

Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services -
Urban Education

College of Education & Professional Studies
(Darden)

Summer 1991

An Analysis of Urban Higher Education CEO's Perceptions of Critical Leadership Behaviors

Linda Ferguson Banis
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Banis, Linda F.. "An Analysis of Urban Higher Education CEO's Perceptions of Critical Leadership Behaviors" (1991). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, , Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/yf2k-jk06
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds/89

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education & Professional Studies (Darden) at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services - Urban Education by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF URBAN HIGHER EDUCATION
CEO'S PERCEPTIONS OF CRITICAL
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

by

Linda Ferguson Banis
M.A. May 1983, Regent University
B.S. June 1970, United States International University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

URBAN SERVICES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
June 1991

Approved by /

John J. DeRolf, Director

Concentration Area Director

Member

Member

Dean of the College of
Education

Copyright by Linda F. Banis 1991

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

An Analysis of Urban Higher Education
CEO's Perception of Critical
Leadership Behaviors

Linda Ferguson Banis
Old Dominion University 1991
Director: John J. DeRolf, III, Ph.D.

The research question for this study asked if CEO's (Chief Executive Officers) of urban higher education institutions hold the same values and beliefs as those attributed to business and industry CEO's through the business literature. Through survey methodology, the analysis of urban higher education CEO's perceptions of critical leadership behaviors revealed very similar belief patterns. The primary discrepancies between the research group and their industry counterparts lie in the degree to which critical behaviors are espoused and in the acceptance of transformational leadership as a proactive model for effective organizational change. The responses to the open-ended portion of the questionnaire gave a clear picture of the kinds of training CEO's consider to be important. The

Likert scale items revealed that urban education CEO's espouse the transformational leadership concept yet are tentative about empowering staff and aligning the organizational structure to facilitate a participative management model. Entrepreneurship and risk taking activities are embraced somewhat tentatively also which would serve to inhibit creativity and innovation within the organization.

The traditional emphasis on academic culture, symbols and the president as leader may be instrumental in encouraging the belief that CEO's should be charismatic and visionary, yet without changing organizational structure and empowering employees, the concept of leadership remains in the traditional domain.

It has been established that urban education CEO's do hold similar beliefs as their business counterparts. The literature search also revealed that many environmental and business conditions are also similar. It is therefore recommended that further research be conducted to identify ways in which transformational leadership methods could best benefit the urban higher education milieu.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, William J. Banis, whose constant encouragement made this project possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Gratitude is extended to the chairperson of my dissertation committee, Dr. John J. DeRolf, III. He has provided direction, guidance, support, and encouragement throughout this research project. Dr. Alfred Rollins and Dr. Jack Robinson, the committee members, always provided positive feedback and assistance. To them is accorded sincere appreciation.

Ms. Jeanne Bowers of the Old Dominion University Office of Research and Planning and Mr. Quo-Ping Yang of Johns Hopkins University provided data entry and programming assistance. Their expertise and kind patience are gratefully acknowledged.

The CEO's of the urban university population gave their valuable time to complete the research questionnaire. Great appreciation is extended to them because their responses provided valuable data for the study.

To Ms. Karen Franklin I extend genuine gratitude for efficient and professional clerical assistance.

I thank my daughters, Kristen, Melissa and Heather for cooperation, understanding and encouragement when I was engaged in academics rather than parenting.

To my parents, Jane and Gordon Ferguson, I extend appreciation for a love of learning and an instilled belief in always pushing on to the next goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER I -- INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Background.....	1
Rationale.....	3
Definition of Constructs.....	6
Limitations of the Study.....	7
References.....	9
CHAPTER II -- LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
Overview.....	11
Historical Overview of the Literature.....	12
Organizational Structure of Colleges and Universities.....	19
Organizational Environment.....	23
Leadership in Higher Education.....	26
General Leadership Literature.....	32
Summary.....	46
Research Questions.....	49
References.....	51
CHAPTER III -- METHODOLOGY.....	54
Introduction.....	54
Assumptions.....	54
Population and Sample.....	56
Instrumentation and Item Design.....	58
Procedure.....	60
References.....	64
CHAPTER IV -- DATA ANALYSIS.....	65
Overview.....	65

CHAPTER IV (cont.)

Frequency Analysis.....	65
Central Tendency Measures.....	68
Split-half Reliability.....	78
Response Findings.....	79
Factor Analysis.....	81
Descriptive Analysis.....	92
References.....	101

CHAPTER V -- SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND

RECOMMENDATIONS.....	102
----------------------	-----

Review of Preceding Chapters.....	102
Conclusions.....	104
Recommendations for Further Study.....	116
References.....	118

APPENDIX A: College and University Chart.....	119
---	-----

APPENDIX B: Critical Leadership Behaviors.....	121
--	-----

APPENDIX C: Letters of Invitation.....	125
--	-----

APPENDIX D: Behavioral Factors Addressed in the Questionnaire.....	129
---	-----

APPENDIX E: Questionnaire.....	152
--------------------------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1	Frequency Distributions.....	66
2	Means and Standard Deviations.....	69
3	Cumulative Frequencies.....	71
4	Rank Order By Means.....	73
5	Rank Order By Standard Deviation...	75
6	Rank Order By Average Mean and Standard Deviation.....	77
7	Orthogonal Transformation, Varimax Rotation Factor Matrix.....	83
8	Factor Inter-correlations.....	86
9	Factor Pattern Matrix by Factor....	90
10	Explained Variance.....	105

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this research project is to determine if Chief Executive Officers (CEO's) of urban higher educational institutions have the same attitudes and values as those attributed to business Chief Executive Officers (CEO's) through the business literature. If a positive relationship is found between the two, a transformational leadership model could be recommended as a tool for the study of the role of CEO (Chief Executive Officer) in urban institutions of higher education. This study, therefore, is intended to be the groundwork upon which clarification of the dynamics of leadership within the higher education milieu can be predicated.

An extension of this research could be to use it as the foundation for the design of formal training and/or learning experiences to strengthen leadership behaviors of individuals in urban university CEO positions.

Background

Urban higher education is facing an increasingly turbulent environment. Economic, social, demographic, and political factors have combined in such a way as to preclude the free wheeling growth of the 1950s and 1960s. Now CEO's are forced to deal with such issues as retrenchment, financial crises and/or declining or steady-state funding, fewer traditional-age students, an aging professorate,

accountability, less support from the public and the government, and an increasingly litigious clientele. All of these issues are well known to the close observer of urban higher education. However, the methods of management and the leadership skills required to successfully maintain institutional vitality remain unclear.

Exacerbating this issue is the fact that very few academic leaders have had formal leadership training (Cohen & March, 1974; Olswang & Cohen, 1979). Instead, they have, generally, been recognized as outstanding specialists and technicians in their chosen fields and have been promoted on that basis rather than on the basis of their management and leadership skills. That may have been acceptable in the past, but the internal and external factors affecting today's urban colleges and universities call for finely tuned and highly refined leadership skills. One of the few currently available formal management development programs aimed exclusively at higher education is that developed by the Kellogg Foundation in 1981 (Sullivan, 1982). Other attempts to train administrators in leadership functions tend to be either developed in-house, are brought in from the outside, or take the form of off-site seminars.

A recent book on academic management reports that students of the higher education situation predict that between 10 percent and 30 percent of America's 3,100 colleges and universities will close their doors or merge

with other institutions by 1995 (Keller, 1983). The implications this condition could have for our urban centers in terms of the economy, research, technical support of, and access to, education are very serious. Although the potential demise of urban colleges and universities in itself is not the focal point of this study, it is an example of a larger set of problems which may result from a lack of highly skilled individuals in leadership positions. It is imperative that leaders in urban higher education be prepared to address the rapidly emerging problems which will attend wide-sweeping changes in the educational milieu in order to avoid possibly devastating negative consequences and to be prepared to avail themselves of potential opportunities.

The literature from business and its related fields supports transformational leadership behaviors as those most likely to be displayed in successful (thriving and growing) businesses. The question to be addressed by this study is: do Chief Executive Officers (CEO's) of urban higher educational institutions have the same attitudes and values as those attributed to business CEO's through the business literature?

Rationale

The academic institution is a vital part of the American economic and social structure. In the greater Hampton Roads urban area alone during 1989-1990, colleges

and universities provided educational opportunities to 69,815 students, employed 10,808 personnel, and were funded by budgets of approximately \$510,000,000 (Virginia Business, 1990. p. 22, see Appendix A).

The failure or serious dysfunction of even one of the twelve local institutions of higher education would have a significant economic impact on the entire region, not to mention the prospective loss of educational opportunity for thousands of current and future students. The demise of institutions at the rate of 10 percent to 30 percent annually as predicted by Keller (1983) would likely be regarded as a national crisis. Additionally, there is a current trend of "take-overs" of at-risk American institutions by other nations. This is presently happening at some of America's smaller liberal arts colleges.

The literature on academic management clearly recognizes the crisis faced by American colleges and universities and attributes much of the cause to poor management and lack of leadership skills (Bennis, 1972; Cohen & March, 1974; Keller, 1983; Whetten, 1984). What constitutes good leadership? Are the behaviors associated with it the same across organizations? The researcher intends to go beyond the broad definitions currently associated with leadership and management and to identify those leadership behaviors which are most crucial to leadership in higher education.

For the most part, the field of higher education has not taken an active role in researching these questions. This is not the case in other fields. Business organizations have been involved in training their executives in management and leadership for years but higher education has not recognized nor accepted this need until recently. Reasons for this may lie within the institution itself. A partial cause could be a sort of generic bias many professors hold against business and economic activities (Keller, 1983). They tend to resist the needs of the organization and view administration as a necessary evil. Another reason for the lack of leadership training in higher education could be the commonly held belief that a society of professional scholars does not need to be "taught" more skills: such individuals are, by definition, self-directed learners. Finally, higher education sees itself as inherently different from other organizations and has difficulty understanding how organizational behavior theories and practices "fit" their unique structure and needs.

This study would contribute to the literature by applying the findings of the business literature to the urban higher education setting. This is to be done by surveying current urban university CEO's to determine if they hold common beliefs and attitudes about leadership behaviors with business CEO's. A positive response would

provide the groundwork for developing a transformational leadership model for use as a tool for further study of urban education CEO leadership behavior. It could lead to the formulation of a training and/or education program designed to produce effective leadership for the urban higher education setting.

Definition of Constructs

There are several constructs which will be used throughout this study. They are listed and defined below:

Behavior - an action a human takes based on an acquired set of beliefs. Actions take the form of stimulus-response connections. For example, in situation S, if an individual believes he or she wants to create a certain consequence C, then he or she does A (Argyris & Schon, 1974).

Attitude - internal states which focus on specific aspects or objects in the environment (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Attitudes are a function of beliefs (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

Value - instruments through which we choose from a variety of information (usually more than we can handle) that simplifies; constructed situations in which we can act, that is, a basis for action (Argyris & Schon, 1980).

Leadership - the specific activity of influencing behavior, beliefs and feelings of other group members in an intended direction (Bass, 1985).

Transactional Leadership - motivation of subordinates

through exchange of some type of reward for the service provided (Burns, 1978).

Transformational Leadership - articulation of the organization's product, service or mission and shaping the values of employees along that vision (Burns, 1978).

Limitations of the Study

Since a major portion of this study is of a conceptual nature, analysis of the literature will be completed through the processes of synthesis and comparison. It will be necessary to apply various concepts and theories to the higher education setting to determine if their use in such an environment is feasible.

Further, the survey population will be used to determine the utility of the hypothesis. Therefore, the only conclusion which can be drawn will be with regard to whether urban university CEO's have the same attitudes and values as those attributed to business CEO's through the business literature. This research is not designed to look at cause and effect relationships or generalizability beyond the survey population.

This study is designed to take a first step towards a viable model of leadership for higher education administrators. As such, its scope will be limited to the conceptual and the theoretical. Further research will be necessary to operationalize the results. After that has been accomplished, a pilot program for the development of

leadership behaviors could be devised and implemented. Out of the pilot program, of course, could come a full leadership development program.

The implications for finding ways to strengthen our country's institutions of higher education are great. In order to educate our youth, to retrain our workforce, to engage in research designed to address agricultural, manufacturing, political, environmental and social needs, our colleges and universities must be healthy organizations managed by knowledgeable and capable leaders. That, in turn, will become one of the avenues through which institutional vitality can be strengthened.

