study of leadership effectiveness, Daugherty and Finch (1997) have found that although females were rated slightly higher on four of the five factors constituting transformational leadership, the ratings were not significantly different to draw any conclusions regarding leadership styles of male and female leaders. As a result of their empirical study, Viegas, Brun, and Hausafus (1998) have found that female subjects who used an experimental transformational leadership curriculum were more likely to change career plans and seriously consider leadership positions than their female counterparts who used a traditional leadership curriculum. As may be seen from the findings of different investigators regarding the role of gender in leadership effectiveness, and while there is evidence to conclude that there are differences in leadership styles and leadership effectiveness, it is hard to make a general interpretation of the differences. One thing that is proven from a variety of the literature is that gender plays a significant role in leadership effectiveness in institutions of higher education.

Based on a content analysis study of women leadership, Stanford, Oates, and Flores (1994) developed a heuristic model of female leadership that characterizes a woman entrepreneur as one who had (a) a high degree of employee involvement that typically results in a team-based management approach; (b) entrepreneurial vision which made her able to effectively communicate to her employees; (c) served as an extraordinary motivating force to achieve her organization's mission; and (d) valued autonomy for her employees. Further research studies are recommended to use the

44

heuristic model developed by Stanford, Oates, and Flores (1994) for determining the extent to which it can be implemented for women's leadership in institutions of higher education. While gender is a factor in the present study, the use of a heuristic model is highly recommended to those who are conducting researches related to leadership effectiveness of women in higher education.

Boatwright (2003) conducted a study to investigate the influence of psychological variables upon female college students' aspirations for leadership positions in their future careers. A number of factors were found to be accounted for a significant amount of the variation in predicting the females' leadership aspirations. They included: (a) connectedness needs, (b) gender role, (c) self-esteem, and (d) fears of negative evaluation. The study concluded that the findings can help improve leadership development initiatives for female college students. A comparative study seems necessary in order to determine whether or not the same variations exist in predicting the male college students' aspirations for leadership positions in their future careers.

A qualitative study was undertaken by Ashby-Scott (2005) to explore the successes and challenges of four women of color leaders in higher education and to celebrate their success in leadership positions. The definition of Leadership for this study includes women who either currently or previously held positions of chair or above in public four-year institutions in the Pacific Northwest. The study used portraiture to understand how the women of the study described their personal, professional, and leadership experiences within the context of higher education. The method of portraiture is a method to examine and understand health and resilience within a person or an organization. The findings of the study presented five major themes that include the women's advice for girls and young women in three areas as follows: (a) general advice

for girls, (b) advice for women pursuing higher education, and (c) women pursuing

leadership in higher education. Also discussed are the themes that helped in the success

of the women with regard to (a) authenticity, (b) strength, (c) perseverance and resiliency,

(d) support systems, and (e) seeking a balanced life. The study was concluded with some

of the changes in higher education the women of the study have experienced in their

years as students to becoming leaders within the system as well as their comments on

recruitment and retention in the academy.

Gender was found to be a significant factor in certain leadership styles in

educational settings. For example, an empirical study was conducted by Walumbwa, Wu,

and Ojode (2004) to examine whether gender discriminates student's perception of

instructors' leadership style. They utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to

collect data for the study. Their findings indicated that although more male students

tended to perceive instructors as exhibiting active management-by-exception, both males

and females converged on their unfavorable assessment of passive management-by-

exception and favorable assessment of transformational leadership, transactional

contingent reward and active management-by-exception.

Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and Van Engen (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of

gender differences utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire normative database

and their findings indicated that female leaders were more transformational than male

leaders. They also found that female leaders engaged in more of the contingent reward

behaviors (one of the components of transactional leadership). However, male leaders

were generally more likely to manifest the other approaches to the transactional

leadership including active and passive management-by-exception. The authors

concluded that female leaders may have to exceed their male counterparts in leadership

qualities to attain the same positions of responsibility and levels of success as males.

Generally speaking, the literature is inconsistent in leadership styles and leadership effectiveness of male and female leaders in the field of higher education. This could be, in part, due to the different methodological approaches that had been used by different investigators.

Ethnic/Racial Background and Leadership Effectiveness

Race and ethnicity have long been subjects of investigation for leadership in higher education. However, there are only a few studies pertinent to the scope of this study. The following provide a review of the studies that are more related to the study.

A qualitative study was conducted by Salleh-Barone (1998) through the use of an interview to examine the career paths of a selected Asian-American women educational leaders and their perceived leadership effectiveness. The findings indicated that women in leadership positions (a) are sensitive to their leadership roles; and (b) are interested in enforcement of policies and practices to bridges the gap between the majority and the minority in educational settings. It was recommended that educational institutions may consider these findings as a guideline to provide appropriate counseling and professional training support for Asian-American women who are interested in pursuing administrative career opportunities in education. More qualitative studies are also recommended to explore opinions of leaders of different ethnic/racial background the factors influencing their leadership effectiveness.

A recent quantitative study by Baumeister (2005) focused on the leadership theory related to transformational and transactional leadership styles. The subjects for the study included three cultural groups -- Mexican Americans, Mexican immigrants, and Non-Hispanic Americans. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed

by Bass and Avolio (2004), was used to determine the subjects' perceptions of their leadership styles. The findings indicated that (a) Non-Hispanic Americans scored significantly higher than Mexican immigrants on factors related to individual consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation; (b) Mexican immigrants scored higher in transactional leadership than Non-Hispanic Americans; (c) Mexican Americans scored significantly lower than Non-Hispanic Americans in transactional leadership; and (d) Mexican Americans scored significantly higher than Mexican immigrants in transactional leadership. Based on these findings it can be concluded that race and ethnicity play significant roles in leadership styles and leadership effectiveness of higher education leaders.

A qualitative case study was conducted by Germany (2005) to investigate the share of African-American women in educational leadership positions. The primary purpose of the study was to determine how they were recruited, the impact of being mentored, their achievements, leadership style, self-images, success, and explored the factors that influenced them to seek their positions. African-American women who were in educational leadership positions were interviewed and African-American women who aspired to be administrators were surveyed. The results of the study indicated that African- American women in educational leadership need to be mentored. The administrators as well as the non-administrators believed more efforts in recruitment would encourage more African-American women to seek higher positions in the world of education. The finding also indicated that more administrators need to prepare potential African-American administrators and allow them to have opportunities to grow.

According to Simmons (2005), leadership training is one of the fastest growing sectors of university continuing education in the United States and Canada. Simmons

attests that a presumption that basic leadership and management skills transfer successfully from culture to culture seems to preclude training aimed at the specific, deep-culture challenges of cross cultural leadership. Additionally, there is a significant lack of representation of Latin American cultures among comparative studies related to leadership behavior. Taking this issue into consideration, Simmons (2005) conducted a qualitative study to determine differences in leadership behaviors between Latin American and non-Latin North American leaders. Simmons (2005) anticipates that the study results may provide as a starting point for defining culturally-appropriate behaviors consistent with transformative/participative leadership style and provide useful information for designing cross-cultural leadership training. The subjects for the study included 18 university and continuing education leaders in North America and Latin America. They were contacted by e-mail and were asked to complete a short essay about their leadership philosophy along with a questionnaire designed to identify the participant's overall leadership style as either transformative/participative or transactional/directive. The subjects were then interviewed by telephone, and further follow-up communications were conducted by e-mail and telephone. Based on the study results, culture, gender, religion, years in a leadership role, and professional background appeared to have significant correlations with the preferred leadership style. The findings also indicate that all respondents highly valued the combined transformative, democratic, and participative leadership style. Moreover, Latin American participants were found to have slightly more social contact with co-workers outside the workplace than did their counterparts in the United States and Canada. Furthermore, participants in two Latin American countries were found to be more concerned about being gentle and humble than their counterparts the United States, Canada, or other Latin American countries.

Additionally, good relationships were slightly more valued by Latin Americans while integrity was slightly more valued by non-Latin respondents. It was also found that many participants of both cultures expressed the belief that effective leadership skills are becoming more global in nature. Latin Americans, in particular, tended to believe that the university in which they worked was "ahead of the game" and therefore not necessarily characteristic of leadership norms in business and government sectors in terms of implementing transformational/participative leadership styles.

Nies and Wolverton (2000) conducted a study to determine academic deans' perceptions of their job responsibility, their role conflict and ambiguity, their job related stress, and their understanding of leadership. The subjects consisted of 1,370 academic deans serving at 360 public and private institutions. The researchers examined informal and formal monitoring, networking, coaching, mentoring relationships, and concepts of sponsorship and mentorship, and the influence of race, gender, and tenure. The findings indicate that regardless of the race or gender (a) less than 50% of the deans have received mentoring support; (b) those who reported receiving mentoring support were satisfied with the results; and (c) the greatest obstacle to mentoring was reported to be a predominantly voluntary, unrecognized, and unrewarded system that requires a great deal of initiative to begin and to maintain the relationship with the mentor. The fact that the study included a large number of deans from a large number of institutions provides sufficient bases for reliability of the results.

Professional Predictors of Higher Education Effective Leaders

A review of the literature indicates that certain professional characteristics of higher education leaders have proven to have significant roles in their leadership effectiveness. The following provides studies related to two of the professional

characteristics that are also subject for the present study.

<u>Leadership Experience and Leadership Effectiveness</u>

Several studies have focused on the possible relationship between leadership experience of college and university chief academic officers and their leadership effectiveness. The following provides a review of the studies that are more related to the scope of the present study.

An empirical study conducted by Wood (2004) to determine whether the four dimensions of leadership styles (i.e., dominance, influence, steadiness, and compliance) were perceived differently by a group of college deans with regard to certain personal and professional factors. The findings revealed a positive relationship between the deans' length of service and their perceptions of their own dominance leadership. Surprisingly, however, length of service in this study was not significantly correlated with the dean's perceptions of their own influence, steadiness, and compliance. This might be related to a number of factors such as lack of sample representation, lack of sufficient appropriate analytical approaches, as well as the role of certain personal and professional characteristics of the participating deans involved in the study.

A quantitative study was conducted by Kilson (1995) to determine the role of certain personal and professional characteristics of graduate deans of colleges and universities on their career paths as well as on their leadership effectiveness. The subjects were asked to provide information about their current positions, length of service, leadership style, relationships with supervisors, involvement with professional associations, research and productivity, professional awards, and satisfactions and frustrations with their current position. Among many interesting findings, length of service as a graduate dean was found to be a significant factor in leadership effectiveness

51

and the job satisfaction of the survey participants. It was, therefore, not surprising to see that experience plays as a significant factor in leadership effectiveness and job satisfaction of the participating subjects.

A qualitative study was conducted by Bisbee (2005) to explore internal leadership development practices in higher education. A web-based survey was utilized to collect data from a randomly selected group of provosts, academic deans, associate deans, and department chairs/directors regarding their perceptions of leadership experiences. The findings indicated that (a) a vast majority of the respondents indicated that job experiences were the most valuable type of training they received and had significantly affected their professional growth; (b) most respondents considered themselves as a leader ever since they were serving as faculty; (c) provosts, deans, and associate deans felt more prepared for their jobs as compared to department chairs/directors; (d) more than three quarters of the subjects reported to be motivated for leadership training by personal satisfaction and growth; and (e) most of the subjects had spent 25% of their training in workshops, seminars, and conferences. The most important strength of this study is based on its methodological approaches to explore opinions of almost all levels of leadership (except at the presidential level) not only a particular group. In terms of generalization, however, precautionary interpretations should be taken into consideration since the study specifically focused on only selected land grant universities.

A mixed qualitative and quantitative study was designed by Lane (2005) to identify the career paths of a group of department chairs with regard to (a) their experiences of department chairs prior to becoming chair; (b) the amount and significance of their scholarly activities; and (c) a comparison of their career paths with similar department chairs. The findings indicated that (a) support of the college/school

dean was an integral part of the career path for department chairs: (b) department chairs indicated that training programs designed to prepare a department chair for his or her professional growth are only offered after an individual becomes chair; and (c) years of experience was found to be a significant factor in career paths of the participating department chairs. This was a case study which had focused on the career paths of department chairs using only a small sample and may not necessarily represent the entire population of department chairs across the nation. Using the mixed qualitative and quantitative analytical methods, however, add value to the study's reliability. Inclusion of a nationwide sample of department chairs is, therefore, recommended for conducting similar studies by future researchers.

Academic Discipline and Leadership Effectiveness

There are only a few studies that have focused on leadership effectiveness within various academic disciplines. The following provides a review of studies that are more related to the scope of the present study.

Griffin (2005) conducted a study to compare the leadership frame of chairpersons of English and Biology departments in baccalaureate colleges with those of chairpersons of the same departments of master's degree colleges located in the southern Regional Education Board states. The findings indicated that (a) academic discipline was a significant factor in the subjects' endorsement of the political leadership frame since English department chairs score significantly higher in this particular aspect of the instrument than their counterparts in Biology department; (b) department size affected negatively the subjects' endorsement of the structural frame and the political frame; and (c) regardless of the academic discipline, female chairs demonstrated a significantly higher utilization of the human resource frame than their male counterparts. There are

three methodological procedures that make the results of this study more reliable as compared to other empirical studies related to the topic. First, the study has included a relatively large sample of department chairs which suppresses the concern about the population representation (210 cases from baccalaureate institutions and 245 cases from master's institutions). Secondly, the study measured the extent to which a number of independent variables (operating jointly) are influential in the perceptions of department chairs regarding various aspects of their leadership frames (gender, academic discipline, department size, institutional classification, and length of service). Lastly, fourteen research questions were examined through the use of appropriate statistical procedures including Chi-square test of contingency and Multiple Analysis of Variance). Future researchers are, therefore, recommended to consider conducting studies to include joint effects of variables through the use of multivariate analyses for testing hypotheses.

Montez and Wolverton (2000) conducted a mixed qualitative and quantitative study to examine perceptions of academic deans regarding their ability to deal effectively with current challenges facing higher education institutions. The study included a sample of 695 deans in the colleges of education, business, liberal arts, and nursing at 360 public and private institutions. The findings indicated that (a) the top three important factors facing the subjects' leadership ability were reported to be fiscal, administration, and curriculum/program development; (b) type of institution, institutional ranking, and discipline were not significantly correlated with the deans' perceptions of their ability to deal effectively with current challenges; and (c) older deans and those with less than two years experience tended to perceive themselves as more effective than those who had longer tenure. While sample representation and other methodological approaches do not cause any concern about the reliability of the findings, it is quite surprising that factors

such as type of institution, institutional ranking, and area of discipline did not play significant roles in leadership effectiveness of the subjects. A possible question of concern may be directed toward the content validity and reliability of the survey instrument that has not been clearly stated in the article.

An empirical study was conducted by Woods (2004) to examine the extent to which Senior Student Affairs Officers of selected community colleges are effective in their leadership. The study also examined the extent to which transformational leadership, self-efficacy, and trust in the Senior Student Affairs Officers are correlated with their leadership effectiveness. The statistical analyses indicated that (a) transformational leadership was the strongest predictor of leadership effectiveness as perceived by both the leaders and their followers; (b) self-efficacy was a significant predictor of leadership effectiveness as perceived by the leaders; and (c) trust was a significant predictor of leadership effectiveness as perceived by the followers. A number of recommendations were made to community colleges in order to improve leadership effectiveness of their senior student affairs officers. An implication of the findings is based on the fact that if senior student affair officers would like to be effective in their jobs, they should consider strengthening their leadership effectiveness through a transformational approach, self-efficiency, and building trust with their students.

A recent empirical study was designed by Del Favero (2006) to determine the relationship between academic discipline and the preparation of deans for their leadership role. A survey was conducted for collection of data from 210 academic deans in research and doctoral institutions. The findings indicated that (a) academic discipline cannot be discounted in considering the preparation of the subjects for leadership roles; (b) experience in past administrative positions and past relationships with faculty readers was

found to be the most highly reliable approaches to learning what the deans' job entails; and (c) deans understanding of their roles is highly related to the type of experiences they had while they served as a faculty member. The findings further suggest that past experiences of the academic deans as faculty members play a significant role in preparation for their future leadership effectiveness.

A qualitative study was undertaken by Terrazas (2005) to investigate the perspectives of spirituality and its influence on leadership in higher education. The subjects included five faculty and administrators from different disciplines including educational administration, engineering, science, liberal arts, and health sciences. In response to the question of how participants describe leadership, they were found to be congruent with concepts in leadership theory. In response to the question of how participants describe spirituality, they defined spirituality from a Judeo-Christian perspective, and some talked about how they appropriately express their spirituality in the workplace. Based on their responses, their spirituality included daily practices such as "quiet time" to connect with God. The study also explored how participants perceive the influence of spirituality on leadership. They stated that their spirituality has a positive impact on their leadership in three areas: (a) their inner self, (b) their interaction with others, and (c) their tasks and activities. The findings also explored some differences between the participants in their responses to each question depending upon their areas of expertise, whether they were serving in educational administration, engineering, science, liberal arts, or health sciences. These findings may expand the knowledge of leadership in higher education by showing that spirituality enhances educational leadership. Finally, the study provided a summary of how findings relate to academic leadership literature, presented an analysis of spirituality from a critical theory perspective, and included

a number of recommendations for future research.

Tsend (2000) examined leadership practices in private and public institutions of higher education to determine how higher education leaders in these institutions perceive themselves as effective leaders and how their leadership practices are perceived by their subordinates. The self-report form of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI-Self) was employed to determine leadership effectiveness of the survey participants; whereas the observer-report form of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI-Observer) was employed to determine their leadership effectiveness as perceived by their subordinates. The results indicated that the followers' ratings on their leaders' practices were significantly lower than the leaders' self-ratings in a number of practices. The findings have significant implications for the educational leaders to reconsider some alternative styles which might be effective for their leadership practices.

Combined Personal and Professional Predictors of Effective Leaders

A few studies have focused on the role of combined personal and professional factors in higher education leadership. Al-Omari (2005), for example, conducted a study to seek the impact of gender, years of experience, and discipline on their leadership styles and style adaptability of deans and department chairs at three public research universities. He utilized Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument to collect the data for the study. The findings revealed a number of interesting conclusions (a) male department chairs scored significantly higher from their female counterparts in the telling and delegating components of the LEAD, while female department chairs scored significantly higher from their male counterparts in the participating component of the LEAD; (b) experience as a leader was found to be significantly and positively correlated with the participating component of the LEAD among department chairs; and

57

(c) type of college/school (discipline) was found to be a significant factor among the participating academic deans in the delegating component of the LEAD. The findings further revealed a statistically significant difference in style adaptability levels among academic deans and department chairs.

Anderson (2002) conducted a study to assess leadership effectiveness of a group of community college chief academic officers by utilizing Mintzberg's taxonomy of managerial roles. The taxonomy identifies managerial roles on the basis of certain behaviors and categorizes them into 10 distinct roles including figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesperson, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator. The survey also examined the impact of two personal variables (age and gender), three situational variables (years in current position, years at institution, and years of managerial experiences), and three environmental variables (span of control, collective bargaining, and region). The findings indicated that while all 10 managerial practices play important roles in job effectiveness of the chief academic officers, leader, liaison, and disseminator roles play the most important role in their job performance. As a result of analyzing the impact of personal, situational, and environmental variables, the findings revealed a number of significant differences between the managerial roles of the subjects as follows: (a) females placed more emphasis on the leader, liaison, and disseminator aspects of their roles than their male counterparts; (b) older subjects placed more emphasis on the monitor aspect of their roles than their younger counterparts; and (c) subjects with more than five years of experience placed more emphasis on the figurehead aspect of their roles than subjects with less than five years of experience. It is interesting though that the three environmental variables did not play any significant roles in the perceptions of the chief academic officers involved in the study. However, due to

the high levels of reliability and content validity of the survey instrument used in the study and on the basis of a relatively large number of subjects who participated in the study, it would seem appropriate to rely upon the study results. Further studies utilizing the same instrument are, therefore, recommended to examine the impact of a variety of other personal, situational, and environmental variables on assessing the managerial roles of other higher education leaders.

A recent study was conducted by Pritchett (2006) at Tennessee's public four-year institutions (a) to determine the relationship between leadership styles of university presidents and the job satisfaction of their chief academic leaders; and (b) to identify the role of gender, age, and experience in job satisfaction of the chief academic leaders. Of the total 135 population, 74 subjects responded to the survey instrument. The study concluded that (a) the participating chief academic leaders expressed high levels of intrinsic, extrinsic, and overall job satisfactions with their respective university presidents; and (b) among the selected demographic factors, age was found to play a significantly positive role in increasing leadership effectiveness of the chief academic deans. It is surprising that while the literature provides sufficient evidence of gender and experience as influential factors in job satisfaction of academic leaders, neither gender nor experience were found to have effect on job satisfaction of the subjects in this study. The only factor that may be considered as a contributor of these unexpected results is the possible role of small sample size (i.e., only 74 subjects).

Madden (2005) examined a number of non-instructional factors influencing job performance of selected department chairs as perceived by faculty. The non-instructional factors included gender, age, racial/ethnic background, marital status, degree earned, years of experience, academic rank, annual income, and tenure status. The data utilized

59

for the study was analyzed through a combination of descriptive statistics, t-tests, and multiple regressions. Department chairs were found to be more satisfied with job security, advancement opportunities, and other job incentives as compared to their faculty members. They were less satisfied with their workload, their time to keep current in their discipline, and faculty effectiveness. Although the descriptive statistics provide some evidence of variations in the overall job performance of the participating department chairs with regard to their non-instructional factors, the multiple regression analyses did not support the non-instructional factors as predictors of their overall job performance.

