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ABSTRACT

University presidents nominated by peers as especially effective and a sample of randomly selected representative presidents were mailed the Effective Leadership Inventory (ELI). From the resulting ELI data set, two meaningful subsets of items were formed using factor and reliability analyses, which resulted in subscales thought to measure transactional and transformational leadership styles. Analyses revealed that both effective and representative presidents, regardless of gender or institution type (i.e., two-year/four-year, public/private) perceived themselves as exhibiting behaviors associated with transactional leadership to a greater degree than behaviors associated with transformational leadership. The single significant between-subjects factor-level finding was that public university presidents endorsed more strongly beliefs and behaviors associated with transactional leadership style than did presidents of private universities. Contrasts between effective and representative presidents on each of the 60 ELI items revealed nine items with significant differences, each with small to moderate effect sizes.

Further exploration into the theory and practice of transactional and transformational leadership is necessary. Additional research is also needed to better understand the leadership style differences between effective and representative presidents, and university presidents and leaders in different contexts. Additional comparative research is needed to determine the extent to which university presidential
leadership style is related to the academic discipline of the highest awarded degree of the president. Research also is needed to determine the extent to which effective presidential leadership can be developed and how it can best be developed.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction and Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to determine whether differences exist in leadership style between university presidents who were nominated as effective and a representative sample of presidents who were not so nominated. Using the Fisher and Koch (2004) Effective Leadership Inventory (ELI), the study explored self-perceived differences between the total sample of effective and representative university presidents, as well as differences between presidents as a function of institutional type. Differences were also examined as a function of presidential gender. The focus of this investigation was to explore the dimensions of leadership known in the literature as transactional and transformational leadership. Contrasts also were made between effective and representative presidents on each on the 60 items of the Fisher and Koch ELI.

The Presidency

The old time president

He could have been called principal, provost, master, or rector; no one knows exactly why Harvard chose the title “president” for Henry Dunster in 1640. Perhaps it was an attempt to totally disassociate the position from Nathaniel Eaton, the first leader of Harvard who had flawless credentials. Dunster was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, had written a dissertation on the Sabbath in Latin and had taught in England. His Harvard term of one year came to an end in 1637 when he was tried for assaulting an assistant with a large stick. Additionally, his wife was charged with not
preparing enough food for the students, watering down the beer, and adding goat dung to the pudding (Levine, 1998). Nevertheless, the title of president was chosen from an array of possible titles from the heritage of Cambridge and Oxford, and the title has since dominated the leadership position of American higher education institutions (Cowley, 1980).

Just as American colleges have changed in the 368 years since Harvard opened its doors in 1636, so has the college presidency evolved into something quite different from the earlier days. Early presidents were predominately clergymen who lived at their colleges and were in residence most of the time. Presidents were essentially “jacks of all trades” (Cowley, 1980) serving as faculty as well as college leaders and were expected to fulfill the “paternal responsibilities” of counselor and head disciplinarian for the young male students (Rudolph, 1990). Additional presidential responsibilities included conducting compulsory chapel, recruiting students, erecting the main college buildings, tending to acres of crops that supported the institution, chopping down trees to make way for expansion, and securing and transporting books across country (Cowley; Schmidt, 1930).

Today’s college president

There were approximately 4,200 institutions of higher education listed in the 2001 Higher Education Directory (Rodenhouse, 2001), ranging from public, private, proprietary for profit, two-year, four-year, doctoral granting, research, liberal arts, and so on. The number of students attending a higher education institution in 2003 was 15.3 million. The total revenue of private institutions was $119.7 billion and $157.2 billion at public institutions (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). Additionally, there have been
horizontal and vertical expansion in organizational charts, growth in faculty unionization, and a changing campus environment that has become increasingly democratized, yet with growing constraints imposed by legislators and governing boards. Furthermore, students and faculty are more diverse than ever before, which has created additional challenges. Collectively, these changes have rendered the current world of higher education a more complicated and demanding place than experienced by the president of Harvard in 1636 (Corson, 1960; Kamm, 1982; McGrath, 1967; Walker, 1979).

The roles of presidents differ substantially today from those in earlier days (Gordon, 1953; Kerr, 1982; Shapiro, 1998). Today’s college presidents are expected to be scholars, technologists, negotiators, fundraisers, lobbyists at state general assemblies, managers of huge budgets and complex physical plants, public relations experts and lecturers at civic and economic clubs. Confirming the change in roles, presidents in 2001, reported spending the majority of their time on planning, fund raising and budgeting (Corrigan, 2002). Presidents in 2001 listed relationships with faculty, legislators, and governing boards as their primary challenges (Corrigan). Earlier presidents would have made a list of challenges that doubtlessly would have been different.

The role of the presidency has evolved from that of an essentially omnipotent leader who shared little leadership responsibility to one that has been described as a “bureaucratic caretaker” (McGrath, 1967, p. 2) with greater responsibilities and a wider group of constituencies than ever before (Shapiro, 1998). Kerr (1982, p.37) referred to the contemporary university as a “multiversity” of students, faculty, alumni, trustees or public groups with each group having its own territory and its own form of governance.
According to Kerr, the president has “multiple masters” and is expected to balance all aspects of the job.

The University president is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, and an active member of a church. Above all he must enjoy traveling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and attending public ceremonies (Kerr, 2001, p. 22).

There is no doubt that the changes that have taken place in higher education have created increasingly complex roles for university presidents. The evolution of universities has created a situation for today’s university leader that starkly contrasts with Walker’s (1979) characterization of the old-time president who simply “knew what he wanted and he got it” (p. 20). The age of the autocratic, omnipotent president is past (McGrath, 1967, p. 5) and has been replaced with a collegial style of leadership (Kamm, 1982), marked by a range of responsibilities that has increased so dramatically that according to Kerr (2001) and Salman (1971), no president can effectively accomplish all the requirements of the job.
The average age of university presidents has been gradually getting older. In a comparison of presidents of the American Association of Universities (AAU) member institutions in 1900 and 1950, Gordon (1953) examined thirty-four institutions and found that the average president was fifty-two years old in 1900 and in 1950 the average age was fifty-six. In a 2001 study of university presidents conducted by the American Council on Education (Corrigan, 2002), the mean age of presidents was almost fifty-eight years.

As time has passed, universities have selected presidents who are more educated. In 1900, thirty-one percent of the college presidents held an earned doctorate; in 1950, sixty-five percent held a terminal degree (Gordon, 1953), and in 2001 almost eighty-one percent of presidents have an earned doctorate (Corrigan, 2002). In 1900, the most common presidential degree was in theology, while most held a law degree in 1950 (Gordon) and in 2001 university presidents most often earned education degrees (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue, 2003-4). According to Gordon, in 1900, seventy-nine percent of presidents came from within the organization of higher education compared with seventy-seven percent in 1950 and eighty-five percent in 2001 (Corrigan). Even in 1953, Gordon concluded that leaders may have been essentially the same as those serving in earlier periods, but the complexity of higher education institutions have created “more pressing current problems and more constraints in responding to them than before” (Association of Governing Boards and Colleges, 1984, p. 6). Kamm (1982), noted that it perhaps may be that it was easier to “keep a tidy shop” as a president in a less complex environment with fewer pressures (p, 148). Birnbaum (1992) asserted that
presidents can at best be minimally effective today, making minor changes, but it is unlikely that major changes equivalent to those made by earlier presidents could be made.

*The role of college presidents*

The extent of a president’s influence within the university has been a point of discussion among scholars of higher education. A theory of university leadership that has probably provoked the most controversy in higher education is that proposed by Cohen and March (1974). These authors suggested that as a result of the way higher education institutions operate, the university president’s role in the administration of an institution is an insignificant one. Their conclusion was based on collected information from a panel of 42 university and college presidents and their assistants. They interviewed 41 presidents, 39 chief academic officers, 36 chief business officers, 42 secretaries, 28 others who were close to the presidents of interest, and 31 student leaders or editors of student publications. Cohen and March theorized that colleges and universities are ungovernable “organized anarchies” with problematic goals, vague technology and fluid participation by faculty and staff who wander in and out of the organization. Essentially, they alleged that as a whole, employees at universities do not know what they are doing, have no clear goals, and have no understanding of their decision-making processes. Cohen and March contended that higher education institutions have “ill-defined preferences,” discovered through trial and error rather than planning, with “garbage can models of decision making attributes that will assure success” (p. 57). Cohen and March depicted presidents as being as “interchangeable as light bulbs,” and largely ceremonial, reactive, symbolic icons of leadership with little control over what takes place on their respective campuses (p. xiv-5). The authors concluded that universities have no demonstrable set of clear...
objectives and presidents must meet no “clear set of attributes that will assure success” (p. 57), and made their case as follows:

The presidency is an illusion. Important aspects of the role seem to disappear on close examination. In particular, decision-making in the university seems to result extensively from a process that decouples problems and choices and makes the president’s role more commonly sporadic and symbolic than significant (p.2).

According to Cohen and March, university presidents face four ambiguities in their individual organized anarchies. The *ambiguity of purpose* referred to the lack of defined goals and clear objectives in universities. Presidents have less power than is typically believed, which limits their ability to make changes, and so, the *ambiguity of power*. The *ambiguity of experience* references the inability of presidents to learn from past experiences, that is, presidents do not control much of what happens in the university and change is rapid within such complex environments producing “false learning” (p. 200). Success for administrators is usually judged by promotion or by organizational output, such as the examination of a profit-loss statement. Few university presidents are promoted, but some move to “better” presidencies and some move into semi-retirement administrative positions. The criteria for measurable output of success are not reliable because the measures of success and standards change over time, depending on such situations as fiscal austerity, demographic shifts, and other factors outside the control of the president. This environment of unreliable measures of success results in what Cohen and March describe as the *ambiguity of success*.

Keller (1983) agreed with Cohen and March that decisions are not made easily within universities and as a result, rather than decisions being made by the president of
the university, they are often made non-systematically by various administrators within the university. Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker and Riley (1978) commended Cohen and March for expanding the thinking about higher education beyond the traditional perception of universities as well organized bureaucracies with clear “chains of command,” to organizations that are “looser, more fluid” (p. 27) and with presidents whose successes depend on bargaining skills.

Millett (1980) disagreed with Cohen’s and March’s assessment of the university as an organized anarchy. He posited that faculty are the “organized anarchy” because of their “abhorrence of economics, bureaucracy, organization, and social constraint” (p. 199). Likewise, former President of the University of Illinois, Stanley Ikenberry (1984) responded to the Cohen and March proposal saying that their pessimistic model of higher education and its leadership fails to represent the complexity of colleges and universities. He pointed out that higher education institutions function rationally and although all presidents can shape their respective institution’s agenda, they may not take advantage of the opportunity to do so. Effective presidents, according to Ikenberry, capitalize on opportunities. Kerr and Gade (1989) agreed that some presidents follow the Cohen and March model by choice and others are turned into practically nonexistent leaders by their administrative boards, staffs, or aggressive unions, but Kerr and Gade also believed that these presidents are the “exception and not the rule” (p. 152).

Stoke (1959, p. 20), in *The American College President*, wrote, “One thing is clear: colleges must have presidents and it makes a great difference who they are!” Millett (1980) agreed that the president’s role is critical to the success of a university and Keller (1983) added that leadership is critical in any organization. Likewise, Fisher and
Koch (1996) emphatically disagreed with both Cohen and March and Birnbaum, and stated that university presidents can be effective and make “profound and positive impacts upon the institutions they lead” (p. viii). To be sure, in the history of higher education, there have been exceptional presidents who have made substantial differences in the success of their respective institutions (Cowley, 1980; Fisher, 1984; Fisher & Koch, 1996). Cowley (p. 70) wrote “Name a great American college or university and you will find in its history a commanding leader or leaders who held its presidency.” For example, Charles W. Eliot is credited with Harvard’s rise from a small college to an institution of national prominence; Daniel Coit Gilman’s leadership gave Johns Hopkins its distinction in research (Cowley, 1980); and, Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame changed the face of Catholic higher education in the United States (Fisher & Koch, 1996).

Leadership

The construct of leadership has been written about for hundreds of years, but was first defined around 1800 (Stogdill, 1974). Few aspects of human behavior have been subjected to such an intensive quest for understanding as that of leadership (Bogue, 1994), and although extensive research and opinion exists on what constitutes leadership there is still no overwhelming consensus as to what it is. There are probably as many definitions of leadership as persons asked to define the construct. As Burns (1978, p. 2) opined, “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth.” McCall and Lombardo (1978) made several astute observations on contradictory leadership theories and called them “fragmented, trivial, unrealistic, or dull” and the number of theories “mind-boggling” (p. 3).
Few books or articles have been written about ineffective leadership, because most studies attempt to discover or elucidate behaviors, styles or situations that characterize or increase effective leadership. Accordingly, throughout this paper, leadership and effective leadership will be used synonymously.

Leadership has been described more than 350 ways (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Birnbaum, 1988; Finzel, 2000; Kouzes & Pozner, 1995) and our concept of effective leadership has evolved with the context of the times — how we define it, how we believe it works, and the way that people apply it is different today than just 20 years ago. The definition of leadership has been continually reexamined as changes in social, political, economic and technological circumstances have warranted new styles of leadership. Rost (1993) bemoaned the fact that there is no universal definition of leadership. Disagreeing with Rost, Klenke (1996) made the point that a single definition is limiting because the defining characteristics may change as a function of changing contexts and agreement on a standard definition may restrict critical thinking about leadership in different institutions or organizations.

Over the years, leaders have been described by individual characteristics of style, personality, behaviors, influence, hierarchical position, and so on. For example, during the early 1900s, a leader was viewed as the pivotal head of a group (Bass, 1981). The 1930s through the 1950s ushered in the recognition of the importance of leaders' influence on the behaviors and activities of others (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Perceptions of leadership may be colored or influenced by response to current leaders. For example, when John F. Kennedy was President of the United States during early 1960s, the concept of leadership was popularized as Kennedy’s own popularity grew. However, with the
downfall of Richard Nixon, the Machiavellian aspects of leadership (now perceived as abuse of power) became foremost in the public perspective and the construct of leadership seemed to fall into disfavor. During the 1980s, when Lee Iaccoca was Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Chrysler, the concept of leadership evolved further and was described in different and more positive terms. The vocabulary used to describe effective ‘leadership’ began to convey broader sentiments, and words such as vision, transformational, inspirational, and mission became everyday parlance in meetings and training workshops (Conger, 1992).

During the last decade there have been many situations that have further inspired a redefinition of leadership. Increasingly, the world has become more competitive and global, and there has been a general loss of trust in leadership following the scandals and troubles within organizations (Gow, 2002). This loss of trust has led to a call for leaders to be ethical, have stronger, clearer visions, and value communication (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991). It is clear from the literature that the concept of leadership is complex and the description of leadership as a construct continues to evolve.