References

- Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1981). Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cohen, M. D. & March, J. G. (1874). Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. (General Report Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Keller, G. (1983). Academic Strategy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Olswang, S. G. & Cohen, W. D. (1979). The Identified Need and Means for the In-house Training of Higher Education Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 174 178).
- Sullivan, L. L. (1982). A Wholistic Model of Educational Management and Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 227 543).
- Whetten, D. A. (1984, November/December). Effective Administrators. Change. pp. 38-43.
- Winer, L. (1983, November). Applying Strategic Planning in Human Resource Development. Training and Development Journal. pp. 81-84.
- Wolotkiewicz, R. J. (1980). College Administrator's Handbook. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Wonder, J. & Donovan, P. (1984). Whole-Brain Thinking. New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc.
- Youngs, B. B. (1983). Identifying and Developing Prospective School Leaders. NASSP Bulletin. 67 (467), 98-106.

- Yukl, G. A. (1981). Leadership in Organizations. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. A. & Van Fleet, D. D. (1982). Cross-Situational, Multi-method Research on Military Leader Effectiveness. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 30, 87-108.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977, May-June). Managers and Leaders: Are They Different? Harvard Business Review. pp. 67-78.
- Zenger, J. H. (1985). Leadership: Management's Better Half. Training. pp. 44-53.

CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW
OVERVIEW

Recent studies by such authors as Peters and Austin (1985) and Bennis and Nanus (1985) have found that effective leadership behavior has certain basic characteristics no matter where that leadership takes place. While there is a situational or contingency aspect to effective leadership behavior such as that espoused by Fiedler (1964) and by Hersey and Blanchard (1977), there also appear to be a complex set of skills and personal characteristics involved.

Historically, leadership has not been clearly defined in the literature. For the most part, leadership has been studied 1) in terms of individuals with certain characteristics, 2) as extensions of organizational positions, and 3) as behavioral manifestations (Stogdill, 1974). While it is difficult to describe the quality "leadership," it is obvious that there are behaviors through which it is manifested. In literature pertaining specifically to the leadership role in higher education, Warren Bennis (1972) stated that a college president should lead rather than manage by creating clear-cut and measurable goals which are based on advice from all elements of the community. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) stated that the essence of leadership is in influencing the behavior of

individuals or groups of people. This definition has also been suggested in the works of several other authorities on organizational behavior (Bass, 1960; Katz & Kahn, 1966; 1978; Hodge & Johnson, 1970). Katz and Kahn (1978) specified that leadership is the influence that motivates people beyond mechanical compliance with routine organizational rules and procedures. It is important to note that leadership is differentiated from management in that it appears to be a somewhat broader concept.

In a comprehensive review of leadership literature, Stogdill (1974) surveyed over 127 empirical studies dating from the early 1900s to the early 1970s. He found no definitive explanation of leadership behavior and concluded that there were almost as many descriptions as there were researchers. For the purposes of this research, leadership is defined as the specific activity of influencing behavior, beliefs and feelings of other group members in an intended direction. It has direct application to executive leadership, that which sets direction for an institution, as opposed to operational leadership, that which directly affects the tasks which must be carried out to produce a product or service.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF LEADERSHIP RESEARCH

Stogdill's (1974) literature survey traced the expansion of leadership theories and research efforts,

noting that until approximately World War II, attention was devoted primarily to the identification of leadership traits and their differentiation from one another. This approach tended to treat personality variables in an atomistic fashion and suggested that each trait acted singly to determine leadership effects. Such early research led one to believe that an individual who exhibited certain traits would be successful leading any group.

Stogdill's synthesis, however, revealed that different group activities seemed to require different leadership behaviors. This led the way for research into the situational aspects of leadership behavior and the impact of those being led.

After World War II, early leadership theories were modified with research which supported the view that trait characteristics in combination with environmental factors interacted to generate personality dynamics which enhanced a person's leadership potential (Fiedler, 1967; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; House & Baetz, 1979; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Called contingency theories, these approaches continue to be widely respected explanations of leadership behavior.

More recently, students of organizational leadership have set out to observe commonalities between well-run companies and among effective leaders with proven records of achievement (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Peters & Austin, 1985;

Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Without exception, the organizations which rank highest are those run by leaders who hold clear visions of their company's future and who can successfully engage their employees in the pursuit of that vision. "Visionary" leaders are creative innovators who rely on their ability to integrate right brain (holistic, creative, intuitive) and left brain (rational, analytical, linear) skills in carrying out their management roles. These leaders are very much like James MacGregor Burns' (1978) transformational leader who articulates the organization's product, service or mission and shapes the values of employees along that vision.

Burns' (1978) concept of a transformational leader is represented by an individual who is able to build upon man's natural need for meaning. So important is this ability in current literature on distinguished leadership that Peters and Waterman (1982) claimed that "We are fairly sure that the culture of almost every excellent company...can be traced to transforming leadership somewhere in its history" (p. 82).

In another study, Warren Bennis (1984) defined effective leaders as "true leaders who affect the culture, who are the social architects of their organizations and who create and maintain values...who do the right thing," as compared with managers who "do things right" (Bennis, 1984, p. 14). By studying 90 leaders who met this definition,

Bennis identified the following four "competencies" of leadership from this group: a) "Management of Attention" is a leader's ability to attract others because of his/her compelling vision, his/her set of intentions, his/her frame of reference, and his/her extraordinary focus of commitment; b) "Management of Meaning" is a leader's ability to communicate his/her vision to others in a way that makes it tangible and real (in order to align others with him/her), and to create meaning in a way that will cause others to enlist in the vision; c) "Management of Trust" is a reliability and constancy of purpose, or a consistency of focus; d) "Management of Self" is self-knowledge concerning one's skills and the ability to deploy them effectively, as well as the ability to perceive unintended negative outcomes, not as failures, but simply as mistakes to be used for learning and for feedback about how to proceed. Bennis also noted from his study that leadership empowers other people by helping them feel significant, by teaching them that learning and competence do matter, by allowing them to be a part of a community, and by showing them that work is exciting.

In his research, Abraham Zaleznik (1977) made some definite distinctions between the characteristics of leaders and those of managers. He described leaders as a) being proactive instead of reactive in shaping ideas, b) projecting their ideas into images and giving them

substance, c) creating identification with shared values and generating excitement in other people, d) developing fresh approaches to problem solving, e) having empathy and paying attention to what a given situation means to others, and f) attracting strong feelings of identity and difference (sometimes love/hate) from others.

More recent accounts by Kiefer and Stroh (1983) described organizations that are capable of inspired performance and listed the following elements which appear to be keys in this mode of operating a) a deep, often noble sense of purpose, frequently expressed as a vision of what the organization stands for or strives to create, which provides shared meaning among employees and work that is intrinsically valuable (over and above merely creating financial security), b) alignment of individuals around this vision, which inspires them to reach for what could be and instills the desire to create rather than the need to survive, c) an emphasis on personal performance and an environment that empowers the individual, d) effective structures that take the systemic aspects of organizations into account, and e) a capacity to integrate reason and intuition. They elaborate on these points by noting that effective leaders use intuition to clarify their vision, to catalyze alignment of people, and to identify leverage points for structural change.

Kiechel (1983) related leadership to vision, charisma,

and the ability to build corporate culture. He noted Zaleznik's (1977) definition of vision as the capacity to see connections and to draw inferences which are unprecedented and not obvious.

In discussing the intuitive aspect of leadership, Rowan (1979) pointed out that the intuitive hunch has been and continues to be a time-honored executive decision-making tool. He found that a corporate executive was a holistic, intuitive thinker who constantly relied on hunches to cope with problems much too complex for rational analysis.

Very little of the current leadership literature focuses on the special needs of and conditions of institutions of higher education. Nor does it deal with the fact that most administrators in higher educational settings have not been trained in leadership and management but rather have been selected for advancement in the organizational ranks due to their technical expertise. As our colleges and universities face greater internal and external environmental demands, it becomes more and more essential that those in leadership positions be skilled in the tasks required to effectively guide their organizations to future vitality. Evidence of the lack of research regarding leadership in institutions of higher education is demonstrated by the fact that there is no journal devoted to the specific issues of administration and organization in higher education (Bass, 1984).

Leadership effectiveness appears to be tied to the leader's personality, organizational factors, environmental conditions, task requirements, and those being lead. Leadership, itself, has been identified as filling a need a) to complete organizational design by coordinating human behavior and maintaining task orientation, b) to maintain organizational stability within a rapidly changing environment, c) for internal coordination of multiple and diverse organizational units, and d) to maintain a stable workforce by promoting personal satisfaction of needs and attainment of goals (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Cohen and March (1974) argue that the conceptual model one has of the governance system in an institution is instrumental in dictating leadership style.

This theoretical classification needs to be framed in behavioral terms to become clear. The difficulty here arises from the fact that institutions of higher education are unique organizations. Because of this, traditional organizational management and leadership theories do not fit perfectly. It is necessary, therefore, to first look at the organizational structure of colleges and universities and then at how leadership within them has evolved, and finally at the literature on leadership in the business world to see if it can be useful in understanding leadership behaviors in higher education.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Instead of being organizations tied to production which can be measured in dollars, higher education institutions create outputs which are diverse and difficult to measure. Although colleges and universities differ in the quality and quantity of outputs, typically they include such things as a) student preparedness, b) student ability to obtain employment in a degree-related field, c) number of students pursuing advanced degrees, d) amount and type of student services offered, e) performance of faculty, f) ability to attract high caliber faculty and staff, g) ability to attract students, h) ability to attract endowment funds, i) scholarship monies and contributions, j) faculty research, k) grant awards, l) faculty publications, and m) community service (Keller, 1983). Institutions of higher education have historically been less attentive to business variables such as profit margin and return on investments (Keller, 1982).

Higher education institutions are largely dependent on individual faculty members to produce desired outputs. This usually occurs through a technology the faculty members devise individually but with resources they do not control (Millett, 1980). This type of operation has been labeled as ambiguous (Cohen & March, 1974) but for the purposes of this research might better be viewed in terms of its uniqueness.

Not only are the outputs/services rendered by higher

education unique, but so is its structural design. In looking at the structure of the university, Walker (1979) declared it to be a pluralistic democracy. The model he describes is based on the following general operating procedures of higher education communities: a) the principle of the consent of the governed is a basis of governance, b) a moral quality is inherent in decision making and behaviors, c) polycentric authority structures apply administratively, and d) leaders are ancillary and expendable (Walker, 1979).

In other research concerning the organizational characteristics inherent in colleges and universities, Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker and Riley (1978) found that institutions of higher education resembled other bureaucratic structures in some ways and differed in some other very significant ways. As bureaucracies, higher education institutions have a) stated goals, b) hierarchical structures and communications systems, c) specified duties and responsibilities to be carried out in chain-of-command fashion, e) delineated procedures for decision making in setting policy, and f) routinized administration procedures for daily work.

Differences, however, occur in the fact that, for institutions of higher education a) goals are more ambiguous and diverse, b) clients are served rather than materials processed or products produced, c) key employees are highly

professionalized, d) technologies are based more on professional skills than on standard operating procedures (which renders them unclear), and e) fluid organizational participation occurs with amateur decision makers who wander in and out of the process (Baldrige et al., 1978). All of these patterns contribute to the unique format of organizational structure found in American colleges and universities. What is more, Baldrige et al. found that, because of differences and diversity among colleges and universities themselves, it was possible to further categorize such institutions into eight groups based on environmental relationships, professional task, and size and complexity, thus rendering their classification even more complex.

In terms of structure, Baldrige argued against the bureaucratic model with its "hero" leader at the top of the hierarchy of power, who assesses problems, considers alternatives and makes decisions in an authoritarian manner. This type of structure would suggest utilization of management procedures such as Planning, Programming and Budgeting Systems, Management by Objectives, Zero Based Budgeting, and the like. However, while these procedures are relatively easy to implement in a bureaucracy, they tend to break down quickly in the higher education setting because they are often predicated on inaccurate assumptions about colleges and universities such as a) that goals are

clear, b) that these are "closed" organizational systems, and c) that planners have the power to execute their decisions (Baldrige et al., 1978).

Further, Baldrige and his colleagues discredited John Millett's collegial model (1962) by declaring that it no longer exists--if it ever truly did. According to Millett, the collegial leader, is at the very most, a "first among equals" in an organization run by the faculty. Millett spoke of a "dynamic of consensus in a community of scholars" (p. 234-5) which requires the leader to facilitate, persuade and negotiate rather than to lead or manage.

While acknowledging that both the bureaucratic and collegial models provide useful insights into aspects of college and university organization, Baldrige and his associates proceeded to propose a political model which described the dynamic processes by which policies and decisions are shaped and which took into account the importance of external forces, conflict and power. Such a model recognized that a university is too complex to be run solely by one person. University systems are also too complex for an autocratic president to rule by directive. The political leader must be able to mediate, negotiate and be politically astute in facilitating cooperation between/among power blocs to achieve workable courses of action.

Since colleges and universities are diverse, it appears

that these three models might best be utilized as frameworks through which to view individual institutions. Upon close examination, it will be found that the various higher education organizations are a subtle mix of bureaucratic, collegial and political dynamics. Leadership of such organizations requires that chief executive officers be aware of and responsive to the specific dynamics within their own institutions.

ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The internal or organizational environment also affects leadership style; however, the CEO can have a greater influence over these factors than is generally the case with external environmental factors.

Task/Role

The task/role dimensions of executive leadership go far beyond those of management. Managers are involved with the maintenance of the organization while leaders are often dedicated to its change. Warren Bennis said that managers are concerned with "doing things right" as opposed to leaders who are concerned with "doing the right thing" (Bennis, 1984, p. 16). The task/role of leadership is to cause movement, to forward the action.

The precise role of CEO will be specific to each institution, of course. However, it generally consists of guiding the processes of a) institutional mission

definition, b) goal setting, c) nurturing political stakeholders and, d) facilitating the day-to-day administration of university affairs.

Inherent in the office of CEO is a certain amount of power: position power. That power along with personal power (a personality factor) and informational power (an aspect of behavior) can be utilized to mobilize people and resources.

Superiors

University CEO's generally are accountable to a governing board. The influence of this group and/or its chairperson can be strong and it would be relatively easy to adopt a transactional approach. However, it could often benefit the CEO to influence the board through transformational means rather than to be indebted through transactional trade-offs. The board could be utilized as a reference group and should represent a measure of the transformational leader's effectiveness.

Subordinates

Of course, leadership cannot take place in the absence of individuals who are willing to respond to a leader's behaviors. As a results, a leader's behavior is affected by his/her followers to the degree that the leader identifies with his/her followers (Bass, 1985). When followers ascribe to the leader's values and power, of course, it is more likely that transformational leadership will take place.

Both transactional and transformational leadership take

place in most institutions. They are not mutually exclusive, however, in times of crisis and threat, transformational leadership appears to be responsible for organizational turn-around.

Subordinates who are receptive to transactional leadership tend to be "oriented toward extrinsic motivation, readily responsive to promised rewards, threats of punishment, and the accomplishment of shortrun objectives" (Bass, 1985, p. 164). In the higher education setting, those subordinates who are "equalitarian, self-confident, highly educated, and high in status" may be somewhat resistant to transformational leadership (Bass, 1985, p. 164).

Consequently, when subordinates value the satisfaction of higher-level needs, a transactional leader will succeed in offering contingent rewards. If that valuation does not exist, transformational approaches may instill such a sense of desirability.

Political Factors

The higher education setting is often highly political. Faculty expects to be part of the decision making process and to take part in various committees seeking recognition of their ideas and points of view. Often individual schools are in competition for limited funds and acknowledgement. Consequently, changes often occur as the result of political trade-offs among powerful coalitions.

As a result, transactional leadership is often the norm. When an institution faces a crisis, however, transformational leadership may be accepted as leaders identify superordinate goals which may unite previously competing factions, i.e., institutional survival which many coalitions can rally behind. Once the crisis has passed, chances are good that transactional leadership will again emerge as special interest groups once again turn attention to their own gain. Consequently, leaders must be acutely aware of these dynamics and must consistently work at providing proactive, transformational leadership. In this day of constant environmental change, static organizations cannot thrive.

LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Since a framework for the understanding of organizational structure has been developed, it is now appropriate to examine leadership within higher education. In synthesizing leader behavior over a twenty year period, Donald Walker (1979) categorized those behaviors as Less Effective and More Effective. The Less Effective administrators tended to strongly identify with the status, authority and privileges of the office. They appeared to regard themselves as inseparable from that status. When criticized, these administrators responded as if attacked and reacted with threat and counter-aggressive behaviors.

They expressed belief that strongly punitive actions were the best deterrents to future attack. Additionally, the Less Effective leaders regarded critics as troublemakers and tended to demean the motives and objectives of individuals who made their views known.

Overall, the Less Effective leaders believed that decision making was a series of personal acts of courage, will and purpose. In the decision making process, their objective was to see that orders were obeyed and rules were followed. That was particularly important after hard, unpopular decisions had been made.

Attitudes of such individuals toward the institution revealed that they regarded it as inert or perverse and saw themselves in a savior role. They became the mind and embodiment of the institution's conscience and felt an obligation to oppose prevalent tendencies to expediency, laziness, inertness, and misbehavior.

In the More Effective administrators, Walker found individuals able to separate themselves from their offices. They saw themselves as colleagues with faculty in decision making and held strong beliefs about the importance of all employees no matter what their position.

Leaders in this group conceptualized the academic community as groups of legitimate constituencies with different interests. They viewed administration as a process of facilitation and service provision.

Additionally, the More Effective individuals tended to be open and willing to accept alternative solutions to problems.

Such behaviors as those identified by Walker in his More Effective group are among those which current students of organizational leadership also cite as being evidenced by effective leaders (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Peters & Austin, 1985; Iacocca, 1984; Bennis & Nanus, 1985). However, Maccoby (1979) found that leadership in higher education was more apt to be like that described in his Gamesman archetype. The Gamesman is highly meritocratic. He enjoys challenges and controls his subordinates by persuasion, enticement and his great enthusiasm (charisma perhaps). Although he is fair, this leader is detached and seemingly afraid of exhibiting feelings of emotion and compassion.

According to Maccoby, Gamesmen began to be seen in higher education in the 1960s. They attempted to make academe fairer by implementing Management by Objectives, Planning, Programming and Budgeting Systems and like programs and responded to Affirmative Action plans.

Maccoby rejected the validity of the Gamesman archetype in today's colleges and universities because neither the functions of these leaders nor their images fit educational organizations faced with limited resources, new societal values, and demands for rights. The Gamesman cannot provide leadership within the types of limitations imposed on higher

education today because his ultimate goal is winning, not developing and considering the greater common good. Consequently, under Gamesman leadership, universities become battlefields as employee groups fight for limited resources while rational planning, student needs, and campus-wide concern with educational policy founder.

Additionally, Maccoby found that employees no longer respond well to the careerism so important to the Gamesman, nor to his lack of interest in those not considered "top-runners." The Gamesman does not foster a sense of service and responsibility in employees since his focus is on winning and personal gain. As a consequence, people under the Gamesman's organization lack a sense of motivation because they feel powerless within a large institution which exudes an anonymous authority that treats employees in a mechanistic manner and ignores the changing values of the workforce.

Maccoby notes that many colleges and universities have moved beyond Gamesman tactics. A recent review of organizational behavior as it relates to higher education (Bobbitt & Behling, 1981), bears out this view but reports that no specific laws of administration have been revealed. However, one universal finding does continue to surface: the behavior of an administrator is a determinant of organizational performance (Bobbitt & Behling, 1981).

In looking at specific administrative skills, Blake and

Mouton (1981) designed the Academic Administrator's Grid with concern for institutional performance and concern for people as its two underlying behavioral factors. Blake and Mouton suggest that effective human interaction in the workplace is necessary for productivity. They feel that relationships must be based on a) trust and respect, b) confrontation of conflict in order to establish collaborative problem solving, c) encouragement of open and candid conversation, d) use of critiques as the basis of personal learning, and e) promotion of shared participation which leads to discussions resulting in understanding and agreement. A leader who exhibits a high degree of concern for institutional performance and a high degree of concern for people fosters teamwork. Burke (1982) calls this an integrated leadership style.

More recent research by Cunningham (1983) identified old versus new or emerging administrative skills. Skills which he found to be useful in the past were a) goal setting and purpose finding, b) planning, c) organizing, d) climate setting, e) trust building, and f) maintaining.

Those skills which were emerging as necessary for the administration of higher education facilities of today and tomorrow include the ability to focus on the present and the future simultaneously, to bridge among and between many sectors of interest, to engage in mixed scanning, monitoring and interpreting, to adapt to sustained changes, to utilize

intuition, to employ decision-making and policy development skills, and to manage symbols (Cunningham, 1983).

Current researchers have suggested that the focus of institutional leadership has shifted from being primarily internal to being a blend of both internal and external efforts. The key to this blend is a vision which articulates where the organization is going (external) and how it is going to get there (internal and external). Manasse (1984) observed that organizational vision was needed for effective leadership and that interpersonal and technical skills were needed to facilitate bringing individuals and subsystems into congruence so that they were working together towards a common goal. It is the clearly articulated vision (mission or goal) which gives impetus to the entire process (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Manasse, 1984; Peters & Austin, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Another researcher (Peck, 1984) studied institutional vitality and success, and identified seven characteristics of small colleges. They were a) sense of mission and purpose, b) consciousness of opportunity, c) innovation and creativity, d) intuition of leaders, e) administration through people not tasks, f) effectiveness being more important than efficiency, and g) well run operations. Peck concluded that classical management theory is not applicable to small college administration in a time of flux.

A final contemporary writer on the subject of

leadership in the educational setting pointed out five forces which he felt impacted on the leadership process. The five forces include a) technical, b) human, c) educational, d) symbolic, and e) cultural elements (Sergiovanni, 1984). Sergiovanni felt that all of these forces must be dealt with in a balanced manner to result in effective leadership.

GENERAL LEADERSHIP LITERATURE

Since very little research has been done on leadership in higher education, it is necessary to turn to the literature on leadership in general to gain some insight. Historically, leadership research can be divided into three main episodes. The study of traits took place from around 1910 until World War II. Between World War II and the late 1960s, the emphasis was on leadership behaviors. From the late 1960s to the present, contingency theories have received major attention.

The early trait theories arose from the belief that individuals who emerged as leaders are different from those who assumed "follower" roles (Chemers, 1984). Researchers tried to identify those traits or personality characteristics which set the leaders apart. Over 120 of the trait studies of this time were reviewed by Ralph Stogdill in 1948 in an attempt to find a consistent and reliable pattern in the findings. He concluded that no

pattern existed. In fact, Stogdill found the data to be so random and inconclusive that he predicted there would be no viable theory of leadership until researchers were able to integrate personality and environmental factors.

The second era in leadership research focused on behaviors rather than traits. This approach was designed to determine exactly what leaders did which influenced other people to follow. It was spearheaded by the work of Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippett, and Ralph K. White in 1939 with their study of autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles. Kurt Lewin's studies focused more specifically on the dynamics of interpersonal relationships and he concluded that behavior was a function of the interaction of personality and situational factors: $B=f(P,S)$.

Further research in the 1950s at the University of Michigan under the direction of Rensis Likert and at Ohio State University under the direction of Ralph Stogdill, Edwin Fleishman, and John Hemphill resulted in factor analysis of behaviors which revealed two distinct factors: 1) consideration, which included concern for feelings of subordinates, use of two-way communication and interpersonal warmth, and 2) initiating structure, which was comprised of behaviors stressing role clarification, maintenance of performance standards and task-related feedback.

While it was found that both consideration and

initiating structure have positive effects (although at different points in the process) on group productivity (House & Baetz, 1979), it was also clear that there was enough inconsistency in patterns (Korman, 1966) that these theories did not identify any "best" leadership style.

The next era of researchers began to devise contingency models which related leader behaviors to environmental factors. A number of contingency theories have evolved including Fiedler's (1964) Contingency Model, Vroom and Yetton's (1973) Normative Decision Theory, House's (1971) Path-Goal Theory, and Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Life Cycle Theory. Fiedler's theory is based on the belief that the productivity/effectiveness of the work group is dependent on the interaction of the favorableness of the situation (based on leader/member relations, task structure and position power) and the style of leadership (task related versus relationship related) exhibited. The Least Preferred Co-worker scale is used to determine whether an individual is task-motivated or relationship-motivated. Those who respond with high task-motivation scores tend to lead in a manner more concerned with task success. Generally, they are more likely to exhibit behaviors which are structured and directive i.e. more authoritative. These individuals do well in situations which are highly favorable such as high task structure, high position power and positive leader-member relations.

Leaders who are relationship-motivated tend to be concerned with avoiding conflict, maintaining high morale, and attending to interpersonal dynamics, that is participative/high consideration leadership. They generally do well in moderately favorable conditions, hence, they are more concerned with relationship than task.

Another contingency model, Normative Decision Theory (Vroom & Yetton, 1973), identifies a range of decision-making styles. The styles include autocratic (leader makes decisions alone), consultative (leader makes decisions after consulting subordinates), and group (leader encourages subordinates to participate in decision-making). A set of decision rules are utilized which help eliminate processes which could place either decision quality or the acceptance of the decision by subordinates at risk (Maier, 1967). If more than one alternative remains after all the rules have been applied, consideration is then given to time factors and the development of subordinates. The purpose of Vroom and Yetton's model is to assist and to teach those in leadership roles to easily select an appropriate strategy which will result in the quickest and most acceptable method of "arriving at" a quality decision.