Summary

This chapter presented the literature related to leadership effectiveness in higher education, leadership styles as predictors of leadership effectiveness in higher education, theories of leadership, as well as the impact of certain personal and professional factors in higher education leadership effectiveness in higher education. The following presents a summary of the literature review:

1. A number of qualitative, quantitative, and evaluative studies related to leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions were presented in this chapter. While the results of a few studies were conclusive (Jackson, 2004; Katundano, 2005; Nelms, 2005), taken all together, the findings of the studies reviewed were not conclusive due to the use of various methods and procedures by different investigators (Beck-Frazier, 2005; Kezar, 200a; McGoey, 2005; Mercer, 1997; Smart, 2003; Yasin, 2005).

2. The chapter presented a number of quantitative and empirical studies related to leadership styles in higher education institutions (Coates, 1992; Hunter, 2000; Matijevic, 2006; Quell, 2005: Reid 2005; Williams, 2004). Focus of attention was directed toward leadership styles of the subjects into transactional and transformational classification of

Bass and Avolio (2004) as related to the purpose of this study.

3. The leadership theories discussed in the chapter included (a) situational theory of Hersey and Blanchard (2006); (b) transformational and transactional theories of Bass and Avolio (2004); (c) authoritative theory of Heifetz (1994); (d) behavioral theory of Doyle and Smith (2001); and (e) trait theory of Stogdill (1981).

4. The literature is inconsistent in comparing leadership styles and leadership effectiveness of male and female leaders in the field of higher education (Ashby-Scott, 2005; Astin & Leland, 1991; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Boatwright, 2003; Daugherty & Finch, 1997; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003; Hite, 2005; Moss & Jensrud, 1995; Rosener, 1990; Stanford, Oates, & Flore, 1994; Thorp, Cummins, & Townsend, 1998; Viegas, Brun, & Hausafus, 1998). This type of inconsistency could be, in part, due to the different methodological procedures used in various studies. However, ethnic/racial background was found by several researchers to be significant in leadership effectiveness within the institutions of higher education (Baumeister, 2005; Nies & Wolverton, 2000; Salleh-Barone, 1998).

5. Deanship experience was found to be positively correlated with leadership effectiveness of college deans as reflected in a number of studies reviewed in this chapter (Bisbee, 2005; Kilson, 1995; Lane, 2005; Woods, 2004). The type of institution was also found to play an important role in leadership effectiveness of deans as reflected in a number of other studies (Del Favero, 2006; Griffin, 2005; Montez & Wolverton, 2000; Terrazas, 2005; Tsend, 2000; Woods, 2004).

6. Several studies reviewed in this chapter presented a combination of both personal and professional factors related to leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions. Al-Omari (2005), for example, has concluded that leadership effectiveness

and leadership style of academic deans are significantly correlated with a combination of their gender, years of experience, and the type of institutions they are serving. In his study of leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions, Anderson (2002) concluded that a combination of gender, age, and years of experience plays a significant role in leadership effectiveness of a group of community college chief academic officers. Likewise, a study conducted by Pritchett (2006) at public four-year institutions, concluded that a combination of gender, age, and years of experience plays a significant role in leadership effectiveness of the chief academic deans. Madden (2005) also conducted a study to determine the extent to which leadership effectiveness of department chairs are correlated with a combination of their gender, age, racial/ethnic background, marital status, degree earned, years of experience, academic rank, annual income, and tenure status. However, due to the small size of sample, the data did not support the hypotheses involved in the study.

Overall, with a few exceptions, the literature reviewed in this chapter supported the extent to which certain leadership styles as well as certain personal and professional characteristics of academic deans serving the United States institutions of higher education are significant in their leadership effectiveness.

Chapter 3

Methods and Procedures

This chapter presents the methods and procedures used in the study. The chapter includes discussion of the subjects for the study, instrumentation, research design, data collection procedures, ethical considerations, description of the dependent and independent variables, and procedures for treatment of the data. A summary of the methods and procedures is presented at the end of the chapter.

Subjects for the Study

The subjects for this study included the academic deans of graduate schools of education in the United States. From among the total population of 1,258 graduate schools of education deans 800 cases were randomly selected for the study. The sample was drawn from an alphabetical list of the United States Colleges and Universities in the Yahoo Directory. It was anticipated that by encouraging participation and follow-up strategies, the data for the study could be collected from at least 30% of the 800 selected cases (i.e., 240 cases). Such a rate of return would be sufficient to represent the entire population and to satisfy the requirements of the statistical tests involved in the study.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument was used to collect the data for the study in order to test the research hypotheses and to provide answers to the stated research questions. As shown in Appendix A, the instrument includes four distinctive parts as follows:

Part 1: Personal and Professional Profiles of the Survey Participants

This part of the questionnaire consisted of eight items related to personal and professional characteristics of the participating deans. These items included (1) gender;

63

(2) age group, (3) ethnic/racial background (Asian, African-American, Hispanic, Caucasian/White, and other ethnic groups); (4) the type of institution currently serving (public vs. private); (5) years served as a dean; (6) years of teaching experience; (7) the highest degree earned; and (8) the major field of education in the highest degree earned.

Part 2: Contributing Factors to Leadership Effectiveness

This part was designed to explore opinions of the participating deans regarding the extent to which certain factors are contributing to their job effectiveness. The ten contributing factors listed in this part were drawn from among a number of studies related to leadership effectiveness. They included (a) creating a motivational work environment, (b) creating a mutual trust atmosphere, (c) making decisions appropriately and promptly, (d) taking responsibility for decisions and actions, (e) fostering good relationships with work associates, (f) involving designated staff and faculty in planning actions, (g) demonstrating honest and ethical behavior, (h) communicating expectations to staff and faculty clearly, (i) resolving conflicts in a professional manner, and (j) demonstrating efficient management of stress factors. The survey participants were asked to rate their job effectiveness based on the scale of 1 for "Not Important" 2 for "Little Important", 3 for "Moderately Important", 4 for "Important", and 5 for "Very Important."

Part 3: Leadership Style

This part includes the short form version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) which consists of 45 multiple choice items designed to determine leadership style of individual respondents. Each item is intended to determine a participant's response on the basis of how frequently that particular item fits his or her leadership style. Responses of each individual to the MLQ items are based on the scale of 0 for "Not at all," 1 for "Once in a while," 2 for

"Sometimes," 3 for "Often," and 4 for "Frequently." As mentioned previously, Bass and Avolio have classified leadership styles of individuals on the basis of the MLQ's two major components defined as follows:

The transformational leadership style refers to the leaders who typically broaden and elevate the interests of their subordinates, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the process and mission of the group, and when they stir their subordinates to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, and consequently for the sake of the society at large.

The transactional leadership style refers to the style of those types of leaders who typically exchange promises of rewards to subordinates for their fulfillment of agreements with the leader.

In response to the instrument items, the survey participants were not aware of the rating strategies described in the MLQ's Manual and, thus, did not know which alternative can be selected to place them into one of the aforementioned leadership styles. The rating assigned to each individual was based on the scoring guidelines delineated in the MLQ's Manual. This instrument was used in the study because (a) according to the MLQ's Manual (2000), it can be specifically applied to leadership styles in institutions of higher education; (b) it has a highly significant degree of reliability and proven to have a convincing level of validity; and (c) it has been applied and tested in a number of other research studies related to the higher education leadership style (Barth, 2004; Bast, 2004; Fiedler, 1997; Greiner, 1972; Temple, 2001; Williams, 2004).

The instrument has copyright protection registered by Bass and Avolio with all rights reserved. Since reproduction of the instrument was prohibited without the Distributor's written consent; this investigator purchased 800 of the instruments and was

granted written permission to use the instrument for the study. However, as shown in Appendix B, permission to use and/or reproduce the instrument was conditional to the following two limitations: (1) only five items from the instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in proposals, theses, or dissertations; and (2) the entire instrument may not be included or reproduces at any time in any other published material. Samples of the items included in the instrument for response by the survey participants are as follows: (a) providing others with assistance in exchange for their efforts; (b) focusing attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards; (c) making clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved; (d) emphasizing the importance of having a collective sense of mission; and (e) considering the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.

<u>Major Components of the MLQ Instrument</u>

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) consists of three major components identified as (1) Transformational Leadership, (2) Transactional Leadership, and (3) Outcomes of Leadership. The Transformational Leadership component of the MLQ consists of five subscales including (a) Idealized Attributes, (b) Idealized Behaviors, (c) Inspirational Motivation, (d) Intellectual Simulation, and (e) Individual Consideration. The Transactional component of the MLQ consists of four subscales including (a) Contingent Reward, (b) Active Management-by-Exception, (c) Passive Management-by-Exception, and (d) Laissez-Faire. The Outcomes of Leadership Component of the MLQ consists of three subscales including (a) Extra Effort, (b) Effective Approach, and (c) Satisfactory Leadership. The following is a brief definition of each major component of the MLQ and its related subscales, as described in the recent version of the MLQ's Manual (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

1. Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is defined as a process of influencing in which leaders

change their associates' awareness of what is important, and direct their attention to see

themselves with regards to new opportunities and challenges of their environment.

Transformational leaders are proactive because they seek to optimize individual, group

and organizational development and innovation. They usually encourage their associates

to make every effort to pursue higher levels of potential as well as higher levels of moral

and ethical standards. These leaders are admirable, respectful, and trustworthy.

     A. Idealized Attributes (IA). These types of leaders instill pride in others for

being associated with them. They go beyond self-interest for the good of the group. They

usually build others' respect and display a sense of power and confidence.

     B. Idealized Behaviors (IB). These leaders usually talk about their most

important values and beliefs. They specify the importance of having a strong sense of

purpose. They consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. They emphasize

the importance of having a collective sense of mission.

     C. Inspirational Motivation (IM). These leaders behave in ways that motivate

those around them by providing meaningful challenges to their followers' work.

Individual and team spirit is aroused. Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed. The leader

encourages followers to envision attractive future states, which they can ultimately

envision for themselves. They talk optimistically about the future. They talk

enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. They articulate a compelling

vision of the future. They express confidence that goals will be achieved.

     D. Intellectual Stimulation (IS). These types of leaders motivate their followers'

effort to be innovative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching

old situations in new ways. They do not ridicule or publicly criticize an individual's mistakes. They solicit creative solutions to problems from the followers who are included in the process of problem solutions. They evaluate critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate. They seek differing perspectives in finding solutions to problems. They involve others to look at problems from different viewpoints. They offer new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.

E. Individual Consideration (IC). By acting as a coach or mentor, these leaders pay attention to individual's need for achievement. Their followers are usually developed to successively higher levels of potential. They provide new learning opportunities which are created along with a supportive climate in which to grow. They recognize individual differences in terms of needs and desires. They spend time to teach and coach their followers. They treat others as individuals not just as a member of the group. They consider each individual's needs, abilities and aspirations from others. They assist their followers in developing their own strengths

2. Transactional Leadership

Transactional leaders demonstrate behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. Their constructive style is labeled as contingent reward and their corrective style is labeled as management-by-exception. Contingent reward and management-by-exception are two core behaviors associated with functions of management in organizations. Transactional leaders usually define expectations and promote performance to achieve these levels.

A. Contingent Reward (CR). Contingent reward leaders clarify expectations from their followers and offers recognition when they achieved such expectations. This should result in individuals and groups achieving the expected levels of performance.

These leaders provide their followers with assistance in exchange for their efforts. They make specific clarification of who is really responsible for achieving performance targets. They make clear what their followers can expect to receive when specified performance goals are achieved. They express satisfaction when their followers meet expectations.

B. <u>Management-by-Exception: Active (MA).</u> These types of leaders usually specify the standards for compliance and clarify what constitutes ineffective performance. They may punish their followers for being out of compliance with those standards. This style of leadership implies closely monitoring for deviances and mistakes and then taking corrective action as quickly as possible when they occur. The leaders focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. They concentrate on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures. They also keep track of all mistakes and direct their attention toward failures to meet standards.

C. <u>Management-by-Exception: Passive (MP).</u> These leaders typically fail to interfere until problems become serious. They wait for things to go wrong before taking action and they demonstrate that problems must become chronic before taking an action.

D. <u>Laissez-Faire (LF).</u> These types of leaders typically avoid getting involved when important issues arise. As a result they can hardly make timely decisions and they delay appropriate responses to urgent questions.

3. <u>Outcomes of Leadership</u>

Successful outcomes of leadership depend upon the degree to which both transformational and transactional leaderships are functioning appropriately. The level of success is measured with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) by (a) how often the raters perceive their leader to be motivating, (b) how effective raters perceive their leader to be at interacting at different levels of the organization, and (c) how

satisfied raters are with their leader's methods of working with others.

A. <u>Extra Effort (EE).</u> In order for outcomes of leadership to be successful, these leaders often encourage their followers to do more than they expected to do. They also heighten others' desire to succeed and increase others' willingness to try harder.

B. <u>Effective Approach (EA).</u> These leaders are effective in meeting others' job-related needs. They are effective in representing their group to higher authority. They are also effective in meeting organizational requirements.

C. <u>Satisfactory Leadership (SL).</u> These leaders utilize methods of leadership that are satisfying and work with their followers in a satisfactory way.

<u>Computation of the MLQ Instrument's Scales and Subscales</u>

In order to calculate each scale or subscale, the sum of ratings assigned by individuals to the items related to that scale or subscale will be divided by the number of items involved. Therefore, the value of each scale or subscale is going to range from 0 for not at all to 4 for frequently, if not always. Of the 45 items comprising the MLQ, 20 items are related to transformational leadership, 16 items are related to transactional leadership, and the remaining 9 items are related to outcomes of leadership. There are only two items related to the satisfactory leadership subscale, three items related to the extra effort subscale, and four items related to each of the remaining ten subscales.

<u>Reliability of the MLQ Instrument.</u> Reliability of the MLQ instrument was established by Bass and Avolio (2004) using a large sample of 27,285 subjects from a variety of the organizations throughout the nation. The sample consisted of 3,755 leaders who rated themselves, 4,268 leaders who were rated by leaders at higher levels, 12,118 subjects who were rated by lower level subordinates, 5,185 subjects who were rated by the same level leaders, and 1,959 subjects who were rated by leaders at other levels.

Table 1 presents reliability coefficients of the five subscales of the MLQ's transformational component of leadership. With regard to the very large sample and subsamples involved in the reliability tests, the statistical results revealed highly significant coefficients for all five subscales of the transformational component of the MLQ at all levels of leadership. As may be seen in this table, overall, the inspirational motivation subscale of the transformational leadership was found to have the highest degree of reliability (R = 0.83), followed in order by its individual consideration subscale (R = 0.77), its individual attributes subscale (R = 0.75), its intellectual simulation subscale (R = 0.75), and its idealized behaviors subscale (R = 0.70).

Table 1. Reliability of the Transformational Subscales of the MLQ

Transformational Component Subscales	Self	Higher	Lower	Same	Other	Total
Individual Attributes	0.70	0.76	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.75
Idealized Behaviors	0.64	0.48	0.70	0.71	0.71	0.70
Inspirational Motivation	0.76	0.83	0.83	0.82	0.83	0.83
Intellectual Simulation	0.64	0.77	0.75	0.77	0.76	0.75
Individual Consideration	0.62	0.70	0.80	0.76	0.77	0.77

Source: Bass and Avolio (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual

Table 2 provides reliability coefficients of the four subscales of the MLQ's transactional component of leadership. Considering the large sample size for each group of leaders, the statistical results revealed highly significant coefficients for all four subscales of the transactional component of the MLQ at all levels of leadership. As reflected in this table, overall, the active management-by-exception subscale of transactional leadership was found to have the highest degree of reliability (R = 0.75),

followed in order by its laissez-faire subscale (R = 0.71), its passive management-by-exception (R = 0.70), and its contingency reward (R = 0.69).

Table 2. Reliability of the Transactional Subscales of the MLQ

Transactional Component Subscales	Self	Higher	Lower	Same	Other	Total
Contingency Reward	0.60	0.66	0.73	0.68	0.70	0.69
Management-by-Exception: Active	0.75	0.79	0.74	0.76	0.73	0.75
Management-by-Exception: Passive	0.64	0.51	0.70	0.70	0.72	0.70
Laissez-Faire	0.60	0.71	0.74	0.72	0.72	0.71

Source: Bass and Avolio (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual

Table 3 presents reliability coefficients of the four subscales of the outcomes of leadership component of the MLQ. Considering the very large sample and subsamples involved in reliability tests, the statistical results revealed highly significant coefficients for all three subscales of the outcomes of leadership component of the MLQ at all levels of leadership. Overall, the extra effort subscale of outcomes of leadership was found to have the highest degree of reliability (R = 0.83), followed in order by its effective approach subscale (R = 0.83), and its satisfactory leadership subscale (R = 0.79).

Table 3. Reliability of the Outcomes of Leadership Subscales of the MLQ

Outcomes of Leadership Component Subscales	Self	Higher	Lower	Same	Other	Total
Extra Effort	0.79	0.83	0.84	0.85	0.83	0.83
Effective Approach	0.67	0.83	0.84	0.83	0.83	0.83
Satisfactory Leadership	0.78	0.75	0.84	0.87	0.82	0.79

Source: Bass and Avolio (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual

Validity of the MLQ Instrument. According to Bass and Avolio (2004), the initiative items of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) were pooled from several sources. In order to secure its content validity, they conducted the following procedural steps: (1) they completed a series of factor analyses with the MLQ, which provided a base for selecting items that exhibited the best convergent and discriminant validities; (2) they utilized the preliminary results of a study by Howell and Avolio (1993) with an earlier version of MLQ, using Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis; (3) they developed some new items for MLQ from the literature pertinent to distinguishing charismatic from transformational leadership; and (4) they selected six experts in the field of leadership to evaluate an earlier version of the MLQ and to make recommendations for modifying and/or eliminating items based on the conceptual model of the full range of leadership. These experts judged whether items referred to behavior or impact, guided by the full range of leadership behaviors and styles. These recommendations were included in the final development phase of the MLQ. The original form of the MLQ included 45 items which were later categorized into three major components and twelve subscales.

Part 4: Leadership Effectiveness

This part includes a copy of the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument developed by Hersey and Blanchard (2006) which consists of 12 multiple choice items designed to rate leadership effectiveness of individual respondents. Each item is designed to determine an individual's possible action in dealing with a hypothetical situation. Based on their situational theory, Hersey and Blanchard have classified effectiveness styles of leaders into four different categories that could be drawn upon to deal with contrasting situations. The following provides a definition of each component of the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description.

Telling/Directing. Telling is referred to those individuals who perceive to have high tasks while demonstrating low relationship behaviors. This leadership style is a one-way communication in which the leader defines the roles of followers and tells them what, how, when, and where to do various tasks. Telling (or directing) leaders define the roles and tasks of the followers and supervise, guide, and direct them closely.

Selling/Coaching. Selling is referred to those individuals who perceive to have high tasks while demonstrating high relationship behaviors. With this leadership style, most of the direction is provided by the leader while the leader attempts through two-way communication and socio-emotional support to get the followers psychologically in order to "buy into" decisions that have to be made. Selling (or coaching) leaders still define, explain, and persuade followers of their roles and tasks, but seek ideas and suggestions from the followers. Although decisions remain the leader's prerogative, communication is much more two-way than in the telling/directing approach.

Participating/Supporting. Participating is referred to those individuals who perceive to have low tasks while demonstrating high relationship behaviors. With this participating leadership style both leader and followers share in decision making through two-way communication and much facilitating behavior from the leader, since the followers have the ability and knowledge to perform the task. Participating (or supporting) leaders pass day-to-day decisions, such as task allocation and processes, to the followers. The leader encourages, facilitates, and takes part in problem solving and decision making, but control is with follower.

Delegating/Monitoring. Delegating is referred to those individuals who perceive to have low tasks while demonstrating low relationship behaviors. This leadership style involves letting followers "run their own show" while the leader delegates presuming that

74

followers are high in readiness, have the ability, and are both willing and able to take

responsibility for directing their own behavior. Delegating (or monitoring) leaders are

still involved in decisions and problem solving, but control of individual tasks is with the

follower. The leader is focused on monitoring and observing. Followers influence when

and how the leader will be involved.

Figure 1 is a four-category quadrant designed to demonstrate task behavior and

relationship behavior variables as described through definitions of telling, selling,

participating, and delegating components of the LEAD instrument. Based on the

individual's responses to each of the 12 situations included in the LEAD instrument,

Hersey and Blanchard (2006) have coded the possible responses to fit in each of the four

category quadrants. Therefore, the number of optional responses assigned to each

quadrant provides the extent to which each individual will fall in that quadrant category.

Figure 1. An Illustration of Different Leadership Behaviors

Participating: Low Task Behavior High Relationship Behavior	**Selling:** High Task Behavior High Relationship Behavior
Delegating: Low Task Behavior Low Relationship Behavior	**Telling:** High Task Behavior Low Relationship Behavior

In response to the instrument items, the survey participants are not aware of the

rating strategies described in the LEAD's Manual and, thus, do not know which

alternative action (A, B, C, or D) can be selected to place them into one of the afore-

mentioned leadership groups. The rating assigned to each individual will be based on the scoring guidelines delineated in the LEAD's Manual. The LEAD instrument will be used in the study because (a) according to the LEAD's Manual (2006), it can be specifically applied to leadership effectiveness in institutions of higher education; (b) it has a highly significant degree of reliability; (c) it has proven to have a convincing level of validity; and (d) it has been applied and tested in a number of other research studies related to the higher education leadership effectiveness (Adrian, 2004; Astin & Scherrei, 1980; Cox, 1994; Hunter, 2000; Mercer, 1997; Tierney, 1989; Williams, 2004). The instrument has copyright protection registered by Center for Leadership Studies with all rights reserved. Since reproduction of the instrument was prohibited without the Distributor's written consent; this investigator purchased 800 of the instrument and was granted a written permission to use the instrument for the study (See Appendix C). A randomly selected example of the 12 situations included in the instrument is paraphrased here in order to have a better understanding of the situations included in the instrument.