Management and leadership in higher education

Leadership is sometimes used synonymously with management, but other times, it is given a distinctiveness that is more positive in nature. Bennis (1989) tritely concluded that the most important distinction between managers and leaders is that leaders do the right thing and managers do things right. Likewise, Kotter (1990) clarified the role of the manager and the leader by defining management as producing consistency and order, whereas leadership produces movement by establishing direction, creating change, and aligning, motivating and inspiring people. Conger, Spreitzer, and Lawler (1999)
interpreted management as maintenance of day-to-day organizational operations and leadership as challenging the status quo, creative visioning for the future, empowering followers, and influencing positive changes in followers' values, attitudes, and behaviors. Giamatti, the late president of Yale, provided a definition of leadership that addressed the differences in management and leadership in higher education:

Leadership is an essentially moral act, not as in most management -- an essentially protective act. It is the assertion of a vision, not simply the exercise of a style: the moral courage to assert a vision of the institution in the future and the intellectual energy to persuade the community or the culture of the wisdom and the validity of the vision. It is to make the vision practicable, and compelling (1988, p.36).

Using a questionnaire designed to assess thinking about management and leadership in higher education, Kamm (1982) surveyed 40 former university presidents chosen by their peers to serve as either president of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) or chairman of the Council of Presidents of the NASULGC. The results indicated that most presidents believe that being a leader or manager is not an “either-or” situation because presidents must manage as well as lead, but leadership must be the priority of the university president.

University presidents and CEOs

Most books written about leadership do not differentiate between contexts or organizations (e.g., military, business, government, and education), but some authors suggest that because colleges and universities are unique contexts with complex organizational structures there may be important differences between leadership within higher education institutions and leadership within corporations. Some theorists believe
that universal leadership theory and the practices of businesses and organizations do not apply to college/university presidencies (Atwell & Green, 1981; Birnbaum, 1988; Corson, 1960; Kauffman, 1989; Kramer & Mendenhall, 1982). Institutions of higher education may be more difficult to administer than, for instance, a department in the federal government because the university president must balance multiple goals, serve at the pleasure of a board and deal with a variety of different constituencies (Flawn, 1990).

According to Corson (1969), the power of the presidency is shared with faculty and is limited by the distinctive characteristics of higher education institutions. He posited that university presidents differ notably from corporate executives because their power is shared with independent faculty who jointly make decisions about educational programming, faculty selection and promotion, and student admission and discipline.

Law (1962) asserted that instead of line workers in a corporation, higher education is composed of highly professional individuals of above average intellect and abilities, creating an altogether different environment. In addition, higher education institutions “function within the context of American’s competing cultural forces” (Gilley, 1991, p. 134). The fundamental substance of a university president’s role is the “engineering of consent, not the giving of commands” as it is in the corporate world (Corson, 1969, p. 191). Although it is difficult for those outside the academy to understand, it seems that university presidents may have more constraints on their leadership than their corporate counterparts (Bowen & Shapiro, 1998; Walker, 1979). William Rainey Harper, former president of the University of Chicago, provided explanation of some of the constraints in his essay *The College President*:
A close study of the situation will show that when all has been said, the limitations of the college president, even when he has the greatest freedom of action are very great. In all business matters he is the servant of the trustees or corporation; and his views will prevail in that body only in so far as they approve themselves to their good judgment. In educational policy he must be in accord with his colleagues. If he cannot persuade them to adopt his views, he must go with them. It is absurd to suppose that any president, however strong or willful he may be, can force a faculty, made up of great leaders of thought, to do his will. The president, if he has the power of veto, may stand in the way of progress, but he cannot secure forward movement except with the co-operation of those with whom he is associated (as cited in Bowen & Shapiro, 1998, p. 110-111).

Kramer and Mendenhall (1982) compared the roles and responsibilities of university and corporate presidents and provided further contrasts between higher education and corporations. They identified two major differences between the milieus in which the university and corporate presidents operate and concluded that change is more gradual in higher education and university presidents are in a position of much higher visibility than corporation CEOs.

Fisher and Koch (1996) resoundingly disagreed that differences exist between university presidents and corporate leaders. In summary, Fisher and Koch concluded, "a leader is a leader is a leader" (p. 19). Similarly, Lenington (1996) warned that because of increasing competition as well as critical financial pressures, higher education institutions must be managed like industries and university leaders must have the same skills as industrial managers. The growing or swelling momentum for the college president to
follow the corporate model has created some fear that the core purpose and values of higher education may be sacrificed under corporate style management (Green & Hayward, 1997).

Theories of Leadership

Several different approaches to the study of leadership in higher education are found in the literature. Traditional views of leadership include transactional and transformational leadership, power and influence theories, behavioral/trait or specific characteristics of leaders, and environmental/personal situational theories. An overview of the major contemporary leadership theories follows.

Transactional and transformational leadership

Two opposing theories of leadership that have remained a topic of discussion over time and continue to be germane are those of transactional and transformational leadership, which were first introduced by political scientist, James McGregor Burns, in 1978. These theories have been a focus of discussion by the majority of authors who have studied presidential leadership since the 1980s.

Bass (1985) has conducted significant research on transactional and transformational leadership. He described a transformational leader as:

someone who raised their awareness about issues of consequence, shifted them to higher-level needs, and influenced them to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group or organization and to work harder than they originally expected they would (p. 29).

This definition was presented to 70 male senior industrial executives, who were asked to describe any person in their career that fit this description. Using the open-ended survey
responses and a survey of the literature, Bass created the *Leadership Questionnaire*, a 73-item survey that described transactional and transformational leadership behaviors. The leadership survey was designed to identify characteristics of ideal leaders (Bass, 1998). From the results of a pilot analysis of the 73 items, Bass conducted factor analytic studies. He identified three transformational factors of *charisma, individualized consideration* and *intellectual stimulation* and two factors of *contingent reward* and *management by exception* as transactional behaviors. Providing the explanation that the literature on charisma and inspiration were different and “salient in charisma is the identification of the follower …and the desire to emulate with him or her” (Bass, 1998, p. 13), Bass identified an additional transformational factor of *inspirational motivation*.

From the factor analyses, Bass and Avolio (1990) developed the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)* survey. Those who work for a leader and those who supervise a leader, as well as the leader can be assessed by the *MLQ*.

**Transactional leadership**

According to Burns (1978), a transactional leader is one who develops relationships with followers based on the exchange of some reward for desired behavior. Transactional leaders reward expectation, compliance, and the completion of tasks that must be accomplished with tangible benefits, such as praise, pay or promotions. Transactional leaders cater to the self-interest of employees (Bass, 1998). Politicians who trade promises for votes exemplify the transactional style of leaders. Transactional leadership is characterized by collegiality, consensus, democracy, inclusivity, participative governance, bargaining one thing for another such as promise and reward for good performance, egalitarianism, maintenance management, delegation of
responsibility, maintenance of friendships during leadership, relying on committees, and administering by the book.

Transactional leadership is based on a contingent reinforcement model, emphasizing reciprocity between leaders and followers. Bass (1981) identified the transactional style of leadership as having two components: contingent reward, which refers to shaping of behaviors by providing rewards, and management by exception, wherein the leader either actively monitors the follower to make sure he or she does not depart from the standards, or waits for the follower to make mistakes and then takes corrective action. A transactional leader understands the culture of the institutions and where followers want to go, and guides them toward their goals (Birnbaum, 1992; Millett, 1980).

Transformational leadership

In contrast to the transactionalist, the transformational leader is a 'change agent' who believes he or she knows where the organization should go, imparts the vision and shows others the way to achieve the desired goals. The transformational leader is concerned with empowering people, seeking development of the whole individual, presenting long-term vision, and inspiring additional effort from followers to go beyond self-interest for the good of the institution. Transformational leadership can be characterized as moral leadership that is a joint effort between leader and follower to reach “higher levels of principled judgement” (Burns, 1978, p. 449) that extends beyond self-interest to a higher level in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Bass, 1981). Simply stated, transformational leadership is about a leader and the follower (Carraway, 1990).

In his most recent book, Transforming Leadership (as cited in Caldwell, 2003), Burns...
emphasizes the relevance of values and morality to leadership and stresses the importance of leaders following an agenda based on the aspirations and expectations of both the leader and the people. He cited Gandhi and Hitler as being at opposite ends of the transformational spectrum. Similarly, Covey (1991) stressed the importance of an institutional “moral compass” and enacting “principle centered leadership”.

Transformational leaders transcend daily affairs, rely on legitimate, expert and charismatic power, have clear, holistic visions; instill pride; inspire confidence and trust; promote intelligence; treat everyone individually; are inspirational and agents of change (Covey, 1991; Fisher & Koch, 1996). Bass (1981) described the four components of transformational leadership as charismatic leadership, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Transactional or transformational presidential leadership

Several scholars of higher education theory have cited transactional leadership as being the most effective style of leadership (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Cohen & March, 1974; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Walker, 1979). Advocates of transactional leadership value a politically adept, democratic presidential style, in which the best path for a president to pursue is that of “persuasion, diplomacy, perseverance, and a sense of direction” (Walker, 1979, p.118). Walker advised that the president should not lead from a “top down” transformational approach, but rather respond to the needs and desires of the faculty and administrators, a style more aligned with the transactional style.

A potential limitation of transactional leadership is that a transactional leader may concentrate too heavily on rewards and punishment and make hasty decisions that are not well thought out, and in the long run may create stress among followers (Bass, 1998).
Cowley (1980) made the assertion that there are too many presidents in higher education today who follow the transactionalist style of leadership. He argued that these presidents are either satisfied with the way things are or simply cannot persuade others to follow their lead. Transactional university presidents may be similar to the general manager described by Bass (1985, p. 2), who was unable to “inspire anyone to exert themselves to come up with new ideas or to feel or see that they and the plant could become the best in the business.” Fisher and Koch (1996, p. xiv) asserted that the transactional style of leadership may be “…contributing to the current leadership malaise.” Likewise, Shaw (1996, p. v) agreed that transactional leadership is a “…recipe for mediocrity and stagnation on American campuses.”

Although some authors may not specify the term transformational when they discuss leadership, they generally endorse the strong leadership tenets of the transformational style (Bennis, 1976; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kerr & Gade, 1989; Vaughn, 1986). As a resolute proponent of the inherent qualities of transformational leadership, Fisher (1984) wrote persuasively about the importance of a transformational president:

I am convinced that it will be strong, assertive, and enlightened presidents who will lead us to a new and higher level of contribution in this difficult period for American higher education. It will not be faculty or key administrators, it will not be governments, it will not be education associations or scholars, and it will not be boards of trustee. All are important, but our future rests on the bold, decisive leadership of college and university presidents nationwide. (p. 11).
Birnbaum (1992) argued that transformational leadership is "an anomaly in higher education" (p. 29) because forces other than powerful leaders shape the future of an institution. New presidents who focus on changing the organization may create a disruptive environment by making programmatic, procedural or value laden changes within the university. Based on interviews with thirty-five presidents, (25 first-time presidents and 10 who had previously held at least one presidency), Bensimon (1989) concluded that transformational leadership might not always be appropriate. Presidents making quick authoritarian changes without understanding the campus community may ruin their chances for future support. Unless a college or university is in crisis and in need of dramatic change, it may be best for a president to make gradual changes when taking office. Taking time to understand the culture, history and rhythm of an institution during a "discovery stage" sends the message that a president is attempting to integrate into the community (Bensimon, p. 9). The payoff for a president's patient approach to change is increased knowledge of the institution and the long-range benefits of respect of constituents and consequent support for future initiatives.

Blend of transactional and transformational

When Burns (1978) first introduced his theory of leadership, he suggested that the dimensions of transactional and transformational leadership were opposite ends of a single continuum. In 1985, Bass contradicted this element of Burns' theory. By using the MLQ, Bass found that transactional and transformational leadership were complementary, a belief that is supported by many contemporary authors.

Millet (1980) proposed that different times and different circumstances in universities warrant a combination of transactional and transformational leadership
attributes. Conditions of crisis may require transformational leadership; conditions of
growth may make it easier and more acceptable to have transactional leadership, and
conditions of decline may require a transforming kind of leadership. Fisher and Koch
(1996) agreed that some circumstances might warrant a transactional leadership style.
When the institution's position is "comfortable and consistent with the needs of its
constituents and mission," there may be reason to have a cautious, reactive president
rather than a proactive president who would otherwise make substantive changes in the
in institution (p. ix).

Bass and Avolio (1994) posited that effective leadership embodies components of
transactional, transformational and laissez-faire or no action leadership. The conclusion
reached by Birnbaum (1991) after his five-year longitudinal study of university
presidents was that a synthesis of both transactional and transformational leadership was
ideal and Covey (1991) wrote that both types of leadership are required, but that
transformational "must be the parent" (p. 287). Chait (1998, p. 4) pointed out that
perhaps successful institutions are those with a "strong internal culture" that is
maintained throughout the years rather than by perpetual transformational leadership.
Moreover, Chait asked rhetorically "What institution would be well served, over time, by
a bold new vision every sabbatical year?"

Power and influence theories

Since the beginning of time, power has been a fundamental issue in discussions of
effective leadership. How does one influence followers and why do some leaders appear
to have more influence than do others? French and Raven's (1959) classification of five
bases of power (i.e., reward, legitimate, coercive, expert, and referent) provides a
framework for discussion of power. This power-based theory is based on the assumption that there is always a leader with some form of power and followers who respond to those various sources of power.

By using reward power a leader can facilitate the desired outcomes by dispersing favors or rewards such as promotions or financial bonuses (Bass, 1981). Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) suggested that presidents should take a different approach to influencing behavior as faculty may be alienated by the use of reward power. Fisher and Koch (1996) warned that enduring support cannot be purchased and rewards are seldom as motivating as “a captivating vision that unifies and invigorates the members of an organization” (p. 29).

Legitimate power refers to the leader’s position, where both the leader and the follower agree to a standard that gives one party the right to influence the other (Fisher, et al., 1988). A source of legitimate power lies in the general belief in hierarchical organization. Fisher et al. noted that a president could successfully use legitimate power as long as it is generally believed that the president’s actions are beneficial for the group and organization. Fisher and Koch (1996) wrote that legitimate power alone will be not be effective, but must be supplemented by other types of power. Being in a position of high status doesn’t automatically make someone a leader but simply provides an advantage. Bornstein (2003) cautioned that a president without legitimacy is “doomed” (p. xi) and suggested five factors of presidential legitimacy: personal background; institutional structural and cultural context; external factors (e.g., funding); perceived effectiveness (e.g., fund-raising, lobbying); and moral and ethical decision making.
Leaders who subscribe to the use of coercive power use threats and punishment for noncompliance. It is often agreed that because of its "negative and manipulative nature," coercive power is the least effective kind of power, particularly in higher education (Fisher et al., p. 32) and leaders should be cautious in its overuse (Fisher, 1984). Kipnis and Lane (1962) suggested that less confident presidents are likely to rely on coercive power.