A third contingency model is House's (1971) Path-Goal Theory. This theory, originated by Evans (1970), was expanded by House (1971) and includes four types of leader behavior: a) directive (provides specific guidance, sets

standards, clarifies roles), b) supportive (focuses on the development of positive interpersonal relationships), c) achievement-oriented (establishes high expectations and challenging goals to meet standards of excellence), and d) participative (encourages subordinate's suggestions and advice in decision-making). According to House, the leader engages in any of the four styles at varying times and to varying degrees in order to facilitate subordinate's accomplishment of goals. A second part of this theory focuses on the leader's ability to reward productive behaviors which, in turn, acts as a motivator for subordinates.

A fourth major contingency theory is the Hersey-Blanchard Life Cycle Theory (1977). It is based on the Michigan and Ohio State studies of leader behavior. Consideration and initiating structure (Ohio State Leadership Studies) are used to derive four leadership behaviors: a) telling, b) selling, c) participating, and d) delegating. Depending on the maturity and orientation of the employee (Michigan studies) an appropriate behavioral mode is selected to help facilitate employee work behavior.

According to Hersey and Blanchard, when employee(s) exhibit a low level of maturity, the leader adopts the telling mode (high task and low relationship). As employee(s) maturity level increase, the leader increases relationship (selling) behavior and then decreases task

(participating) behavior. When the employee(s) reach maturity, the leader can engage in delegating behavior by decreasing both task and relationship.

All of these contingency theories are currently in use to describe and explain behaviors which leaders can and do exhibit to facilitate subordinate's behaviors and/or productivity. These theories are also called transactional theories because they focus on the exchange which takes place in the leader-follower relationship. The basic assumption here is that when the follower is not motivated or satisfied by the job and/or environment, the leader can provide what is missing to enhance follower motivation and satisfaction. This is accomplished by understanding the environment, the task, the follower's motivation and competence and by making a series of exchange or implicit bargains between leader and follower which are designed to increase satisfaction, motivation and performance.

Within the past decade, however, a new group of researchers have begun to take a fresh look at leadership. These new theories are called charismatic or transformational theories. They are used to describe leadership which results in performance which is beyond the normal expectation; where followers voluntarily expend extra effort to help insure the success of the enterprise. Students of transformational leadership have made several important observations concerning the nature of leader

behavior. James MacGregor Burns (1978) described transforming leadership as that in which the leader articulates the organization's product, service or mission and shapes the values of employees within that vision. He said that transformational leaders attend to followers' "wants, needs and other motivations, as well as their own and, thus, they serve as an independent force in changing the make-up of followers' motive base through gratifying their motives" (Burns, 1978, p. 20).

Burns was the first to label leadership as transactional and transformational. He saw the transactional leader as one who motivated subordinates through exchanging some type of reward for the service they provided. While Burns referred mainly to the political transactional leader, Bass related transactional leadership to the general superior-subordinate relationship. Bass noted the following behaviors of the transactional leader towards subordinates a) he/she is aware of what subordinates want from work and tries to supply those things based on performance, b) he/she rewards or promises reward in exchange for efforts in the workplace, and c) if work gets completed, he/she tries to be responsive to subordinates' immediate self-interests (Bass, 1985). In contrast to the transactional leader behavior, both Burns and Bass have studied transformational leader behavior: that which results in subordinates who work beyond expectations. According to

Burns, both the transactional and the transformational leader recognize that subordinates must have their lower level needs met (per Maslow) but the transformational leader has the ability to address higher level needs through communications and role modeling. Generally, this results in subordinates who are more "self-directing and self-reinforcing" (Burns, 1978, p. 3). As a consequence, they tend to "take on greater responsibility" and become leaders themselves (Burns, 1978, p. 3).

Bandura (1982) has shown the importance of self-regulation with regard to performance issues and concluded that "transforming leaders provide the high standards of performance and accomplishment and the inspiration to reach such standards" (Bass, 1985 p. 20). As followers become more and more self-actualizing, the successes they have achieved become more self-reinforcing.

Bass points out that transformational leaders heighten the awareness of their co-workers, subordinates, followers, clients and constituents. This requires a leader with vision, self-confidence and inner strength to argue successfully for what he sees as right or good, not for what is popular or is acceptable according to the established wisdom of the time.

The result of this type of behavior is performance of the subordinate beyond what they originally expected to do. Since the transformational leader raises the original level

of an employee's self-confidence, employees are able to perform at higher levels of productivity, efficiency and enthusiasm.

Bass (1985) states that this kind of transformation can be encouraged by a) raising the subordinates' level of awareness and consciousness concerning the value of specific outcomes and helping to point out various paths to reaching those goals, b) providing superordinate goals which encourage subordinates to transcend their own needs for the sake of the team, unit, department, division and/or organization, c) inducing subordinates to change their need level (Maslow or Alderfer) and/or d) persuading subordinates to see that their needs or wants have expanded.

While Burns and Bass are very similar in their views of transactional and transformational leadership, they differ in some very important aspects. Bass extends the concept of transformation by adding the idea that the followers' needs and wants can be expanded. Burns thought that transformation took place in only positive ways but Bass felt that it could affect also what is negative for people, groups and organizations. Finally, Burns saw transformational leadership as being on a continuum with the opposite end being transactional leadership while Bass found that leaders exhibit a "variety of transactional and transformational leadership" (p. 22). He stated that "most leaders do both, but in different amounts" (p 22).

In other recent studies, Peters and Waterman (1982) agreed with the concept of transforming leadership. They found that high performance organizations were run by leaders who could create a sense of mission or purpose which functioned to give meaning and direction to the various activities of employees.

In their recent book, Peters and Austin (1985) distilled the strategies of excellent leadership into three broad areas. First, there must be a willingness to encourage entrepreneurial activity. Second, the focus must be on the needs of the customer. Finally, a commitment must be made to people (employees) and their empowerment to attain productivity.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) also studied the renewed organization and maintain that transforming vision is supported by corporate culture. They described the making of corporate culture and suggested that strong cultures are necessary for long-term institutional survival. Corporate culture must be shaped by top-ranking leaders who articulate their vision, are willing to role model, set policy, and initiate programming to uphold that culture.

In addition, Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Zelznick (1977) found strong organizational cultures to be spearheaded by leaders who kept focused on the primary values of the organization. They called such leaders "visionaries" who had a "commitment to making the business

strong by treating people well and instilling in them a lasting sense of values - even after the hero is gone..." (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 47). The idea that executive leaders are deeply involved in creating culture is also upheld by Schein (1985).

Another leader behavior identified in the current literature as being important to transformational leadership is that of entrepreneurial activity. Pinchot's (1985) recent work calls it a necessity for survival into the next century. He feels that the most innovative individuals, those who can create new enterprises and product/service lines, are leaving organizations which do not accommodate and encourage them. This leaves no one to breathe vitality into the business. As a consequence, the organization is left with only individuals who can react to environmental changes instead of those adept at anticipation and strategic positioning. In essence, Pinchot feels that the management of innovation and entrepreneurial practices will be a major leadership task in the future and will require leaders to know the skills involved in entrepreneurship.

In his leadership research, Warren Bennis (1984) looked at leader characteristics of charismatic CEO's and identified four areas of commonality a) the focus of attention/commitment through a vision which guides all of the activities and processes of the organization, b) the communication of meaning which serves to align all forces

within the organization to achieve the common goal, c) the building of trust by behaving in a reliable manner which is consistent with the vision and the market niche, and d) the continuous search for self-knowledge so that skills and abilities can be used effectively to enhance the organization. Bennis also concluded that effective leaders empower their subordinates in such a way as to make them feel significant, place value on learning and competent behavior, encourage teamwork and sense of community, and provide work experiences and an atmosphere which are stimulating and fun.

Keifer and Stroh (1983) observed many of the same organizational elements as detailed by Bennis (1984) as well as by Peters and Waterman (1982), Peters and Austin (1985), Deal and Kennedy (1982), Pinchot (1985), and Bennis and Nanus (1985). They noted a) a deep sense of purpose, often expressed as a vision, which provides shared meaning and work which is intrinsically valuable, b) alignment of employees around the vision which serves to inspire them and place emphasis on creation rather than on survival, c) emphasis on people, personal performance and an environment which empowers, d) effective organizational structures which enhance and support systems, and e) organizational ability to integrate reason and intuition. Further, they observed that effective leaders of these organizations use intuition to clarify their vision, to catalyze alignment of

people, and to identify leverage points for structural change.

Blakeslee (1980) observed that many other business decisions rely on "gut feel" or "intuition." This is especially true in a rapidly changing environment, such as that facing higher education, where decisions must often be made quickly and with incomplete data.

Finally, in his studies of visionary leadership, Marshall Sashkin (1985) concluded that there are three critical elements which comprise the visionary leader's mode of operating. The first element consists of personality prerequisites and cognitive skills which include a need for power. This power is focused on the empowerment of followers and a level of cognitive development which relies on increasingly longer time spans while a) formulating and expressing a vision behaviorally, b) expressing vision verbally and in written form, c) extending the vision to other parts of the organization, and d) expanding the vision on a global basis. The second element consists of the ability to manipulate and define the vision so that it a) deals with change, b) incorporates ideal goals, and c) focuses on people working together. Finally, the third element consists of the ability to communicate the vision through a) focusing attention on key issues, b) communicating personally, c) demonstrating trustworthiness, d) displaying respect for others, and e) creating and taking

risks (Sashkin, 1985).

Current leadership researchers who have chronicled instances of corporate or institutional turn-around and revitalization seemed to be describing transformational leadership which goes beyond the recognition of employee's current needs and seeks to arouse and fulfill higher needs (Burns 1978). In this way, transformational leadership attempts to encourage self-actualization and consequently elicit greater contribution by the employee. There is not necessarily a reward given for such performance. Often intrinsic satisfaction suffices or perhaps the opportunity to engage in entrepreneurial activity is offered.

It is important to note, that while the transactional and transformational leadership are conceptually different, they are often exhibited by the same individual given different contexts. They are also exhibited in varying degrees depending on the situation and the leader's personality.

For example, Franklin D. Roosevelt was the epitome of the transformational leader while engaging in fireside chats, moving speeches and promotion of creative problem solving at the national level. However, he could also display transactional behaviors with regard to the politics of balance between the various governmental constituencies. He was not likely to engage in struggles unless he knew he could win (Bass, 1985).

In current leadership literature there are numerous accounts of transformational leadership which has resulted in sweeping effects on individuals and organizations alike. One must question whether such transformation can take place in complex organizations such as universities which serve a variety of publics and which are comprised of a mixture of independent professionals pursuing diverse goals and more traditional employees who operate within a bureaucratic reporting structure. However, the literature tells us that Tom Watson transformed IBM, Lee Iacocca transformed Chrysler Corporation, Jan Carlson transformed the Scandinavian Air Systems, and in the world of higher education, Robert Hutchins transformed the University of Chicago, Charles Eliot transformed Harvard University, and Frank Aydelotte transformed Swarthmore College. Consequently, the researcher contends that transformational leadership can take place in higher education as well as in other complex organizational settings.

SUMMARY

The literature search identified the common factors which consistently appeared in instances of effective leadership (see Appendix B). Those factors have also been related to the leadership role of CEO's in higher education.

The first group of factors appear in the external environment. Essentially, factors in the external

environment are ones over which the institutional CEO has little control. Some may be managed or influenced to an extent (i.e., some legislative issues) but for the most part, these are factors to be monitored and to be used in forecasting so that strategies can be formulated to capitalize on the situations they produce. Colleges and universities whose leaders have taken a proactive approach to their changing environment have fared much better in their efforts toward effectiveness and efficiency than those who have adhered to reactive measures (Keller, 1983).

Often the nature of the environment impacts the type of leadership that develops within the institution. When the environment is stable and highly structured, it is more likely that transactional leadership patterns will be utilized while a turbulent and unstructured environment encourages transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). This has been true historically, as times of crisis have seen the rise of charismatic leaders. Although most notable in political environments, it also happens in organizational settings. Lee Iacocca's leadership at Chrysler is a well known example.

Currently, there is a shift in the environment of higher education in terms of increased technology, tighter economic factors, changing demographics, stricter political and legal restrictions and restructuring of sociocultural variables regarding values, life-styles and the scope of

education itself. This is causing new curriculum demands, restricted funding, fewer traditional aged students, less public and government support, and demand for accountability. Although such factors encourage a reaction of "hunkering down" in order to preserve the "status quo", transformational leaders capitalize on such times by engaging in creativity and innovation to meet the challenges presented. These leaders:

engage in the intellectual stimulation of re-examining priorities; re-assessing benefits of different activities; exploring, exchanging and sharing resources with others; searching for alternative sources of support; scanning for innovative, new models of service and production that requires less use of resources; restructuring roles and reorganizing operations to maximize use of humans and technical resources (Lippitt, 1982, p. 398).

As an outgrowth of this process of innovation in the face of change and addition challenges, the business world re-evaluates goals with a long-term focus as the environment is constantly scanned for emerging trends. Market niche is carefully defined and sometimes bold, new ventures undertaken to ensure that programs and services will be in place to meet the needs of a rapidly changing society.