Example: People in your organization are not responding to your friendly conversations and your obvious concern about their welfare. You are observing that their performance is rapidly declining. Which one of the following actions would you take into consideration: You would (a) Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity of task completion; (b) Make yourself available for discussion but do not push your involvement; (c) Talk with them and then set goals; or (d) Purposely not intervene.

Computation of the LEAD Instrument's Scales and Subscales

The Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description instrument consists of two major components including (a) Leadership Style Profile; and (b) Leadership Style

76

Adaptability. Definition of these two components as well as description of procedures for scoring related to each component, are presented as follows:

Leadership style profile. This type of leadership consists of primary style and supporting style. The primary style is defined as the style that individuals tend to use most frequently; whether it is related to telling, or selling, or participating or delegating. Therefore, the largest number of options chosen by an individual from among the options involved in the 12 situation categories. The supporting style is described as the second largest number of options chosen by an individual from among the options involved in the 12 situation categories. Overall, as indicated by Hersey and Blanchard (2006), three or more responses in a quadrant indicate a high degree of flexibility in the use of behaviors in the quadrant. Two responses in a quadrant indicate moderate flexibility. One response in a quadrant is not statistically significant, and therefore it is difficult to predict flexibility in the use of behaviors in conjunction with that particular style. Needless to say that since there are only 12 situational categories involved in the LEAD instrument, the total number of options chosen by each individual is 12 and, consequently, the number of responses within each quadrant can only range from 0 to 12.

Leadership style Adaptability. This type of leadership has been defined by Hersey and Blanchard (2006) as the degree to which an individual is able to vary his or her style appropriately to the performance readiness level of an individual in a specific situation. Leadership style adaptability is especially important in gaining insight into a leader's ability to influence the followers. It is also important because adaptability of a variety of styles is always helpful for the sake of leadership effectiveness. In terms of scoring, points rewarded to each alternative action are based on the rating scale of 0 to 3, given that in selecting each alternative pertinent to each situation, 0 represent the lowest

probability of success, 1 represents a relatively low probability of success, 2 represent a relatively high probability of success, and 3 represents the highest probability of success. Accordingly, in response to all 12 situation items involved in the LEAD instrument, each individual's leadership style adaptability score will range from 0 to 36. According to Hersey and Blanchard (2006), in response to the 12 situation items (a) scores in the range of 0-23 reflect a relatively low degree of leadership style adaptability; (b) scores in the range of 24-29 indicate a moderate degree of leadership style adaptability; and (c) scores in the range of 30-36 reflect a high degree of leadership style adaptability. An implication of these scores indicate that in response to the 12 situation categories (a) those who fall within the 0-23 range need for self-development to improve both the ability to diagnose task readiness and to use appropriate influence behaviors; (b) those who fall within the 24-29 range are attributed to a higher degree of commitment in primary leadership style with less flexibility into the supporting styles; and (c) those who fall within the 30-36 range accurately diagnose the ability and willingness to pursue the best alternative action for a majority of the situations and adjust accordingly.

     Reliability of the LEAD Instrument. Reliability of the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument was tested through the use of Cronbach's Alpha method of internal consistency as well as by securing its test-retest reliability. As a result, the overall internal consistency of the instrument was found to be (R = 0.83) and its overall test-retest reliability was found to be (R = 0.75). As may be seen in Table 4, all correlation coefficients resulted from testing the instrument and its four components are strongly significant indicating a high degree of instrument's reliability. The participating/supporting component of the instrument was found to have the highest degree of internal consistency (R = 0.86), followed in order by its

selling/coaching component (R = 0.84), its telling/directing component (R = 0.81), and its delegating/monitoring component (R = 0.79). Similar results were also found in examining test-retest reliability of the instrument. The participating/supporting component of the instrument had the highest degree of test-retest reliability (R = 0.79), followed in order by its selling/coaching component (R = 0.76), its telling/directing component (R = 0.74), and its delegating/monitoring component (R = 0.73).

Table 4. Test-Retest Reliability and Internal Consistency of the LEAD

The LEAD Components	Internal Consistency	Test-Retest Reliability
Telling/Directing	0.81	0.74
Selling/Coaching	0.84	0.76
Participating/Supporting	0.86	0.79
Delegating/Monitoring	0.79	0.73
Overall Reliability	0.83	0.75

Validity of the LEAD Instrument. The LEAD instrument was standardized through the responses of a sample of 265 North American managers. The managers ranged in age from 21 to 64. Among them, 30% were at the entry level of management, 55% were middle managers, and the remaining 15% were at the high level of management. Validity coefficients of the rating assigned to the 12 situation items ranged from 0.11 to 0.52; while 10 of the 12 coefficients were higher than 0.25. Eleven coefficients were found to be statistically significant beyond the 0.01 and only one was significant beyond the 0.05 level. Each response option met the operationally defined criterion of less than 80% with respect to selection frequency. Furthermore, the stability of the instrument was moderately strong. In two administrations across a six-week

79

interval, 75% of the managers maintained their dominant style and 71% maintained their alternative style. The contingency coefficients were both 0.71 and statistically significant beyond the 0.01 level. The correlation coefficient for the adaptability scores was 0.69 and, thus, significant beyond the 0.01 level. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that the instrument will remain relatively stable across time, and as indicated by Hersey and Blanchard (2004), the user may rely upon the results as consistent measures. Several empirical validity studies were also conducted to determine the extent to which certain demographic variables such as sex, age, years of experience, degree and level of management are influential in the perceptions of individuals regarding their own leadership effectiveness. Satisfactory results reported supporting the four components of the instrument using a modified approach to factor structure. Therefore, the instrument is deemed to be an empirically sound instrument for measuring leadership effectiveness.

Part 5: Open-ended Questions

This final part includes two open-ended questions seeking opinions of the participating deans regarding (a) the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness; and (b) the way they manage to overcome the obstacles.

<div align="center">Research Design</div>

The research design in this study included both qualitative and quantitative procedures. A qualitative design was used to provide answers to the first two research questions by analyzing the responses of the survey participants to the open-ended items of the survey instrument. A quantitative design was conducted to examine the third research question through descriptive analyses and to test the research hypotheses through inferential analyses of the responses of the survey participants to the measurable items of the survey instrument.

Data Collection Procedures

Upon approval of the dissertation proposal by the consultative committee, the investigator sought approval from The George Washington University Office of Human Research for conducting the study. As a result, a revised copy the proposal signed by the Educational Leadership chair and the dissertation committee chair was submitted to the Office of Human Research for procedural considerations by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The investigator was also advised by the Office of Human Research to take an online course (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative) and successfully passed its required tests to be educated about the rights of survey participants and confidentiality of their responses. Several other documents such as application for approval of the study, a synopsis of the study, a full protocol of the study, and a summary of the methods and procedures were also provided to the Office of Human Research. As a result, the investigator was granted an approval for a maximum number of 200 subjects (See Appendix D). However, since the ultimate goal was to collect at least 240 questionnaires, once again the investigator applied for inclusion of 240 subjects in the study and was granted permission accordingly. After granting the second approval from the Institutional Review Board, copies of the survey instrument were mailed to a randomly selected sample of academic deans of graduate schools of education across the nation. In a cover letter attached to the survey instrument, the respondents were encouraged to complete the survey and return it to the investigator in a pre-paid postage stamped and pre-addressed envelope provided to them. Several other precautionary steps were also followed to avoid any possible biases that may have influenced the study's results. First, anonymity and confidentiality of the individual respondents are important and were promised to them through the cover letter. Second, the cover letter explained the study's objectives and

encouraged openness in their responses. Third, as an option to encourage more participation, in the cover letter to survey participants, it was indicated that if an individual would like to receive a copy of his or her leadership style and leadership effectiveness profile, he or she may provide a preferred mailing address to the investigator. Finally, through three follow-up attempts, the researcher collected as many responses as necessary to satisfy the sample size requirements of the multiple regression analysis for testing the research hypotheses involved in the study.

Due to the involvement of human subjects in this study, ethical issues were important and were carefully taken into consideration by the investigator prior to the data collection. Such consideration included precautionary actions such as promising ethical and moral obligations of the investigator toward the rights of human subjects and for securing the identity of the survey participants and confidentiality of their responses.

After three follow-up attempts, a total of 247 returned surveys were collected. Due to the restrictions reflected in the permission letter from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the investigator decided to discard 7 of the returned surveys that had a few non-respondent items. As a result, the original goal of collecting at least 30% of the surveys was accomplished (i.e., 240 out of 800).

Table 5 is designed to show some specified personal and professional profiles of the survey participants. The table provides a cross-tabulation of personal and professional profiles of the participating academic deans by gender. The personal factors included gender, age, and ethnic/racial classification. The professional factors included years served as a dean, years of teaching experience, and type of school currently serving. Males represented 51.3% of the survey participants, while females represented the remaining 48.7%. Of the total 143 participating deans (or 59.6%) who reported to serve

public institutions, 83 (or 33.8%) were male and the remaining 62 (or 25.8%) were female. From among 97 participating deans (or 40.4%) who reported to serve private institutions, 42 (or 17.5) were male and the remaining 55 (or 22.9%) were female. Distribution of male and female respondents by the number of years in their current position included (a) of the total 93 (or 38.8%) subjects with less than 5 years of deanship experience, 45 (or 18.8%) were male and 48 (or 20.0%) were female; (b) from among 116 (or 48.3%) of the subjects who had between 5 to 10 years of deanship experience, 62 (or 25.8%) were male and 54 (or 22.5%) were female; and (c) of the total 31 (or 12.9%) subjects with more than 10 years of deanship experience, 16 (or 6.7%) were male and 15 (or 6.2%) were female. Distribution of male and female subjects by years of teaching experience is as follows: (a) a total 63 (or 26.3%) of those who had less than 5 years of teaching experience, 23 (or 9.6%) were male and 40 (or 16.7%) were female; (b) a total 96 (or 40%) of those who had between 5 to 10 years of teaching experience, 54 (or 22.5%) were male and 42 (or 17.5%) were female; and (c) a total 81 (or 33.8%) of those who more than 10 years of teaching experience, 46 (or 19.2%) were male and 35 (or 14.6%) were female. In comparison of different age groups (a) 36 (or 15.0%) were under 40 years of age consisting of 25 (or 10.4%) males and 11 (or 4.6%) females; (b) 115 (or 47.9%) were between 40 to 50 years of age consisting of 58 (or 24.2%) males and 57 (or 23.8%) females; and (c) 89 (or 37.1%) were over 50 years of age consisting of 40 (or 16.7%) males and 49 (or 20.4%) females. Of the total 26 (or 10.8%) African-American subjects, 11 (or 4.6%) were male and 15 (or 6.3%) were female. From among the 185 (or 77.1%) White/Caucasian subjects, 90 (or 37.5%) were male and the remaining 95 (or 39.6%) were female. Other ethnic and racial groups included 29 (or 12.1%) of the subjects consisting of 22 (or 9.2%) males and 7 (or 2.9%) females.

Overall, considering that the subject for the study were selected randomly from among the entire graduate schools of education throughout the United States, and knowing the fact that there is no evidence to believe males and female have different degrees of tendency (or desire) to decide whether or not to respond the survey which is related to their fields of expertise, the findings reflected in table 5 indicate that while representation of men and women as deans of graduate schools of education is nearly equal (51.2% men comparing to 48.8% women), their distributions among various groups are considerably different (in terms of age, ethnicity, the type of institutions they are currently serving, and the years of deanship and teaching experiences).

Table 5. A Cross-tabulation of Personal and Professional Profile of the Deans by Gender

Personal and Professional Profiles of Deans		Male		Female		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Type of school	Public Institutions	81	33.8	62	25.8	143	59.6
	Private Institutions	42	17.5	55	22.9	97	40.4
Years served as a dean	Less than 5 years	45	18.8	48	20.0	93	38.8
	From 5-10 years	62	25.8	54	22.5	116	48.3
	More than 10 years	16	6.7	15	6.2	31	12.9
Teaching experience	Less than 5 years	23	9.6	40	16.7	63	26.3
	From 5-10 years	54	22.5	42	17.5	96	40.0
	More than 10 years	46	19.2	35	14.6	81	33.8
Age group	Under 40 years	25	10.4	11	4.6	36	15.0
	From 40-50 years	58	24.2	57	23.8	115	47.9
	Over 50 years	40	16.7	49	20.4	89	37.1
Ethnic/racial group	African American	11	4.6	15	6.3	26	10.8
	White/Caucasian	90	37.5	95	39.6	185	77.1
	Other Groups	22	9.2	7	2.9	29	12.1
Overall Participating Deans		123	51.3	117	48.8	240	100.0

Table 6 provides the chronological steps necessary to pursue the study and the projected timeline for data collection, data analysis, and completion of the final draft of the dissertation. According to this timeline, the investigator projected to collect the data by mid September 2008, to complete the dissertation by mid October 2008, to submit the final draft for the dissertation oral examination by the end of October 2008, and to defend the dissertation by mid December 2008.

Table 6. Timeline for Data Collection and Completion of the Dissertation

Necessary Steps for Completion of the Dissertation	Timeline
Gaining approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB)	Mid August
Mailing the survey to the deans of graduate schools	Mid August
Mailing the first follow-up survey to the non-respondents	Early September
Mailing the second follow-up survey to the non-respondents	Mid September
Timeframe for completion of the dissertation	Mid October
Submitting the final draft and paperwork for the oral examination	End October
Approximate date for the dissertation oral examination	Mid December

Ethical and Legal Considerations

Since most educational research deals with human beings, it is necessary to understand the ethical and legal responsibilities of conducting research. It is ultimately the responsibility of the researcher to weigh such ethical and legal considerations and make the best professional judgment possible. Several professionals have studied ethical and legal issues in depth and have provided guidelines for planning and conducting research in such a way as to protect the rights of the subjects (McMillan & Schumacher, 1998; Ferguson, 2005; Maxwell, 1996). However, most relevant for educational research is the recent set of ethical principals published by the American Psychological

Association (2005). Realizing the fact that the researcher's institution has some legal and ethical obligations to provide protection to human research subjects, approval by the Office of Human Research is required for all research studies involving human subjects (The George Washington University, 2004). For that reason, this researcher reflected her obligation to the survey participants that the survey is going to be used for the purpose of overall data analyses and will remain strictly confidential. The researcher also promised the survey participants that she remains solely responsible for anonymity of all respondents and their prospective institutions.

<div align="center">Description of the Dependent and Independent Variables</div>

The variables involved in the research hypotheses were identified as dependent and independent variables. The dependent variable in this study was the self-perceived leadership effectiveness of the participating graduate school deans as measured by the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument. The independent variables in this study included: (a) the self-reported leadership styles of the participating graduate school deans as determined by the short form of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ); (b) the survey participants' personal factors including gender, age group, and ethnic/racial background; and (c) their professional factors including years of experience as a school dean, years of teaching experience, major field of expertise, and the type of institution currently serving.

The following chart (figure 1) depicts the subjects for the study, the major dependent variable involved in the study (i.e., leadership effectiveness), the major predictor of the deans' leadership effectiveness (i.e., leadership styles), and other predictors of the deans' leadership effectiveness (personal and professional factors). The chart also depicts: (a) the relationship between the major dependent variable (leadership

effectiveness) and the major predictor (leadership style) to be determined by testing the

first research hypothesis; (b) relationship between the dependent variable (leadership

effectiveness) and the subjects' personal factors (age group, gender, and ethnic/racial

background) by testing the second research hypothesis; (c) relationship between the

dependent variable (leadership effectiveness) and the subjects' professional factors (years

served as a dean, years of teaching experience, and the type of institution they are

currently serving) by testing the fourth research question; and (d) relationship of the

dependent variable (leadership effectiveness) with combined major predictor (leadership

style) and minor predictors (personal and professional factors) related to the participating

deans to be determined by testing the major research hypotheses.

Figure 2. SELECTED PREDICTORS OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Subjects: Academic Deans Serving Graduate Schools of Education

↓

Dependent Variable = Leadership Effectiveness Testing the Major Hypothesis 4: Multiple Regression Analysis

Professional Predictors	Leadership Styles	Personal Predictors

| | Testing Hypothesis 1:
Pearson Correlation | |

| Testing Hypothesis 2:
Pearson Correlation
t-test for two groups
One-way ANOVA | | Testing Hypothesis 3:
Pearson Correlation
t-test for two groups
One-way ANOVA |

Treatment of the Data

The data obtained from the returned questionnaires were coded numerically and compiled for computer programming and analysis purposes. The most recent Windows version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2007) was utilized in generating a computer program for analysis of the data. This package was utilized because it is designed to analyze the data collected in the field of social sciences.

1. Procedures for Examining the Research Questions

A qualitative method of analysis was employed to examine the first two research question involved in this study. According to Crowl (2004), the qualitative approach is commonly used to provide a narrative description of particular phenomena as they are. While there are different qualitative techniques that can be used to provide verbal descriptions, the goal of each is to capture the richness and complexity of behavior that occurs in natural settings from the participants' perspective. Objectivity, according to Scriven (2004), refers to the quality of the data produced by the procedures for collecting and analyzing data and not the researcher's personal bias. Objectivity in qualitative methods is a crucial issue which focuses on the open-minded, unbiased, and logical interpretation of the data (McMillan & Schumcher, 1998). Subjectivity also plays a critical role throughout the research process and is constantly evolving in response to the researcher's experiences during a qualitative study (Peshkin, 1988). Patton (1990) contends that contrary to quantitative methods, qualitative methods typically produce a wealth of detailed information about a much smaller number of cases. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) refer to several properties that in their view are important for conducting any qualitative research. They assert that in conducting qualitative research: (a) the natural setting is the data source and the researcher is the key data-collection instrument; (b) it

attempts primarily to describe and secondarily to analyze; (c) its data are analyzed inductively; and (d) the concern is with process as much as with outcome. Similar properties of qualitative research are stated by Maxwell (1996) in his publication of Qualitative Research Design focusing on interactive approaches for data collection.

With regard to the aforementioned issues and points of argument, the qualitative analysis of the data in this study was approached by examining the first two research questions involved in the study. Responses of the survey participants to the open-ended items of the questionnaire were analyzed to examine these research questions. The open-ended items were included in the questionnaire in order to determine the perceptions of the participating deans regarding (a) the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness; and (b) how do they manage to overcome these obstacles. In analyzing each item, the responses were coded and categorized based on the type and frequency of similar responses, for a more systematic approach and appropriate interpretation. Interpretation of the responses to each item was based on the most interesting comments as well as their frequency of occurrence. The coding strategies were also helpful in determining the possible links between certain personal and professional backgrounds of the survey participants and their responses to the open-ended items of the questionnaire.

A quantitative analysis approach was employed to examine the third research question involved in the study. This research question was examined through the use of descriptive analyses including frequency distribution of the responses to the second part of the survey instrument which includes ten items concentrating on the importance of each factor in the respondents' leadership effectiveness. Certain measures of central tendency (i.e., mean ratings) and dispersion (i.e., standard deviation) were also calculated to determine the extent to which each factors is important in leadership effectiveness.

2. Procedures for Testing the Research Hypotheses

        The final research question was converted to four research hypotheses and was tested through the use of appropriate statistical procedures. An inferential analysis method was utilized to test the research hypotheses involved in the study. Several statistical procedures including the Pearson Product Moment correlation technique along with its test of significance, the t-test for two independent means, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) along with the Scheffe' test of post hoc comparison, and a stepwise multiple regression analysis were employed to test the research hypotheses.

        The first research hypothesis was tested through the use of Pearson correlation technique along with its test of significance. This test is typically used to determine the extent to which two dependent variables (or pairs of variables) are correlated with each other. This statistic is often used to predict the measure of one variable (criterion) from that of another (predictor). The value of this statistic ranges from -1 for a perfect inverse correlation to +1 for a perfect positive correlation. A positive correlation indicates the larger the value of one variable, the larger the value of another. Conversely, a negative correlation indicates the larger the value of one variable, the smaller the value of another. The pairs of variables in testing the first research hypotheses are scores on leadership effectiveness and scores on leadership style of the participating deans.

        The second research hypothesis was tested using (a) the Pearson correlation technique along with its test of significance to determine whether leadership effectiveness of the subjects is significantly correlated with their years of experience in their current position as well as their years of teaching experiences; and (b) the t-test for comparison of two independent means to determine whether there is a significant difference between leadership effectiveness of those subjects who reported serving in public institutions and

90

those who reported serving in private institutions. The strategy of the t-test is to compare

the actual means difference observed with the means difference expected by chance

(Norusis, 2007). In other words, the t-test determines whether the observed means

difference is sufficiently larger than means difference which would be expected by

chance. The two independent means in testing this hypothesis are self-perceived scores

on leadership effectiveness by those participating deans who are serving in public

institutions and by those who are serving in private institutions.

The third research hypothesis was tested utilizing (a) the t-test for comparison of

two independent means to determine whether there is a significant difference between

leadership effectiveness of male and female subjects; and (b) the one-way analysis of

variance along with the Scheffe' test of pair-wise comparison to determine whether there

are significant differences among leadership effectiveness of subjects with different

ethnic/racial backgrounds as well as whether there are significant differences among

leadership effectiveness of subjects of different age groups. The one-way analysis of

variance is usually performed in testing hypotheses for comparison of more than two

independent means: (a) by determining the extent to which the ratio of "variation

between groups" to "variation within groups" is large enough to assume a possibility of

significant differences between independent means; and (b) in the occasions that such a

ratio is found to be statistically significant, a post hoc comparison is necessary to

determine the extent to which those independent means are significantly different from

each other. The Scheffe$^{'}$ posterior test was selected for comparison of the independent

means in testing this part of hypothesis because it is appropriate to be used for (a)

analyzing both equal and unequal sample sizes, and (b) pair-wise comparison of a group

of independent means (Crowl, 2004).