Referent power is based on the leader's ability to influence the group because followers like and respect the leader (Bass, 1981). Fisher and Koch (1996) contended that referent power is synonymous with charisma. Charisma is defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Woolf, 1979) as "a personal magic of leadership arousing special popular loyalty or enthusiasm for a public figure...a special magnetic charm or appeal" (p. 186). Fisher and Koch asserted that referent power or charisma is the most effective type of leadership, but charisma is not a "special gift, grace, or talent" that some have and others do not, but a quality that can be learned (p. 38). Birnbaum (1992) wrote of charisma as a "double-edged sword" because the magnetic qualities of the leader can beneficially move an institution toward goal accomplishment, yet charisma can also present a "dark side" (p. 32). Charismatic leaders may become narcissistic and come to believe that normal rules do not apply to them. They may reduce communication with others and as a result, the forward progress of an institution may be hindered (Birnbaum, 1992). In contrast to Fisher and Koch's assertion that charisma can be learned, Birnbaum made the point that generally scholars do not understand the source of charisma or how it can be cultivated.
French and Raven (1959) also identified the value of *expert power*, which is based on the followers' perception that the leader possesses special knowledge or skills or as Fisher et al. (1988, p. 33) stated, expert power simply comes from “knowing what you are doing.” In attempting to gain followers’ support, presidents can be more successful if they are perceived as experts, but if they are found out to not be experts, they will likely “court disaster” (Fisher & Koch, 1996, p. 37).

As Birnbaum (1988) noted, different types of power are more suited for different kinds of organizations. For example, the military uses legitimate and expert bases of power and is generally successful in its mission accomplishment. Reward and legitimate power are effective means to control followers within a business organization and coercive approaches are the most commonly used sources of power within prisons. A university president’s use of expert power and referent power with moral authority is more likely to produce motivated and committed followers within higher education institutions. According to Fisher and Koch (1996), transactional leaders are more likely to rely on coercive and reward forms of power. Transformational leaders rely principally on legitimate, expert and referent or the power of public presence.

*Environmental/personal situational theories*

Earlier authors took a contingency or situational approach to leadership, an approach that considers the abilities of the leader and the circumstances of the time and place (Fiedler, 1967; Tannebaum, Weschler, & Massarik, 1961; Yukl, 1989). According to Fiedler’s (1967) *Contingency Model*, the best predictor of success is the proper match of the person’s abilities and attributes for a given situation. For example, the combination of the nature and the mission of the institution and the prevailing
demographics and economic situation may be conducive to specific styles of leadership. Some institutions may have external relationships that need to be rebuilt, and others may need programmatic changes. For some institutions, personnel morale may be a low point or budgetary issues may be pressing. There may be a desire for status quo at some institutions and others may be in need of a strong, visionary, somewhat autocratic leader. Birnbaum (1992) cautioned that assuming that some presidents can be successful in any setting and that only certain characteristics or traits are related to leadership effectiveness is “potentially dangerous” (p. 37). In a 1998 essay, the late president of Yale University, Giamatti said that “the fortuitous combination of circumstances and personality can produce unique results, for good or ill, and changes in the mix would yield results of a materially different character” (p. 21).

Some situationist champions have suggested that leaders can be more effective if they shift styles of leadership depending on the situation that confronts them. Bargh, Bocock, Scott, and Smithe (2000), Kerr and Gade (1989), and Shaw (1999) advised that presidents should not be attracted to one style of leadership or another, but should remain flexible enough to use whatever style is best suited to the context.

**Trait/behavioral theories**

Some authors have described leadership using personality or trait theories to define the “great man,” one who has the right combination of personality and inherent characteristics of success. The list of ideal traits or characteristics can be long and variable, depending on who has compiled it. Some people describe leaders using humanistic terms or personality characteristics, such as being a good person, encouraging the heart, setting an example, doing what is promised, developing character, evincing a
positive attitude, and exhibiting generosity (Bogue, 1994; Kouzes & Pozner, 1995; Maxwell, 1999). Gilley, Fulmer and Reithlingshoefer (1986) suggested that successful presidents are “people-oriented, caring, supportive, and nurturing” (p.115).

Fisher et al. (1988) conducted an empirical study that investigated the leadership and behavioral characteristics of university presidents nominated by peers as “effective.” They reported significant differences between leadership styles and attitudes among 312 university presidents who were nominated as “especially effective, especially successful” by their peers, as compared to 303 representative university presidents who were not so nominated. The presidents were surveyed using the FTELI (Fisher et al., 1988). The authors compared the two groups of presidents across FTELI factors, as well as across individual items. Fisher et al. found significant difference between groups only in one three-item factor they identified as embodying presidential “confidence,” which assessed the presidents’ belief that they could make a difference in their respective institutions. They found no significant differences across groups in any of the remaining four factors (i.e., human relations, image, social relationships, and management and leadership style). In an item-by-item analysis within each of the five FTELI factors, differences were discovered on individual items within three factors (i.e., management and leadership style, social relationships, and confidence). Using analysis of variance (ANOVA) for factor comparisons and independent t-tests for item contrasts, Fisher et al. found seven specific characteristics attributed to effective presidential leadership. Effective presidents believed that the respect of those to be led is essential, that they are not primarily concerned about being liked, they do not believe in close collegial relationships, and they perceive themselves as tending to work long hours. More so than
the representative presidents, effective presidents believed in organizational structure and claimed to only occasionally speak spontaneously.

It should be recognized, however, that the differences and conclusions reported by Fisher et al. warrant additional analysis and reflection. Because of the additive nature of probability and the number of scale items contrasted by Fisher et al. (i.e., 40), there is considerable likelihood that several of their significant findings were due to alpha slippage related to increased experiment-wise error. Using the Bonferroni procedure to correct for alpha slippage (i.e., alpha divided by the number of consecutive comparisons conducted), the alpha level that should have been used to maintain overall experiment-wise error of .05 would have been $p < .00125$). Using this corrected alpha level, Fisher et al. would have found that only one item differed significantly across all factors between the two groups. Despite the single issue of the additive nature of probability on the 40 items, the study by Fisher et al. is noteworthy, because the study was systematic and scientific with a sufficient sample size. In addition, the study by Fisher et al. is well documented and easily replicated.

**Gender and Leadership**

In 2001, 21.1 percent of university presidents were women, an upward climb from 9.5 percent in 1986 (Corrigan, 2002). Of the women presidents in 2001, 13 percent were executives at doctoral granting institutions, 20 percent served at master’s institutions, 18.7 percent at baccalaureate level institutions, 26.8 percent at two-year institutions, and 14.8 percent at specialized institutions (Corrigan, 2002). Twenty percent of the women were presidents of public institutions and 18 percent were presidents of private colleges. Of recently hired presidents, nearly one-quarter were women (23.9 percent) and more
than a third of recently hired presidents at two-year institutions were women (Corrigan, 2002).

It is a long held belief that males exhibit effective leadership behaviors more often than females (Maher, 1997). Aburdene and Naisbitt (1992) identified 25 behaviors that characterized women leaders - - behaviors that empower, restructure, teach, provide role models, encourage openness, and stimulate questioning. They coined the phrase "women leadership" to embody these characteristics. Traditionally, men have been portrayed as independent, aggressive, self-confident, dominant, rational, and so on, while women have been described as gentle, sympathetic, passive, emotional (Adams & Yoder, 1985). However, there seems to be little empirical evidence, particularly in field studies that provide any convincing evidence that women behave differently from men in leadership roles (Adams & Yoder).

In a multivariate analysis of effective presidents, Fisher and Koch (2004) noted that gender was not a discriminating factor when presidents were nominated as effective. Partial explanation for a smaller percentage of female presidents being nominated as effective may be the demographics of female led institutions and fewer years of experience of female presidents. Women are more often presidents of two-year institutions or smaller, less prestigious institutions and generally have less presidential experience. In 2001, more males held an immediate prior position of president (21.6 percent) than did female presidents (15.9 percent) (Corrigan, 2002).

In a comprehensive meta-analytic review of 162 studies on gender and leadership style using instruments such as the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire and Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-
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Worker Scale, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found both similarities and differences between leadership styles of men and women. Based on the overview of the literature, the authors focused on two aspects of leadership – task-oriented style and interpersonal style. Task style refers to “behavior such as having subordinates follow rules and procedures, maintaining high standards for performance, and making leader and subordinate roles explicit” (Eagly & Johnson, p. 7). Interpersonal style includes helping behaviors and concern for the welfare of subordinates. According to the authors, the two dimensions of leadership are most often considered to be on opposite ends of a continuum; however, the authors’ analyses showed no gender differences on the two dimensions. Examination of the literature did reveal a tendency for women to be more democratic and participative than autocratic in leadership style. Eagly and Johnson noted that neither dimension necessarily enhances a leader’s effectiveness. Under some circumstances a democratic leadership style may be most effective, while an autocratic style may enhance a leader’s effectiveness in other situations.

Dobbins and Platz (1986) conducted a meta analysis of 17 studies investigating sex differences in leadership and found that male leaders were rated as more effective than females, but these differences were found only in laboratory studies. Additionally, the authors found no differences between males and females in “initiating structure and consideration” and both gender groups tended to have “equally satisfied subordinates” (p. 118).

Wheeler and Tack (1989) used data collected in the study of effective presidents cited above (Fisher et al., 1988) to investigate whether male and female presidents behave differently or exhibit different attitudes. Wheeler and Tack found that “male and
female college presidents maintain similar overall leadership behaviors and attitudes" (p. 19). However, when evaluating behaviors and attitudes as separate variables, Wheeler and Tack discovered that male and female presidents differed in two leadership behaviors and four leadership attitudes. On the self-reported Fisher et al. FTELI survey, female presidents agreed more than male presidents that they smile a lot, attempt to achieve consensus, value committee meetings more, and are conversely less concerned about being liked. In addition, female presidents were more concerned than male presidents with being perceived as self confident, and female presidents value merit pay to a lesser extent than male presidents.

Findings on differences in gender and transactional and transformational leadership are equivocal. Gender differences between upper level managers in Fortune 500 high-tech industrial firms were studied by Bass and Avolio (as cited in Maher, 1997). The authors found that females were rated as more transformational by both male and female subordinates. Druskat (1994) studied leaders in all-female religious orders and leaders in all-male orders in the Roman Catholic Church. Female subordinates evaluated female leaders as being transformational in their leadership style. In contrast, male leaders were evaluated as less transformational in their leadership styles. Bass and Avolio (as cited in Maher, 1997) and Druskat (1994) attributed their findings to the perception that females are generally perceived as being more nurturing and promoting of development, characteristics that are associated with transformational leadership.

In an investigation of gender differences in transactional and transformational leadership, Maher (1997) asked undergraduate evening students at a university to complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990) to evaluate
their current or past supervisor on transactional and transformational leadership styles. There were no significant differences in university students' ratings of male or female managers on either transformational or transactional leadership styles.

**Effective Presidential Leadership**

Just as there are many opinions as to what characterizes leadership, there is no clear conclusion as to what distinguishes effective leadership from less effective leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Katz, 1955). Clemens and Mayer (1987, p. xiii) claimed that effective leadership has been the same for the past 3,000 years and cited the core components of effective leadership as "motivation, inspiration, sensitivity, and communication." Colin Powell said that the supreme measure of a leader is the performance of an organization (as cited in Avolio & Bass, 2002). Drucker (1967) noted that effective leadership is simply getting the right things done and Burns (1978) and Kouzes and Pozner (1995) suggested that the best way to understand the nature and characteristics of effective leaders is to learn more about their day-to-day practices. Some common measures of presidential effectiveness have been longevity in office, support of constituents, or movement to a presidential position at a larger or more prestigious institution, but these factors are "mythic thinking" according to Hahn (1996).

Conventional thinking suggests effectiveness can be assessed by employing some specific criterion measure, such as "growth rate, ability to attract members, efficiency in use of resources, gross productivity, and the like" (Katz & Kahn 1966, p. 310). Corson (1969) argued that there are no determined or consistent methods to measure this kind of progress in colleges and universities. Whereas corporate organizations have tangible criteria that define effectiveness (e.g. manufacturing output, revenue generation, expense
reduction), universities' criteria for effectiveness rests largely on intangibles that are not well defined or agreed upon. Therefore, it is easier to define an effective leader in the corporate world than in academe (Smith, 1992). Birnbaum (1988, p. 226) noted that it is not easy for presidents to create measurable change because institutions are resistant to change and any attempt by leaders to modify or improve higher education institutions may create unbalance among the combination of "bureaucratic, collegial, political, and symbolic elements." According to Birnbaum, the effective president has to maintain balance or status quo, giving attention to areas that fall below acceptable levels and making sure that other systems do not become so dominant as to create a dysfunctional organization.

Institutional functioning as a measure of effective leadership

In an effort to establish a measure of presidential effectiveness, Birnbaum (1989) created the *Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI)* and administered it to full time faculty at ninety-three colleges and universities between 1968 and 1970 and to a similar sample of faculty in 1980 and 1981. The IFI assessed faculty's perceptions of institutional functioning on eleven scales that emphasized institutional culture and motivational changes related to financial health, facilities, and so on. Changes in institutional functioning over the decade were very small, even considering the emergence of new pressures within the environment. Additionally, significant changes were not reflected in any of the eleven institutional functioning measures, even when the college or university had one or more presidents during the ten-year period between 1970 and 1980. Birnbaum concluded that if presidents actually made significant differences in institutional functioning, greater variations would have occurred when there were
changes in the presidency. Birnbaum acknowledged that institutions are essentially stable, and budgetary issues, normal operating procedures, existing personnel, and external expectations of the role of the institution may inhibit change. He suggested that rather than measuring presidential effectiveness as a function of changes that take place, presidential effectiveness might be measured by the maintenance of institutional stability.

*Interpretative and symbolic view of effective leadership*

Birnbaum (1989) and Tierney (2000) offered a thoughtful perspective of interpretative and symbolic views of effective presidential leadership. Birnbaum noted that it is difficult to capture the essence of effective presidential leadership because from a constructionist view, each observer constructs his or her own reality. Philosopher David Hume (as cited in Hendel, 1955) offered the insight that as humans, we make assumptions that there are causes for everything that happens, which makes the world a more predictable place. Each person sees only a part of the complex environment and each action holds different meaning to the viewer. Additionally, those within higher education will most likely attribute both positive and negative actions to the institutional president. Birnbaum (1992) emphasized that effective leadership, like beauty, may be held in the eyes of the beholder. Within the complex world of higher education, some constituents may perceive some presidential actions as evidence of good leadership, while others may interpret the same behaviors as inferior leadership depending upon their individual viewpoints. Shapiro (1998) clarified the interpretative view; "The position of a university president has certain prism-like qualities in the sense that a change in one’s perspective or position yields somewhat different colors" (p. 65). The effectiveness of a leader may depend solely on the personal perception of the interpreter.
Birnbaum (1989) and Pfeffer (2000) suggested that the psychological process of attribution might be a factor in our individual perception of leadership. As humans, we search for some meaningful cause of inexplicable outcomes, and attribution theory suggests that it is likely that we will attribute changes simply to a human rather than a complex interaction of human behaviors and situational events. In a university, observers are more likely to attribute broad institutional changes to the president. Birnbaum (1989) suggested that effective presidents might be those who can disassociate themselves from failures and associate themselves with institutional successes. According to Tierney (2000), everything a leader does and says is imbued with symbolism and managing the symbolic aspects to accomplish goals is an important aspect of the presidency. The “ability to manipulate symbols” (p. 133) may result in perceived effectiveness.