This is no easy task to expect of a university,

especially a public one. Not only are public institutions enmeshed in internal traditions and norms, but they are also bound by state bureaucracy and political trade-offs.

However, since their institutional goals are so diverse and broad, university leaders often have the option of turning those goals into operational objectives, thereby exhibiting transformational leadership behaviors within a structured, mechanistic setting (Bass, 1985).

The current literature suggests the problems of leadership today lie in establishing organizational goals which will motivate and bring out the best in personnel who have become skeptical of authority, interested in self-development and self-affirmation, and increasingly interested in enjoying life. These workers seem to adapt to career and job requirements but rebel against wasting time in dehumanizing bureaucracies (Maccoby, 1978).

Until recently, higher education has tended to ignore these changes in societal values, employee needs, and organizational health. They have not actively provided the education nor training needed for responsive leadership in the future.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The question addressed by this research is: do CEO's of urban higher educational institutions hold the same values and attitudes as those espoused by business CEO's through

the business literature? The null hypothesis, therefore, is CEO's of urban higher educational institutions do not hold the same values and attitudes as those espoused by business CEO's through the business literature.

Secondary questions are: a) What do urban CEO's consider to be the major leadership obstacles facing Presidents of urban insitutions of higher education as they move toward the year 2000? b) What leadership skills, abilities and/or training would the sample like to have had before becoming a college/university president? and, c) What are some experiences which have uniquely prepared the sample for the presidency?

References

- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. & Riley, G. L. (1978). Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.
- Bandura, A. (1982, February). Self-efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. American Psychologist. 122-147.
- Bennis, W. (1972, December). The University Leader. Saturday Review. p. 42-50.
- Bennis, W. (1984). The Four Competencies of Leadership. Training & Development Journal, 38, 14-19.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., & Williams, M. S. (1981). The Academic Administrator Grid. Washington: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Blakeslee, T. R. (1980). The Right Brain. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Bobbitt, H. R. & Behling, O. C. (1981). Organizational Behavior: A Review of the Literature. Journal of Higher Education. 52, 29-44.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cohen, M. D. & March, J. G. (1974). Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. (General Report Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education). NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Cunningham, L. L. (1983). Educational Leadership: What Next? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 239388).
- Deal, T. E. & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate Cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.
- Evans, M. G. (1970). The Effects of Supervisory Behavior on the Path-Goal Relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 5, 277-298.

- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. In Leonard Berkowitz, (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Psychology. New York: Academic Press. 1.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hodge, B. J. & Johnson, H J. (1970). Management and Organizational Behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- House, R. J. (1971). A Path-Goal Thoery of Leader Effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.
- House, R. J. & Baetz, M. L. (1979). Leadership: Some Generalizations and New Research Directions. In B.M. Staw (Ed.), Research in Organizational Behavior. Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.
- Iacocca, L. (1984). Iacocca. New York: Bantam Books.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Keller, G. (1983). Academic Strategy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Korman, A. (1966). Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria - A Review. Personnel Psychology. 19, 349-362.
- Lippett, G. L. (1982, July). Managing Conflict in Today's Organizations. Training and Development Journal. 36(7), p. 66-74.
- Maccoby, M. (1976). The Gamesman. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Maier, N.R.F. (1967). Assets and Liabilities in Group Problem Solving. Psychology Review. 74, 239-249.
- Manasse, L. (1984). Principals as Leaders of High Performance Systems. Educational Leadership, 41 (5), 42-46.
- Millett, J. D. (1962). The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.
- Millett, J. D. (1980). Management, Governance and Leadership. New York: AMACOM.

- Peck, R. D. (1984). Entrepreneurship as a Significant Factor in Successful Adaptation. Journal of Higher Education. 55(2), 269-285.
- Peters, T. & Austin, N. (1985). A Passion for Excellence. New York: Random House.
- Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best Run Companies. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Pinchot, G. III. (1985). Intrapreneuring. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rowan, R. (1979, April 23). Those Business Hunches are More Than Blind Faith. Fortune. p. 110-114.
- Sashkin, M. & Fulmer, R. M. (1985a, July). A New Framework for Leadership. A paper presented at the Biennial Leadership Symposium held by Texas Tech University.
- Sashkin, M. & Fulmer, R. M. (1985b, July). Toward an Organizational Leadership Theory: Revision of a paper presented at the Biennial Leadership Symposium held by Texas Tech University.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and Excellence in Schooling. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 4-13u.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. Journal of Psychology. 25, 35-71.
- Vroom, V. H. & Yetton, P. (1973). Leadership and Decision Making. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Walker, D. E. (1979). The Effective Administrator. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977, May-June). Managers and Leaders: Are They Different? Harvard Business Review. p. 67-78.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine if CEO's of urban institutions of higher education hold values and beliefs similar to those espoused by CEO's in business and industry. The entire population of urban higher educational CEO's was surveyed with responses entered on a five point Likert scale.

Additionally, three open-ended questions were asked and the results tabulated to gain greater understanding of the urban education CEO role.

ASSUMPTIONS

This research is based on several assumptions drawn from the literature search. First, this research assumes that the changing environment and the diverse organizational demands of the urban higher educational milieu are relatively similar to conditions which confront leaders of other types of organizations. While the organizational structure of higher education is unique, these institutions are being required to respond to a rapidly changing environment. The problem of dealing with a turbulent environment is a situation which is confronting business, industry and service organizations alike.

A second assumption of this dissertation is that

behavior, personality and environmental/situational factors are all instrumental in leadership effectiveness. The transformational leadership theory has been selected because it focused on all three sets of variables present in circumstances where leadership occurs; behavior, personality factors, and the environment or situation. Other theories tended to address only one or two of these variables. For example, as described in the literature review, early theorists dealt only with personality traits, the Ohio State Studies were concerned only with behavior, Fiedler (1964) discussed personality and situation, and House (1971) observed behavior and situation.

A third assumption is that a leader's belief and/or value system helps determine behaviors. Subordinates who work for visible leaders tend to read the leader's behaviors and values and then act according to those observed or felt behaviors rather than to espoused values/beliefs (Argyris & Schon, 1981). It follows then, that the leadership behaviors found to be effective in the literature were exhibited by individuals who valued and believed in those behaviors.

The fourth assumption is that leadership is manifested in behaviors which promote change in the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of others. This assumption is made because the leadership theories previously reviewed suggested the activity of directing or causing movement in others. This

implies change and the management of that change.

A final assumption upon which this research is built is that the essential aspects of leadership behavior fall within the context of James MacGregor Burns' (1978) and Bernard Bass' (1986) work detailing transactional and transformational leadership. This viewpoint is taken since the researcher found that early theories focused primarily on a leader's ability to influence increased quantity, quality and associated measures of performance. Leadership was considered essentially to be a process of exchange or transactional relationship where employee's needs were met when they attained the performance expectations agreed upon with their superiors, i.e., praise given on completion of a project or promotion for continued high performance (Burns, 1978).

Current leadership literature has documented that organizations which have responded well, which have attained new vitality and which have anticipated change have often been guided by leaders who exhibited specific behaviors which, taken together, result in transformational leadership. Consequently, a transformational leadership model may have utility as a tool for understanding the leadership behaviors which will be important to the health of urban academic institutions in the future.

Population and Sample

The population targeted for this study was chief

executive officers (presidents and chancellors) of urban institutions of higher education. The institutions included in the study were those which had self-selected themselves into the category of "urban institutions" by becoming a member of a) the Association for Urban Universities and/or b) the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AASCU) Committee on Urban Affairs.

Urban universities are those universities which 1) are located in major urban centers, 2) have programs designed to make higher education more accessible to students living in surrounding areas, and 3) have a commitment to the cities in which they reside. The category "urban universities" was selected to restrict variables which could affect presidential leadership such as a) two year versus four year institutions, b) proprietary or for-profit institutions which specialize in law, medicine and/or theology, c) major Land Grant institutions, d) community expectations, e) institutional mission, f) student body characteristics, and g) public services commitment.

Since the entire membership of both urban university organizations yielded only 62 separate institutions, it was decided to sample the entire population. It was recognized that a major difficulty in surveying this population would be in attaining a response from a large enough percentage of the population. In an attempt to increase the response rate, the researcher did not ask respondents to identify

their own behaviors which could be considered threatening. They were, instead, asked to rate the degree to which they agree or disagree with each behavioral statement on the questionnaire. A second strategy was to send out a follow-up mailing to non-respondents three weeks after the first mailing. Third, a cover letter was written by both the researcher and by Dr. Alfred B. Rollins, Jr., past President of Old Dominion University. Both letters were designed to encourage response rate. (Appendix C) Fourth, a 50% rate of return rather than the usual 70% was considered acceptable from this population due to the heavy demands on their time. Accordingly, the researcher expected a minimum of 31 completed questionnaires in order to make an analysis which could be considered representative of the population.

Instrumentation and Item Design

Since little research of transformational leadership in the higher education environment has been previously conducted, it was determined that the first step should be to discover if chief executive officers of higher education institutions agreed with the literature in the business and industry areas. For this purpose a questionnaire was designed which a) identified behaviors found in the transformational leadership literature search and b) translated them into behaviors appropriate to urban higher education institutions.

The process of item design was as follows: first, a

search of the business and educational literature was made to define the traits which were identified as being important to transformational leadership. Each trait was then explained in terms of how it might be manifest in urban higher education. Second, a set of potential items was drawn up for each trait by the researcher. The items were then discussed with a committee member who was also a past urban education CEO. Adjustments were made as necessary. Third, possible items were discussed with and decided upon by the researcher and her committee. Fourth, the item pool was rated by urban higher education professionals who had held administrative offices to determine the content validity of each item. This was done within the higher education field to ensure appropriateness of items. Fifth, the items were administered to four university leaders who each discussed the questionnaire item-by-item. Suggestions were made for wording, placement and administration time. Revisions were completed based on these recommendations. Sixth, a field test was completed by presenting the questionnaire to two former urban university presidents and one current vice president. After completing the questionnaire, each respondent offered suggestions and comments on an item-by-item basis. They also concurred on the face validity of the instrument (see rationale and final items, Appendix D).

The responses of these executives were compared to

determine whether the instrument would differentiate, i.e., indicate values and beliefs rather than acceptance of the items, based on personal opinion and common understanding. Since differentiation did occur and the pilot executives determined that the items were clear and understandable, the instrument was considered finalized. It was then processed for distribution. The instrument is found in Appendix E.

Procedure

As described in the literature review, a thorough review of the business and industry and the higher education leadership literature revealed specific behaviors which have been observed and documented as being exhibited by leaders who have effectively brought about positive change in their organizations. These behaviors were defined and then set in the urban higher education environment through the method detailed in the instrumentation section.

The questionnaire was piloted with two former urban university presidents and one current senior administrator at a mid-Atlantic urban university. All of these individuals had spent more than twenty years in the urban higher education environment. In this pilot process, each subject responded to each item, discussed their interpretation of each item, and assessed its face validity. Any ambiguous or low validity items were adjusted and/or omitted as appropriate.

Construct validity of the items was first established

by tying them directly to the literature. This was accomplished by identifying specific transformational leadership behaviors in the literature and then representing each behavior as it typically would be enacted in the urban higher education setting. Content validity was established by piloting each item with former presidents and current executive level administrators who could judge their validity. Face validity was also established through the pilot process as described in the section on instrumentation and item design.

Reliability was addressed in several ways. The first was during the pilot process where administrators who had exhibited quite different leadership styles were asked to respond to the questionnaire. As anticipated, their scores resulted in a clear variation which they acknowledge was based on their beliefs concerning leadership in the urban higher education setting.

Secondly, an item design process was conducted for each item on the questionnaire. The steps for conducting the item design were detailed in the Instrumentation and Item Design section of this chapter.

Prior to data collection, membership lists were solicited from the Association for Urban Universities and the American Association of Colleges and Universities. The lists were consolidated and each institution was called to verify address and name of CEO.

Concurrently, cover letters were drafted in conjunction with Dr. Alfred B. Rollins, Jr., a former urban university president. Dr. Rollins signed each letter and added personal notes to his acquaintances in an effort to increase participation. This approach was considered necessary because it was anticipated that response might be low (less than 50%) due to heavy time demands on CEO's time and the practice many have of not completing such requests personally. For this reason also, the instrument was limited to 36 items in an effort to not impose on time and to make the request of a personal response appear reasonable. A second cover letter was designed by the researcher which explained the study and its importance (see Appendix C).