The final research hypothesis was tested through the use of stepwise multiple regression analysis to include leadership effectiveness as the major dependent variable (or criterion), leadership style as well as personal and professional factors as independent variables (or predictors). The strategy of regression analysis is based on the statistical inference procedures to test the null hypothesis that the multiple correlation result is zero in the population from which the sample was drawn (Crowl, 2004). A multiple regression analysis typically requires involvement of a dependent variable (also called criterion variable) and a number of independent variables while operating jointly (also called predictors). The resulting statistical test determined the extent to which a dependent variable can be predicted by a number of independent variables.

Selecting the Level of Significance. In order to test the statistical hypotheses, it is necessary to select an appropriate level of significance relevant to the nature of the study. The level of significance is defined as the risk of error in generalization of the findings obtained from a sample of a population from which the sample had been drawn (Crowl, 2004). With respect to a common agreement among statisticians in adopting a level of significance for studies involving human perceptions/attitudes, the 0.05 level of significance was selected for testing the null hypotheses involved in this study. This criterion allows a maximum 5% risk of error and secures a minimum 95% confidence in generalizing the hypothesis results from the sample to the population (Fergusen, 2004).

Table 7 presents a summary of the quantitative and qualitative research design and treatment of the data including the dependent and independent variables involved in each research question, their correspondent items in the questionnaire, and the analytical procedures for examining each research question as well as the statistical procedures for testing each research hypothesis.

Table 7. Research Design and Analytical Procedures for Treatment of the Data

Questions/Hypotheses	Independent Variables	Analytical Methods
Research Question 1	The first open-ended item of survey instrument	Qualitative analysis
Research Question 2	The second open-ended item of survey instrument	Qualitative analysis
Research Question 3	Factors contributing to leadership effectiveness	Descriptive analysis
Research Question 4	Leadership effectiveness and selected predictors	Inferential analysis
Research Hypothesis 1	Leadership effectiveness and leadership style	Bivariate correlation
Research Hypothesis 2	Leadership effectiveness and professional factors	t-test and correlation
Research Hypothesis 3	Leadership effectiveness and personal factors	t-test and ANOVA
Research Hypothesis 4	Leadership effectiveness and all predictors	Regression analysis

Summary

The methods and procedures to be used in the study were discussed in this
chapter. The data for the study was collected by mailing the survey to deans of graduate
schools of education in the United States. Each survey included (1) a self-developed
questionnaire consisted of eight items related to personal and professional profiles of the
participating deans, ten multiple choice items as the contributing factors to their
leadership effectiveness, and two open-ended items asking them to list some of the
obstacles that are hindering their leadership effectiveness and describing how they
usually manage to overcome those obstacles; (2) a copy of the Leadership Effectiveness

and Adaptability Description (LEAD) consisted of twelve multiple choice items to measure their leadership effectiveness; and (3) a copy of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to identify their leadership style. In this study, the MLQ and the LEAD instruments were selected from among many other standardized instruments listed in Appendix E because (a) they both have been repeatedly used for assessing leadership style and effectiveness in higher education institutions; and (b) according to the literature, they both have strong degrees of reliability and validity.

The data obtained from the returned questionnaires were coded numerically and then transcribed into the computer for compiling, organizing, and statistical analyses. The most recent Windows version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2007) was utilized for statistical analyses of the data. This package was selected in the study because it is generally designed to analyze the data collected in studies related to the fields of humanities and social sciences.

Qualitative analysis of the data was conducted by coding, categorizing, and interpreting the responses provided by the survey participants to the open-ended items of the questionnaire. For each open-ended question, the answers were analyzed based on the classification and frequency of similar responses to the question. Whenever appropriate, comments of the respondents were quoted for further understanding of their perceptions as well as their organizational contexts.

Quantitative analysis of the data included descriptive and inferential methods and procedures. Descriptive analysis of the data was achieved through the use of: (a) frequency distribution of the responses provided by the survey participants to the individual items of the questionnaires; and (b) certain measures of central tendency and dispersion, including mean and standard deviation of the scalable items of the

questionnaire. Inferential analysis of the data was conducted to test certain null

hypotheses through the use of the Pearson Correlation analysis accompanied with its test

of significance, the t-test to examine certain null hypotheses involving two independent

means, the one-way analysis of variance along with the Scheffe' test of pair-wise

comparison to test certain null hypotheses involving more than two independent means,

and the multiple regression analysis to examine the combined predictors of leadership

effectiveness in higher education. All research hypotheses were tested at the selected 0.05

level of significance. This criterion usually allows a maximum 5% risk of error and

secures a minimum 95% confidence in generalizing the hypothesis results from the

sample to the population. The findings are presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 4

Analysis of the Data

This chapter presents analysis of the data collected for the study. Certain

qualitative and quantitative methods and procedures were utilized in order to examine the

research questions. The research hypotheses were tested through the use of appropriate

inferential statistics including Pearson correlation along with its test of significance, t-test

for two independent means, one-way analysis of variance along with the Scheffe' test of

pair-wise comparison, and multiple regression analysis accompanied with its test of

significance. The chapter is organized into two parts. The first part includes examining

the research questions. The second part presents testing the null hypotheses derived from

the research hypotheses. A summary of the findings is included at the end the chapter.

Part 1: Examining the Research Questions

The following sections provide answers to the first three research questions. In

order to examine each question, a re-statement of the question is presented, followed by a

brief discussion of the methods and procedures used to analyze the data pertinent to that

question, and a detailed description of the findings.

<u>Examining the First Research Question</u>

How do the academic deans of graduate schools of education perceive the

challenging obstacles hindering their job effectiveness?

<u>Findings.</u> Only about 25% of the 240 participating deans (n = 59) responded to

the first open-ended item of the questionnaire related to this research question. As shown

in table 8, their responses reflect a number of challenging obstacles hindering their job

effectiveness. Such obstacles are listed below in the order of their frequency occurrences:

(a) lack of sufficient funds to make appropriate budgetary decisions were the most frequently mentioned of challenging obstacles hindering job effectiveness of the participating deans (64%); followed in order by (b) imbalanced authority versus responsibility due to lack of adequate resources and lack of sufficient time to manage many overwhelming responsibilities with limited authority (48%); (c) disagreement with the direction taken by upper level administration (33%); (d) being challenged by both lower and upper level administration for making unpopular decisions (26%); (e) being forced to implement some old and inappropriate policies and procedures that are not in the best interest of the institution (21%); (f) existence of some role conflicts among job description of employees at different levels of administration (18%); (g) existence of a bureaucratic system which is not necessary most of the time, but usually results in waste of time and effort by staff and faculty as well (15%); (h) pressure from hierarchies to implement new strategies that are not beneficial to the interest of institution (13%); (i) facing the problems with respective departments that could have been resolved prior to reaching to dean's office (9%); and (j) deferred maintenance of school facilities which requires adequate decisions by appointed officials at the university level (5%). Obviously, lack of sufficient funds to make budgetary decisions was the most frequently mentioned obstacle hindering the deans' job effectiveness. An example of a dean's concern about budget restrictions is quoted as follows: "As a small school our budgetary resources are very limited which ultimately makes it hard to function appropriately."

Examining the Second Research Question

How do the academic deans of graduate schools of education manage to overcome the challenging obstacles hindering their job effectiveness?

Findings. Only about 20% of the 240 participating deans (n = 47) responded to

this second open-ended item of the questionnaire related to this research question. As shown in table 8, their responses reflect a number of solutions to overcome some challenging obstacles hindering their job effectiveness. Such solutions are listed below in the order of their frequency occurrences: (a) make arrangements to discuss the problem of budgetary restrictions with appropriate authority and try to convince them of the extent to which such restrictions have negative impacts on the quality of education and to what extent are hindering your job effectiveness (59%); (b) recruit additional resources through appropriate proposals for grants and other types of fund raising approaches (45%); (c) try to meet with hierarchies and discuss your disagreement with some ineffective policies and practices that are not in the interest of the institution as a whole (32%); (d) before making any unpopular decisions try to engage as many individuals as possible and make them educated about the possible consequences (25%); (e) implement new and creative policies and procedures to help improve the quality of your leadership effectiveness (20%); (f) review and revise job descriptions of faculty and administrators to prevent any future role conflicts (16%); (g) meet with upper level administrators to discuss disadvantages of the bureaucratic system and suggest some innovative strategies to avoid bureaucracy (9%); (h) challenge logically with hierarchies who are trying to pressure you for implementing some strategies that you believe are not in the interest of institution (6%); (i) convene individual meetings with department chairpersons and provide them with appropriate delegation to help resolve many of the problems at the departmental level before they reach to dean's office (4%); and (j) arrange a meeting with appropriate authority and inform them about the actions necessary for maintenance of school facilities, especially in case of emergencies (2%). An example of a dean's solution to the obstacle of budget restrictions is quoted as follows:

"Try to persuade appropriate budgetary decision makers to convince them of the extent to which lack of sufficient funds has negative impacts on the quality of education."

Table 8. A List of Obstacles Hindering Leadership Effectiveness and Suggested Solutions

Obstacles of Leadership Effectiveness	Suggested Solutions to the Obstacles
Budget restrictions and lack of sufficient funds to make appropriate budgetary decisions were the most frequently mentioned of challenging obstacles hindering job effectiveness of the participating deans (64%).	Make arrangements to discuss the problem of budgetary restrictions with appropriate authority and try to convince them of the extent to which such restrictions have negative impacts on the quality of education (59%).
Imbalanced authority versus responsibility due to lack of adequate resources and lack of sufficient time to manage many overwhelming responsibilities with limited authority (48%).	Recruit additional resources through appropriate proposals for grants and other types of fund-raising strategies (45%).
Disagreement with the direction taken by upper level administration (33%).	Try to meet with hierarchies and discuss your disagreement with some ineffective policies and practices that are not in the interest of the institution as a whole (32%).
Being challenged by both lower and upper level administration for making unpopular decisions (26%).	Before making any unpopular decisions try to engage as many people as possible and make them aware of possible consequences (25%).
Being forced to implement some old and inappropriate policies and procedures that are not in the best interest of the institution (21%).	Implement new and creative policies and procedures to help improve the quality of your leadership effectiveness (20%).
Existence of some role conflicts among job description of employees at different levels of administration (18%).	Review and revise job descriptions of faculty and administrators to prevent any future role conflicts (16%).
Existence of a bureaucratic system which is not only necessary most of the time, but usually results in waste of time and effort by staff and faculty as well (15%).	Meet with upper level administrators to discuss disadvantages of bureaucratic system and suggest some innovative strategies to avoid bureaucracy (9%).
Pressure from hierarchies to implement new strategies that are not beneficial to the interest of institution (13%).	Challenge logically with hierarchies who are trying to pressure you for implementing some strategies that you believe are not in the interest of institution (6%).
Facing the problems with respective departments that could have been resolved prior to reaching to dean's office (9%).	Convene individual meetings with department chairs and provide them with proper delegation to resolve some problems at the departmental level before reaching to dean's office (4%).
Deferred maintenance of school facilities which requires adequate decisions by appointed officials at the university level (5%).	Arrange a meeting with appropriate authority and inform them about the actions necessary for maintenance of school facilities (2%).

<u>Examining the Third Research Question</u>

What factors do the academic deans of graduate schools of education perceive to have contributed to their leadership effectiveness?

<u>Findings.</u> The factors selected to provide answer to this research question were derived from among a number of studies pertinent to the topics of leadership style and leadership effectiveness. This research question was examined through the use of certain measures of central tendency and dispersion (i.e., mean and standard deviation) of the ratings assigned by the survey participant to the factors contributing to leadership effectiveness. The alternative ratings were based on the scale of 1 for "Not Important", 2 for "Little Important", 3 for "Moderately Important", 4 for "Important", and 5 for "Very Important." The findings are incorporated into table 9. As may be seen in this table, all ten contributing factors were rated by the survey participants in the range of either important or very important with small degrees of variation as reflected in the standard deviation of the ratings. In addition, as a result of comparing the mean ratings by the participating deans to each individual factor, it was concluded that they have perceived that demonstrating honest and ethical behavior (4.79) is one of the most important factors contributing to their leadership effectiveness followed in order by taking responsibility for decisions and actions (4.73), creating a mutual trust atmosphere (4.46), resolving conflicts in a professional manner (4.45), fostering good relationships with work associates (4.40), creating a motivational work environment (4.29), communicating expectations to staff and faculty (4.15), making decisions appropriately and promptly (4.12), involving designated staff and faculty in planning (4.02), and handling efficient management of stress factors (3.90). Therefore, it was concluded that all ten factors had significant contributions to leadership effectiveness.

Table 9. Mean and Standard Deviation of the Ratings Assigned by the Participating
Deans to Each of the Factors Contributing to Their Leadership Effectiveness

Contributing Factors to Leadership Effectiveness	Ratings	
	MEAN	S.D.
1. Creating a motivational work environment.	4.29	0.65
2. Creating a mutual trust atmosphere.	4.46	0.71
3. Making decisions appropriately and promptly.	4.12	0.67
4. Taking responsibility for decisions and actions.	4.73	0.45
5. Fostering good relationships with work associates.	4.40	0.91
6. Involving designated staff and faculty in planning.	4.02	0.86
7. Demonstrating honest and ethical behavior.	4.79	0.46
8. Communicating expectations to staff and faculty.	4.15	0.74
9. Resolving conflicts in a professional manner.	4.46	0.54
10. Handling efficient management of stress factors.	3.90	0.72

1 = Not Important   2 = Little Important   3 = Moderate   4 = Important   5 = Very Important

Research Question 4

       To what extent are certain leadership styles and selected personal and professional

characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education correlated with

their leadership effectiveness?

       This final research question was converted to four research hypotheses which

were then tested through the use of appropriate statistical procedures. An inferential

analysis method was approached to test the research hypotheses involved in the study.

The following section provides responses to the research hypotheses through the use of

Pearson correlation, the t-test, one-way analysis of variance, and stepwise regression.

Part 2: Testing the Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses formulated for the study are examined in this part

through the use of appropriate statistical procedures. The null hypotheses derived from

the research hypotheses were tested at the selected 0.05 level of significance by utilizing

appropriate inferential statistics. The following format was approached to examine each

research hypothesis: (a) re-statement of the research hypothesis, (b) statement of the

hypothesis in the null form, (c) a description of the statistical procedures used to test the

null hypothesis, (d) tabulation and presentation of the statistical results, (e) test of the null

hypothesis at the selected level of significance, and (f) interpretation of the significant

statistical results based on the rejection or acceptance of the null hypothesis for scales

and/or subscales of the data related to each hypothesis.

Testing the First Research Hypothesis

Certain leadership styles of the academic deans of graduate schools of education

are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Null Hypothesis 1

There is no significant relationship between leadership effectiveness and

leadership styles of the academic deans of graduate schools of education.

Test Results. This hypothesis was tested through the use of Pearson correlation

coefficient along its test of significance. The two dependent variables in this test include

the participating deans' self-perceived ratings on their leadership effectiveness and their

leadership style. Table 10 presents the resulting statistical tests for this hypothesis. The

findings revealed significant relationships between leadership styles of the participating

deans and their ratings assigned to the four components of leadership effectiveness.

Positive and statistically significant correlations were found between the following pairs

of leadership style and leadership effectiveness: (a) transactional leadership style with the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness (r = +0.21 and p = 0.004 < 0.05); (b) transactional leadership style with the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness (r = +0.26 and p = 0.000 < 0.05); (c) transformational leadership style with the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness (r = +0.15 and p = 0.018 < 0.05); and (d) transformational leadership style with the participating/supporting component of leadership effectiveness (r = +0.16 and p = 0.016 < 0.05). Negative and statistically significant correlations were found between the following pairs of leadership style and leadership effectiveness: (a) transformational leadership style with the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness (r = - 0.19 and p = 0.001 < 0.05); (b) transactional leadership style with the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness (r = - 0.31 and p = 0.000 < 0.05); and (c) transformational leadership style with the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness (r = - 0.17 and p = 0.008 < 0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for the aforementioned correlations and was accepted for the remaining correlations. These findings are indicative of the extent to which different leadership styles will result in different degrees of leadership effectiveness strategies including telling/directing, selling/coaching, participating/supporting, and delegating/monitoring. A positive correlation between transformational leadership style and the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness, for example, can be interpreted as transformational style leaders are more likely to use the selling/coaching approaches in order to be effective. Conversely, a negative correlation between transactional leadership style and the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness can be interpreted as transactional style leaders are less likely to use selling/coaching approaches in order to be effective.

Table 10. Test of Correlations between the Four Components of Leadership
Effectiveness and Leadership Styles of the Participating Deans

Leadership Effectiveness	Leadership Styles	Correlations	Significance
Telling/Directing	Transformational Leadership	- 0.19*	0.001
	Transactional Leadership	+0.21*	0.004
Selling/Coaching	Transformational Leadership	+0.15*	0.018
	Transactional Leadership	- 0.31*	0.000
Participating/Supporting	Transformational Leadership	+0.16*	0.016
	Transactional Leadership	- 0.07	0.264
Delegating/Monitoring	Transformational Leadership	- 0.17*	0.008
	Transactional Leadership	+0.26*	0.000

Note: An asterisk denotes a significant correlation between pairs of variables ($p < 0.05$).

Testing the Second Research Hypothesis

Certain professional characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Null Hypothesis 2

Certain professional characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are not significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Test Results. This hypothesis was tested utilizing (a) the t-test for two independent means to determine whether there is a significant difference between leadership effectiveness of the participating deans who are currently serving private institutions and those who are currently serving private institutions; and (b) the Pearson correlation coefficient along with its test of significance to determine whether there are significant correlations between leadership effectiveness of the participating deans and

their years of experience in current position, as well as their years of teaching experience. Table 11 presents the statistical test results regarding the significance of the differences between leadership effectiveness of those deans who are currently serving public institutions and those who are currently serving private institutions. Of the total 240 graduate school deans who participated in the study, 143 (or 59.6%) reported to have served in public institutions and the remaining 97 (or 40.4%) reported to have served in private institutions. The t-test comparison revealed significant differences between leadership effectiveness of the two groups in two of the four components of leadership effectiveness -- selling/coaching and delegating/monitoring. Those who reported serving public institutions found themselves to be more effective in using delegating/monitoring approaches of leadership than their counterparts who were serving private institutions ($M_1 = 1.80 > M_2 = 1.47$, t = +2.57 and p = 0.011 < 0.05); while they perceived themselves to be less effective in using the selling/coaching approaches of leadership than their counterparts who were serving private institutions ($M_1 = 4.08 < M_2 = 4.49$, t = -2.67 and p = 0.008 < 0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected in testing these two components of leadership effectiveness and was accepted for the remaining two components -- telling/directing and participating/supporting. An interpretation of these findings is that the subjects who serve public institutions have found themselves to be more effective by using the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness, whereas those who serve private institutions have found themselves to be more effective in using the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness. However, the test results revealed no significant differences in leadership effectiveness of the two groups in using the telling/directing as well as the participating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness.

Table 11. Test of Significant Differences between Leadership Effectiveness of Those
Who Are Serving Public Institutions and Those Who Are Serving Private Institutions

Leadership Effectiveness	Public (n = 143)		Private (n = 97)		Test Results	
	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	t	p
Telling/Directing	2.10	1.04	2.01	1.08	+0.66	0.528
Selling/Coaching	4.08	1.09	4.49	1.28	- 2.67*	0.008
Participating/Supporting	3.95	1.17	4.02	1.07	- 0.47	0.641
Delegating/Monitoring	1.80	0.89	1.47	1.04	+2.57*	0.011

Note: An asterisk denotes a significant difference between independent means ($p < 0.05$).

Table 12 presents the resulting statistical test showing the relationships between participants' self-perceived leadership effectiveness and the number of years in the current position. As may be seen in this table, positive and statistically significant relationships were found between the subjects' years of experience in their current positions and (a) their use of selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness ($r = +0.15$ and $p = 0.017 < 0.05$); and (b) their use of participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness ($r = +0.20$ and $p = 0.002 < 0.05$). These findings indicate that deans with more years of experience are more likely to approach the selling/coaching and participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness. However, according to the test results, there were negative but still significant relationships between the subjects' years of experience in current positions and (a) their use of telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness ($r = - 0.23$ and $p = 0.017 < 0.05$); and (b) their use of delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness ($r = - 0.16$ and $p = 0.011 < 0.05$). These findings indicate that deans with more years of experience are less likely

to approach the telling/directing and delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness. Overall, the statistical results supported rejecting the null hypothesis and accepting the research hypothesis.

Table 12. Test of Significant Correlations between Leadership Effectiveness of the Participating Deans and Years of Experience in Their Current Position

Leadership Effectiveness	MEAN	S.D.	Correlation	Significance
Telling/Directing	2.06	1.05	- 0.23*	0.000
Selling/Coaching	4.25	1.18	+0.15*	0.017
Participating/Supporting	3.98	1.13	+0.20*	0.002
Delegating/Monitoring	1.67	0.97	- 0.16*	0.011

Note: An asterisk denotes a significant correlation between pairs of variables ($p < 0.05$).