Need for effective leadership

Urgent calls for effective presidential leadership have come from many different sources (Kamm, 1982; Kauffman, 1980; Keller, 1983; Law, 1962). Cowley (1980) noted that there are too few college presidents today who seem to be leaders, and Lovett, in an April, 2002 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, argued that leaders such as Hesburgh, Gilman, and Eliot are rare in the current higher education environment. Claar (1990) agreed that there is a crisis in university leadership and the challenges of institutional debt, rising tuition, degree devaluation, and deteriorating image of higher education may create a need for leadership skills that are not possessed by today’s leaders. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (1984) called for strengthening presidential leadership and described this need as “one of the most urgent concerns on the agenda of higher education in the United States” (p. 102).
Chait (1998) did not agree that higher education is in a leadership crisis and gave five reasons for his position. He suggested that some people assume a leadership vacuum exists because the “good old boy” network of grooming and handpicking leadership is not as active as it once was, thus creating a perception that there are fewer leaders. In addition, Chait (p. 1) pointed out that memory can be “colored with sentimentality and notoriously unreliable” and the presidential “giants” of yesterday were not perfect. Third, although there are many challenges in today’s academy, there were as many or more challenges in the past. The different nature of today’s challenges in higher education should not lead one to conclude that there are fewer effective presidents in the university today than in the past. Fourth, today’s president may have substantially more constraints placed on them, and finally, the position of president may be more complicated than in the past.

In a 1992 keynote address, Bennis noted that effective leaders in the future may be different than those in the past, and judgement of presidential effectiveness should be related to the era in which the president served (Norris, 1992). Rosenzweig (1998) proposed that there is no reason to believe that there are fewer outstanding presidents today than years past, but rather the environment of higher education and the demands on the leadership have evolved, creating a need for a different style of leadership. Moreover, as early as 1976, in an article of the Association of American Colleges (AAC), Frederic Ness pointed out that the changes that have occurred in higher education do not preclude leadership, simply a new lens may be needed to recognize it. According to Ness (p. v), the complexity of structure and organization may have spawned a “new style of educational leadership.”
Smith (1992) acknowledged that the road to presidential effectiveness might not be an easy one to tread, because the means to achieve effectiveness may not be as apparent within a university setting as in other organizations. He pointed out that several obstacles are present in higher education institutions such as the short seven-year average term of university presidents and the lack of clarity of goals, which make the measurement of progress difficult at best. The prominent obstacle in assessing presidential effectiveness may be the inherent condition of faculty members’ first loyalty to their focused disciplines, thereby limiting their support for broad executive initiatives. Because of these obstacles, presidential effectiveness, according to Smith (1992) may simply be the successful use of force at an unobtrusive level, which results in forward progress of the university.

Numerous examples in history as well as in recent events have confirmed that not all university presidents are effective. Birnbaum (1992) estimated that one-quarter of college presidents will be exemplary, one quarter will be considered unsuccessful, and half- the “modal presidents” (p. 195) will keep the university at status quo and avoid failing. Gale (1989) wrote that colleges and universities could move to a higher level, continue on the same course, or start down the road of failure due to the person selected to lead the institution. Cowley (1980) asserted that some great colleges became great under the leadership of great leaders, but other institutions with equal promise have deteriorated due to poor leadership. Within this context, it should be recognized that not all persons who hold leadership positions are true leaders, and it should it should also be recognized that not all leaders hold formal leadership positions.
As Birnbaum, Gale and Cowley have pointed out simply occupying the office of the president does not ensure effectiveness. Leadership is a process, not a position (Adams & Yoder, 1985), and some presidents simply may not be effective leaders. Some leaders may be preoccupied, as Walker (1979) submitted, with the status of their positions and the coexistent authority and privileges. Furthermore, just as some corporations have difficulty because their chief executives fail to take needed actions (Akst, 2003), some universities may not progress due to presidential inaction.

Levine (1998) concluded that it is inevitable that any profession with a history of three and a half centuries would have examples of ineffective leadership. Many university presidents may be recognized for their leadership, but may have been considered ineffective presidents. For example, Francis Wayland, president of Brown University from 1827 to 1855 during the industrial revolution, introduced a radical curriculum plan, that called for an end to the rigid four-year course of study in the classics. He proposed an elective curriculum with utilitarian programs, extension programs, accelerated programs and non-classical degree programs. The University’s Board ceded to his request but five years later, Wayland’s resignation was accepted. The curriculum change had cost the University more than the revenue increase brought in by the increased number of enrollments (Levine). As Levine suggested, some leaders may have extraordinary vision, but are unable to translate the visions into reality.

Despite the disheartening forecast for effective leadership, Botstein (1985, p. 108) wrote that being an effective college president is a “delightful and possible task.” Walker (1979) suggested that theory and practice cannot be separated, and Davis (2003) agreed that presidents who have an in-depth understanding of leadership and the characteristics,
behaviors, skills and attitudes that constitute leadership may be those who provide
effective leadership. They “must know certain things, be able to apply this knowledge,
cultivate specific skills and abilities, and maintain appropriate attitudes” (Davis, p. xv).
Davis also pointed out that effectiveness hinges on the understanding of effective
leadership and the context of the organization.

Michael, Schwartz and Balraj (2001) conducted a study of trustees of higher
education institutions using indicators of presidential effectiveness. The results of the
study revealed that trustees expect effective presidents to have knowledge of the unique
nature of colleges and universities to attract resources, management skills, and successful
relationships with key constituents.

Significance of Study

The primary purpose of this study was to advance the knowledge of leadership
beliefs and behaviors of effective university presidents. Enlightenment about effective
university presidents and the beliefs or behaviors that differentiate them from
representative university chief executives can provide critical or fundamental insights
into the phenomenon of effective presidential leadership. The role of the university
president is becoming increasingly complex and because calls for effective presidential
leadership are becoming more common, additional insight into the nature and
characteristics of effective leadership would be beneficial to presidents and governing
boards.

Much of today’s understanding of women in leadership roles has come from
studies about male leaders and until the 1980s, most leadership studies were conducted
by men about men (Klenke, 1996). In higher education institutions, understanding the
similarities and differences between leadership styles of men and women is relevant, as an ever-increasing number of women assume university leadership roles. Moreover, the extent to which stereotypes exist regarding the leadership styles of women, further research can serve to either dispel ideas or enlighten readers of the value of actual gender differences in leadership behaviors. Additionally, through research such as this, women who aspire to become presidents of higher education institutions can become more knowledgeable about the leadership styles, behaviors, and attitudes of extant female presidents.

A clearer understanding of the styles and attitudes of effective leaders may assist search companies, search committees, and university board members to better identify strong presidents and become better educated about what is needed for their presidents to lead effectively and succeed on their respective campuses. In addition, this study will provide direction and information with which governing boards can better evaluate academic leaders.

Although there has been speculation that differences exist between presidents who serve at different types of institutions (i.e., doctoral research institutions and community colleges), a search of the literature produced no publications on the topic. This study examined the leadership style differences between presidents of public and private university presidents, as well as presidents from four-year and two-year institutions. The results may provide valuable insight into the role, expectations, and perceptions of top leaders in different institution types. Additionally, the results of this investigation may stimulate increased interest and focused research on the topic of presidential leadership within different types of institutions.
Some authors believe that leaders are "made and not born" (e.g., Aldag & Joseph, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 1995) and others believe that leadership is a combination of individual traits and behavior and skills that can be learned (Green, 1988). If leadership can be learned, the results of this study may provide valuable information for presidential training programs where the traits, styles, and attitudes associated with effective campus leaders can be taught. New presidents often report that they wish that they had known more about what to expect in their new role (Bensimon, 1989; Sigmar, 1997). If leaders can acquire effective leadership characteristics or understand more about just what effective leaders do, the results of this study will allow aspiring and current presidents to emulate characteristics of successful presidents and possibly become more effective as a result.

The review of the literature and resulting issues related to leadership beliefs and behaviors led to eighteen questions being asked in this study. The questions address the differences in beliefs and behaviors between effective and representative presidents, presidential gender, and institution type.

**Research Questions**

Q₁ Are there differences between effective and representative university presidents in self-reported transactional beliefs and behaviors?

Q₂ Are there differences between effective and representative university presidents in self-reported transformational beliefs and behaviors?

Q₃ Are there differences between male and female university presidents in self-reported transactional beliefs and behaviors?
Q4 Are there differences between male and female university presidents in self-reported transformational beliefs and behaviors?

Q5 Are there differences between effective university presidents across four-year and two-year institutions in self-reported transactional beliefs and behaviors?

Q6 Are there differences between effective university presidents across four-year and two-year institutions in self-reported transformational beliefs and behaviors?

Q7 Are there differences between presidents of public and private institutions in self-reported transactional beliefs and behaviors?

Q8 Are there differences between presidents of public and private institutions in self-reported transformational beliefs and behaviors?

Q9 Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of effective university presidents?

Q10 Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of representative presidents?

Q11 Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of male university presidents?

Q12 Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of female university presidents?

Q13 Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of presidents of public universities?

Q14 Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of presidents of private universities?
Q_{15}  Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of presidents of four-year institutions?

Q_{16}  Are there differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of presidents of two-year institutions?

Q_{17}  What is the relationship between transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors for the total sample and subsamples?

Q_{18}  Are there differences between effective and representative presidents in self-reported beliefs and behaviors as measured by the original 60 items on the *Effective Leadership Inventory*?
CHAPTER 2

Method

Data Source

The data used for this research were derived from a survey conducted by Dr. James V. Koch, former president of the University of Montana and Old Dominion University, and Dr. James L. Fisher, former President of Towson University and President Emeritus of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. The Fisher and Koch (2004) study was funded by a grant from the Kauffman Foundation.

Participants

The participants in this study included presidents from two-year and four-year institutions who completed the dependent measure the Effective Leadership Inventory (ELI) (N=713). Of the original 713 presidents who completed the ELI, 13 were eliminated from this study due to missing demographic data. Additionally, data from 25 institutions were missing, and these cases were eliminated. The resulting sample with complete data included 350 presidents who were nominated as effective and 325 representative presidents who were not so nominated (N = 675). A description of the manner by which the effective presidents and representative presidents were identified follows.

Effective Presidents

Sitting university presidents or chancellors in the United States and outlying areas (e.g., American Samoa, Puerto Rico) were systematically selected from the 2001 Higher
Education Directory (HED); (Burke, 2001). These leaders were mailed letters requesting them to nominate as many as six individuals whom they considered to be especially effective presidents (Appendix B). Because there is no common definition of "especially effective, especially successful," individuals who received the requests for nominations were required to employ their own definition of what constituted an especially effective president. Letters also were mailed to interim or acting presidents, but letters were not mailed to deans or directors of branch campuses who were listed in the HED.

A total of 393 additional individuals who head major education-related organizations cited in the HED, also were mailed letters requesting nominations. These individuals included directors of Statewide Agencies of Higher Education, directors of Higher Education Associations, (e.g., American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities), United States Department of Education Offices directors, and Executive Directors of all major accrediting bodies, (e.g., Southern Association of Colleges and Schools). Koch (personal communication, September 13, 2002) selected the most influential associations and consortia from the Consortia of Institutions of Higher Education and national, professional and specialized accrediting organizations (e.g., AACSB, The American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business) to receive mailed nomination requests.

From all solicited sources, 720 effective presidential nominations were received. Each of the nominated presidents was mailed a copy of the 60-item ELI, and the nominees were asked to complete and return the inventory to the principal investigators (See Appendix C for survey letter). Ultimately, 371 surveys were completed and
returned, which yielded a 51.5 percent-response rate for the effective presidents. Table 1 provides demographic information about the sample and subsamples of effective presidents.

Representative Presidents

Thirteen-hundred and twenty-nine sitting presidents who were not among those nominated as especially effective also were mailed a copy of the ELI. These 1329 presidents/chancellors were selected systematically from the 2001 HED in a manner that assured no overlap with the original 2049 contacted presidents/chancellors. To ensure that the non-nominated or representative presidents/chancellors had not received the prior letter requesting nominations, every even numbered (i.e., 2nd, 4th, 6th, etc.) president/chancellor was mailed a letter (Appendix D) asking him or her to complete and return the survey. If a president on this list had been nominated as especially effective, he or she was not mailed a letter and the selection process moved on to identify the next "even" president on the list. Of the 1329 letters mailed, 342 responses were received, yielding a response rate of 25 percent for the representative presidents. Table 1 provides information about the sample and subsamples of the representative presidents.

A chi-square was conducted to test the proportion of presidents of each gender and from different institution types who responded to the ELI as compared to the proportion of presidents of each gender and from different institution types in the population listed in The American College President, 2002 edition (ACP) (Corrigan, 2002). Significant chi-squares were detected for both public/private and two-year/four-year samples, $X^2 (1, N = 4) = 8.19, p \leq .01$; $X^2 (1, N = 4) = 4.56, p \leq .05$, respectively.

The results indicated that proportionally fewer presidents from public institutions
responded to the ELI than exist in the ACP and proportionally more presidents from private institutions were represented in the sample. Whereas 59 percent of the institutions in the ACP were public institutions, 52 percent of the responding institutions were public. Forty-one percent of the institutions in the ACP were private institutions, whereas 47 percent of presidents from private institutions responded to the ELI survey. Proportionally fewer presidents from two-year institutions and proportionally more presidents of four-year institutions responded to the survey than are reported in the ACP. Forty-four percent of the institutions reported in the ACP were two-year institutions, whereas 39 percent of the presidents responding to the ELI were from two-year institutions. Fifty-six percent of the institutions included in the ACP were four-year colleges, whereas 61 percent of the sample that responded to the survey were presidents of four-year institutions.

The results of the chi-square revealed the distribution of males and females to be similar, $X^2 (1, N = 4) = 2.46$, ns. The proportions of male and female presidents who responded to the ELI survey are equivalent to the male/female proportions represented in the ACP. The representation of males in the ACP report was 78 percent, and 81 percent of the respondents to the survey were male. Twenty-two percent of institution presidents in the ACP were female, and 19 percent of the respondents to the ELI were female.

**Instruments**

The 40-item Fisher Tack Effective Leadership Inventory (FTELI) (1988) leadership scale was modified for this study into a 60-item scale, the Effective Leadership Inventory (ELI). The ELI is a self-report survey assessing aspects of effective leadership (see Appendix E for the Effective Leadership Inventory). Across the two leadership
instruments (i.e., FTELI and ELI), 26 of the items have identical wording; however, Fisher and Koch (2004) modified the wording in nine of the FTELI items, eliminated three FTELI items, and added 25 new items to the new ELI. Specifically, Fisher and Koch (2004) expanded the ELI to include questions related to current topics and issues, including distance learning, dotcoms, politics, and so on.