Two cover letters, a questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope were sent to each member ($N=62$) of the target population. CEO's were asked to spend about twenty minutes completing the questionnaire. They were also asked to return completed questionnaires within two weeks. Each return envelope was coded so that the researcher would be able to determine which chief executives failed to return questionnaires. By the end of the allotted period, twenty-five returns were received. A second mailing was made to non-respondents three weeks after the first mailing. An additional thirteen responses were received. The final response rate was a total of 37 questionnaires or

61% which well exceeded the anticipated rate of 50%. An additional four CEO's returned either the uncompleted questionnaire or a letter with the explanation that they maintained a policy of not taking part in research studies.

References

- Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1981). Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. In Leonard Berkowitz, (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Psychology, Vol.1. New York: Academic Press.
- House, R. J. & Baetz, M. L. (1979). Leadership: Some Generalizations and New Research Directions. In B.M. Staw (Ed.), Research in Organizational Behavior. Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine if CEO's of urban higher education institutions hold the same attitudes and values as CEO's in business and industry. To accomplish this, the business and educational leadership literature was searched. Leadership behaviors were identified which consistently appeared in CEO's and organizations which experienced a) major turnarounds, b) ability to anticipate and respond positively to the changing environment, and c) otherwise positive organizational outcomes.

A questionnaire was built from the literature search. The questionnaire was validated and checked for reliability through a panel of experts, a split-half reliability test, and a pilot process. When finalized, the questionnaire was sent to the entire population of CEO's of urban higher education institutions. Follow-up letters were sent to non-respondents in an effort to obtain more returns.

The data from the questionnaire (Likert scale items) was tabulated and a series of statistical analyses were run. The open-ended questions on the questionnaire were tabulated in executive summary format.

Statistical Analysis

Frequency Analysis. Survey data was collected on a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly

disagree) for questions one through thirty-three. In order to determine degree of agreement, measures of frequency and central tendency were computed for each question. The computer software SAS was used to compute data for this study. Frequency distributions revealed how many respondents fell within each of the categories of agreement on the Likert scale (Table 1). While the questionnaire items were sometimes posed in the negative and sometimes in the positive, the scoring was adjusted so that interpretation could be made with all positive responses appearing as agree and all negative responses appearing as disagree. All questionnaires were completely filled out so there was no issue of omission of answers. The researcher had originally planned to treat missing answers as fitting in the "undecided" category. Additionally, upon careful review, it was found that there were no items which elicited equal responses in all Likert categories. Clear differences of opinion and degree of acceptance were expressed by respondents.

Table 1

Frequency Distributions (1=SA, 5=SD)

	Frequencies				
	1	2	3	4	5
Item					

1 roles 0 3 4 17 13

Table 1 (cont.)

Frequency Distributions (1=SA, 5=SD)

		Frequencies				

Item		1	2	3	4	5
2	decisions	6	18	6	6	1
3	new ideas	1	0	0	18	18
4	morale	0	7	6	20	4
5	risk	1	7	3	19	7
6	viewpoints	1	0	3	26	7
7	meeting	0	2	4	25	6
8	loyalty	2	2	1	26	6
9	authority	4	18	1	13	1
10	effective	4	19	2	12	0
11	ability	0	7	3	26	1
12	input	0	0	0	28	9
13	logos	1	6	0	25	5
14	vision	0	5	2	14	16
15	lead	1	7	1	20	8
16	learner	0	6	4	18	9
17	results	1	10	6	20	0
18	goals	1	2	0	20	14
19	training	1	2	4	23	7

Table 1 (cont.)

Frequency Distributions (1=SA, 5=SD)

		Frequencies				

Item		1	2	3	4	5
20	time	0	4	8	18	7
21	groups	1	1	0	16	19
22	principle	1	1	1	18	16
23	rational	0	2	6	19	7
24	weak	1	6	7	19	4
25	resources	2	23	10	2	0
26	change	0	8	1	21	7
27	listening	0	5	9	22	1
28	runs	0	10	4	22	1
29	traditions	0	7	7	22	1
30	intrusion	0	2	9	22	4
31	fair	1	3	6	27	0
32	disruptive	2	11	6	16	2
33	market	1	10	3	21	2

Central Tendency Measures

Central tendency measures computed were means and standard deviations for each Likert scale item. They are both reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations

Items	Means	Standard Deviations
	-----	-----
1 roles	4.08	.894
2 decisions	2.41	1.04
3 new ideas	4.41	.762
4 morale	3.57	.929
5 risk	3.65	1.09
6 viewpoints	4.03	.726
7 meeting	3.95	.705
8 loyalty	3.86	.948
9 authority	3.70	1.15
10 effective	2.59	1.07
11 ability	3.58	.834
12 input	4.24	.434
13 logos	3.73	.990
14 vision	4.11	1.02
15 lead	3.73	1.10
16 learner	3.81	.996
17 results	3.22	.948
18 goals	4.19	.908
19 training	3.89	.875
20 time	3.76	.895
21 groups	4.38	.861

Table 2 (cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations

Items	Means	Standard Deviations
	-----	-----
22 principle	4.27	.871
23 rational	3.76	.925
24 weak	3.51	.989
25 resources	2.32	.669
26 change	3.73	1.02
27 listening	3.51	.768
28 runs	3.38	.924
29 traditions	3.46	.836
30 intrusion	3.76	.723
31 fair	3.59	.762
32 disruptive	3.14	1.08
33 market	3.35	1.03

Each item was carefully examined for variance because extreme scores have disproportionate influence on the mean and may cause misrepresentation of the data (Myers, 1977). Items did show differentiation among respondents i.e., they reflected both agreement and disagreement. Almost a third showed polarization between one extreme or the other. Items #3, #12, #18, #21 and #22 reflected the greatest amount of agreement among respondents.

Table 3

Cumulative Frequencies

Frequencies (Cumulative Frequencies)					

Item	1	2	3	4	5
1 roles	0	3 (3)	4 (7)	17 (24)	13 (37)
2 decis.	6 (6)	18 (24)	6 (30)	6 (36)	1 (37)
3 ideas	1 (1)	0	0	18 (19)	18 (37)
4 morale	0	7 (7)	6 (13)	20 (33)	4 (37)
5 risk	1 (1)	7 (8)	3 (11)	19 (30)	7 (37)
6 view.	1 (1)	0	3 (4)	26 (30)	7 (37)
7 meet.	0	2 (2)	4 (6)	25 (31)	6 (37)
8 loyal.	2 (2)	2 (4)	1 (5)	26 (31)	6 (37)
9 author.	4 (4)	18 (22)	1 (23)	13 (36)	1 (37)
10 effect.	4 (4)	19 (23)	2 (25)	12 (37)	0
11 abil.	0	7 (7)	3 (10)	26 (36)	1 (37)
12 input	0	0	0	28 (28)	9 (37)
13 logos	1 (1)	6 (7)	0	25 (32)	5 (37)
14 vision	0	5 (5)	2 (7)	14 (21)	16 (37)
15 lead	1 (1)	7 (8)	1 (9)	20 (29)	8 (37)
16 learn.	0	6 (6)	4 (10)	18 (28)	9 (37)
17 result	1 (1)	10 (11)	6 (17)	20 (37)	0

Table 3 (Cont.)

Cumulative Frequencies

Item	Frequencies (Cumulative Frequencies)				
	1	2	3	4	5
18 goals	1(1)	2(3)	0	20(23)	14(37)
19 train.	1(1)	2(3)	4(7)	23(30)	7(37)
20 time	0	4(4)	8(12)	18(30)	7(37)
21 groups	1(1)	1(2)	0	16(18)	19(37)
22 princ.	1(1)	1(2)	1(3)	18(21)	16(37)
23 rat.	0	5(5)	6(11)	19(30)	7(37)
24 weak	1(1)	6(7)	7(14)	19(33)	4(37)
25 resour.	2(2)	23(25)	10(35)	2(37)	0
26 change	0	8(8)	1(9)	21(30)	7(37)
27 listen.	0	5(5)	9(14)	22(36)	1(37)
28 runs	0	10(10)	4(14)	22(36)	1(37)
29 trad.	0	7(7)	7(14)	22(36)	1(37)
30 intru.	0	2(2)	9(11)	22(33)	4(37)
31 fair	1(1)	3(4)	6(10)	27(37)	0
32 disr.	2(2)	11(13)	6(19)	16(35)	2(37)
33 market	1(1)	10(11)	3(14)	21(35)	2(37)

A second use of both mean and standard deviation came about by rank ordering them. Rank ordering by mean was used

to reveal the items which were most important to urban education CEO's and which were least important (Table 4).

Table 4

Rank Order By Mean

Item	Behavior	Mean

3	Self-knowledge	4.41
21	Vision	4.37
22	Self-knowledge	4.27
12	Effec. Org. Structure	4.24
18	Vision	4.18
14	Charisma	4.11
1	Charisma	4.18
6	Vision	4.03
7	Communication	3.95
31	Intuition/Insight	3.95
19	Communication	3.89
8	Symbols/Culture	3.86
16	Self-knowledge	3.81
23	Cognitive Development	3.76
20	Task vs Consideration	3.75
30	Task vs Consideration	3.75
26	Task vs Consideration	3.73
13	Symbols/Culture	3.72
15	Task vs Consideration	3.72

Table 4 (Cont.)

Rank Order By Mean

Item	Behavior	Mean

5	Vision	3.64
11	Empowerment	3.56
4	Effec. Org. Structure	3.56
27	Cognitive Development	3.51
24	Entrepreneurism	3.51
29	Intuition/Insight	3.46
28	Entrepreneurism	3.37
33	Symbols/Culture	3.35
17	Entrepreneurism	3.21
32	Cognitive Development	3.13
9	Empowerment	2.70
10	Effect. Org. Structure	2.60
2	Charisma	2.41
25	Empowerment	2.32

Rank ordering by standard deviation resulted in the identification of which items Urban CEO's most agreed with versus those least agreed with (Table 5).

Table 5

Rank Order By Standard Deviation

Item	Behavior	S. D.
12	Effect. Org. Structure	.435
25	Empowerment	.669
7	Communication	.705
30	Task vs Consideration	.723
6	Vision	.726
31	Intuition/Insight	.762
3	Self-knowledge	.762
27	Cognitive Development	.768
11	Empowerment	.835
29	Intuition/Insight	.836
21	Vision	.861
22	Self-knowledge	.871
19	Communication	.875
1	Charisma	.894
20	Task vs Consideration	.895
18	Vision	.908
28	Entrepreneurism	.924
23	Cognitive Development	.925
4	Effec. Org. Structure	.929
17	Entrepreneurism	.947
8	Symbols/Culture	.948
24	Entrepreneurism	.989

Table 5 (Cont.)

Rank Order By Standard Deviation

Item	Behavior	S. D.
13	Symbols/Culture	.990
16	Self-knowledge	.995
26	Task vs Consideration	1.018
14	Charisma	1.022
33	Symbols/Culture	1.033
2	Charisma	1.040
10	Effec. Org. Structure	1.066
32	Cognitive Development	1.084
5	Vision	1.086
15	Task vs Consideration	1.097
9	Effect. Org. Structure	1.151

In an effort to look at the data from another viewpoint, means and standard deviations were averaged according to each behavior. This provided an overall mean and standard deviation according to behavioral construct. It was then possible to rank order each behavior to discover which were considered most important (mean) and which received the greatest degree of agreement (standard deviation). The obtained results are found in Table 6.

Table 6

Rank Order By Behavior Average Mean and Standard Deviation

Mean	Behavior	S.D.	Behavior
-----		-----	
4.10	Charisma	.752	Empowerment
4.06	Vision	.799	Intuition/Insight
4.06	Self-knowledge	.811	Effect. Org. Structure
3.86	Communication	.867	Communication
3.71	Intuition/Insight	.881	Self-knowledge
3.65	Symbols/Culture	.897	Vision
3.63	Task vs Consider.	.924	Cognitive Development
3.54	Entrepreneurism	.936	Entrepreneurism
3.47	Cognitive Develop.	.937	Task vs Consideration
3.47	Effect. Org. Struct..	.957	Charisma
2.94	Empowerment	.989	Symbols/Culture

Mean rankings were divided into thirds to see if there was any real difference in the way subjects responded; was there a clear distribution in perceptions of critical behaviors? The low score of the top third and the top score of the bottom third were compared. A t-test of related means revealed that the difference was not likely to have occurred by chance ($t \leq 2.4237$; $p = .05$).

Split-half Reliability

A split-half reliability test was computed to determine the degree of internal consistency achieved by the questionnaire. First, the questions were grouped according to the behaviors found in the literature (Appendix 1). Items were then randomly selected from each behavior for each half of the test. If there were an odd number of items in a category, one was randomly eliminated before the even number of items was randomly assigned to each half of the test. When completed, each half-test consisted of fourteen items. The Pearson-Product Moment Coefficient computed was $r=.81$. Since this correlation coefficient provides a reliability score for approximately half of the original questionnaire, the reliability of the entire questionnaire has been underestimated due to the fact that reliability tends to increase with test length (Cascio, 1982). The longer test had the effect of sampling a greater portion of the content domain and also produced a wider range of scores. Since the questionnaire was divided in half to compute the split-half coefficient, the sampling and range were diminished. Both of these effects tend to decrease reliability. To correct for the underestimation of reliability as regards test length, the Spearman-Brown formula was applied. This corrected split-half correlation generally results in the highest estimate of reliability because it allows for the fewest number of contaminating

factors to influence reliability (Cascio, 1982). Since both halves of the questionnaire were administered at the same time, only short-term errors which could affect one item were allowed to operate. The corrected reliability score computed by the Spearman-Brown formula was $r=.86$.