Table 13 presents the statistical test results indicating the relationships between participants' self-perceived leadership effectiveness and their years of teaching experience. According to the data in this table, positive and statistically significant relationships was found between the subjects' years of teaching experience and their use of selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness ($r = +0.33$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). This indicates that the subjects who have more years of teaching experience are more likely to approach the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness. However, the test results revealed significant but negative relationships between the participating deans' years of teaching experience and their use of (a) telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness ($r = - 0.24$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$); and (b) delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness ($r = - 0.15$ and $p = 0.022 < 0.05$). This indicates that the subjects who have more years of teaching experience are

less likely to approach the telling/directing and delegating/monitoring aspects leadership effectiveness. Overall, except for the significant relationship between years in the current position and the participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness, the findings of this hypothesis is consistent with those of previous hypotheses, indicating that years of experience whether in deanship or in teaching have similar impacts on leadership effectiveness. Therefore, these findings supported rejecting the null hypothesis and therefore accepting the research hypothesis.

Table 13. Test of Significant Correlations between the Four Components of Leadership Effectiveness of the Participating Deans and Their Years of Teaching Experience

Leadership Effectiveness	MEAN	S.D.	Correlation	Significance
Telling/Directing	2.06	1.05	- 0.24*	0.000
Selling/Coaching	4.25	1.18	+0.33*	0.000
Participating/Supporting	3.98	1.13	+0.02	0.971
Delegating/Monitoring	1.67	0.97	- 0.15*	0.022

Note: An asterisk denotes a significant correlation between pairs of variables ($p < 0.05$).

Testing the Third Research Hypothesis

Certain personal characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Null Hypothesis 3

Certain personal characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are not significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Test Results. This hypothesis was tested utilizing (a) the t-test for two independent means to determine whether there is a significant difference between

108

leadership effectiveness of male and female participating deans; and (b) the one-way

analysis of variance along with the Scheffe' test of comparison to determine whether

there are significant differences between leadership effectiveness of the participating

deans with regard to age group and ethnic/racial background.

Table 14 provides the resulting statistical test to compare leadership effectiveness

of male and female participating deans. The findings revealed significant differences

between male and female subjects in their perceptions of (a) the telling/directing

approaches of leadership effectiveness ($M_1 = 2.22 > M_2 = 1.90$, t = +2.40 and p = 0.017<

0.05); and (b) participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness ($M_1 = 3.87$

< $M_2 = 4.09$, t = - 2.06 and p = 0.038 < 0.05). These findings indicate that, as compared

to their female counterparts, male subjects are more in favor of the telling/directing

approached to leadership and less in favor of the participating/supporting approaches to

leadership. There were no significant differences between the two groups in the use of the

selling/coaching and delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness.

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected in testing two of the four components.

Table 14. Test of Significant Differences between the Four Components of
Leadership Effectiveness of the Participating Male and Female Deans

Leadership Effectiveness	Males (n =123)		Females (n = 117)		Test Results	
	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	t	p
Telling/Directing	2.22	1.10	1.90	0.98	+2.40*	0.017
Selling/Coaching	4.20	1.14	4.30	1.23	- 0.625	0.532
Participating/Supporting	3.87	1.02	4.19	1.22	- 2.06*	0.038
Delegating/Monitoring	1.67	0.90	1.66	1.04	+0.133	0.894

Note: An asterisk denotes a significant difference between independent means (p < 0.05).

Table 15 presents the resulting one-way analysis of variance to determine variations between and within the subjects' perceived leadership effectiveness with regard to their age group. The findings revealed existence of significant variations in their perceptions of using the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness ($F = 4.02$ and $p = 0.047 < 0.05$) as well as their perceptions of using the participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness ($F = 4.84$ and $p = 0.009 < 0.05$). These significant variations are evidence of possible differences between the perceptions of subjects with regard to their age group. Therefore, a post hoc test of comparison was necessary to determine the extent to which the three age groups were different in their perceptions of different leadership components. Based on the rationale indicated in the previous chapter, the Scheffe' test of comparison was selected to examine this part of the null hypothesis.

Table 15. Test of Significant Differences between the Four Components of Leadership Effectiveness of the Participating Deans Based on Their Age group

Leadership Effectiveness		Variations		Test Results	
		SS	MS	F	p
Telling/Directing	Between Groups	8.68	4.34		
	Within Groups	255.38	1.08	4.02*	0.047
	Total Variation	264.06			
Selling/Coaching	Between Groups	6.63	3.31		
	Within Groups	328.38	1.39	2.39	0.012
	Total Variation	335.00			
Participating/Supporting	Between Groups	11.96	5.98		
	Within Groups	292.93	1.24	4.84*	0.009
	Total Variation	304.90			
Delegating/Monitoring	Between Groups	0.52	0.26		
	Within Groups	222.81	0.94	0.28	0.759
	Total Variation	223.33			

Note 1: Degrees of freedom: Between Groups = 2, Within Groups = 237, Total = 239.
Note 2: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores ($p < 0.05$).

Tables 16 and 17 present the resulting statistical test performed through the use of the Scheffe' post hoc comparison. As may be seen in these tables, the mean difference between the perceptions of the subjects who were under 40 years of age perceived the use of telling/directing to be more effective as compared to the perceptions of those who were between 40 to 50 years of age ($M_1 - M_2 = 2.17 - 1.69 = +0.48$ and $p = 0.045 < 0.05$). This indicates the younger subjects are more in favor of the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their middle age counterparts. The resulting statistical test also indicates that the subjects under 40 years of age perceived the use of participating/supporting to be more effective as compared to the perceptions of those who were between 40 to 50 years of age ($M_1 - M_2 = 4.44 - 4.00 = +0.44$ and $p = 0.048 < 0.05$) and the perceptions of those who were over 50 years of age ($M_1 - M_2 = 4.44 - 3.76 = +0.68$ and $p = 0.009 < 0.05$). An interpretation of these findings is that the younger the subjects are, the more likely they are in favor of the participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness. Overall, the null hypothesis was rejected for only the aforementioned comparisons and supported for the remaining comparisons.

Table 16. A Descriptive Comparison of the Four Components of Leadership
Effectiveness of the Participating Deans with Regard to Their Age Group

Leadership Effectiveness	Under 40 (n = 36)		40-50 (n = 115)		Over 50 (n = 89)	
	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
Telling/Directing	1.69	1.04	2.17	1.13	2.07	0.91
Selling/Coaching	4.28	0.70	4.09	1.42	4.45	0.97
Participating/Supporting	4.44	0.73	4.00	1.22	3.76	1.09
Delegating/Monitoring	1.58	0.73	1.65	0.96	1.72	1.06

Table 17. The Scheffe' Pair-wise Comparison of Leadership
Effectiveness of the Participating Deans by Their Age Group

Leadership Effectiveness	Pair-wise Comparison		MD	SE	p
Telling/Directing	Under 40	40-50	- 0.48*	0.20	0.045
		Over 50	- 0.37	0.21	0.196
	40-50	Under 40	+0.48*	0.20	0.045
		Over 50	+0.11	0.15	0.770
	Over 50	Under 40	+0.37	0.21	0.196
		40-50	- 0.11	0.15	0.770
Selling/Coaching	Under 40	40-50	+0.19	0.23	0.698
		Over 50	- 0.17	0.23	0.762
	40-50	Under 40	- 0.19	0.23	0.698
		Over 50	- 0.36	0.17	0.095
	Over 50	Under 40	+0.17	0.23	0.762
		40-50	+0.36	0.17	0.095
Participating/Supporting	Under 40	40-50	+0.44*	0.21	0.048
		Over 50	+0.68*	0.22	0.009
	40-50	Under 40	- 0.44*	0.21	0.048
		Over 50	+0.24	0.16	0.325
	Over 50	Under 40	- 0.68*	0.22	0.009
		40-50	- 0.24	0.16	0.325
Delegating/Monitoring	Under 40	40-50	- 0.07	0.19	0.933
		Over 50	- 0.14	0.19	0.778
	40-50	Under 40	+0.07	0.19	0.933
		Over 50	- 0.07	0.14	0.887
	Over 50	Under 40	+0.14	0.19	0.778
		40-50	+0. 07	0.14	0.887

Note 1: Coding: MA = Mean Difference, SE = Standard Error, p = Test of Significance
Note 2: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores (p < 0.05).

Table 18 presents the resulting one-way analysis of variance to determine variations between and within the subjects' perceived leadership effectiveness with regard to their ethnic/racial background. The statistical test revealed existence of significant variations in their perceptions of using the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness (F = 5.68 and p = 0.004 < 0.05) as well as their perceptions of using the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness (F = 7.31 and p = 0.001 < 0.05). These significant variations are evidence of possible differences between the perceptions of subjects with regard to their ethnic/racial background.

Table 18. Test of Significant Differences between the Four Components of Leadership Effectiveness of the Participating Deans Based on Their Ethnic/Racial Background

Leadership Effectiveness		Variations		Test Results	
		SS	MS	F	p
Telling/Directing	Between Groups	3.42	1.71		
	Within Groups	260.64	1.10	1.56	0.213
	Total Variation	264.06			
Selling/Coaching	Between Groups	15.33	7.67		
	Within Groups	319.67	1.35	5.68*	0.004
	Total Variation	335.00			
Participating/Supporting	Between Groups	3.48	1.74		
	Within Groups	301.42	1.27	1.37	0.257
	Total Variation	304.9			
Delegating/Monitoring	Between Groups	12.98	6.49		
	Within Groups	210.36	0.89	7.31*	0.001
	Total Variation	223.33			

Note 1: Degrees of freedom: Between Groups = 2, Within Groups = 237, Total = 239.
Note 2: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores (p < 0.05).

Tables 19 and 20 present the resulting statistical test performed through the use of the Scheffe' post hoc comparison. Of the total 240 graduate school deans who participated in this study, 26 (or 10.8%) were African-American, 185 (or 77.1%) were White/Caucasian, and the remaining 29 (or 12.1%) were from among all other ethnic and racial groups. The mean difference between the perceptions of White/Caucasian and African-American subjects indicates that the first group were more in favor of using the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to the second group ($M_1 - M_2 = 4.38 - 3.62 = +0.76$ and $p = 0.008 < 0.05$). The resulting statistical test also indicates that African-Americans were more in favor of the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their White/Caucasian counterparts ($M_1 - M_2 = 2.04 - 1.54 = +0.50$ and $p = 0.043 < 0.05$). Other ethnic/racial groups were also more in favor of approaching delegating/monitoring leadership effectiveness as compared to their White/Caucasian subjects ($M_1 - M_2 = 2.14 - 1.54 = +0.60$ and $p = 0.007 < 0.05$). Overall, the null hypothesis was rejected for only the aforementioned comparisons and supported for the remaining comparisons.

Table 19. A Descriptive Comparison of the Four Components of Leadership Effectiveness of the Participating Deans by Their Ethnic/Racial Background

Leadership Effectiveness	African-American		White/Caucasian		Other Groups	
	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.	MEAN	S.D.
Telling/Directing	2.35	0.85	2.00	1.07	2.21	1.08
Selling/Coaching	3.62	1.36	4.38	1.15	4.00	1.04
Participating/Supporting	4.00	1.67	4.03	1.08	3.66	0.77
Delegating/Monitoring	2.04	0.66	1.54	0.98	2.14	0.92

African-American (n = 26)   White/Caucasian (n = 185)   All others (n = 29)

Table 20. The Scheffe' Pair-wise Comparison of Leadership
Effectiveness of the Participating Deans by Their Ethnic/Racial Background

Leadership Effectiveness	Pair-wise Comparison		MD	SE	p
Telling/Directing	African-American	White/Caucasian	+0.35	0.22	0.291
		Other Groups	+0.14	0.28	0.886
	White/Caucasian	African-American	- 0.35	0.22	0.291
		Other Groups	- 0.21	0.21	0.615
	Other Groups	African-American	- 0.14	0.28	0.886
		White/Caucasian	+0.21	0.21	0.615
Selling/Coaching	African-American	White/Caucasian	- 0.76*	0.24	0.008
		Other Groups	- 0.38	0.31	0.473
	White/Caucasian	African-American	+0.76*	0.24	0.008
		Other Groups	+0.38	0.23	0.266
	Other Groups	African-American	+0.38	0.31	0.473
		White/Caucasian	- 0.38	0.23	0.266
Participating/Supporting	African-American	White/Caucasian	- 0.02	0.24	0.993
		Other Groups	+0.34	0.31	0.528
	White/Caucasian	African-American	+0.02	0.24	0.993
		Other Groups	+0.37	0.23	0.258
	Other Groups	African-American	- 0.34	0.31	0.528
		White/Caucasian	- 0.37	0.23	0.258
Delegating/Monitoring	African-American	White/Caucasian	+0.50*	0.20	0.043
		Other Groups	- 0.09	0.25	0.926
	White/Caucasian	African-American	- 0.50*	0.20	0.043
		Other Groups	- 0.60*	0.19	0.007
	Other Groups	African-American	+0.09	0.25	0.926
		White/Caucasian	+0.60*	0.19	0.007

Note 1: Coding: MA = Mean Difference, SE = Standard Error, p = Test of Significance
Note 2: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores ($p < 0.05$).

Testing the Fourth Research Hypothesis

A combination of certain leadership styles and selected personal and professional characteristics of the academic deans of graduate schools of education are significantly correlated with their leadership effectiveness.

Null Hypothesis 4

Leadership effectiveness of the academic deans of graduate schools of education is not significantly correlated with a combination of their leadership styles, and their personal and professional characteristics.

Test Results. This final research hypothesis was tested through the use of stepwise multiple regression analysis to include leadership effectiveness as the major dependent variable (or criterion) and personal and professional factors as the independent variables (or predictors). Professional factors involved in this regression analysis are the participating deans' years of experience in their current position, their years of teaching experience, and whether they are currently serving a public institution or a private institution. Personal factors involved in this regression analysis are the participating deans' gender, age group, and ethnic/racial background.

Table 21 presents stepwise multiple regression analysis using the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness as the dependent variable. Of the total independent variables involved in the model, four variables entered in the regression equation. The model included the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness as the criterion variable. In the first step, teaching experience was entered in the equation as a significant predictor ($F = 14.62$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). The second step included teaching experience and years in the current position operating jointly as a set of significant predictors ($F = 14.43$ and $p = 0.001 < 0.05$). The third step included teaching experience,

years in the current position, and transformational leadership style operating jointly as another set of significant predictors (F = 15.03 and p = 0.000 < 0.05). Finally, the fourth step included teaching experience, years in the current position, transformational leadership style, and gender operating jointly as another group of significant predictors (F = 13.96 and p = 0.002 < 0.05). Based on these findings, teaching experience of the participating graduate school deans had the highest degree of contribution to the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness, followed in order by years in the current position, transformational leadership style, and gender.

Table 21. Stepwise Regression: Predictors of Effective Telling/Directing Leadership

Leadership Effectiveness (Telling/Directing)		Variations			Test Results	
		SS	df	MS	F	p
Step 1: Teaching Experience	Regression	15.28	1	15.28	14.62*	0.000
	Residual	248.78	238	1.05		
	Total	264.05	239			
Step 2: Teaching Experience and Years in Current Position	Regression	28.66	2	14.33	14.43*	0.001
	Residual	235.41	237	0.99		
	Total	264.06	239			
Step 3: Teaching Experience Years in Current Position Transformational Style	Regression	42.36	3	14.12	15.03*	0.000
	Residual	221.70	236	0.94		
	Total	264.06	239			
Step 4: Teaching Experience Years in Current Position Transformational Style Gender	Regression	50.70	4	12.67	13.96*	0.002
	Residual	213.37	235	0.91		
	Total	264.06	239			

Note: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores (p < 0.05).

Table 22 provides certain statistics to determine the extent to which each factor as well as all possible combinations of factors contributing to the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness. In this table, $R^2 = 0.058$ indicates an approximately 5.8% variation in the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience in the regression equation as a contributing factor ($F = 14.62$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$); $R^2 = 0.109$ is an indicative of an approximately 10.9% variation in the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience and years in the current position in the regression equation as a set of contributing factors operating jointly ($F = 13.47$ and $p = 0.002 < 0.05$); $R^2 = 0.160$ is demonstrating an approximately 16.0% variation in the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience, years in the current position, and transformational leadership style in the regression equation as another set of contributing factors operating jointly ($F = 14.59$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$); and $R^2 = 0.192$ indicates an approximately 19.2% variation in the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience, years in the current position, transformational leadership style, and gender in the regression equation as whole set of contributing factors operating jointly ($F = 9.18$ and $p = 0.003 < 0.05$). The values of R^2 change in the following table can be interpreted as an approximately 5.8% variation in the criterion variable resulting from entering a single predictor, an extra 5.1% variation as a result of entering the second predictor, an additional 5.1% variation as a result of entering the third predictor; and an extra 3.2% variation as a result of entering the fourth predictor. The total amount of R^2 changes indicates a 19.2% variation in the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness

which represents the same amount of variation that has occurred in the final step of entering the entire contributing factors.

Table 22.   Stepwise Regression Analysis: Selected Statistics Revealing a
Combination of Contributing Factors to the Telling/Directing Component of Leadership

Stepwise Factors	Related Statistics			Test Results	
	R	R^2	R^2 Changes	F	p
Step 1: A single factor	0.241	0.058	0.058	14.62*	0.000
Step 2: Combined 2 factors	0.329	0.109	0.051	13.47*	0.002
Step 3: Combined 3 factors	0.401	0.160	0.051	14.59*	0.000
Step 4: Combined 4 factors	0.438	0.192	0.032	9.18*	0.003

Step 1: Teaching Experience
Step 2: Teaching Experience and Years in Current Position
Step 3: Teaching Experience, Years in Current Position, and Transformational Style
Step 4: Teaching Experience, Years in Current Position, Transformational Style, Gender
Note: An asterisk denotes a significant correlation between pairs of variables ($p < 0.05$).

Table 23 presents stepwise multiple regression analysis using the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness as the dependent variable and leadership style, and personal and professional factors as the independent variables (or predictors). Of the total independent variables involved in the model, four variables entered in the regression equation. The model included the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness as the criterion variable. In the first step, teaching experience was entered in the equation as a significant predictor ($F = 28.16$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). The second step included teaching experience and transactional leadership style operating jointly as a set of significant predictors ($F = 23.73$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). The third step included teaching experience, transactional leadership style, and type of institution operating jointly as another set of significant predictors ($F = 21.61$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). Finally, the fourth

step included teaching experience, transactional leadership style, type of institution, and years in the current position operating jointly as another group of significant predictors (F = 17.46 and p = 0.000 < 0.05). Based on these findings, teaching experience of the participating graduate school deans had the highest contribution to the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness, followed in order by transactional leadership style, type of institution (public versus private), and years in the current position.

Table 23. Stepwise Regression: Predictors of Effective Selling/Coaching Leadership

Leadership Effectiveness (Selling/Coaching)		Variations			Test Results	
		SS	df	MS	F	p
Step 1: Teaching Experience	Regression	35.44	1	35.44		
	Residual	299.56	238	1.26	28.16*	0.000
	Total	335.00	239			
Step 2: Teaching Experience and Transactional Style	Regression	55.89	2	27.95		
	Residual	279.11	237	1.18	23.73*	0.000
	Total	335.00	239			
Step 3: Teaching Experience Transactional Style Type of Institution	Regression	72.19	3	24.06		
	Residual	262.81	236	1.12	21.61*	0.000
	Total	335.00	239			
Step 4: Teaching Experience Transactional Style Type of Institution Years in Current Position	Regression	26.76	4	19.19		
	Residual	258.24	235	1.10	17.46*	0.000
	Total	335.00	239			

Note: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores (p < 0.05).

Table 24 provides certain statistics to determine the extent to which each factor as well as all possible combinations of factors, contributes to the selling/coaching

component of leadership effectiveness. In this table, $R^2 = 0.106$ indicates an approximately 10.6% variation in the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience in the regression equation as a contributing factor (F = 28.16 and p = 0.000 < 0.05); $R^2 = 0.167$ is an indicative of an approximately 16.7% variation in the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience and transactional leadership style in the regression equation as a set of contributing factors operating jointly (F = 17.37 and p = 0.000 < 0.05); $R^2 = 0.215$ is demonstrating an approximately 21.5% variation in the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience, transactional leadership style, and type of institution in the regression equation as another set of contributing factors operating jointly (F = 14.64 and p = 0.000 < 0.05); and $R^2 = 0.229$ indicates an approximately 22.9% variation in the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering teaching experience, transactional leadership style, type of institution, and years in the current position in the regression equation as whole set of contributing factors operating jointly (F = 4.16 and p = 0.043 < 0.05). The values of R^2 change in the following table can be interpreted as an approximately 10.6% variation in the criterion variable (the selling/coaching approaches of the participating graduate school deans) resulting from entering a single predictor, an extra 6.1% variation as a result of entering the second predictor, an additional 4.8% variation as a result of entering the third predictor; and an extra 1.4% variation as a result of entering the fourth predictor. The total amount of R^2 changes is a 22.9% variation which is the same amount of variation occurred in the final step of entering the entire contributing factors (as a result of teaching experience, transactional style, type of institution, and years in position operating jointly).

Table 24. Stepwise Regression Analysis: Selected Statistics Revealing a
Combination of Contributing Factors to the Selling/Coaching Component of Leadership

Stepwise Factors	Related Statistics			Test Results	
	R	R^2	R^2 Changes	F	p
Step 1: A single factor	0.325	0.106	0.106	28.16*	0.000
Step 2: Combined 2 factors	0.408	0.167	0.061	17.37*	0.000
Step 3: Combined 3 factors	0.464	0.215	0.048	14.64*	0.000
Step 4: Combined 4 factors	0.479	0.229	0.014	4.16*	0.043

Step 1: Teaching Experience
Step 2: Teaching Experience and Transactional Style
Step 3: Teaching Experience, Transactional Style, and Type of Institution
Step 4: Teaching Experience, Transactional Style, Type of Institution, Years in Position
Note: An asterisk denotes a significant correlation between pairs of variables ($p < 0.05$).