Table 1

Demographic Representation of the Total Sample and Subsamples of Representative and Effective Presidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Type</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Four-year</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ELI is composed of three subparts. Part I of the ELI is currently a conventional 60-item leadership scale using a 5-point Likert scale, with item response options ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The items on Part I of the ELI measure the extent to which respondents endorse beliefs and behaviors associated with leadership styles and personal attitudes. Part II of the ELI catalogs professional background information such as the respondents’ degrees earned, institutions granting degrees, and so on. Part III surveys such personal and demographic information as the respondents’ gender and marital status.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Procedures

The original 2049 sitting presidents and the 393 directors of education organizations cited in and selected from the 2001 *HED* were each mailed a letter asking them to nominate up to six especially effective college or university presidents/chancellors and requesting that they return the nominations to the researchers within six weeks. The 720 presidents nominated as effective by this process were then mailed the *ELI* and asked to complete the inventory and return it to the researchers within one month.

The 1349 non-nominated or representative presidents, selected from the 2001 *HED*, were mailed the *ELI* and asked to return the completed inventory to the researchers within one month. For follow-up purposes, each inventory was coded numerically prior to being mailed, thereby allowing the researchers to determine from whom the completed *ELI* had been received. Participants were promised anonymity and confidentiality with respect to themselves, their institutions and other personal identifying information; however, respondents were not promised the results of the study. All completed forms were returned to Koch, who entered the majority of the data. This author entered additional data and completed the necessary analyses to answer the questions posed in this study.

Analysis of Data

Evaluation of the data from this study was processed using the SPSS (SPSS, Inc) software systems. Principal components exploratory factor analyses were to reduce the data set to meaningful subsets (i.e., factors). Only salient loadings with a magnitude .30 and greater were included in the factor definitions. In the initial analysis, using an
eigenvalue of 1.0, twenty principal components were formed, with eighteen of the factors composed of fewer than seven items, often with cross-loadings. A second factor analysis was performed to reduce the twenty subscales to a smaller, more interpretable number of factors. In the second factor extraction, an eigenvalue of 2.0 was employed, based on the unique contributive value of each successive eigenvalue as displayed in the scree plot.

To ensure adequate representation of the data, the factor matrix was rotated using the varimax procedure to determine the unique contribution of each item to a single factor. Based on item loadings, two resulting scales emerged, which appeared to correspond to the theoretical constructs of transactional and transformational leadership. Factor one was saliently represented by twenty-two items that reflect characteristics of transactional beliefs and behaviors. Factor two consists of twelve items that appear to represent transformational beliefs and behaviors. From this point forward, transactional and transformational styles of leadership will be operationally defined as the resulting scale scores on factors one and two of the modified ELI, respectively (Appendix A).

The factor analysis ended with a two-factor solution because factors beyond two were plagued with too few items to produce acceptable scale reliability or contribute meaningfully to interpretation. After the scales were reduced to two, based on the factor analysis, several iterations of reliability analyses (i.e. internal consistency) were performed to eliminate all items that did not contribute to improved scale reliability. Any item that improved reliability by its removal was deleted from the scale. In addition, items with negative factor loadings were reverse scored. Appendix F provides a list of items and indicates further which items were eliminated from the instrument and the reason for removal. Correlation coefficients were generated to examine the relationships...
between the two leadership scales for the total sample and all subsamples. Appendix G provides the alpha coefficients for transactional and transformational scales and item correlation with respective scales. The resulting coefficient alphas for the transactional and transformational scales (.79 and .74, respectively) are considered acceptable for use in research (Bracken, 1987; Wasserman & Bracken, 2003).

Means and standard deviations were calculated for the total sample, and for subsamples identified as effective and representative, male, female, public, private, two-year, and four-year institutions. For between subjects analyses a 2 (gender) x 2 (institutional type) x 2 (public/private) x 2 (effective/representative) x 2 (transformational/transactional) multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to compare groups on each of the two scales. Within-group comparisons were conducted using dependent t-tests to test differences in transactional and transformational leadership styles within-demographic subgroups.

Mean score comparisons (i.e. the average of all items contributing to each scale) between effective and representative presidents were conducted for each of the original 60 ELI items, with transactional and transformational items identified separately in the analyses. Independent t-tests were used to determine whether significant differences exist between each of the respective 60 items. Because this level of analysis was conducted for exploratory purposes, a liberal alpha level of .10 was used. To correct for alpha slippage and to maintain an overall experiment-wise error rate of .10, the Bonferonni correction was applied (i.e., .10 ÷ 60), resulting in an individual item alpha level of $p \leq .002$. 
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For all significant findings from ANOVA calculations, paired sample $t$-tests, and independent $t$-tests, effect sizes were calculated using the Cohen's $d$ statistics. For all calculations, pooled sample standard deviations were employed in the denominator, with the difference between the respective sample means in the numerator. Cohen (1988, p. 25) defined effect sizes as small, $d = .2$, medium, $d = .5$, and large, $d = .8$, but cautioned that there is a risk in offering such an operational definition for diverse areas of inquiry.
CHAPTER 3

Results

Data analyses for this study included descriptive, correlational, and inferential statistics, and the results are presented in the sections that follow. Descriptive statistics (i.e., item means and standard deviations) for the total sample and demographic sub-samples (e.g., presidential type, gender) on the transactional and transformational factors are presented in Table 2. Descriptive statistics are also presented for each of the 60 ELI items for effective and representative presidents. Results are presented sequentially to address each of the 18 research questions asked.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Means and Standard Deviations and Sample Sizes for Total Sample and Subsamples on Transactional and Transformational Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To answer research questions One through Eight, a mixed design MANOVA was conducted to examine differences in presidents' endorsement of beliefs and behaviors.
associated with transactional and transformational leadership styles, contrasting effective and representative presidents, male and female presidents, presidents from private versus public universities, and presidents from four-year versus two-year institutions. Results indicated that no significant interactions existed for any combination of the independent variables, but a single significant main effect was found for the public and private institution category.

Research questions One and Two addressed the possible differences in self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors between effective and representative presidents. The mixed design MANOVA revealed a nonsignificant main effect for presidential type, Wilks’ \( \Lambda = .99, F(2, 655) = 2.21, p = .11 \). There were no differences in either transactional or transformational leadership styles between effective and representative presidents as assessed by the modified ELI.

Questions Three and Four asked whether differences exist between male and female presidents in their self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors. The main effect for gender was nonsignificant, Wilks’ \( \Lambda = .99, F(2, 655) = 2.45, p = .06 \), suggesting that male presidents and female presidents did not differ in either transactional or transformational leadership styles as assessed by the modified ELI.

Research questions Five and Six addressed whether there are differences in self-assessed leadership styles between presidents of two-year and four-year institutions. The MANOVA indicated that no significant main effect was found for transactional and transformational leadership styles between presidents from two-year and four-year institutions, Wilks’ \( \Lambda = .99, F(2, 655) = .25, p = .78 \). The implication of this finding is that there were no differences in self-reported transactional or transformational beliefs or
behaviors between presidents of two-year and four-year institutions as assessed by the modified ELI.

Questions Seven and Eight asked whether there are differences in self-reported leadership styles between presidents of public versus private institutions. The main effect for leadership styles between presidents from public and private institutions was significant, Wilks' $\Lambda = .99, F(2, 655) = 5.04, p < .007$. As a follow-up to this significant finding, an ANOVA was conducted for public and private institutions. The results revealed that presidents from public and private institutions did not differ with respect to self-reported transformational leadership beliefs or behaviors, but presidents did differ significantly as a function of institution type on the transactional scale, $F(1, 667) = 23.92, p < .001, d = .40$. Public institution presidents endorsed transactional scale items more strongly than did presidents of private institutions. Cohen's $d$ statistics revealed a small to moderate effect between presidents of public and private institutions.

To answer research questions Nine through Sixteen, paired-sample $t$-tests were conducted to compare the mean differences in transactional and transformational scales within-groups (i.e., effective, representative, male, female, two-year, four-year, public and private presidents). Table 3 presents the results for the four dependent $t$-tests. Effect sizes were calculated for all significant $t$-tests using Cohen's $d$ statistics.

Question Nine asked whether there are differences between effective university presidents' self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors. The means for transactional and transformational leadership scales differed significantly for effective presidents, revealing that effective presidents endorsed more strongly transactional than transformational items, $t(348) = 46.30, p = < .001, d = 2.48$. 
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Similarly, the results for research question Ten indicated that the representative presidents' transactional leadership style item mean was significantly greater than the item mean for transformational leadership style, \( t(322) = 39.96, p = .001, d = 2.25 \). The Cohen's \( d \) statistic revealed a large effect size for both effective and representative presidents.

Paired-samples \( t \)-tests also were conducted to answer questions Eleven and Twelve, which asked whether there are differences in self-endorsed transactional and transformational leadership beliefs and behaviors among university presidents on the basis of gender. The results indicated that the transactional scale mean for female presidents was significantly greater, \( t(130) = 28.88, p < .001, d = 2.61 \), than for transformational scale mean (See Table 3). For male presidents, the transactional style scale mean also was significantly higher than the scale mean for the transformational style, \( t(540) = 53.89, p < .001, d = 2.30 \). For both males and females, the magnitude of the effect was large.

Questions Thirteen and Fourteen asked whether there are differences between the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of presidents of public institutions, as well as for presidents of private universities. Paired-sample \( t \)-test results indicated that presidents of private institutions endorsed transactional beliefs and behaviors more strongly than transformational beliefs and behaviors, \( t(317) = 40.24, p < .001, d = 2.20 \). Presidents from public institutions also endorsed characteristics associated with transactional more than those associated with transformational leadership, \( t(353) = 46.57, p < .001, d = 2.52 \). The Cohen's \( d \) statistic revealed a large effect size for both private and public institution presidents.
Research questions Fifteen and Sixteen asked whether there are differences in the self-reported transactional and transformational beliefs and behaviors of presidents of two-year institutions, as well as for presidents of four-year institutions. The results (Table 3) indicated that presidents of two-year institutions endorsed transactional beliefs and behaviors more strongly than transformational beliefs and behaviors, \( t(262) = 39.36, p < .001 \). Presidents of four-year institutions also endorsed more strongly endorsed transactional beliefs and behaviors than transformational beliefs and behaviors, \( t(408) = 46.43, p < .001 \). For both two-year and four-year institution presidents, the \( d \) values were 2.46 and 2.31, respectively, indicating a large effect size.

Table 3

Presidents' Transactional and Transformational Leadership Mean Score Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( d )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Year</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .001 \)

Question Seventeen asked about the relationship between the transactional and transformational leadership scales for the total sample and demographic subsamples. Pearson product moment correlations were computed between the two leadership scale scores for the total sample and for each presidential subgroup. The results of the
correlational analyses revealed that all coefficients scales were nonsignificant (Table 4). For all presidential subgroups, transactional and transformational leadership style scale scores correlated to a degree that was not significantly greater than zero.

*Table 4*

*Correlations Between Transactional and Transformational Leadership Scales for Each Presidential Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Year</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All correlations were nonsignificant, p. >.05

To address question Eighteen, which explored whether differences exist between the perceptions of effective and representative presidents on each of the original 60 *ELI* items, mean comparisons between effective and representative presidents were conducted. Independent *t*-tests compared representative and effective presidents on each of the respective items, using a liberal exploratory alpha level of .10. To correct for alpha slippage associated with conducting 60 contrasts, the Bonferroni correction was applied (i.e., .10 ÷ 60), resulting in an individual *t*-test alpha level of *p* ≤ .002, with an overall experiment-wise alpha of .10.
Mean comparisons using $t$-tests assume equal variance between the samples contrasted. This assumption was tested for each contrast employing the Levene's test of equality of variances, which is reported as an ANOVA $F$ ratio. Whenever the contrasting variances were found to be significantly different, the subsequent $t$-test was conducted using the proper adjusted degrees of freedom as a correction. In addition to the 60 items analyzed, 12 transformational and 22 transactional items are identified separately for the reader and are noted in Table 5. To determine the effect size indices, the Cohen's $d$ statistic was computed only for those items that were significant.

Significant differences were found on ELI items 5, 21, 28, 43, 46, 47, 49, 51, and 59 (See Table 5). These results collectively reveal that as compared to representative presidents, effective presidents perceived themselves as more energetic, more active in national higher education organizations, more politically adept, having stronger support of their governing boards, having been more successful at concluding partnerships with businesses and government agencies, generating more innovative ideas, and more internationalist in outlook. Representative presidents reported that they believe more in organizational structure and that they are more burdened by governing boards that attempt to micromanage their respective institutions. Obtained results and alpha levels are shown in Table 5 with significant differences (i.e., $p \leq .002$) indicated by asterisks. Using Cohen's descriptive criteria for the nine significant items, the effect sizes for the significant items ranged from small to medium.

The results of the analyses of this study revealed that both effective and representative university presidents, regardless of gender and institution type, endorsed more strongly beliefs and behaviors associated with transactional leadership more so than...
beliefs and behaviors associated with transformational leadership as assessed by the modified ELL. The single significant between-subjects factor-level finding was that presidents of public universities endorsed beliefs and behaviors associated with transactional leadership more so than did presidents of private institutions. Comparison between effective and representative presidents on the 60 ELL items revealed significant differences on nine items.
Table 5

Mean Score Comparisons Between Representative and Effective Presidents on ELI Transactional (†) and Transformational (††) Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELI Items</th>
<th>Presidential Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed. †† Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Believe respect from those I lead is crucial.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Place a high value on consensus. †† (Reversed Scored)</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Believe in organizational structure.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Believe in close collegial relationships with faculty. †† (Reversed Scored)</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Believe that a leader serves the people.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELI Items</th>
<th>Presidential Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Believe in merit pay.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Am sometimes viewed as assertive.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Frequently violate the status quo.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Believe the economy’s failed dot.com firms provided cautionary lesson for higher education.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Always use social and athletic functions as opportunities to promote my institution. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Accept losses gracefully.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELI Items</th>
<th>Presidential Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Maintain a measure of mystic. † †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Am more likely than most presidents to consider alternative methods of delivering higher education.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Choose another CEO as a confidant. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Am highly involved in the community. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-2.91</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Always appear energetic. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.002 *</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Am often viewed as a loner. † †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Count committee meetings as mistakes. † †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than as a good colleague. † †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Tend to work long hours. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELI Items</td>
<td>Presidential Type</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Often like people who are different.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Only occasionally speak spontaneously.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Participate actively in national higher education organizations. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-6.46</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Dress well. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Care deeply about the welfare of the individual. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Put my institution before myself. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Encourage creative individuals even though we may disagree. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Appear to make decisions easily.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Appear confident even when in doubt. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELI Items</th>
<th>Presidential Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Have made decisions that could have resulted in my losing my job if the results had turned out badly.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof. † †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Enjoy stirring things up. † †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Am feared by some. † †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Smile a lot. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Believe fund-raising and development tasks are my highest priority.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Would consider moving to a better position.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Am viewed as politically adept. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELI Items</th>
<th>Presidential Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. Am viewed as a strongly academic person.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. View the faculty senate as a substantially useless appendage. ††</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Have the strong support of my governing board.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-3.64</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Have successfully concluded many partnerships involving business and</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-5.49</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government with my institution. †</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Make many mistakes.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Am burdened by governing board that attempts to micromanage the</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution.</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Am solely responsible for teaching a course at least once every two</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years.</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Generate many innovative ideas. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELI Items</td>
<td>Presidential Type</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Believe the President is the final authority under the governing board on all matters affecting the institution.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Believe faculty should make academic decisions.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Am warm and affable. †† (Reversed Scored)</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Believe intercollegiate athletics are in need of reform.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Spend a great deal of time dealing with the media and the press. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Frequently walk my campus and am seen by students and faculty.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Am viewed by minorities and women as highly supportive of them. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Am an internationalist in outlook. †</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-3.40</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Believe the campus involvement of my spouse or significant other is important.</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items significant with Bonferonni Correction applied p≤.002.
CHAPTER 4
Discussion

This study investigated the relationship between self-reported leadership beliefs and behaviors within and between groups of university presidents nominated as effective by their peers and non-nominated, "representative" university presidents. In addition, differences were examined between effective and representative presidents on each of the 60 ELI items. The study also considered differences in self-perceived leadership styles among university presidents based on institution type (i.e., public/private, two-year/four-year) and presidential gender. Using factor and reliability analyses, scales were developed in an effort to represent transactional and transformational styles of leadership.