Response Findings

Frequency tabulations resulted in item response patterns that revealed that nine of thirty-three items polarized at either end of the Likert scale. Six of the items had response patterns where there was over 90% agreement. Six items resulted in 20% of respondents reporting that they were undecided about their beliefs. Five items reflected 75% to 89% agreement among respondents. The remaining seven items showed agreement among 65% to 74% of the respondents. High split-half correlations ($r=.86$) corroborated these findings in that they indicated that respondents answered like-items in similar fashion.

Ranked means indicated that urban education CEO's found the constructs of Self-knowledge, Vision, Charisma, and Communication to be most important in effective leadership. The constructs considered least important were Entrepreneurism, Cognitive Development, Effective Organizational Structure, and Empowerment. When the mean scores of the variables within each construct (as identified in the factor analysis) were averaged and then ranked the results were the same. As described previously, a t-test

of related means was run between the lowest mean in the top third of the group of constructs and the highest mean of the lowest third of the group of constructs. It revealed that there was a significant difference between the two groups of means ($t \leq 2.4237$; $p = .05$). This statistical test indicated that the difference in means would not normally occur by chance. It can be concluded, then, that urban education CEO's believed that there was a difference in the importance between these two groups of constructs.

Ranking by standard deviation revealed those constructs upon which the CEO's most agreed. Comparison of the top and bottom thirds ranked by standard deviation revealed that CEO's agreed that Empowerment and Effective Organization Structure were of least importance, Intuition/Insight was of medium importance and Communication was of high importance.

The lower third of the standard deviation rankings showed less agreement among the respondents. This indicated that there was more spread in their responses on the Likert scale dimensions. For instance, Charisma ranked high in importance with a mean of 4.10. Its' standard deviation was .957, however, because of the high number of 4 and 5 responses, and the spread of 2 and 3 responses. This pattern indicates that while the majority of respondents felt that Charisma was an important behavior, there were also a number of respondents who either disagreed or were undecided. The same is true to a lesser extent for the

constructs Entrepreneurism, Task vs Consideration and Culture/Symbols. One dimension, Cognitive Development had medium agreement that it was less important and two dimensions, Self-knowledge and Vision, had medium agreement that they were more important.

Factor Analysis

In order to check the validity of the factors derived from the literature and their corresponding questionnaire items, a factor analysis was computed. This was done to gain a better understanding of similar variables and to remove duplicated information from the set of variables established through the literature search. Thus, factor analysis is designed to cluster highly correlated variables so that a common, underlying variable, or factor, is isolated.

Although each of the original variables which define a factor often has some degree of correlation with some of the other variables, factor analysis is used to identify factors which are highly related and which are relatively independent of each other (Kachigan, 1982). Factor analysis is a powerful technique for data reduction.

The factor analysis procedure begins with a data matrix (objects by variables, $O \times V$) with O =frequency and V =questionnaire item. It is appropriate to have more objects than variables so that relationship by chance can be more effectively ruled out.

However, the population n was not much larger than the number of questionnaire items in this study. Consequently, results from the factor analysis must be judged accordingly; it is anticipated that the resultant factors may not be stable due to sample size.

The second stage of the factor analysis procedure is to create a correlation matrix. This is accomplished by determining the correlation coefficients for each possible pair of variables. The correlations are then displayed in matrix form. A series of mathematical computations on the matrix data results in a factor matrix with the columns providing the displayed factors and the rows displaying the original input variables.

Each cell in the factor matrix contains a factor loading which varies from -1.00 to +1.00. The factor loading identifies the degree to which each of the variables correlates with each of the factors. Variables with high factor loadings are those which contribute most to the meaning of the factor. It follows then, that variables which highly correlate with each other will form the various factors. By this procedure, factor analysis removes the redundancy from a set of variables.

Each factor derived from factor analysis is assigned an eigenvalue. Eigenvalues correspond to the number of variables which the factor represents. Another importance of eigenvalues is that they assist in the decision to retain

factors. Generally, factors are retained to the point where an additional factor would account for less than one eigenvalue, which is equivalent to the variance of a typical variable (Kachigan, 1982).

The final step in factor analysis is to redefine the factors so that the explained variance is redistributed among the new factors. Factor rotation allows loadings on the new factors to be either very high or very low. This procedure allows for clearer interpretation of the data. In this study, orthogonal transformation with varimax rotation was used to reallocate variance to the factors so that the sharpest distinction in the meaning of the factors could be obtained. Factor rotation does not change the number of factors nor the amount of variance explained.

Table 7 shows the resulting factor pattern. Factor analysis upheld the factors found in the literature.

Table 7

Orthogonal Transformation, Varimax Rotation Factor Matrix

		Factors										

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
#	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR	
1	.15	-.01	-.14	-.06	.20	.19	.13	.53	-.17	-.06	.58	
2	-.41	.16	-.12	-.17	.30	-.26	.06	.32	-.27	.04	.33	

Table 7 (cont.)

Orthogonal Transformation, Varimax Rotation Factor Matrix

#	Factors										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR
3	.06	.67	-.27	.03	-.10	-.01	.37	-.04	.05	-.05	-.13
4	.35	-.32	.02	-.01	.05	-.49	.25	-.19	.04	-.11	.05
5	.69	-.16	-.27	-.01	.13	-.07	-.15	.15	.01	-.21	.06
6	.75	.11	.08	-.09	.10	-.18	.34	-.06	.10	-.19	-.28
7	.39	.18	.01	-.09	.31	-.19	.62	-.04	.09	-.15	-.07
8	-.01	-.25	.41	.62	.16	-.26	-.01	-.13	.18	.19	.19
9	-.05	-.32	.35	.17	.21	-.40	.02	.31	-.01	.11	-.33
10	-.18	-.05	.04	.04	.06	.81	.05	.04	.02	-.09	.01
11	.07	-.06	.78	.01	-.06	.01	.21	.20	.01	-.08	-.01
12	.24	.04	.17	.31	-.28	-.46	.23	.01	.01	-.16	-.04
13	.29	.31	.12	.56	-.32	.24	.10	-.04	.03	.27	.01
14	-.14	.09	.04	-.01	-.07	-.03	.02	-.19	.02	-.07	.84
15	.04	-.15	-.01	-.12	.07	.04	-.01	.05	.88	.10	-.06
16	-.20	.72	.25	-.21	-.11	.19	-.11	.11	-.11	-.01	.17
17	.03	.26	-.38	.11	.18	.11	.12	.32	.30	-.22	-.02
18	.84	.11	.39	.05	.04	-.15	-.02	-.03	-.06	.14	.05
19	-.13	.24	.16	.01	.01	.02	.79	.01	-.04	.22	-.16
20	.23	.49	.26	.27	.06	-.29	.13	-.05	.49	-.15	-.17

Table 7 (Cont.)

Orthogonal Transformation, Varimax Rotation Factor Matrix

Factors											

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
#	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR
21	.78	.02	.03	.20	-.19	-.11	.04	-.04	.03	-.02	-.02
22	.10	.71	-.11	.06	.09	-.07	.17	.01	-.05	.25	.15
23	.01	.01	-.10	.01	-.10	.15	.27	.10	.14	.72	-.03
24	-.01	-.02	.06	-.09	-.14	.06	-.06	.70	.01	.09	-.01
25	-.16	-.11	-.67	-.02	-.09	-.04	.14	.45	-.08	-.08	.07
26	-.35	.21	.12	-.00	.10	.07	-.38	-.22	.43	-.04	.07
27	-.01	.03	.06	.40	-.12	-.18	-.08	.07	-.11	.61	-.10
28	.23	.21	-.03	.37	.21	-.11	.03	.57	.31	-.03	-.13
29	.10	.13	.08	.07	.78	.11	.17	-.13	.01	-.08	-.04
30	.15	-.01	-.27	.11	-.31	-.37	.28	.23	.46	.05	.31
31	-.12	-.35	-.09	.20	.71	.01	-.10	.14	.17	-.02	.02
32	.21	-.32	-.19	.20	-.22	.15	.23	.19	-.02	-.60	.03
33	-.05	.06	.15	-.80	-.21	-.03	.06	-.02	.13	-.02	.09

Eigenvalue											
	4.7	3.1	2.8	2.3	2.0	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.1

Table 7 (Cont.)

Orthogonal Transformation, Varimax Rotation Factor Matrix

Factors											

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
#	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR
Explained											
Variance											
	3.5	2.7	2.2	2.1	2.04	2.0	1.98	1.96	1.9	1.7	1.67

Factors were then inter-correlated to provide information on how much underlying interdependence might be present among factors.

Table 8

Factor Inter-correlations

Factors											

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
F	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR
1	1.0	.03	-.04	.24	-.09	-.12	.37	-.01	.21	-.28	-.18
2	.03	1.0	.16	.01	.01	.05	.04	-.13	.12	.07	-.04
3	-.04	.16	1.0	.08	.04	-.17	-.20	-.29	.02	.20	-.13

Table 8 (cont.)

Factor Inter-correlations

		Factors										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
F	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR	
4	.24	.001	.08	1.0	-.13	-.20	.21	.08	.34	-.12	-.16	
5	-.09	.01	.05	-.13	1.0	-.14	-.16	.11	-.03	-.05	-.01	
6	-.13	.05	-.17	-.20	-.14	1.0	-.16	-.04	-.19	.07	.08	
7	.37	.05	-.20	.21	-.16	-.16	1.0	.20	.21	-.28	-.04	
8	-.01	-.14	-.29	.08	.11	-.04	.20	1.0	-.04	-.08	.12	
9	.21	.12	.02	.34	-.03	0.19	.21	-.04	1.0	-.25	-.19	
10	-.28	.07	.20	-.12	-.05	.07	-.28	-.08	-.25	1.0	.10	
11	-.18	-.04	-.13	-.16	-.01	.08	-.04	.12	-.19	.10	1.0	

Table 8 reveals that only Factors 7 and 1 and Factors 9 and 4 have a slightly significant degree of inter-correlation. Since the n in this study was so small, the researcher believes that further study should be done in this area to see if the inter-correlations hold with a larger population. When factor analysis with orthogonal transformation and varimax rotation was computed for the questionnaire data, eleven factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than one. Their combined variance accounted for 76%

of the common variance among the thirty-three questionnaire items.

In order to have highly stable outcomes on a factor analysis of 33 items, six times that number, or 198 respondents would have been needed. Unfortunately, the entire population for this study had an n of 37 returned questionnaires. Factor analysis has been pursued, however, because when both a principle components and a factor analysis were run, clear loadings appeared on the same factors that were derived from the literature. It is still necessary, however, to remain aware of the question of stability of the factor analysis.

In an attempt to deal with viable items within each factor, the researcher decided to examine factor loadings which were relatively high. Statistical criteria require that in means for samples of less than 100, factor loadings would have to be greater than .30 to be considered statistically significant (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1983). In the case of this study, factor loadings greater than .50 are given the greatest consideration, particularly in the first two factors which account for the greatest amount of variance. Loadings less than .35 are not discussed.

Table 9

Factor Pattern Matrix by Factor

		Factors										

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Items	M	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR
18	4.18	.84										
21	4.37	.77										
6	4.03	.75										
5	3.64	.69										
16	3.81		.72									
22	4.27		.71									
3	4.41		.67									
20	3.75		.49									
11	3.56			.78								
25	2.32			-.67								
17	3.21			-.38								
33	3.35				-.80							
8	3.86				.62							
13	3.73				.56							
29	3.46					.78						
31	3.95					.71						

Table 9 (cont.)

Factor Pattern Matrix by Factor

		Factors										

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Items	M	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR
10	2.60						.81					
4	3.56						-.49					
12	4.24						-.46					
19	3.89							.79				
7	3.95							.62				
26	3.73							-.38				
24	3.51								.70			
28	3.37								.57			
1	4.08								.53			
15	3.72									.88		
20	3.75									.49		
30	3.75									.46		
26	3.73									.43		
23	3.76										.72	
27	3.51										.61	
32	3.13											-.59

Table 9

Factor Pattern Matrix by Factor

		Factors										

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Items	M	V	S-K	EMP	S/C	I/I	EOS	C	ENT	T/C	CD	CHAR
14	4.11											.84
1	4.08											.58

Note: Negative factor loadings indicate that respondents answered in the obverse. Appendix D contains a definition of each factor construct and the questionnaire items which evolved from each rationale. Appendix E contains the questionnaire itself.