Table 25 presents stepwise multiple regression analysis using the

participating/supporting component of leadership effectiveness as the dependent variable

and leadership style, and personal and professional factors as the independent variables

(or predictors). Of the total independent variables involved in the model, only two

variables entered in the regression equation. The model included the participating/

supporting component of leadership effectiveness as the criterion variable. In the first

step, years in the current position was entered in the equation as a significant predictor (F

= 9.40 and p = 0.002 < 0.05). The second step included years in the current position and

transformational leadership style operating jointly as a set of significant predictors (F =

9.37 and p = 0.003 < 0.05). Based on these findings, years in the current position

appeared to have the highest degree of contribution to the participating/supporting

approaches of the graduate school deans to leadership effectiveness followed by their

transformational leadership style.

Table 25. Stepwise Regression Analysis: Predictors of Effective Participating Leadership

Leadership Effectiveness (Participating/Supporting)		Variations			Test Results	
		SS	df	MS	F	p
Step 1: Years in Current Position	Regression	11.58	1	11.28	9.40*	0.002
	Residual	293.31	238	1.23		
	Total	304.90	239			
Step 2: Years in Current Position Transformational Style	Regression	22.35	2	11.18	9.37*	0.003
	Residual	282.55	237	1.19		
	Total	304.90	239			

Note: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores ($p < 0.05$).

Table 26 provides certain statistics to determine the extent to which each factor as well as all possible combination of factors may contribute to the participating/supporting component of leadership effectiveness. In this table, $R^2 = 0.038$ indicates an approximately 3.8% variation in the participating/supporting component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering years in the current position in the regression equation as a contributing factor ($F = 9.40$ and $p = 0.002 < 0.05$); and $R^2 = 0.073$ is an indicative of an approximately 7.3% variation in the participating/supporting component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering years in the current position and transformational leadership style in the regression equation as a set of contributing factors operating jointly ($F = 9.03$ and $p = 0.003 < 0.05$). The values of R^2 change in the following table can be interpreted as an approximately 3.8% variation in the criterion variable resulting from entering a single predictor (in this case a dean's years of experience in the current position); and an extra 3.5% variation as a result of entering the second predictor (in this case a dean's transformational leadership style).

Table 26. Stepwise Regression Analysis: Selected Statistics Revealing a
Combination of Contributing Factors to the Participating Component of Leadership

Stepwise Factors	Related Statistics			Test Results	
	R	R^2	R^2 Changes	F	p
Step 1: A single factor	0.195	0.038	0.038	9.40*	0.002
Step 2: Combined 2 factors	0.271	0.073	0.035	9.03*	0.003

Step 1: Years in Current Position
Step 2: Years in Current Position and Transformational Style
Note: An asterisk denotes a significant correlation between pairs of variables (p < 0.05).

Table 27 presents a multiple regression analysis using the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness as the dependent variable and leadership style, and personal and professional factors as the independent variables (or predictors). Of the total independent variables involved in the model, three variables entered in the regression equation. The model included the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness as the criterion variable. In the first step, transactional leadership style was entered in the equation as a significant predictor (F = 17.20 and p = 0.000 < 0.05). The second step included transactional leadership style and type of institution operating jointly as a set of significant predictors (F = 14.94 and p = 0.001 < 0.05). Finally, the third step included transactional leadership style, type of institution, and years in the current position operating jointly as another set of significant predictors of the delegating component of leadership effectiveness (F = 11.81 and p = 0.002 < 0.05). Based on these findings, transactional leadership style of the participating graduate school deans had the highest degree of contribution to the delegating/monitoring approaches of their leadership effectiveness, followed in order by the type of institution they serve (public versus private), and years of experience in their current position.

124

Table 27. Stepwise Regression Analysis: Predictors of Effective Delegating Leadership

Leadership Effectiveness (Delegating/Monitoring)		Variations			Test Results	
		SS	df	MS	F	p
Step 1: Transactional Style	Regression	15.05	1	15.05		
	Residual	208.28	238	0.88	17.20*	0.000
	Total	223.33	239			
Step 2: Transactional Style Type of Institution	Regression	25.00	2	12.50		
	Residual	198.34	237	0.84	14.94*	0.001
	Total	223.33	239			
Step 3: Transactional Style Type of Institution Years in Current Position	Regression	29.16	3	9.72		
	Residual	194.18	236	0.82	11.81*	0.002
	Total	223.33	239			

Note: An asterisk denotes a statistically significant variation of mean scores ($p < 0.05$).

Table 28 provides certain statistics to determine the extent to which each factor as well as all possible combination of factors may contribute to the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness. In this table, $R^2 = 0.067$ indicates an approximately 6.7% variation in the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering transactional leadership style in the regression equation as a contributing factor ($F = 17.20$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$); $R^2 = 0.112$ is an indicative of an approximately 11.2% variation in the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness as a result of entering transactional leadership style and type of institution in the regression equation as a set of contributing factors operating jointly ($F = 11.89$ and $p = 0.001 < 0.05$); and $R^2 = 0.131$ is demonstrating an approximately 13.1% variation in the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness as a

result of entering transactional leadership style, type of institution, and years in the current position in the regression equation as another set of contributing factors operating jointly (F = 5.05 and p = 0.026 < 0.05). The values of R^2 change in the following table can be interpreted as an approximately 6.7% variation in the criterion variable resulting from entering a single predictor, an extra 4.5% variation as a result of entering the second predictor, an additional 1.9% variation as a result of entering the third predictor. The total amount of R^2 changes is a 13.1% variation which is the same amount of variation occurs in the final step of entering the entire contributing factors.

Table 28.   Stepwise Regression Analysis: Selected Statistics Revealing a Combination of Contributing Factors to the Delegating Component of Leadership

Stepwise Factors	Related Statistics			Test Results	
	R	R^2	R^2 Changes	F	p
Step 1: A single factor	0.260	0.067	0.067	17.20*	0.000
Step 2: Combined 2 factors	0.335	0.112	0.045	11.89*	0.001
Step 3: Combined 3 factors	0.361	0.131	0.019	5.05*	0.026

Step 1: Transactional Style
Step 2: Transactional Style and Type of Institution
Step 3: Transactional Style, Type of Institution, and Years in Current Position
Note: An asterisk denotes a significant correlation between pairs of variables (p < 0.05).

The total amount of R^2 changes in this table is a 36.1% variation in the delegating/monitoring approaches of the participating graduate deans to leadership effectiveness which is a relatively noticeable in terms of factors contributing to leadership effectiveness. This value represents the amount of variation which occurred in the final step of entering the entire contributing factors as a result of entering transactional leadership style, the type of institution, and years in current position operating jointly.

126

Summary

The data collected for the study was analyzed in this chapter through the use of appropriate qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative analysis of the data was achieved to provide answers to the first two research questions by analyzing the responses of the participating deans to the open-ended items of the survey instrument. The open-ended items were included in the questionnaire in order to determine the perceptions of the participating deans regarding (a) the type of obstacles hindering their job effectiveness; and (b) the type of strategies they usually implement to overcome the obstacles. The most frequently stated obstacles were budget restrictions, imbalanced authority versus responsibility, and challenges with a bureaucratic system. A solution recommended by the academic deans to help overcome some obstacles included making arrangements to discuss the problem of budgetary restrictions with appropriate authority figures and try to convince them of the extent to which such restrictions have negative impacts on the overall quality of education across the board.

As a result of examining the third research question through descriptive statistics, there was a common agreement among graduate school deans regarding the importance of a number of factors contributing to their leadership effectiveness. Such factors included demonstrating honest and ethical behavior, resolving conflicts in a professional manner, taking responsibility for decisions, creating a mutual trust atmosphere.

The research hypotheses were tested through inferential analyses at the 0.05 level of significance, and a number of significant findings were derived from the test results. Positive and statistically significant correlations were found between (a) transactional leadership style with the telling/directing and the delegating/monitoring components of leadership effectiveness, and (b) transformational leadership style with the

127

selling/coaching and participating/supporting components of leadership effectiveness. But, negative and statistically significant correlations were found between (a) transformational leadership style with the telling/directing and delegating/monitoring components of leadership effectiveness, and (b) transactional leadership style with the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness. Positive and statistically significant relationships were found between years of experience in current positions and (a) the use of selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness; and (b) the use of participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness. But, there were negative and still statistically significant relationships between years of experience in current positions and (a) the use of telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness; and (b) the use of delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness. Male academic deans tend to be more in favor of the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their female counterparts. Younger academic deans were found to be more in favor of the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their middle age counterparts. White/Caucasians were found to be more likely to use the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their African-American counterparts.

Overall, the findings revealed significant variations in leadership effectiveness of the participating academic deans as a result of combining their leadership styles, their years of experience as a dean, their years of teaching experience, the type of institutions they are currently serving, as well as a number of personal factors including age, gender, and ethnic/racial background. A summary of the study as well as general conclusions and recommendations based on these findings are presented in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This final chapter presents a summary of the study, conclusions and implications derived from the study's findings, recommendations based on the conclusions, suggestions for future research, as well as the researcher's concluding remarks.

Summary of the Study

Although there are numerous studies related to leadership effectiveness in higher education institutions, the literature is very limited in identifying certain factors that could specifically be associated with leadership effectiveness in these institutions. Such factors include various leadership styles as well as certain personal and professional characteristics of individuals involved in leadership of higher education institutions. It would, therefore, seem appropriate to examine what type of leadership style may best result in leadership effectiveness of higher education institutions. It would also seem appropriate to determine which personal and professional characteristics of higher education leaders contribute to their leadership effectiveness.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine to what extent certain leadership styles and selected personal and professional characteristics of academic deans of graduate schools of education are associated with their leadership effectiveness. The study was also designed to seek perceptions of the participating deans regarding: (a) the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness; (b) the strategies they pursue to overcome such hindering obstacles; and (c) the factors they perceive to be the most important contributors to their leadership effectiveness.

The data for the study was collected by mailing a survey to 800 academic deans of graduate schools of education throughout the United States. Each survey consisted of five

parts to collect necessary data for examining the research questions and testing the research hypotheses. The first part included eight items related to the respondents' personal and professional information. The second part consisted of ten factors to be rated by the survey participants as the extent to which they perceive each factor is important in their leadership effectiveness. The third part included a copy of the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument comprised of twelve situational leadership and developed by Hersey and Blanchard (2006) based on its four major components that are defined as follows: (1) telling/directing (refers to high task with low relationship behavior of an individual); (2) selling/coaching (refers to high task with high relationship behavior of an individual); (3) participating/ supporting (refers to low task with high relationship behavior of an individual); and (4) delegating/monitoring (refers to low task with low relationship behavior of an individual). Part four of the survey included a copy of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) comprised of 45 items and developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) on the basis of its two major components -- transformational and transactional leadership styles. The final part of the survey included two open-ended questions asking the survey participants (a) to list the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness, and (b) to suggest strategies to overcome the obstacles. The survey also included a cover letter describing the purpose of the study and promising the anonymity of the respondents and confidentiality of their responses. The survey participants were also encouraged to complete the survey and return it to the investigator in a pre-paid postage stamped and pre-addressed envelope provided to them. As an option to encourage more participation, they were asked if they would like to receive a profile of their leadership style as well as a profile of their leadership effectiveness, they may provide a preferred mailing address to the investigator. Finally,

after three follow-up attempts, the researcher was able to collect 240 completed surveys which were necessary to satisfy the sample size requirements of the multiple regression analysis for testing the research hypotheses involved in the study.

A qualitative method of analysis was employed to examine the first two research question involved in this study. Responses of the survey participants to the open-ended items of the questionnaire were analyzed to examine these research questions. The open-ended items were included in the questionnaire in order to determine the perceptions of the participating deans regarding (a) the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness; and (b) how do they manage to overcome these obstacles. In analyzing each item, the responses were coded and categorized based on the type and frequency of similar responses, for a more systematic approach and appropriate interpretation. Interpretation of the responses to each item was based on the most interesting and salient comments as well as their frequency of occurrence.

Quantitative analysis of the data was accomplished through the use of descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive analysis of the data was achieved by examining the third research question through the use of certain measures of central tendency (i.e., mean) and dispersion (i.e., standard deviation). Inferential analysis of the data was accomplished by testing the null hypotheses associated with the four research hypotheses. The first research hypothesis was examined through the Pearson correlation technique along with its test of significance. The second research hypothesis was tested using (a) the t-test for two independent means to determine whether significant differences exist between leadership effectiveness of those academic deans who are currently serving public institutions and their counterparts who are currently serving private institutions; and (b) the Pearson correlation technique along with its test of

significance to determine whether significant relationships exist between leadership

effectiveness of the academic deans and their years in the current position as well as their

years of teaching experiences. The third research hypothesis was tested using (a) the t-test

for two independent means to determine whether significant differences exist between

leadership effectiveness of male and female participating deans; and (b) the one-way

analysis of variance along with the Scheffe' post hoc test of comparison to determine

whether significant differences exist between leadership effectiveness of the academic

deans in comparison of their age groups as well as their ethnic/racial background. The

final research hypothesis was tested through the use of stepwise multiple regression

analysis to determine the extent to which certain leadership styles as well as certain

personal and professional factors are contributing to leadership effectiveness of the

academic deans. All four hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

A summary of the most salient findings derived from examining the research

questions and testing the research hypotheses is listed as follows:

1. One of the most frequently stated obstacles hindering the job effectiveness of

the academic deans was budget restrictions and lack of sufficient funds to make

appropriate budgetary decisions. A suggested solution by the academic deans to this type

of obstacle was to make arrangements to discuss the problem of budgetary restrictions

with appropriate authority and try to convince them of the extent to which such

restrictions have negative impacts on the overall quality of education across the board.

2. Demonstrating honest and ethical behavior was found by the participating

deans as one of the most important factors contributing to their leadership effectiveness

followed in order by taking responsibility for decisions and actions; creating a mutual

trust atmosphere; resolving conflicts in a professional manner; fostering good

relationships with work associates; creating a motivational work environment; communicating expectations to staff and faculty; making decisions appropriately and promptly; involving designated staff and faculty in planning; and handling efficient management of stress factors.

3. Significant relationships were found between leadership styles of the participating deans and their ratings assigned to the four components of leadership effectiveness. Positive and statistically significant correlations were found between the following pairs of leadership style and leadership effectiveness: (a) transactional leadership style with the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness; (b) transformational leadership style with the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness; (c) transformational leadership style with the participating/supporting component of leadership effectiveness; and (d) transactional leadership style with the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness. Negative and statistically significant correlations were found between the following pairs of leadership style and leadership effectiveness: (a) transformational leadership style with the telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness; (b) transactional leadership style with the selling/coaching component of leadership effectiveness; and (c) transformational leadership style with the delegating/monitoring component of leadership effectiveness.

4. Those academic deans who were serving public institutions have found themselves to be more effective by using the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness, whereas those who were serving private institutions have found themselves to be more effective in using the selling/coaching approaches to leadership.

5. Positive and statistically significant correlations were found between the academic deans' years of experience in their current positions as well as their years of

133

teaching experience with regard to (a) their use of selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness; and (b) their use of participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness. However, negative and statistically significant correlations were found between the academic deans' years of experience in their current position as well as their years of teaching experience with regard to (a) their use of selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness; and (b) their use of participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness. These findings indicate that the academic deans with more years of experience in their current position as well as those with more years of teaching experience are more likely to approach the selling/coaching and the participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness.

6. Negative but still significant relationships were found between the deans' years of experience in their current position as well as their years of teaching experience with regard to (a) their use of telling/directing component of leadership effectiveness; and (b) their use of delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness. These findings indicate that academic deans with more years of experience in their current position as well as those with more years of teaching experience are less likely to approach the telling/directing and delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership.

7. Significant differences were found between male and female academic deans in their perceptions of (a) telling/directing approaches of leadership effectiveness; and (b) participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness. These findings indicate that while both groups were equally in favor of the delegating/monitoring and the selling/coaching and approaches to leadership, males were more in favor of the telling/directing approaches to leadership and are less in favor of the participating/ supporting approaches to leadership as compared to those of their female counterparts.

8. The younger academic deans were more in favor of the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their middle age counterparts. The younger academic deans were also more in favor of participative approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their counterparts from other groups.

9. White/Caucasian academic deans were found to be more in favor of using the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their African-American counterparts. African-American academic deans were more in favor of the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their White/Caucasian counterparts. Other ethnic and racial groups of academic deans were also more in favor of the delegating/monitory approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their White/Caucasian counterparts.

10. Teaching experience of the participating academic deans was found to have the highest degree of contribution to the telling/selling approaches to their leadership effectiveness, followed in order by the number of years they have served in the current position, their transformational leadership style, and their gender group. The best predictors of the academic deans' selling/coaching leadership effectiveness were found to be their years of teaching experience, followed in order by their transformational leadership style, the type of institution they serve, and the number of years they have served in the current position. Years of teaching experience and the number of years academic deans served in the current position were found to be the best predictors of their participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness. In addition, the best predictors of the academic deans' delegating/monitoring leadership effectiveness were found to be their transformational leadership style, followed in order by the type of institution they serve, and the number of years they have been in their current position.

Taken as a whole, the findings of this study revealed a number of obstacles hindering the job effectiveness of the participating deans which in their point of view required appropriate decisions on the part of higher level administrators to overcome the obstacles. The findings also revealed a number of factors as contributors to leadership effectiveness of the participating deans. The findings further revealed significant differences in the perceptions of the participating academic deans with regard to a number of contributing factors to their leadership effectiveness. These factors included their leadership styles, their years of experience as a dean, their years of teaching experience, the type of institutions they are currently serving, as well as a number of personal factors including age, gender, and ethnic/racial background.

General Conclusions and Implications

The following conclusions and implications were drawn from examining the research questions and testing the research hypotheses involved in this study.

1. Based on the findings derived from the first research question, it can be concluded that a majority of the graduate school deans are typically faced with a number of obstacles that their solutions are not within the boundary of their authority. Such obstacles include budget restrictions and lack of sufficient funds to make appropriate budgetary decisions; imbalanced authority versus responsibility due to lack of adequate resources and lack of sufficient time to manage many overwhelming responsibilities with limited authority; disagreement with the direction taken by upper level administration; being challenged by both lower and upper level administration for making unpopular decisions; being forced to implement some old and inappropriate policies and procedures that are not in the best interest of the institution; existence of some role conflicts among job description of employees at different levels of administration; existence of a

bureaucratic system which is not necessary most of the time but usually results in waste of time and effort by staff and faculty as well; pressure from hierarchies to implement new strategies that are not beneficial to the interest of institution; facing the problems with respective departments that could have been resolved prior to reaching to the dean's office; and deferred maintenance of school facilities which requires adequate decisions by appointed officials at the university level.

2. By evaluating the responses of the participating deans to the second research question, it can be concluded that most of the obstacles hindering their job effectiveness are implicitly related to the policies and procedures at the higher levels of administration. It can also be concluded that those academic deans who have reported such obstacles cannot possibly function at their best capacities unless the higher level administrators review and modify their policies and procedures to prevent some of the obstacles facing the academic deans at the school level.

3. Based on the findings of the third research question, it can be concluded that almost all graduate school deans agreed upon the importance of a number of factors contributing to their leadership effectiveness. Such factors in the order of importance included demonstrating honest and ethical behavior; taking responsibility for decisions and actions; creating a mutual trust atmosphere; resolving conflicts in a professional manner; fostering good relationships with work associates; creating a motivational work environment; communicating expectations to staff and faculty; making decisions appropriately and promptly; involving designated staff and faculty in planning; and handling efficient management of stress factors.

4. By examining the first research hypothesis, it can be concluded that since the transformational leadership style of graduate school of education deans is positively and

significantly correlated with the selling/coaching and participating/supporting approaches to their leadership, it has, therefore, a positive impact upon their job effectiveness. This indicates that those educational leaders who often use the transformational leadership style are more likely to be successful in implementation of the selling/coaching and participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness.

5. As a result of testing the second research hypothesis, it can be concluded that (a) graduate school of education academic deans serving public institutions are more likely to perform effectively by using the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness, whereas their counterparts in private institutions are more likely to perform effectively by using the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness; and (b) graduate school of education deans who have more years of experience in their current position as well as those who have more years of teaching experience are more likely to favor the selling/coaching and the participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness; while they are less likely to approach the delegating/monitoring and the telling/directing aspects of leadership effectiveness.

6. Several conclusions can be drawn from the results of testing the third research hypothesis as follows: (a) male academic deans are more likely to favor the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness and are less likely to favor the participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their female counterparts; (b) younger academic deans are more likely to favor the telling/directing approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their middle age counterparts; (c) younger academic deans are more likely to favor the participating/supporting approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their counterparts from both middle age and older counterparts; (d) White/Caucasian deans are

more likely to favor the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their African-American counterparts; and (e) African-American and other minority groups of deans are more likely to favor the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness as compared to their White/Caucasian counterparts.