Across effective and representative presidents surveyed and all combinations of presidential demographic subgroups, presidents performed similarly on the transactional and transformational scales. This was the principal finding derived from the MANOVA analyses, which revealed a single significant main effect and no significant interactions between any combination of the independent variables and the measures of transactional and transformational leadership. That is, there were no significant main effects between presidents in their apparent transactional and transformational leadership styles related to any of the demographic categories (i.e., effective and representative, male and female, two-year and four-year presidents), except one (i.e., public and private universities). Presidents of public universities responded to the ELI reflecting a significantly more transactional style than did presidents of private universities.
The follow up analysis revealed a small to moderate effect for this single significant factor.

Analysis of the mean differences between transactional and transformational scales within the demographic groups revealed that every group responded in a more transactional than transformational leadership style. Effect sizes for these differences were large for all groups (i.e., 2.20 to 2.61), suggesting that across the board, university presidents overwhelmingly perceived they exhibited beliefs and behaviors associated with transactional leadership to a greater degree than those associated with transformational behaviors.

Contrasts between effective and representative presidents on each of the 60 ELI items revealed nine items that yielded significant differences, each with small to moderate effect sizes. Collectively, effective presidents perceived themselves as more energetic, more active in national higher education organizations, more politically adept, more successful at forming partnerships with business and government agencies, more internationalist in outlook, generating more innovative ideas, and having stronger support of their boards. Representative presidents indicated that they believe more in organizational structure, and that they are more burdened by governing boards that attempt to micromanage their respective institutions than effective presidents.

**Transactional and Transformational Leadership**

Transactional and transformational leadership appear to not be mutually exclusive conditions. Bass (1985) contended that transactional and transformational leadership do not lie along a continuum with leaders being either transactional or transformational. Rather, the two styles should be thought of as complementary and that leaders likely
exercise a mixture of the two styles. Noteworthy in this study is the finding that transacti

ional and transformational scale scores were not significantly correlated, supporting Bass’ contention of a complementary rather than correlated relationship. In this study, university presidents perceived themselves as exhibiting behaviors identified as transactional more often than those associated with transformational leadership, but they also endorsed behaviors that represent a combination of both transactional and transformational styles. The sample mean for effective presidents on the transactional scale was 4.18, and 2.68 on the transformational scale. Representative presidents’ total sample mean on the transactional scale was 4.06, and 2.68 on the transformational scale. With a total sample mean of 4.12 on the transactional scale and a mean of 2.68 on the transformational scale, presidents overall favored a transactional style of leadership, but appear to not be exclusively transactional in their beliefs and behaviors.

Birnbaum (1992) proposed that a blend of transactional and transformational leadership might be the most effective style of leadership. He did not propose an ideal appropriate admixture of the two styles, but was more supportive of behaviors associated with transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio (1994) also proposed that there is an optimal blend of leadership style, including transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership. Effective leaders, according to Bass and Avolio, display each style in differing degrees and intensities, but more frequently manifest transformational leadership styles. Others wrote of the different styles of leadership in terms of situational suitability. Fisher and Koch (1996) and Millett (1980) noted that some circumstances might warrant transactional leadership and some might warrant transformational leadership. For example, a transformational style might be most appropriate when an
institution is foundering or in crisis. However, as Fisher and Koch concluded, an existing “comfortable” situation within an institution might be suitable reason for transactional presidential leadership.

Different Times and Circumstances

Some authors have suggested that different times and circumstances foster different styles of leadership (Fiedler, 1967; Yukl, 1989). Fisher, Tack and Wheeler (1988) surveyed university presidents using the FTELI and followed up by interviewing 18 university presidents. The authors examined the survey results and interviews and concluded that effective university presidents perceived themselves as more transformational than transactional, conclusions which run counter to the central finding of this study. It is possible that different times and circumstances may have resulted in current presidents with different leadership styles than presidents of the recent past. Earlier “transformational” presidents, such as Eliot and Hesburgh, were considered to be effective leaders, but unfortunately there is no way to predict with certainty how these presidents would have responded to the ELI. However, these early leaders have been fairly uniformly described by words such as “strong, powerful, and innovative”, descriptors that are associated with and connote transformational leadership.

Increased Pressure on Institutions and University Presidents

Vaill (1996, p. xiv) described our society as turbulent “permanent white water” and he described higher education as continually responding to tumultuous and erratic changes in direction, presses, and expectations. Furthermore, Ward (2004) suggested that the magnitude of change in higher education over the past ten years has been greater than during any period since 1960. Current social, economic, and political pressure may have
significantly altered the environments experienced by earlier presidents who were considered effective (e.g., Eliot, Hutchins, and Hesburgh). Changes in society have created increasing pressure on higher education institutions and this accelerating rate and intensity of pressure may have limited the ability of university presidents to act as transformational leaders.

Financial pressure

A prominent example of the escalating pressures beset upon higher education and university presidents is the preponderance of criticism from the general public, governors, and legislators about rising tuition rates. Over the past decade, in real, inflation adjusted dollars tuition has increased an average of 37.9 percent at public four-year colleges and 39.2 percent at private four-year colleges. That is, the amounts have been equated and contrasted with constant 2002 dollars (Farrell, 2003). Moreover, between 1976 and 1995 tuition and fees increased by more than 100 percent (Benjamin, 1998).

The financial state of universities has continually changed, compounding the difficulties experienced by university presidents. Over the past decades, there has been increased competition for state appropriations from social programs, prisons, health care, and K-12 education. For example, between the 2001-02 and 2002-03 academic years, twenty-five states received no increases in state appropriations or experienced actual decreases in support (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue, 2003-4). In addition, the demands for increased accountability are resounding from both state and federal governments, combining with a rising level of discussion about performance funding (Burke, 2002). Exacerbating the financial situations of both public and private
higher education institutions are the vicissitudes of the stock market and interest rate declines occurring during the past three years, which have seriously eroded returns on endowment investments.

Pressure from the media

During the past decade, media coverage has become increasingly critical of higher education and appear to “thrive on conflict,” especially conflict within highly visible colleges and universities (Campbell, 2000, p. 161). University presidents seemingly are always “on duty” and must be always on guard because negative attention from the media can be a president’s “worst nightmare” (Cotton, 2003, p. AO). The media also can be a friend to a university president, but such friendship means that presidents must make the choice to invest the necessary time to develop and maintain trusting relationships with the local media. Whether friend or foe, changing times and circumstances during the last decade have resulted in the media becoming a major force to be reckoned with in higher education and a challenge in the life of virtually every university president.

Current Environment of Higher Education

The social and political circumstances of today’s presidencies appear to differ from those of presidents who were considered effective in years past. Some notable circumstantial differences in higher education over the last decade include the changes in demographic characteristics of students and faculty, affirmative action issues, increasingly litigious environments, lessened prestige of university presidents, board members with strong agendas, and pressures from donors. As a result of these environmental changes, the leadership role of presidents has become more complex. These internal and external factors may cause some presidents to become risk-averse and
avoid situations that may become contentious. As a result, presidents may be less likely to be “strong, assertive” presidents (Fisher, 1984). Some of these current realities also may have influenced the results of this study, which revealed that both effective and representative presidents perceived themselves as behaving more in a transactional than transformational style.

Limitations of leadership

It is possible that, as Rosenzweig (1998) and Chait (1998) suggested, circumstantial changes in higher education environments may have resulted in a less effective style of presidential leadership. In extensive interviews with twelve university presidents, Leslie and Fretwell (1996) reported that every president interviewed felt “hamstrung and whipsawed by the divergent interests of powerful internal and external constituencies” (p. 88), essentially resulting in presidents perceiving an inability to effectively bring about change. The President Emeritus of Stanford University, Donald Kennedy (1994) implied similar sentiments by acknowledging that in the current context of higher education there are serious influences that limit effective leadership.

Changing role of university presidents

The type of university president in today’s institutions appears to differ substantially from that of earlier university leaders, which may be a result of changing presidential roles. Today’s university presidents are expected to be lobbyists, fundraisers, and public relations experts (Lovett, 2002). In recent years, presidential activity has been increasingly concentrated on fundraising and addressing external constituencies (Boyer, 1990, Corrigan, 2002). Strong leadership styles and a focus on shaping the future of an institution appear less important today than projecting a warm, positive, and dynamic
image similar to that projected by political candidates. Rita Bomstein (1995, p. 4), the past president of Rollins College, made a similar observation and wrote that the way to “get on” is “to be safe, to be sound, to be agreeable, to be inoffensive, to have no views on important matters not sanctioned by the majority, by your superiors, or by your group.” Such described individuals would be described as transactional rather than transformational.

Selection of university presidents

In 2003, an estimated 80 percent of institution selection committees and board members interviewed presidential candidates who were forwarded by “headhunters” or consultants (Lovett, 2002). Headhunters and consultants likely do not identify or present those candidates who would “challenge the conventional wisdom of their constituents, and create new paradigms in higher education” (Lovett, 2002, p. 3). Moreover, if presidents with a transformational style of leadership were presented by consultants or headhunters, selection committees might not choose them because of a preference for congenial consensus builders and facilitators instead of candidates who are nonconformists, change agents, and risk takers. In this competitive environment, some aspiring presidents hire public relations or marketing specialists or attend classes in public relations in an effort to present an executive image in person and on their resumes (Lovett, 2002). Because there are several training programs for aspiring presidents (e.g., American Council on Education Fellows Program, Columbia University’s Presidential Leadership Program, Harvard University’s Institute for Educational Management), it should be asked in what manner presidents are being trained by these organizations and whether these programs are essentially producing cookie cutter transactional presidents.
Public and Private Institutions

This study revealed that public university presidents perceived themselves as exhibiting more transactional beliefs and behaviors than did private university presidents. A possible explanation for this result is that public institution presidents serve a wider and more diverse group of stakeholders that includes legislators, community leaders, private donors, and the general public, and as a result may have more constraints placed on them than are imposed on private university presidents. Private institution presidents are responsible to a governing board, alumni, and donors, but are not responsible to legislators and the general public and do not face state rules, audits, and so on. Although presidents of private universities have responsibilities to their local communities, these responsibilities and community demands are not as complicated as those experienced by presidents of public institutions.

Fundamental differences between institution types may also be important. Private institutions receive little tax-based funding from state governments and therefore are not accountable to taxpayers. In the fiscal year 2000, public four-year institutions received 30.9 percent of their expenditure budgets from state appropriations, whereas private four-year institutions received less than one percent of their expenditures from state funds (The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue, 2003-4). Along with funding allocations from state governments come concomitant regulations, constraints, and political pressures.

Another significant difference between private and public institutions is that private university governing boards are neither elected by the public nor appointed by the governor and legislature, as they are at public institutions. Some board members of
public institutions may be appointed primarily for political reasons and their individual agendas may not be related to contributing to the success of the university president. Additionally, private institutions generally are subject to less scrutiny from the public and experience fewer attacks from the media.

Further, some states have “sunshine laws” which require public college and university board meetings to be open to the general public. These open meetings could reveal controversial conversations and decisions that may result in criticism by the public and media. Private institutions are not legally required by sunshine laws to hold public board or committee sessions, thereby fostering an environment that is more conducive to change and unimpeded exchange of information. Private institutions also face fewer requirements to abide by federal regulations, regulations that can create hardships and restraints for public institutions. For example, most state versions of the Freedom of Information Acts require public institutions to disclose records to any person who makes a request in writing. The release of personnel and financial records of an institution can engender public criticism of an institution and ultimately, of the president. Although some private institutions are subject to certain freedom of information provisions because they receive federal funding, most private universities are not required to reveal critical personnel records and institutional leadership decisions.

It seems logical that presidents of private institutions have more freedom in their leadership decision-making than do public university presidents because there are fewer political pressures created by the state political system, fewer state and federal regulatory mandates, and less scrutiny and criticism from the public and media. These issues/constraints may be some of the factors influencing the finding of this study, in
which public university presidents perceived themselves as more transactional in their approach to leadership than did private university presidents. It may simply be that the public university presidents perceived themselves as more transactional in orientation and behavior because they believe they have little choice to be otherwise.

Male and Female Presidents

The results of the study revealed that male and female presidents did not respond differentially on the transactional and transformational leadership style scales. This finding is in contrast to the outcome of a study by Bass and Avolio (as cited in Maher, 1997) using subordinate ratings. Bass and Avolio found that when rated by male and female subordinates, female leaders were rated more transformational than male leaders in their leadership style. In a study by Druskat (1994), female subordinates also rated female leaders as more transformational than males. While the Bass and Avolio study focused on upper level managers in industrial firms and the Druskat study took place in an all-female religious order of the Roman Catholic Church, this study focused on college and university presidents. The discrepancy in the findings of this study and the Bass and Avolio and Druskat studies may be due to the differences in raters (i.e., self vs. subordinates) and the dissimilar contexts of higher education, religious order, and corporate settings. In a higher education context, Bass (1985) conducted a study of undergraduate evening students who were asked to evaluate any current or past supervisor on transactional and transformational leadership styles. The results revealed no significant differences between male and female supervisors on the two assessed styles of leadership. Each of the prior studies (i.e., Bass & Avolio, Druskat, and Bass
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studies) collected ratings from subordinates, whereas, this study focused on self-reported data obtained from male and female university presidents.

**Effective and Representative Presidents**

Using an uncorrected experiment-wise alpha level (i.e., \( p < .05 \)), Fisher, Tack and Wheeler (1988) compared effective and representative presidents on the 40 *FTELI* items. Their results revealed significant differences on seven of the 40 *FTELI* items. As compared to representative presidents, effective presidents reported that they believed more in organizational structure, they only occasionally spoke spontaneously and they believed in the institution at all costs. More so than effective presidents, representative presidents believed having the respect of those to be led is essential; they were primarily concerned about being liked; they believed more in close collegial relationships; and they tended more to work long hours.

Although this study used a corrected alpha level in its analyses and interpretation, to make a more direct comparison with the results of the previous studies, contrasts were also made using the same experiment-wise alpha level as Fisher et al. (1988).

Comparison of effective and representative presidents on the 60 *ELI* items revealed significant differences on 13 items (\( p < .05 \)). In the current study, effective presidents perceived themselves as more frequently violating the status quo, as being more highly involved in the community, as appearing more energetic, as participating more actively in national higher education organizations, as being viewed as more politically adept, and as having stronger support of their governing boards. Effective presidents also perceived themselves as having concluded more partnerships between their institution and businesses and government organizations, as spending more time dealing with the media.
and press, as generating more innovative ideas, and as being more internationalist in outlook. Representative presidents perceived themselves as believing more in organizational structure and more burdened by a board that attempts to micromanage their institution. Representative, more often than effective presidents, reported that they are solely responsible for teaching a class at least once every two years.

Comparing across studies and instruments, only one item common to both scales was significant on both the FTELI and ELI. In the Fisher et al. (1988) study, and in the current study, representative presidents perceived they believed more strongly in organizational structure than effective presidents.

A few items on the ELI were strongly related in content to items on the FTELI, but with minor differences in wording. Two such items were significant on the ELI—items referring to violating the status quo and community involvement. The items on the ELI revealed that current effective presidents perceived that they more frequently violate the status quo than representative presidents. The comparable item on the FTELI, “am rarely in keeping with the status quo,” did not differ between effective and representative presidents in the Fisher et al. (1988) study. Also, one item on the ELI revealed that current effective presidents perceived themselves as being more highly involved in the community than their representative presidential peers; however, past effective presidents did not differ on the comparable FTELI item related to community involvement, “believe in community involvement.” Because these items were worded slightly differently, a direct comparison of the results is not feasible. The remaining ten significant ELI items were not part of the FTELI, and therefore preclude comparisons across instruments and between current and past samples of effective and representative presidents.
Is there a meaningful relationship between the current findings that university presidents endorsed more transactional beliefs and behaviors and the recurring calls for stronger, more effective presidents (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984; Cowley, 1980; Kamm, 1982; Kauffman, 1980; Keller, 1983; Lovett, 2002)? Observers such as Fisher and Koch (1996) and Shaw (1996) proposed just such a relationship. Fisher and Koch concluded that a "comfortable" situation within an institution may be a primary reason for transactional leadership, but comfortable situations have not existed on many campuses during the past couple decades. Strong proponents of transformational leadership, Fisher and Koch implied that transactional leadership might be consistent with simply "riding the wave" or maintaining the status quo, and suggested that transactional or collegial, consensual leadership may be the prescription for creating not outstanding, but mediocre institutions.

**Limitations of Study**

**Identifying effective presidents**

Leaders of regional accrediting bodies and presidents of higher education organizations, in addition to chancellors and presidents of higher education institutions were asked to nominate effective presidents for this study. Because the leaders, chancellors and presidents were not provided a common definition of effectiveness, they were required to employ their own definitions when nominating presidents (i.e., "Please use your own definition of effectiveness"). It is not known how the nominating individuals defined effective or the criteria they employed when making nominations; therefore, it is possible that presidents who were nominated as effective were identified for reasons unrelated to effective leadership. For example, it may be that presidents were
nominated because of congenial, likeable, facilitative attributes. Given that these characteristics are identified with transactional leadership, more presidents with transactional qualities may have been nominated as effective. Supporting the possibility that more transactional presidents were nominated, a significant positive bivariate correlation existed between the 99 presidents who were nominated more than once and their score on the transactional scale, \((r = .15, p < .001)\). Conversely, the correlation between number of nominations and scores on the transformational scale was negative and nonsignificant \((r = -.04)\).

It is possible that presidents of prestigious institutions, leaders of universities that have successful athletic teams, and those presidents who are in the news more were perceived as more effective because of their institutions’ visibility. However, these nominees may have merely inherited coaches, public relations officers, and others who are effective – inherited effective employees who make the president also appear effective.

Importantly, although 99 presidents received two or more nominations, there were nearly three times as many presidents \((N=251)\) presidents who received only a single nomination. In some cases, a president’s nomination as effective was a self-nomination. It would seem that if these 251 nominated presidents were conclusively effective, they should not have been allowed to nominate themselves and they should have received multiple nominations. Moreover, it is also highly likely that there were effective presidents among the representative sample who were not nominated, with a myriad of reasons for their non-nomination. Also, presidents may be effective at some roles and functions and not others, which further muddies the nomination process and reduces any
real differences that exist between the two groups studied. In future studies, to better understand the true differences between presidents who are effective there should be agreement on the criteria employed for judging presidential effectiveness.

Albeit, there may have been differences of opinion in this study about the definition of presidential effectiveness and it is possible that some participants would not have agreed to participate if a definition of effective leadership had been provided. However, a common definition of effective leadership likely would have resulted in a greater consensus among participating nominators if a common definition had been employed. Moreover, a method of externally and objectively validating effective presidents would appear essential for ensuring accurate and distinct groups for comparison. An example of such external validation might include returning the full list of nominated presidents to each of the nominators for rank ordering in an effort to obtain consensus or otherwise establishing objective criteria for operationally defining effectiveness.

Presidents' self-reported data

Several researchers who surveyed leaders and their subordinates using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire found that leaders often inflated their self-reports (Bass & Yammarino, 1991). It is noteworthy that this study was based on university presidents' self-reported impressions, which may have been influenced by the responding presidents' cognitive biases, or egocentric factors. It is also feasible that the responses by university presidents on the ELI were colored by social desirability, the tendency for individuals to project favorable images (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). University presidents likely would not want to project an image that might offend diverse
constituents, have a negative effect on fundraising, or create a negative reaction among trustees. Presidents may have responded to survey items in a manner consistent with self-protective descriptors consistent with transactional leadership. For example, because of a desire to project a positive social image, presidents may have endorsed items that connoted collegiality, consensus, inclusivity, participative governance, and egalitarianism. University presidents may have considered the ELI transactional items to be more socially appropriate or desirable than behaviors that are perceived as strong, assertive, authoritative, and powerful, items associated with transformational leadership. The self-perceived ratings may not accurately reflect the respondents’ actual leadership style, but merely they way they would like to be seen.

Surveying subordinates of the presidents and presidents’ constituents about their respective presidents’ leadership styles, and subsequently comparing the results to the presidential self-reported data would provide one source of external validity for a president’s self-reported data.

*Constructs of leadership*

It should be considered that the two leadership style scales created and assessed by the *ELI* might not accurately reflect the constructs associated with the two styles of leadership due to construct sampling limitations. Because the *ELI* was not originally designed to measure the constructs of transactional and transformational leadership, it is possible that the scales developed through the data reduction process of factor and reliability analyses resulted in an under-sampling of the constructs. This limitation could be overcome in future studies through the creation of theoretically based scales that are
intended to more comprehensively measure the constructs of transactional and transformational leadership.

Elimination of ELI items

This study's research design employed factor and reliability analyses, which resulted in the elimination of items due to poor factor contribution or low internal consistency within the two subsequent scales. As a result, many items not associated with transactional or transformational leadership styles were eliminated from the instrument and therefore did not contribute to a larger, more comprehensive understanding of effective university presidents as were included in the instrument originally developed by Fisher and Koch (2004). Although the reliability and factor analyses created measures of transactional and transformational leadership that were as strong as possible given the original ELI item pool, the result may have reduced the discriminative value of the entire ELI as a whole.

Recommendations for Future Study

Given the results of this study and the findings reported by other authors about leadership styles of university presidents, there are additional areas of research that might contribute to increased knowledge about effective university presidents and their styles of leadership.

Development of transactional and transformational scales

The concept of transactional and transformational leadership styles was conceived by Burns in 1978. Twenty-six years later, this distinction is still well-respected, relevant, and is cited in the majority of general leadership textbooks. Continued research on transactional and transformational leadership would be useful in advancing knowledge
about the effectiveness of the two styles of leadership, not only in higher education, but also across contexts. Using the Fisher and Koch (2004) methodology for selecting the groups of effective and representative presidents, a comprehensive well-developed and validated scale based on the constructs of transactional and transformational leadership styles should be created and administered to externally validated groups of effective and representative university presidents. Several pilot studies should be conducted to ensure a universal sampling of the constructs of transactional and transformational leadership behaviors.

Comparison across contexts

In an effort to determine if the results of this study are unique to higher education leaders, such a newly developed scale should also be administered to leaders in other diverse settings, such as commanding officers in the military, senior administrators in government agencies, and CEOs of corporations. Several authors have argued that the context of higher education is unique and requires a different style of leadership than other organizations (Atwell & Green, 1981; Birnbaum, 1988; Corson, 1960; Flawn, 1990; Kaufman, 1989; Kramer & Mendenhall, 1982). In contrast to this view, Fisher and Koch (1996) suggested that fundamental leadership qualities are the same, no matter the context. This question may be worth re-examining as a decade has elapsed since the most recent investigations. In 2004, the qualities of leadership across the contexts of higher education, business, and the military may be different, creating more of a need for current data. Comparison of results across higher education, business, and the military would benefit university presidents as well as leaders in other settings.
Over the past several decades, an increasing number of university presidents have come from fields outside higher education. In 2001 almost 15 percent of university presidents came directly from outside academe, as compared to 10 percent in 1986. More than 60 percent of recent presidents have worked outside higher education in private businesses, government, or in the military (Corrigan, 2002). If leadership styles were found to be comparable across contexts as Fisher and Koch (1996) suggested, search committees and university-governing boards could be more confident when selecting CEOs or military officers as presidents of institutions. However, it is noteworthy that in The Entrepreneurial College President, Fisher and Koch (2004) found that presidents nominated as effective have spent 2.6 years less time outside of higher education than representative presidents. If leadership style differences exist between leaders of higher education institutions and other sectors in the population, then increased research should be conducted to learn more about the meaningful differences. Knowledge about differential contextual leadership styles might have implications for effective leadership across all contexts.

Comparison of different disciplines

The 2003-4 Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac Issue reported that a large percent of university presidents across the United States received their academic degrees in Education (43.8 percent). It is possible that university presidents’ collective field of study has influenced the findings of this study and the current university context. If more presidents were from other academic disciplines, such as engineering or the sciences, then results of this study might be different. Comparative research on deans and department chairs, using the proposed scale created for transactional and transformational
leadership, might provide more insight about whether the style of university presidential leadership is related to educational background, specifically, the discipline of the highest awarded degree.

Implications for Leadership in Higher Education

If the present time and circumstances and the role of current university presidents in fact more conducive to a transactional style of leadership, what are the implications for presidents who have transformational qualities? Gow (2002) presents several intriguing stories about recent presidents who have been in the center of campus controversies and concluded with the thought-provoking question, “...can a president serve and lead at the same time, and still remain in office?” (p.50). Given the current environment in higher education, it might be judicious for aspiring or current presidents to be personally congenial, democratic, and facilitating, but find alternative, more direct avenues for advancing their agendas for change. Presidents who make significant and sometimes controversial changes in today’s academic environment may put their positions at risk. An alternative, less risky path may be to empower the top-level administrators under the president to spearhead transformations associated with the president’s vision for the institution. Selecting the right persons to serve in key roles might be an effective means to getting things done and at the same time, allowing the president to maintain cordial relationships with the wide array of constituents. Because other administrators are not as visible as presidents and may not be under the same level of public scrutiny of the media, legislators, alumni or the public, they may have more freedom to exercise transformational leadership. Presidential delegation of responsibilities appears to be
something of a trend as Basinger (2003) contended that there are more and more provosts who have taken on more significant roles than in the past.

Making the right choices

Wiseman (1991, p. 7) suggested that university presidents should consider being “academic leaders” as well as fund-raisers and public relations emissaries. Being able to balance the internal and external matters of the institution is the ideal. However, because of insufficient time and multiple demands, this may not be possible for every president. Perhaps the distinction of an “effective” president is one who can decide among the myriad of responsibilities what is most essential to address at his/her respective institution, and successfully make the right choices and adjustments to fit the institution’s needs.

Goodness of fit

Fiedler (1967) suggested that presidents might be a better match for some institutions than they are for others, and that the best predictor of success is the proper match of a leader’s abilities and attributes for a given situation. This concept was echoed by Chess and Thomas (2003) when they proposed that a dynamic interaction could occur if there is a “goodness of fit,” a match of an individual’s characteristics with the “successive demands, expectations, and opportunities of the environment” (p. 1). It may be best if presidents assess the culture of the institution, its mission, role in the community, financial situation, relationship to donors and alumni, degree of support of the governing board, and if a public institution, relationships with governor and legislators. This assessment process will help the president determine where he or she should focus his/her energies and what duties and responsibilities should be delegated to
the top administrators of the institution. For example, it may beneficial for the president to be an external president if the relationship with the legislators, potential donors, or alumni is at a low degree of confidence, instead of entrusting development officers or public relations emissaries. If there are internal academic issues, such as needed curricular changes or low satisfaction level with the faculty and staff, the president may choose to focus on rebuilding internal relationships, rather than delegating the responsibilities to senior level staff. Presidential effectiveness may depend on a carefully crafted blend of transactional and transformational leadership matched with the state of the institution’s culture and circumstances.

The results of this study hold some potential significance for university board members. University presidents play significant roles in the future of colleges and universities and higher education. In the current challenging environment, stronger transformational presidential leadership may be more appropriate and board members may need to take calculated risks and hire presidents who can provide transformational leadership. However, it is unlikely that presidents of higher education institutions will have the freedom to be transformational in their leadership style, unless board members provide a supportive and facilitative environment for their presidents.

Conclusion

Despite considerable progress, further exploration into the theory and practice of transactional and transformational leadership is necessary. The ever-changing circumstances of higher education and the consequential role of the university president warrant continued research on transactional and transformational leadership of presidents of higher education institutions. It is imperative that more be learned about what
differentiates effective presidents from those who are not as effective. In addition, more information is needed to determine if effective presidential leadership can be developed and how it can best be developed.
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Dear Academic Colleague:

Almost 15 years ago, James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, and Karen J. Wheeler published *The Effective College President*, the first statistically rigorous and replicable empirical study of what makes some college presidents more effective and successful than others. Funded by the Exxon Foundation, their work firmly established that exceptionally effective college presidents are different from all other presidents in terms of how they see their jobs, do their work, and relate to others.

Now, funded by the Kauffman Foundation, we are testing and extending the Fisher/Tack/Wheeler study. Our special focus is on entrepreneurial presidents, but we also are giving additional attention to women and minority presidents, whose numbers have swelled considerably in recent years. Are they different from other presidents?

However, in order for us to proceed, we need your help! **We would like you to nominate up to six sitting college presidents as “especially effective, especially successful” in their jobs.** Please use your own definition of effectiveness.

Please use this sheet and the attached, postage paid envelope to send us up to six of your nominations. Do not hesitate to contact us at ikoch@odu.edu should you have any questions or suggestions.

Sincerely,

James V. Koch  
Board of Visitors Professor of Economics  
and President Emeritus, Old Dominion University

James L. Fisher  
President Emeritus, Towson University, and President Emeritus, Council for the Advancement and Support of Education

MY “MOST EFFECTIVE PRESIDENT” NOMINEES ARE:

________________________________________  ______________________________________  ______________________________________

________________________________________  ______________________________________  ______________________________________
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6 March 2002

Dear Academic Colleague:

We need your help! Almost 15 years ago, James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, and Karen J. Wheeler published *The Effective College President*, the first statistically rigorous and replicable empirical study of what makes some college presidents more effective and successful than others. Funded by the Exxon Foundation, their work firmly established that exceptionally effective college presidents are different from all other presidents in terms of how they see their jobs, do their work, and relate to others.