7. A number of conclusions can be drawn from the results of testing the final research hypothesis. From among the selected independent factors: (a) teaching experience of the academic deans has the highest degree of contribution to the telling/selling aspects of leadership effectiveness, followed in order by the number of years they have served in the current position, their transformational leadership style, and their gender group; (b) teaching experience of the academic deans has the highest degree of contribution to the selling/coaching approaches to leadership effectiveness, followed in order by their transformational leadership style, the type of institution they serve, and the number of years they have served in the current position; (c) The number of years in current position has the highest degree of contribution to the participating/supporting approaches of the academic deans to leadership effectiveness, followed by using their transformational leadership style; and (d) the transactional leadership style of the academic deans has the highest degree of contribution to the delegating/monitoring approaches to leadership effectiveness, followed in order by the type of institution they serve (public or private), and the number of years in their current position.

<center>Recommendations</center>

Based on the findings derived from the study's research questions and research hypotheses, as well as the general conclusions and implications drawn from the findings, a number of recommendations may be particularly helpful to academic deans of graduate schools of education as well as to their higher level administrators.

1. Both the literature and the findings of this study affirm that there is a lack of balance between the responsibility and authority provided to graduate school of education deans in higher education institutions. In fact, there are many obstacles facing the daily routine leadership practices of academic deans that require immediate action with a higher level of authority if leadership at the school level needs to be successful. Academic deans are, therefore, recommended to negotiate additional authority from their superiors to be able to overcome the problems hindering their job effectiveness.

2. Much of the research pertinent to leadership in higher education has emphasized a number of problems such as the lack of necessary educational resources, the lack of an appropriate budget necessary to handle the costs, and the lack of necessary trained faculty and staff as an obstacle hindering the higher education leadership. Academic deans are, therefore, recommended to establish policies and procedures at the school level in order to address these issues.

3. Based on the findings of this study, and in accordance with the literature review, in order to improve the quality of leadership in institutions of higher education, it is imperative for educational leaders to consider implementing a number of strategies which have been proven to improve the quality of leadership effectiveness. Such strategies include: (1) creating a pleasant atmosphere for building trust and confidence of staff and faculty; (2) demonstrating honest ethical behavior; (3) taking full responsibility for decisions and actions; (4) resolving conflicts in a professional manner; (5) fostering professional relationships with work associates; (6) properly communicating expectations to staff and faculty; (7) engaging designated staff and faculty in planning; (8) creating a motivational work environment; (9) making decisions appropriately and promptly demonstrating tolerance of people's differences and dealing with their issues fairly; (10)

acknowledging and recognizing staff and faculty for their contributions and performance; (11) handling efficient management of stress factors; and (12) continually seeking improvement in the quality of services.

4. As reflected in the literature, professional development and periodic training programs for faculty and staff are very important in improving the quality of education for all students. Therefore, it is recommended that academic deans establish professional development for faculty and staff. Individual differences among students are equally important and should be considered as a part of training programs designed for the professional development of the teaching faculty. Focus of attention should be directed to the new information technology and telecommunication training needs of the teaching faculty in order to provide students with the intellectual stimulation and necessary opportunities to develop new knowledge and skills, through networking facilities.

5. As reflected in the findings of this study, in order to overcome some challenging obstacles hindering academic deans' job effectiveness, a number of recommendations seem to be appropriate to help prevent and/or resolve such obstacles. They include: (a) making arrangements to discuss the problem of budgetary restrictions with appropriate authority and try to convince them of the extent to which such restrictions have negative impacts on the quality of education and to what extent are hindering your job effectiveness; (b) securing additional resources through appropriate proposals for grants and other types of fund raising approaches; (c) making arrangements to meet with hierarchies to discuss disagreements with ineffective policies and practices that are not in the interest of the institution as a whole; (d) before making any unpopular decisions, engaging as many individuals as possible to inform them about possible consequences; (e) implementing new and creative policies and procedures to help

improve the quality of leadership effectiveness; (f) reviewing and revising job descriptions of faculty and administrators to prevent any future role conflicts; (g) meeting with upper level administrators to discuss disadvantages of ineffective and inefficient procedures and to suggest some alternative innovative strategies; (h) challenging higher level authorities logically who try to impose strategies that are not in the interest of institution; (i) convening individual meetings with department chairpersons and provide them with appropriate delegation authority to help resolve many of the problems at the departmental level before they reach to dean's office; and (j) making arrangements to meet with appropriate authorities and to inform them about the actions necessary for maintenance of school facilities, especially in case of emergency.

6. Since almost all institutions of higher education in the United States have many international students from different educational and cultural backgrounds, they would need special attention to adjust themselves with the educational system of this country. The leadership in higher education institutions is, therefore, recommended to implement appropriate orientation strategies that are specifically designed to fulfill the special educational needs of international students.

Suggestions for Future Research

As is the case with the majority of the studies reviewed, this study has its own scope and limitations including the sample selection, the survey instrument, the data collection procedures, as well as the research design. Accordingly, the following suggestions may be considered worthwhile by future researchers who might be interested in conducting other possible studies related to the topic.

1. This study was limited to the perceptions of a selected sample of academic deans from among graduate schools of education throughout the United States. Interested

future investigators are encouraged to conduct a replication of the study to compare the perceptions of academic deans serving other graduate schools including business, engineering, law, and medical schools.

2. While the academic deans in this study were not aware of the most appropriate alternative in response to any of the twelve situational leadership questions, and also the survey instrument has its own strong validity and reliability, a question that needs to be addressed is to what extent they were accurate in their responses to each item of the survey. With this issue of concern in mind, a replication of this study is recommended to assess self-perceived leadership effectiveness of academic deans in institutions of higher education and compare it with the assessment of their performance by their superiors and by their subordinates to include faculty and other staff. Another replication of this study is also recommended to use alternative instruments for measuring leadership effectiveness and leadership styles of academic deans.

3. Certain personal and professional characteristics of the academic deans were included in this study to determine the extent to which they are correlated with their leadership effectiveness. Future researchers are recommended to investigate the extent to which a number of other factors are influential in leadership effectiveness of academic deans. Such factors may include the amount of budget allocated to each school, the size of student enrollment, the number of full-time and part-time faculty, as well as the subjects' marital status, educational background, parental education, family size, family income, and their previous leadership experiences. Future researchers are, therefore recommended to engage in developing more innovative and objective variables that can adequately measure leadership effectiveness.

4. As reflected in the findings of this study, most of the obstacles hindering academic deans can only be resolved at the higher levels of administration. Future investigators are, therefore, encouraged to conduct empirical studies involving colleges and university presidents to determine how they recommend handling the obstacles at the school level and to what extent are they willing to delegate some degree of authority to the academic deans in order to overcome some of the hindering obstacles facing academic deans and other administrative decision makers.

5. While relatively comprehensive in nature, the survey instrument developed for this study lacked a number of other important open-ended items to explore the reasons behind perceptions of the survey participants. Therefore, further research studies are recommended to include additional open-ended questions such as: What types of policies and procedures should be implemented in order to improve leadership effectiveness in higher education? To what extent would authority be delegated to respective department chairperson and other staff members? What type of advice can you recommend to other academic deans to help improve their leadership effectiveness? Would are the best and worst challenges deans have experienced during their services as an educational leader?

Concluding Remarks

The challenge for academe, more specifically leaders in academe, is to initiate and follow innovative leadership that can promote best practices and that can overcome unethical, failed and out-of-date policies of campus governance. In addition to knowledge and skill, a higher education leader must be armed with a number of qualifications including accountability, creativity, global thinking, decisiveness, trustworthiness, and most importantly the ability to implement ethical standards. To be effective, leaders in institutions of higher education need to demonstrate honest and proper ethical behavior,

to create an atmosphere of mutual trust, to communicate with charisma and effectiveness, to make and communicate decisions promptly, to take responsibility for decisions, to resolve conflicts with the goal for all to succeed, and to reward people for work well done. If colleges and universities in the United States are to raise standards and to improve the overall campus environment, they need to advance and improve their leadership practices for providing the quality of education their students deserve. Effectiveness of the college and university campuses is an emerging crisis -- a crisis which is directly related to failure or successful practices in certain areas of leadership. Obviously, a movement in competition for scarce resources and a decreased in the public's trust in higher education practices have resulted in demands for campuses to demonstrate their productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency. Leadership in higher education can be examined from the perspective of theories related to leadership and organizational frames. Therefore, an appropriate evaluation model for assessing and monitoring the effectiveness academic deans by faculty and administrative staff has been proven to be the best feedback for improving the quality of education in institutions of higher education. An effective academic leader should be able to negotiate the multicultural environment by fully recognizing diversity and difference while exercising leadership that unites all individuals toward a common goal. Overall, leadership in higher education institutions requires new directions to include more progressive, innovative, and creative strategies for a successful reformation of the educational environment.

References

References

Aaron, L.S. (2005). *Responsibilities and leadership styles of radiologic technology program directors: Implications for leadership development.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Louisiana State University.

Addison, E. P. (2006). The principles of leadership effectiveness in higher education. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Adrian, L. P. (2004). *Asian-American leaders in higher education: An exploration of a dynamic constructivist approach to leadership.* The Claremont Graduate University and San Diego State University.

Allen, T. K. (2004). *The relationship of the beliefs and characteristics of deans and student performance on the National Council Licensure Examination.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.

Al-Omari, A. A. (2005). *Leadership styles and adaptability of deans and department chairs at three public research universities.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Washington State University.

American Council on Education. (2000). *Taking stock: How Americans judge quality, affordability, and leadership at U.S. colleges and universities.* Washington, D.C.

America's Best Graduate Schools (2006). U.S. News and World Report. [Online]. Available. www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings.

Ancona, D., Kochan, T., Schully, M., VanMaanen, J., & Westney, D. E. (1996). *Managing for the future: Organizational behavior and processes.* Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Anderson, P. W. (2002). *The managerial roles of community college chief academic officers.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation

Arter, M. H. (1981). *Career advancement from institutional research to academic management utilizing institutional research.* Paper presented at the 21st Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional research. Minneapolis, MS: May 17-20, ERIC Document No. 205119.

Ashby-Scott, T.M. (2005). *Women of color leaders in higher education: Four portraits.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gonzaga University.

Astin, H., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of Influence, Women of Vision.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Book Company.

Astin, A. W., & Scherrei, R. A. (1980). *Maximizing Leadership Effectiveness.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Baldridge, V. J. (1971). *Academic governance.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Barge, J. K., & Hirokawa, R. Y. (1998). *Toward a communication competency model of group leadership.* [Online]. Available: http://Courses.smsu.edu.

Barth, R. A. (2004). *Leadership behaviors among deans of students at public research universities in the southeast.* University of Florida.

Bass, B. M. (1996). *New paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership.* Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for Social Sciences.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).* [Online]. Available: http://www.mindgarden.com/oldsite/Assessments/mlq.htm

Bast, M. R. (2004). *Leadership and the Enneagram.* [Online]. Available: http://www.breakoutofthebox.com/ldrho.htm.

Baumeister, P. (2005). *Implicit leadership theory in the U.S.: A comparative study of Mexican immigrants, Mexican Americans, and non-Hispanic Americans.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent University.

Beck-Frazier, S.G. (2005). *Perceptions of selected university deans' leadership behavior.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Carolina University.

Bennis, W. (2001). *The future of leadership: Today's top leadership thinkers speak to tomorrow's leaders (pp. 3-13).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bennis, W. (1998). *On becoming a leader.* London, England: Arrow.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (2001). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education.* Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University.

Billing, Y. D., & Alvesson, M. (1994). *Gender, managers, and organizations.* New York: de Gruyter.

Birnbaum, R. (2000). *The life cycle of academic management fads. Journal of Higher Education, 71:1.*

Birnbaum, R., & Umbach, P. D. (2001). Scholar, steward, spanner, and stranger: The four career paths of college presidents. *The Review of Higher Education, 24 (3).*

Bisbee, D. C. (2005). *Current practices of land grant universities for identifying and training academic leaders.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Arkansas.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1978). *The New Managerial Grid.* Houston, TX

Blair, J. (2000). Schools of education tracking down big money. *Education Week, Number 22.*

Boatwright, K. J. (2003). <u>Psychological predictors of college women's leadership aspirations</u>. *Journal of College Student Development,* 44:5, pp. 653-669.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative Research in Education.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations. Artistry, choice and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Broad, M. C. (2000). *College and university administration.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Brown, C. M. (2003). College deans: Leading from within. *The Review of Higher Education, 26:4.*

Brungardt, C. (1998). *The new face of leadership: Implications for higher education.* Fort Hays State University. [Online]. Available: <u>http://</u>sunsite.unc.edu/horizon.

Bullen, M. (1998). *A case study of participation and critical thinking at a university-level course delivered by computer conferencing.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Chase, H. (2000). Miles to go, promises to keep: Higher education in the 21st century. *Business Officer, 28-38.*

Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Cleveland, H. (2002). *Nobody in charge: Essays on the future of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Clark, D. C., and Clark, Sally N. (1997). Addressing dilemmas inherent in educational leadership preparation programs through collaborative restructuring. PJE. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72: 2, p. 21.*

Cloke, K., & Goldsmith, J. (2002). *The end of management and the rise of organizational democracy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coates, J. L. (1992). *Situational leadership: A study of the perceived leadership styles of deans of students at selected liberal arts colleges.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Coaxum, J. (2004). Managing people: A guide for department chairs and deans. *The Review of Higher Education, 27:2.*

Cohen, B. H. (2004). *Essentials of Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Corbin, C. (2000). *Great Leaders See The Future First: Taking Your Organization To The Top In Five Revolutionary Steps*. Chicago, IL: Dearborn Publishing.

Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York, NY: Summit Books.

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People: Restoring the Character Ethic*. Franklin Covey Company. New York, NY: Free Press: A division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Cox, T. (1994). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research and Practice (Second Edition).* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research and Practice.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Crowl, T K. (2004). *Fundamentals of Quantitative Research.* New York: Brown and Benchmark Publishers.

Dabney, D. W. (2004). *Leadership styles of African-American female presidents at 4-year comprehensive institutions of higher education.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Daugherty, L. H., & Finch, C. R. (1997). Effective leadership of vocational administrators as a function of gender and leadership style. *Journal of Vocational Education Research, 22: 3.*

Davis, K. V. (1996). A study of the personality types and leadership styles of women administrators in the South Carolina Technical College System. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57(03A), 0940.*

Dean, D. R. (2004). Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration. *The Review of Higher Education, 27:4, pp. 578-579.*

Dede, C. J. (1993). *Leadership without followers.* [Online]. Available:
http://www.virtual.gmu.edu/leadpdf.htm

Dede, C. J. (1993). *The Future of Higher Education.* Paper presented at annual meeting
of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada. (ERIC
Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 159).

Del Favero, M. (2006). Discilinary variation in preparation for the academic dean role.
Higher Education Research and Development, 25:3, pp. 277-92.

Demb, A. (2004). Change dynamics and leadership in technology implementation.
Journal of Higher Education, 75:6.

De Pree, M. (2001). Creative leadership. *Leader to Leader, 20,* New York,
NY: The Drucker Foundation.

Dill, W. R. (1980). The deanship: An unstable craft. In E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty
(Eds.). *The dilemma of leadership.* Danville, IL: Interstate Publishers.

Doyle, M. E., & Smith, M. K. (2001). *Classical leadership: The encyclopedia of Informal
Education.* [Online]. Available:
http://www.infed.org/leadership.

Drucker, P. F., & Senge, P. M. (2000, Fall). Strategies for change leaders. *Leader to
leader, 18,* 15-20. New York, NY: The Drucker Foundation.

Dutschke, J. (2003). *Chief enrollment manager leadership style and enrollment
performance: A correlation study.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent
University: School of Leadership Studies.

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2004). *The leadership styles of women and
men.* Questia Media America, Inc.

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C., & Engen, M.L. (2003). Transformational,
transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing men
and women. Psychological Bulletin, 129, PP. 569-591.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of
leaders: A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108, 3-12.*

Einstein, W. O., & Humphreys, J. H. (2003). Transforming leadership: matching
diagnostics to leader behaviors.

Eisenmann, L. (2003). Gender and the restructured university: Changing management
and culture in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 26:4.*

Fagin, C. M. (1977). The leadership role of a dean. In M. J. Austin, F. L. Ahearn, & R. A. English (Eds.), *The professional dean: Meeting the leadership challenges (Vol. 25, pp. 95-99).*

Fairhurst, G. T., & Sarr, R. A. (1996). *The Art of Framing: Managing the Language of Leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Farlex (2008). *The Free Dictionary.* [Online]. Available: http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/bureaucratic.

Feltner, B. D., & Goodsell, D. R. (1972). The academic dean and conflict management. *Journal of Higher Education, 43, 691-701.*

Ferentinos, C. (1996). *Linking social intelligence and leadership: an investigation of leaders' situational responsiveness under condition of changing group tasks and membership.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Mason University.

Ferguson, G. A. (2002). *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Fiedler, F. E. (1997). *Situational control and a dynamic theory of leadership.* In K. Grint (ed.) (1997) *Leadership. Classical, contemporary and critical approaches*, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Fife, J. D. (2003). Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail. *Journal of Higher Education, 74:4.*

Fisher, J. L. (2002). *Positive power: Your path to a higher leadership profile*. Provo, UT: Executive Excellence Publishing.

Fisher, B. A. (1986). *Leadership: When does the difference make difference?* In R. Y. Hirokawa & M. S. Poole (Eds). Communication and group decision-making (pp. 197-218). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Freeman, F. H., Knott, K. B., & Schwartz, M. K. (1996). *Leadership education: A source book 1996-1997 – volume 1 courses and programs.* Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership.

Gappa, J. M. (2003). Women Administrators in higher education: Historical and contemporary perspectives. *The Review of Higher Education, 26:4.*

Gardner, J. (1989). *On Leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Gardner, J. W. (1987). *The Moral Aspect of Leadership: Leadership Papers.* Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector.

Germany, C. D. (2005). *African-American women in educational leadership: An examination of their characteristics, attitudes, leadership styles, self-images, and perceptions.* Capella University.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (2005). Legitimacy in the academic presidency: From entrance to exit. *The Review of Higher Education, 28:3.*

Glover, J. A., Bruning, R. H., & Filbeck, R. W. (1993). *Educational Psychology: Principles and Applications.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company, Inc.

Gmelch, W.H., & Wolverton, M. (2002). *An investigation of dean leadership.* ERIC Clearinghouse. Publication number ED 465343. Washington, DC.

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Sarros, J. C. (1999). The academic dean: An imperiled species searching for balance. *Research in Higher Education, 40, December, 717-740.*

Goleman, D. (2001a). What makes a leader. (In *Harvard Business Review on What Makes a Leader p. 1-25*). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Goleman, D. (2001b). Leadership that gets results. (In *Harvard Business Review on What Makes a Leader, 53-85*). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Gonzaga University, *School of Professional Studies. Gonzaga University Leadership* Home Page (2004). [Online]. Available: http://www.Gonzaga.edu

Gorham, J. (1998). A Study of the relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education,* 3: 40-53.

Grace-Odeleye, B. (2003). *An examination of the role of forgiveness in the leadership practices of women leaders in higher education.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent University: School of Leadership Studies.

Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership. (2002). *What is servant leadership?* [Online]. Available: http://www.greenleaf.org/leadership/servantleadership.

Greiner, L. (1972). Evolution and revolution as organizations grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 50: 37-46.

Griffin, M. S. (2005). *A comparison of the leadership orientations of chairpersons of biology and English departments at baccalaureate and master's institutions in the southern region. **An unpublished doctoral dissertation.*** West Virginia University

Hahs-Vaughn, D. (2004). <u>The impact of parents' education level on college students: An analysis using the beginning postsecondary students' longitudinal study 1990-92/94</u>. *Journal of College Student Development, 45:5, pp. 483-500.*

Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Employee creativity, personal and cotexual factors at work relationship between organizational structure and group in context: A model of task group effectiveness.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.

Harrop, M. (2001). *A study of the leadership traits, behaviors, and characteristics of public two-year college chief financial officers.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.

Hartness, C. C. (1997). *The development of a modular curriculum for a seminar on organizational development.* An unpublished dissertation. University of Georgia.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers.* Cambridge, Belknap Press.

Hersey, P. (1994). *The Situational Leader.* New York, NY: Warner.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (2006). *Leader effectiveness and adaptability description (LEAD).* Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies.

Hiebert, M., & Klatt, B. (2001). *The encyclopedia of leadership: A practical guide to popular leadership theories and techniques*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hite, M.D. (2005). *A measure of gender-congruency and leadership styles among department chairs.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation: The University of Southern Mississippi

Hoffman, A. M., & Summers, R. W. (2002). *Managing colleges and universities: Issues for Leadership.* Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, Publishers.

House, R. J. (1991). A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 321-328.*

Howe, W., & Freeman, F. H. (1997). *Leadership education in American colleges and universities: An overview.* [Online]. Available: http://sunsite.unc.edu/horizon.

Huck, S. W. (2004). *Reading Statistics and Research.* (Fourth Edition). Boston: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Hunter, N. (2000). *An investigation of leadership style, style range, and style adaptability of the president, vice-presidents and deans and the readiness level of staff members of a community college.* Spalding University.

Jackson, F. L. (2004). <u>Toward a business model of executive behavior: an exploration of the workdays of four colleges of education deans at large research universities</u>. *The Review of Higher Education, 27:3, pp. 409-427.*

Johnson, C. E. (2001). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light or shadow*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnson, P. (1976). Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. *Journal of Social Issues, 32:3, pp. 99-110.*

Katundano, T.K. (2005). *A woman's leadership experience at a private coeducational university in the Midwest.* An unpublished doctoral. Marquette University.

Keller, G. (2003). Managing the learning university. *Review of Higher Education, 26: 4.*

Keller, G. (1999). Universities and their leadership. *Journal of Higher Education, 70:3.*

Kempner, K. M. (2003). <u>The search for cultural leaders</u>. *The Review of Higher Education, 26:3, pp. 363-385.*

Kerlinger, F. N. (1993). *Foundation of Behavioral Research.* NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Kezar, A. J. (2000a). *ERIC Trends 1999-2000: Administration*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Kezar, A. J. (2000b). Pluralistic leadership. *Journal of Higher Education, 71.*

Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *Journal of Higher Education, 73:4.*

Kotter, J. P. (1993). What leaders really do? *Harvard Business Review, 63(3), 103-11.*

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1990). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations.* Jossey-Bass.

Lambert, L. (1998). How to build leadership capacity? *Educational Leadership, 55:7.*

Lane, B. L. (2002). *The impact of gender on decision making among customized training administrators.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent University.

Lane, H. A. (2005). *Career paths of department chairs in primary care disciplines of internal medicine, family medicine and pediatrics.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. East Carolina University.

Lemaster, G. D. (2004). *An investigation of the relationship between individual-culture congruence and affective, continuance, and normative commitment in selected christian colleges and universities in Southern California.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent University: School of Leadership Studies.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (1999). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals.* Fifth Edition. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Madden, P. M. (2005). *Non-instructional factors influencing job satisfaction of department chairs in American colleges and universities.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio University.

Matijevic, P.A. (2006). *Creating opportunity: A study of the factors that influence professional advancement for senior-level women administrators from Illinois colleges and universities.* An unpublished dissertation. Loyola University.

Maurik, J. (2001). *Writers on Leadership.* London, England: Penguin.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

McGoey, S. P. (2005). *A comparison of institutional stakeholders' perceptions of presidential effectiveness.* An unpublished dissertation. Kent State University.

McGrath, E. J. (1999). The dean. *Journal of Higher Education, 70:5.*

McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (1998). *Research in Education.* The Third Edition, New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Mercer, J. (1997). Fund raising has become a job requirement for many deans. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 43, July 18, p. A31.*

Michigan State University Leadership Academy Task Group. (1995). *Leadership development programs in Michigan.* East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Miller, B. W., Hotes, R. W., & Terry, J. D. (2004). *Leadership in higher education: A handbook for practicing administrators.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Montez, J. M. (2003). The roles and challenges of deans. *The Review of Higher Education, 26:2, pp. 241-266.*

Montez, J., & Wolverton, M. (2000). *The challenge of the deanship.* ERIC
　　　　Clearinghouse: Publication Number: ED442445.

Montez, J. M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). The roles and challenges of
　　　　deans. *The Review of Higher Education, 26:2.*

Moore, K. M., Slaimbene, A. N., Marlier, J. D., & Bragg, S. M. (1983). The structure of
　　　　presidents' and deans' careers. *Journal of Higher Education, 54,
　　　　September/October, 500-511.*

Morse, R. J., & Flanigan, S. (2004). *The ranking methodology. U.S. News and World
　　　　Report.* [Online]. Available:
　　　　http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/grad/rankings.

Mortimer, K. P. (2003). Governance in higher education: The university in a state of flux.
　　　　The Review of Higher Education, 26:4.

Moss, J., & Jensrud, Q. (1995). Gender, leadership, and vocational education. *Journal of
　　　　Industrial Teacher Education, 33, no. 1.*

Moxley, R. S. (2000). *Leadership and spirit: Breathing new vitality and energy into
　　　　individuals and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: The Jossey-Bass Business &
　　　　Management Series and the Center for Creative Leadership.

Nelms, K. J. (2005). *A reliability and validation study of an administrative effectiveness
　　　　survey for deans at institutions of higher education.* An unpublished doctoral
　　　　dissertation. The University of Tennessee.

Nelson, S. J. (2000). *Leaders in the crucible: The Moral Voice of College Presidents.*
　　　　Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey, Publishers.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. (2005). *Statistical
　　　　Package for the Social Sciences.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Nies. C., & Wolverton, M. (2000). Mentoring Deans. ERIC Clearinghouse: Publication
　　　　Number ED442446.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks,
　　　　California: Sage Publications.

Norusis, M. J. (2007). *SPSS Base System User's Guide: Statistical Package for the
　　　　Social Sciences.* Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.

Pahal, D.L. (2000). *Effective leadership: An Information Technology perspective.*
　　　　[Online]. Available: http://www.westga.edu.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Pauls, T. S. (2005). *A study of the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership, and conflict management styles in Ohio college presidents.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent University: School of Leadership Studies.

Posner, B. Z. (2004). A leadership development instrument for students. *Journal of College Student Development, 45:4, pp. 443-456.*

Pritchett, W. P. (2006). *The relationship between the president's leadership style(s) at Tennessee's public four-year institutions and the job satisfaction of their chief academic leaders.* An unpublished dissertation. Tennessee State University.

Quell, T.T. (2005). *Job satisfaction in the role of the academic dean in schools of nursing.* An unpublished dissertation. University of Connecticut.

Rath, T.K. (2005). *Transformational leadership qualities of Florida community college student government advisors.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Central Florida.

Reid, L. (2005). *The relationship between strategic management and presidential leadership in selected Colorado state-supported and private institutions of higher education.* An unpublished dissertation. Southeastern University.

Ridgeway, C. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues,* 57(4).

Rhoades, G. (2000). Who's doing it right? Strategic activity in public research universities. *Review of Higher Education, 24(1), 41-66.*

Roaden, A. L. (1970). The college deanship: A new middle management in higher education. *Theory into Practice, 9(4), 272-276.*

Roberts, W. (1990). *Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hum.* NY: Warner Books.

Ropers-Huilman, B., Carwile, L., & Barnett, K. (2005). Student activists' characterizations of administrators in higher education: Perceptions of power in "the System." *The Review of Higher Education, 28:3.*

Rosenbach, W., & Taylor, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Contemporary issues in leadership* (pp. 1-25). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, Inc.

Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 119-125.*

Rosser, V. J., Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. *Journal of Higher Education, 74:1.*

Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *The Journal of Leadership Studies: 91-110.*

Roth, K.K. (2003). *Executive leadership attributes relating to transformed organizational human resource services: A Study of transformational leadership.* An unpublished dissertation. Argosy University Sarasota, Florida.

Ryan, M.K., & Haslam, S.A. (2005). *The glass cliff: Implicit theories of leadership and gender and the precariousness of women's leadership positions. In Implicit leadership theories: Essays and explorations.* Schyns, B. & Meindl J.R. Editors. Information Age Publishing: Greenwich, Connecticut.

Sagaria, M. A. (2002). An exploratory model of filtering in administrative searches. *Journal of Higher Education, 74:6.*

Salleh-Barone, N. (1998). *Asian American women educators: Narrations of their career paths to leadership.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Sanders, S. L. (1998). *The leadership behaviors and styles of selected female academic deans.* The University of Texas at Austin.

Sarros, J. C., & Gmelch, W. H. (1996). *The Role of the Department Head in American Universities: Tasks and Stress.* Victoria, Australia: Monash University.

Schlosser, G. (1994). Who will lead? *Physician Executives, 23 (8): 37-40.*

Schumacher, S., & McMillan, J. (1993). *Research in Education.* New York: Harper Collins College Publications.

Schwartz, R. A. (2003). The rise and demise of deans of men. *The Review of Higher Education, 26:2.*

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline. The art and practice of the learning organization.* London, England: Random House.

Shavez, M. G. (2004). *A study of feminist leadership characteristics in Women's Centers and Women's Studies Programs at Southern California universities and colleges.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Siegrist, G. (2005). *Educational leadership must move beyond management training to visionary and moral transformational leaders.* Questia Media America, Inc.

Slavin, R. E. (1992). *Research Methods in Education* (Second Edition). Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Smart, J. C. (2003). Organizational fffectiveness of two-year colleges: The centrality of cultural and leadership complexity. *Research in Higher Education, 44:6.*

Smith, H. W. (1990). *Learning style and leadership style: determinants of instructional strategies in nursing education.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Sorenson, G. (2002). *An intellectual history of leadership studies: The role of James MacGregor Burns.* The James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership. [Online]. Available: http://www.academy.umd.edu/scholarship/casl/articles.

Spencer, T. B. (2004). Governance in the twenty-first-century university: Approaches to effective leadership and strategic. *The Review of Higher Education, 27(4).*

Stanford, J. H., Oates, B. R., & Flores, D. (1994). *Entrepreneurs in the 1990s: A heuristic analysis.* Annual Conference Proceedings, Southwest Small Business Institute Association, Dallas, Texas, March, 1994.

Stanley, A. D. (2004). *Leadership styles and conflict management styles: An exploratory study.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent University: School of Leadership Studies.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (*Windows, 1998 Release: Version 8.0*). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Stefkovich, J. A. (2001). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, publishers.

Stogdill, R. M. (1981). Personal factors associated with leadership. A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology. 25: 35-71.*

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., & Merriman, H. O. (1997). *Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making.* Itasca, IL: Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1973). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review, pp. 162-180.*

Temple, J. A. (2001). *Leadership style of technical-vocational deans in American community colleges: A predictive study.* Texas Tech University.

Terrazas, L. (2005). *Perspectives of spirituality and its influence on leadership in higher education.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas.

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (2000). *Measuring up 2000: The state-by-state report card for higher education*. Washington.

Thomas, W. (1996). *Understanding and performing quantitative education research for doctoral students.* An unpublished monograph of instructor developed explanations and exercises. Fairfax, Virginia: Gorge Mason University.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 68:1.*

Tierney, W. G., & Foster, W. (1991). Educational leadership and the struggle for mind. PJE. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66: 3, p. 21.*

Thorp, L., Cummins, R., & Townsend, C. (1998). Woman's self-perceived leadership skills in a collegiate agricultural education course. *Journal of agricultural Education, 39 (1).*

Tsend, A. (2000). *Leadership practices in higher education in Mongolia.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Virginia Tech.

Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1991). *The academic dean: Dove, dragon, and diplomat.* New York: American Council on Education.

Viegas, S., Brun, J. K., & Hausafus, C. O. (1998). Leadership development in family and consumer sciences college graduates. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 90 (3): 47-52.*

Walsh, J. F., & Metcalf, J. (2003). Faculty and administrative support for institutional effectiveness activities: A bridge across chasm? *Journal of Higher Education, 74.*

Walumbwa, F.O., Wu, C., & Ojode, L. (2004). Gender and instructional outcomes: The mediating effects of leadership styles. *Journal of Management Development, 23.*

Wheatley, M. J. (2001, Spring). Innovation means relying on everyone's creativity. *Leader to leader, 20, 14-20.* New York, NY: The Drucker Foundation.

White, R. (1997). Seekers and scalars: The future leaders. *Training and Development*, *51(1).*

Wilking, K. A. (2004). *Asian Pacific American female chief executive officers in higher education: Their challenges and strategies to the top.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Williams, H. A. (2004). *Relationship between perceived leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness of academic deans in selected tertiary institutions in Jamaica.* Nova Southeastern University.

Winters, M. (1997). Identifying and supporting potential leaders. *Human Resources Focus, 74(7).*

Wolverton, M., & Wolverton M. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. *Journal of Higher Education, 70 (1).*

Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2001). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. *Journal of Higher Education, 70 (1).*

Woods, R. D. (2004). *Leadership behaviors of academic college deans in Mississippi's eight state-supported universities.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Southern Mississippi.

Woods, R. S. (2004). *The effects of self-efficacy, transformational leadership, and trust on leadership effectiveness of senior student affairs officers.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Regent University: School of Leadership Studies.

Wright, P. (1996). *Managerial Leadership.* London, England: Routledge.

Yasin, M.Z. (2005). *The use of strategic leadership actions by deans in Malaysian and American public universities.* An unpublished doctoral dissertation. Florida Atlantic University.

Yielder, J., & Codling, A. (2004). Management and leadership in contemporary university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 26:3, pp. 315-28.

Yoder, J.D. (2007). *Judging leadership climate for prospective women leaders. National Center for Women and Information Technology.* Boulder, Colorado.

Appendices

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

A Survey of Factors Contributing to Leadership Effectiveness in Higher Education

Dear Dean,

As a doctoral degree candidate in the field of educational leadership, I am currently in the process of collecting data for my dissertation which is designed to investigate the role of leadership style and personal and professional characteristics of academic deans of graduate schools of education on their leadership effectiveness. Your responses to the attached survey will only be used for the purpose of overall data analyses and will remain strictly confidential. But, if you would like to receive a profile of your Leadership Style (as measured by the attached Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) as well as a profile of your Leadership Effectiveness (as measured by the attached Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description), please provide me with your preferred mailing address. In that case, I will also send you back your original response to the survey instead of discarding that as an anonymous survey.

For the sake of each respondent's anonymity, as required by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I will personally process the data and I will shred each survey right after computer data processing. I will also remain solely responsible for the anonymity of all respondents and their respective institutions. As a prerequisite training course required by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for conducting human research studies, I have been trained by participating in the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative, have passed its required tests, and have been granted approval from for data collection. Therefore, I am literally aware of my ethical obligations to all survey participants.

Your prompt response will help in meeting my dissertation deadlines and your dedicated time for completion of this survey will be greatly appreciated. Please keep in mind that your participation in this study is enormously important and will positively affect the findings of this study. I am certain that your constructive comments, recommendations, and suggestions relating to current issues in higher education leadership will make a significant contribution to leadership effectiveness in institutions of higher education.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. A self-addressed paid postage stamped envelope is enclosed for mailing your completed survey. Further information about your rights as a research participant can also be provided to you by the Office of Human Research of The George Washington University, at telephone number (202) 994-2715.

Sincerely Yours,

Afnan Al-Shuaiby, Doctoral Degree Candidate
The George Washington University

Part 1: Personal and Professional Information

1. Gender: __Male   __Female

2. Age group: __ Under 40   __40-50   __ Over 50

3. Ethnicity: __ African-American   __ White/Caucasian   __ Other Groups

4. Type of institution you are currently serving: __Public   __Private

5. Years in your current position: _____

6. Years of teaching experience: _____

7. The highest degree you have earned: _____

8. Your major field of expertise: _____

Part 2: Contributing Factors to Leadership Effectiveness

Based on the following rating scales, please rate the extent to which each of the following factors has played an important role in your leadership effectiveness:

1 = Not Important   2 = Little Important   3 = Moderate   4 = Important   5 = Very Important

Contributing Factors to Leadership Effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
1. Creating a motivational work environment.					
2. Creating a mutual trust atmosphere.					
3. Making decisions appropriately and promptly.					
4. Taking responsibility for decisions and actions.					
5. Fostering good relationships with work associates.					
6. Involving designated staff and faculty in planning actions.					
7. Demonstrating honest and ethical behavior.					
8. Communicating expectations to staff and faculty clearly.					
9. Resolving conflicts in a professional manner.					
10. Demonstrating efficient management of stress factors.					

Part 3: Leadership Style Profile

This part included the new version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) which comprised of 45 multiple choice items designed to provide leadership style profile of the respondents. According to the Author's note, in order to preserve its proprietary nature, the questions in their entirety are not permitted to be included in this study. The instrument has copyright protection registered by Bass and Avolio with all rights reserved. Reproduction of the instrument is prohibited without the Distributor's written consent. This investigator purchased 800 of the MLQ instrument and was granted a written permission to use the instrument for the study; but was only allowed to reveal a limited number of sample items for the readers. Therefore, the entire copy of the instrument cannot be included in this Appendix.

Part 4: Leadership Effectiveness Profile

This part included the most recent version of the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) developed by Hersey and Blanchard (2006). The questionnaire describes 12 decision making situations and offers four possible leadership actions – one representing each of the four possible situations. The instrument has copyright protection registered by Hersey and Blanchard with all rights reserved. Reproduction of the instrument is prohibited without written consent of the Center for Leadership Studies. This investigator purchased 800 of the LEAD instrument and was granted a written permission to use the instrument for the study; but was only allowed to reveal a limited number of sample items for the readers. Therefore, the entire copy of the instrument cannot be included in this Appendix.

Part 5: Open-Ended Questions

1. Please list some of the obstacles that are hindering your leadership effectiveness:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Please briefly describe how do you usually manage to overcome the challenging obstacles hindering your leadership effectiveness?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your professional contribution to my study

Appendix B

Permission Letter to Use the MLQ Instrument

mind garden

www.mindgarden.com

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for the above named person to use the following copyright material:

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Authors: *Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Copyright: *1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

for his/her thesis research.

Five sample items from instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any published material.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

Vicki Jaimez
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

Appendix C

Permission Letter to Use the LEAD Instrument

Center for Leadership Studies

Afnan Al-Shuaiby
1350 Beverly Road, Unit 115
McLean, Virginia 22101

Reference: Permission Request 2008-07-02 A

PERMISSION GRANTED

Dear Afnan Al-Shuaiby,

I am writing on behalf of the Center for Leadership Studies (CLS).

At this time, permission to use our intellectual property, more specifically our LEAD Self instrument, in research associated with your dissertation has been approved. To recap, you have agreed not to reproduce (put any copy of) our copyrighted material in the body of your dissertation but have been granted permission for its use in your research and the right to publish those results based upon the use of said instrument. Permission is granted for this current project only. Our material may not be used in derivative works. **Permission has been granted for printed text, *non-exclusive* distributions only. None of our copyrighted material may be made available electronically.**

Additionally, permission to reproduce our copyrighted figure in the manner consistent with Addendum A has been approved. To recap, you have agreed to use the 2006 copyrighted version of the model (Addendum A) with the credit line: "Copyright 2006 Reprinted with permission of the Center for Leadership Studies, Inc. Escondido, CA 92025. All rights reserved." Permission is granted for this current project only. Our material may not be used in derivative works. **Permission has been granted for printed text, *non-exclusive* distributions only. None of our copyrighted material may be made available electronically.**

You agree to mail a complete copy of the dissertation to CLS as submitted to your accredited college. Use of our copyrighted material in your body of work will be construed as agreement to allow CLS to make any use of said documents as submitted to us available for any such use as the organization wishes to make of them to include but not limited to promotional and marketing materials. You also grant CLS the right to make those documents available for use by other academics, either in their original form or as modified by the Company. Furthermore, other individuals who use such material have the right to modify or adapt the material themselves in print media only with proper reference to the author (you) who created it.

All references to Situational Leadership or Performance Readiness therein must ba capitalized and have the follow whenever it appears.

We are pleased to grant permission and wish you much success.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

Brandy Archambeault
Contracts, Copyrights & Permissions
Center for Leadership Studies, Inc.
Brandy.archambeault@situational.com

> Center for Leadership Studies, Inc.
> 230 W. Third Ave.
> Escondido, CA 92025
> 1-800-330-2840

Appendix D

Permission Letter from the

Institutional Review Board to Conduct the Study

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

WASHINGTON DC

Date: May 15, 2008
To: Joel Gomez, ED.D

From: Samuel J. Simmens, PhD
               IRB Designee, Committee on Human Research
               Institutional Review Board Panel #3, FWA00005945

Re: Correspondence dated 5/6/2008

Subject: IRB#050811 -- *Factors Contributing to Leadership Effectiveness in Higher Education*

Sponsor:

<u>**Risk Level: Minimal**</u>   <u>**Status:** Active</u>   <u>**Expiration date: 5/15/2009**</u>

This is to certify that the Institutional Review Board has fully approved the above referenced protocol via an expedited review process pursuant to Federal regulations 45 CFR 46.110 (1), 46 CFR 8392. The IRB determined that this project qualifies for expedited review under category #7. Pursuant to 45 CFR 46.117 (c), this study qualifies for a waiver of documentation of consent.

The expiration date of this project is **5/15/2009**. HHS regulations at 45 CFR 46.109 (e) require that continuing review of research be conducted by the IRB at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk and not less than once per year. The regulations make no provision for any grace period extending the conduct of the research beyond the expiration date of IRB approval. When your protocol expires all research activities must stop. Please mark your calendar now to insure that the IRB receives a renewal request 30 days before the anniversary date of the project, if this study is expected to extend beyond one year.

This protocol has been approved for **a maximum number of <u>200</u> subjects** to be enrolled under the auspices of George Washington University. If you wish to be increase enrollment beyond this number, you must submit a modification request to the IRB and obtain approval before exceeding this number.

Investigators are reminded that the IRB must be notified if the project is altered in any way (change in location, personnel, number of subjects, age of subjects, or any change in research protocol). If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Office of Human Research either by email at ohrirb@gwumc.edu or via phone at 202-994-2715.

Appendix E

**A List of Standardized Instruments for
Examining Leadership Style and Effectiveness**

Appendix E

A List of Standardized Instruments for Examining Leadership Style and Effectiveness

Leadership Style Instruments	Leadership Effectiveness Instruments
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	Leadership Effectiveness & Adaptability Description
Leadership Opinion Questionnaire	Leadership Behavior Questionnaire
Leadership Practices Inventory	Leadership Effectiveness Analysis
Leadership Practices Style	Leadership Appraisal Survey
Leadership Teamwork Inventory	Leadership Assessment System
Management Style Inventory	Leadership Competency Inventory
Management Styles Questionnaire	Leadership Effectiveness Profile System
Management Style Appraisal	Leadership Development Questionnaire
Management Styles Inventory	Leadership Development Report
Management and Leadership Systems	Leadership Self-Development Scale
Management Interest Inventory	Leadership Skills Inventory
Management Inventory on Leadership	Leadership Skills Profile
Management Relations Survey	Leadership Spectrum Profile
Management Situation Checklist	Leadership Behavior Analysis
Managerial Style Questionnaire	Leadership Versatility Index
Style of Leadership Survey	Leadership Aptitude Test
Style of Managerial Inventory	Leadership Readiness Profile
Style of Teamwork Inventory	Managerial Competency Questionnaire