Now, funded by the Kauffman Foundation, we are testing and extending the Fisher/Tack/Wheeler study. Our special focus is on entrepreneurial presidents, but we also are giving additional attention to women and minority presidents, whose numbers have swelled considerably in recent years. Are they different from other presidents?

However, in order for us to proceed, we need your help! You have been nominated as an especially effective and successful president. Now, we would like you to complete the attached survey form so we can learn more about the attitudes and activities of especially effective presidents such as you.

Please use the attached, postage paid envelope to send us your survey. Do not hesitate to contact us at jkoch@odu.edu should you have any questions or suggestions.

Sincerely,

James V. Koch
Board of Visitors Professor of Economics
and President Emeritus, Old Dominion University

James L. Fisher
President Emeritus, Towson University, and President Emeritus, Council for the Advancement and Support of Education
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6 March 2002

Dear Academic Colleague:

We need your help! Almost 15 years ago, James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, and Karen J. Wheeler published *The Effective College President*, the first statistically rigorous and replicable empirical study of what makes some college presidents more effective and successful than others. Funded by the Exxon Foundation, their work firmly established that exceptionally effective college presidents are different from all other presidents in terms of how they see their jobs, do their work, and relate to others.

Now, funded by the Kauffman Foundation, we are testing and extending the Fisher/Tack/Wheeler study. Our special focus is on entrepreneurial presidents, but we also are giving additional attention to women and minority presidents, whose numbers have swelled considerably in recent years. Are they different from other presidents?

However, in order for us to proceed, we need your help! We would like you to complete the attached survey form so we can learn more about the attitudes and activities of sitting presidents such as you.

Please use the attached, postage paid envelope to send us your survey. Do not hesitate to contact us at jkoch@odu.edu should you have any questions or suggestions.

Sincerely,

James V. Koch

James L. Fisher

Board of Visitors Professor of Economics and President Emeritus, Old Dominion University

President Emeritus, Towson University, and President Emeritus, Council for the Advancement and Support of Education
Appendix D

EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP INVENTORY

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to identify the characteristics of an effective college president (chancellor) and focuses on three areas: styles/attitudes, professional information, and personal data. Please provide the information in the format requested.

PART I: PERSONAL ATTITUDES AND LEADERSHIP STYLE

Please react to the following statements about your own characteristics as a leader by checking the appropriate responses. Your responses should represent your perceptions of yourself as a leader.

SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  UD = Undecided  D = Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree

As a college president, I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Believe that respect from those I lead is crucial.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Place a high value on consensus.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Believe in organizational structure.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Believe in close collegial relationships with faculty.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Believe that a leader serves the people.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Believe in merit pay.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Am sometimes viewed as assertive.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Frequently violate the status quo.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Believe the economy’s failed dot.com firms provide a cautionary lesson for higher education.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Always use social and athletic functions as opportunities to promote my institution.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
16. Accept losses gracefully. | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

17. Maintain a measure of mystique. | SA | A | UD | D | SD |
18. Am more likely than most presidents to consider alternative methods of delivering higher education. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
19. Choose another CEO as a confidant. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
20. Am highly involved in the community. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
21. Always appear energetic. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
22. Am often viewed as a loner. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
23. Count committee meetings as mistakes. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
24. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than as a good colleague. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
25. Tend to work long hours. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
26. Often like people who are different. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
27. Only occasionally speak spontaneously. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
28. Participate actively in national higher education organizations. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
29. Dress well. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
30. Care deeply about the welfare of the individual. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
31. Put my institution before myself. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
32. Encourage creative individuals even even though we may disagree. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
33. Appear to make decisions easily. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
34. Appear confident even when in doubt. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
35. Have made decisions that could have resulted in my losing my job if the results had turned out badly | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
37. Enjoy stirring things up. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
39. Am feared by some. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
40. Smile a lot. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
41. Believe fund-raising and development tasks are my highest priority. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
42. Would consider moving to a better position. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
43. Am viewed as politically adept. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
44. Am viewed by faculty as a strongly academic person. | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
45. View the faculty senate as a substantially useless appendage. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
46. Have the strong support of my governing board. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
47. Have successfully concluded many partnerships involving business and government with my institution. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
48. Make many mistakes. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
49. Am burdened by a governing board that attempts to micromanage the institution. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
50. Am solely responsible for teaching a course at least once every two years. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
51. Generate many innovative ideas. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
52. Believe the President is the final authority under the governing board, on all matters affecting the institution. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
53. Believe faculty should make academic decisions. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
54. Am warm and affable. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
55. Believe intercollegiate athletics are in need of reform. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
56. Spend a great deal of time dealing with the media and the press. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
57. Frequently walk my campus and am seen by students and faculty. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
58. Am viewed by minorities and women as highly supportive of them. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
59. Am an internationalist in outlook. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
60. Believe the campus involvement of my spouse or significant other is important. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

**PART II: PROFESSIONAL DATA**

**Degrees Earned**

I hold a Doctoral degree:

No [ ]
Yes [ ]

If yes, type of degree:

- Ph.D. [ ]
- JD [ ]
- One or more honorary degrees [ ]
- Ed.D. [ ]
- MD [ ]
- Other [ ]
Institution Granting Degree: ____________________________

Type of Institution: Public [ ]
Private [ ]

Major: ____________________________

I hold a Master’s degree:
No [ ]
Yes [ ]

If yes, type of degree:
MA, MS [ ] MBA [ ]
M.Ed. [ ] MFA [ ] Other [ ]

Institution Granting Degree: ____________________________

Type of Institution: Public [ ]
Private [ ]

Major: ____________________________

I hold a Baccalaureate degree:
No [ ]
Yes [ ]

If yes, type of degree:
BS [ ] BFA [ ]
BA [ ] Other [ ]

Institution Granting Degree: ____________________________

Type of Institution: Public [ ]
Private [ ]

Coursework: I have taken two or more courses in the following academic areas:

Economics [ ] Accounting [ ]
Statistics [ ] Computer Science [ ]

Use of Technology:
I use the Internet frequently [ ] I require the most important
I use a computer frequently [ ] individuals who report to me
to carry a cell phone or
I carry a cell phone with me when pager so I can reach them [ ]
I’m away from campus [ ]
Previous Experience

Positions Held in Higher Education (Beginning with the first position, indicate the offices you have held using the codes listed below. When designating associate or assistant positions, codes should be combined, e.g., JE = assistant dean. If you changed institutions, but kept the same title, please make separate entries for each position occupied. Additionally, please refer to the institutional codes when identifying the type of institution at which you were employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Code</th>
<th>Institutional Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = Full-time faculty member</td>
<td>F = Assistant to the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Department chairperson</td>
<td>G = Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Coordinator</td>
<td>H = President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Director</td>
<td>I = Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Dean</td>
<td>J = Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K = Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Chronology</th>
<th>Position Code</th>
<th>Academic Dept.</th>
<th>Years in Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Total Years in Higher Education Administration: __________
Total Years of Experience Outside of Higher Education: __________
Total Years in Presidential Position: __________
Age upon Assumption of First Presidency: __________

Current Position

Years in Current Presidency: __________

Type of Institution: Public [ ]
Private [ ]
Two-Year [ ]
Four-Year [ ]

Student Population (headcount) of my campus: __________

Scholarly Activity

Number of Books Published: __________
Approximate Number of Articles in Refereed Journals: __________
Approximate Number of Professional Organization Memberships: __________
Two Professional Organizations in Which You Participate Frequently:

Organization #1: ____________________________
Office(s) Held: ____________________________
Organization #2: ____________________________
Office(s) Held: ____________________________

Positions Outside of Higher Education:

Immediately prior to assuming my first presidency, I held a position outside of higher education [ ]
Prior to becoming a college president, I was the CEO or equivalent of a business firm, foundation, or governmental agency [ ]
The total number of years I have spent as a full-time employee outside of higher education is: __________

PART III: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Age: _____  Sex: Male [ ]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race:</th>
<th>Native American [ ]</th>
<th>Asian American [ ]</th>
<th>African American [ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion:</td>
<td>Eastern Orthodox [ ]</td>
<td>Jewish [ ]</td>
<td>Muslim [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td>Never Married [ ]</td>
<td>Divorced [ ]</td>
<td>Widowed [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino [ ]</td>
<td>Caucasian [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Marriages:</td>
<td>0 [ ]</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My spouse or significant other is:</td>
<td>Employed full-time [ ]</td>
<td>Employed part-time [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes substantial uncompensated time to my institution [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not attend many major institutional activities such as graduations, athletic contests and social events [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is compensated by the institution for his/her contributions [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children:</td>
<td>0 [ ]</td>
<td>1 [ ]</td>
<td>2 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages of Children:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State or Foreign Country of Birth:</td>
<td>______________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Current Residence:</td>
<td>______________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation:</td>
<td>Independent [ ]</td>
<td>Democrat [ ]</td>
<td>Republican [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education:</td>
<td>Less Than High School [ ]</td>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate Courses [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Doctoral Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mother's Education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Doctoral Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Siblings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sibling Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger Brothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Sisters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Brothers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Sisters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return this instrument in the attached envelope to:

**James V. Koch**  
Board of Visitors Professor of Economics  
and President Emeritus  
Department of Economics  
Old Dominion University  
Norfolk, VA 23529

**or**  
James V. Koch  
240 Keith Avenue  
Missoula, MT 59801-4308

If you have questions, e-mail James V. Koch at jkoch@odu.edu.
Appendix E

Operational definitions of transactional and transformational leadership based on factorial analysis of the *ELI*. Numbers correspond to the original items in the *ELI*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Believe that the leader should be perceived as self confident</td>
<td>1 Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates</td>
<td>4 Do not place a high value on consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings</td>
<td>7 Do not believe in close collegial relationships with faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Always use social and athletic functions as opportunities to promote my institution</td>
<td>17 Maintain a measure of mystique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Choose another CEO as a confidant</td>
<td>22 Am often viewed as a loner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Am highly involved in the community</td>
<td>23 Count committee meetings as mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Always appear energetic</td>
<td>24 Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than as a good colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tend to work long hours</td>
<td>36 Am often seen as somewhat aloof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Participate actively in national higher education organizations</td>
<td>37 Enjoy stirring things up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dress well</td>
<td>39 Am feared by some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Care deeply about the welfare of the individual</td>
<td>45 View the faculty senate as a substantially useless appendage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Put my institution before myself</td>
<td>54 Do not consider myself warm and affable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Encourage creative individuals even though we may disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E (Continued)

Operational definitions of transactional and transformational leadership based on factorial analysis of the ELI. Numbers correspond to the original items in the ELI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 Appear confident even when in doubt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Smile a lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Am viewed as politically adept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Have successfully concluded many partnerships involving business and government with my institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Generate many innovative ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Spend a great deal of time dealing with the media and the press</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Frequently walk my campus and am seen by students and faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Am viewed by minorities and women as highly supportive of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Am an internationalist in outlook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Effective Leadership Inventory
Eliminated Items

1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed.
2. Believe that respect from those I lead is crucial.
* 3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks.
4. Place a high value on consensus.
** 5. Believe in organizational structure.
   6. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident.
   7. Believe in close collegial relationships with faculty.
* 8. Believe that a leader serves the people.
***10. Am sometimes viewed as assertive.
***11. Frequently violate the status quo.
   12. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates.
   13. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings.
** 14. Believe the economy’s failed dot.com firms provide a cautionary lesson for higher education.
   15. Always use social and athletic functions as opportunities to promote my institution.
** 16. Accept losses gracefully.
   17. Maintain a measure of mystique.
* 18. Am more likely than most presidents to consider alternative methods of delivering higher education.
Appendix F

*Effective Leadership Inventory*

Eliminated Items (continued)

19. Choose another CEO as a confidant.

20. Am highly involved in the community.


22. Am often viewed as a loner.

23. Count committee meetings as mistakes.

24. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than as a good colleague.

25. Tend to work long hours.

** 26. Often like people who are different.

** 27. Only occasionally speak spontaneously.

28. Participate actively in national higher education organizations.

29. Dress well.

30. Care deeply about the welfare of the individual.

31. Put my institution before myself.

32. Encourage creative individuals even though we may disagree.

* 33. Appear to make decisions easily.

34. Appear confident even when in doubt.

** 35. Have made decisions that could have resulted in my losing my job if the results had turned out badly.

36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof.

37. Enjoy stirring things up.

** 38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant.
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*Effective Leadership Inventory*

Eliminated Items (continued)

39. Am feared by some.

40. Smile a lot.

** 41. Believe fund-raising and development tasks are my highest priority.

* 42. Would consider moving to a better position.

43. Am viewed as politically adept.

** 44. Am viewed by faculty as a strongly academic person.

45. View the faculty senate as a substantially useless appendage.

** 46. Have the strong support of my governing board.

47. Have successfully concluded many partnerships involving business and government with my institution.

** 48. Make many mistakes.

** 49. Am burdened by a governing board that attempts to micromanage the institution.

** 50. Am solely responsible for teaching a course at least once every two years.

51. Generate many innovative ideas.

** 52. Believe the President is the final authority under the governing board on all matters affecting the institution.

** 53. Believe faculty should make academic decisions.

54. Am warm and affable.

** 55. Believe intercollegiate athletics are in need of reform.

56. Spend a great deal of time dealing with the media and the press.

57. Frequently walk my campus and am seen by students and faculty.
Appendix F

Effective Leadership Inventory
Eliminated Items (continued)

58. Am viewed by minorities and women as highly supportive of them.

59. Am an internationalist in outlook.

** 60. Believe the campus involvement of my spouse or significant other is important.

Notes:

* items eliminated due to dual loadings on two factors.

** items eliminated due to no significant loading on either factor.

*** items eliminated due to items that would diminish the scale reliability if retained.
**Appendix G**

Alpha Coefficients for transactional and transformational scales and item correlations with respective scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believe that the leader should be perceived as self confident</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always use social and athletic functions as opportunities to promote my institution</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose another CEO as a confidant</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am highly involved in the community</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always appear energetic</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to work long hours</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate actively in national higher education organizations</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress well</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care deeply about the welfare of the individual</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put my institution before myself</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage creative individuals even though we may disagree</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G (Continued)

Alpha Coefficients for transactional and transformational scales and item correlations with respective scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>.47</strong> Appear confident even when in doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.42</strong> Smile a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.44</strong> Am viewed as politically adept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.45</strong> Have successfully concluded many partnerships involving business and government with my institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.41</strong> Generate many innovative ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.36</strong> Spend a great deal of time dealing with the media and the press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.35</strong> Frequently walk my campus and am seen by students and faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.50</strong> Am viewed by minorities and women as highly supportive of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.33</strong> Am an internationalist in outlook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r = .79 \] \hspace{1cm} \[ r = .73 \]
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