In a few instances, a single item may have similar loadings on more than one factor. Item 1 loads on factors 8 and 11 (Entrepreneurism and Charisma). The loadings are .53 and .58 respectively. Since the two constructs involved have somewhat similar behaviors and since the survey sample was so small, the researcher decided to leave both loadings but to focus on factor 11 since it had both the highest loading and was the final factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1.

Items 9 and 17 loaded marginally on more than one

factor also. Since the sample was so small, these items were not considered as contributing significantly to any particular factor. However, they should be included in future research involving more subjects.

Finally, item 20 loaded evenly on factor 2 and 9. It was considered as contributing more to factor 2 because it fit better with the other items contributing to that factor. It, too, should undergo further study.

The lack of a clear factor loading for some items may be due to the low number of respondents in this study, to the fact that some of the constructs may have slightly different meanings to various people, and/or to the statement in the literature that the identified behaviors do not act separately from one another.

Descriptive Analysis

The last three questions on the survey were asked in open-ended format. This was done to encourage respondents to provide some personal insights and to see if any trends were present in the respondent's past experience and/or views on the future.

An executive summary for each open-ended question has been compiled. Responses followed by a number indicate how many individuals said the same thing. Responses followed by no number were expressed by one person.

The open-ended answers to question 34 fall into four broad categories. Respondents felt that the most important

issues facing urban higher education CEO's in the future would be in the areas of a) fiscal restraints/budgetary issues, b) faculty quality/recruitment issues, c) student enrollment/preparedness issues, d) leadership skills of university administrators.

Question 34. What do you consider to be the major leadership obstacle(s) facing Presidents of urban institutions of higher education as they move toward the year 2000?

Fiscal restraints/Budgetary Issues

- fiscal restraints (15)
- interference by federal and state agencies, lack of support for inner city residents and institutions (3)
- outdated/outmoded equipment & facilities
- lower institutional status (compared to research universities and liberal arts colleges)
- cost of maintaining high-tech equipment & labs
- extensive public apathy concerning quality higher education
- student access to financial aid

Faculty Quality/Recruitment Issues

- faculty recruitment challenges (retirement, reduced graduate school enrollments, etc.) (3)
- access
- lack of under-represented faculty, strongly

entrenched old-line faculty who have
significant difficulties dealing with the new
"look" of the campus

Student Enrollment/Preparedness Issues

- poorly prepared minority pool (student & faculty) (5)
- deterioration of quality of K-12 education, especially in math, sciences and language skills (3)
- declining enrollment (2)
- minority enrollment trends (2)
- diversity of students
- competition for bright students
- not being overwhelmed by the pressure to admit large numbers of unqualified students from disadvantaged sectors
- the continued disintegration of American society

Leadership Skills of University Administrators

- lack of understanding of how universities and communities can work together for the greater good (2)
- general lack of financial management in urban institutions
- quality
- how to gain sufficient political powers to give urban institutions their rightful place vis-

a-vis land grant "flagships"

- competing constituents seem to have grown
 - shriller - media attention to non-academic matters i.e. zoning, racial problems, drug and alcohol, sexual preference, athletics - all seem more glaring
- balancing internal constituencies and public regard for institutions
- accreditation groups which are relevant
- time
- development of leaders
- job has been over politicized
- creating and maintaining a safe environment for students
- dealing with pressure for more external commitment to the "problems" of the community
- boards of trustees that do not understand the changing conditions and situations which face urban institutions
- pressures from special interest groups
- expectations that exceed our capabilities

The open-ended answers to question 35 fall into four broad categories. Respondents reported that their job as CEO would have been easier had they received specific training in a) interpersonal and communication skills, b) financial skills, c) management and leadership skills, and d)

law/legal/union-related skills.

Question 35. What leadership skills, abilities and/or training would you like to have had before you became a college/university president?

Interpersonal and Communication Skills

- conflict resolution skills (3)
- greater patience (2)
- communication skills (2)
- getting along with people/interpersonal relationships (2)
- more public speaking training (2)
- fundraising (2)
- group communication (2)
- improved listening skills
- writing skills
- sales training
- press relations
- foreign languages

Financial Skills

- economics (20)
- training in finance (3)
- accounting

Management and Leadership Skills

- organizational management skills (3)
- community development skills
- a greater acceptance of the dictum "no good

deeds go unpunished" and resistance to the naivete that "reasonable people can solve any problem reasonably"

- more political savvy for public sector
- most of my previous life was spent in acquiring and exercising leadership skills
- advanced management
- teambuilding
- be more assertive - understand directive leadership
- understand the difficulty in faculty to accept change
- a more extroverted personality
- delegation skills
- knowledge that self-understanding is the key to leadership success
- persuasion = teaching everyday as a president

Law/Legal/Union Related Skills

- law (2)
- arbitration skills
- union negotiating
- more diverse experience in dealing with some of the constituencies that are of primary importance to the success of higher learning institutions, especially state legislators and other political representatives

The open-ended answers to question 36 fall into three broad categories. Respondents stated that they had been best prepared for the position of CEO by a) their previous work and life experiences such as holding posts and/or roles within the professional setting, b) exceptional mentoring from superiors, and c) attendance at formal training opportunities.

Question 36. What are some experiences you have had which uniquely prepared you for the presidency?

Previous Work & Life Experiences

- academic leadership roles (7)
- teaching (4)
- previous experience as Dean of Faculty, Provost (2)
- successful conflict resolution challenges
- training as a chemist
- a wide variety of academic/administrative jobs -
 - I never said no to a job that needed doing
- grievances
- academic program development
- combat with the Flying Tigers in China
- subordinate positions which provided the
 - opportunity of hands-on experience in an
 - "acting" capacity
- a great deal of personnel work
- experience as a political and union organizer

- experience in academic administration at several different universities
- being a trustee and board chair before becoming a CEO. I had a pretty good grasp of the institution. I had also spent 30 years in important leadership roles.
- student advising
- no one thing
- urban background - understand value of "street smarts"
- political awareness
- academic training
- consulting experience
- growing up in the Great Depression as a country boy
- command experience in WWII
- 2 small children
- PhD in science and MBA
- pain
- executive leadership in a major agency
- dealing with conflict in 1960's at U. of CA
- honing my verbal and written communication skills
- extensive development experience

Mentoring From Superiors

- strong mentoring (3)

Formal Training Opportunities

- participation in several national leadership development programs (3)
- ACE fellowships (2)

The open-ended comments revealed a considerable amount of agreement concerning the need for special experience in fiscal management (47 comments) and in the need for increased leadership skills (51 comments). CEO comments focused on only a few separate items which also indicates that they tend to agree on problematic areas; trends lie in the areas of executive leadership skills, of faculty quality and recruitment, and of student enrollment and preparedness.

While there were thirty-nine comments about previous life experiences which prepared CEO's for their leadership roles, only eight individuals specifically mentioned formal training or mentoring relationships. This tends to support the structured question results which revealed that CEO's consider various leadership behaviors to be important but do not agree with them to the extent that transformational business leaders (who have virtually all had formal leadership training) do.

References

- Cascio, W. F. (1982). Applied Psychology in Personnel Management. Reston, VA: Prentice-Hall.
- Kachigan, S. K. (1982). Multivariate Analysis. New York: Radius Press.
- Myers, J.L. (1977). Fundamentals of Experimental Design (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn Bacon.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1983). Using Multivariate Statistics. New York: Harper & Row.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations

In the first four chapters, the research problem statement, literature review, methodology and data analysis were presented. This chapter will provide a review of previous chapters, conclusions drawn from the data and recommendations for further research.

Review of the Preceding Chapters

The purpose of this study was to determine if CEO's of urban higher education institutions have the same attitudes and values as those attributed to business CEO's through the business literature. The social, financial, political and demographic environment in which higher education must operate is placing increasing demands upon CEO's to keep their institutions healthy and viable. Positive leadership skills are crucial to guiding businesses through turbulent times. In an era where universities of all sorts are being threatened, it is essential that CEO's of urban higher educational institutions have the leadership skills necessary to engage in effective management.

Literature was reviewed from the following perspectives: a) identification in the business literature of attitudes and values attributed to effective leaders, b) translation of those attitudes and values into behaviors, c) clarification of the differences between organizational variables in the urban higher education environment with those in the business environment, and d) adaptation of

behaviors found in the business literature to the urban higher education setting.

Although various situations require differing leadership behaviors, there was a set of behaviors which appeared throughout the literature as being consistently identified in the presence of effective leadership. Rather than appearing singly, they worked together as a guiding philosophy to shape corporate culture and to encourage personnel to work beyond expectations in their day-to-day functioning.

Effective leadership behaviors fell into eleven categories. They were a) insight/intuition, b) vision, c) communication, d) self-knowledge, e) task vs consideration, f) cognitive development g) managing symbols/culture, h) empowerment, i) charisma, j) entrepreneurship/risk taking and, k) effective use of organizational structure.

Next, the organizational structure and environment of urban higher education was studied and compared to that of business and industry. While differences were found in a) use of and ability to measure outcomes, b) structural design, and c) bureaucratic, collegial and political factors, the same leadership behaviors as those found in the business literature seemed to be appropriate for the higher education setting. A study of the higher education leadership literature revealed this to be true in the general higher education environment.

Consequently, the researcher questioned whether a transformational leadership model such as that espoused by Burns (1978) and Bass (1986) might be a useful tool for further study of executive leadership in the urban higher education setting. Internal consistency of the instrument was determined by a split-half reliability test. Factor analysis was computed to validate the content of the instrument and the stability of responses.

CONCLUSIONS

Instrumentation

Split-half testing of the instrument resulted in a Pearson-product Moment correlation of $r=.81$. Correction for reduction in item length and in sampling through application of the Spearman-Brown formula increased the instrument reliability coefficient to $r=.86$. Reliability coefficients of .5 and .6 are generally considered acceptable, consequently, the coefficients of .81 and .86 found in this study are quite good. Therefore, it can be concluded that this instrument has gathered reliable information from the respondents.

A factor analysis was conducted to determine the construct validity of the instrument. A factor pattern resulting from orthogonal transformation and varimax rotation yielded eleven factors which corresponded to the eleven factors found in the literature search. The eleven

factors accounted for explained variances ranging from .5521 to .9184 for the thirty-three items in the questionnaire.

Table 10 reflects the explained variance for each factor.

Table 10

Explained variance

Factors	Variances	Factors	Variances
1	4.70		
2	3.13	7	1.67
3	2.80	8	1.50
4	2.30	9	1.39
5	2.04	10	1.21
6	1.82	11	1.14

Note: Total explained variance = 76.29

Table 10 reveals that 76% of the variance of the items is accounted for by the eleven identified factors. The remaining 24% of variance may be due to chance and/or to the intercorrelations of some of the variables. This would substantiate the literature which indicated that the behavioral factors present in transformational leadership do not occur in isolation; they work together to provide opportunities for subordinates to work beyond expectations (Bass, 1985).

Questionnaire Response Findings

Frequency tabulations resulted in item response patterns that revealed that nine of thirty-three items polarized at either end of the Likert scale. Six of the items had response patterns where there was over 90% agreement. Six items resulted in 20% of respondents reporting that they were undecided about their beliefs. Five items reflected 75% to 89% agreement among respondents. The remaining seven items showed agreement among 65% to 74% of the respondents. High split-half correlations ($r=.86$) corroborated these findings in that they indicated that respondents answered like-items in similar fashion.

Ranked means indicated that urban education CEO's found the constructs of Self-knowledge, Vision, Charisma, and Communication to be most important in effective leadership. The constructs considered least important were Entrepreneurism, Cognitive Development, Effective Organizational Structure, and Empowerment. When the mean scores of the variables within each construct (as identified in the factor analysis) were averaged and then ranked the results were the same. As described previously, a t-test of related means was run between the lowest mean in the top third of the group of constructs and the highest mean of the lowest third of the group of constructs. It revealed that there was a significant difference between the two groups of means ($t=2.4237$; $p=.05$). This statistical test indicated

that the difference in means would not normally occur by chance. It can be concluded, then, that urban education CEO's believed that there was a difference in the importance between these two groups of constructs.

Ranking by standard deviation revealed those constructs upon which the CEO's most agreed. Comparison of the top and bottom thirds ranked by standard deviation revealed that CEO's agreed that Empowerment and Effective Organization Structure were of least importance, Intuition/Insight was of medium importance and Communication was of high importance.

The lower third of the standard deviation rankings showed less agreement among the respondents. This indicated that there was more spread in their responses on the Likert scale dimensions. For instance, Charisma ranked high in importance with a mean of 4.10. Its' standard deviation was .957, however, because of the high number of 4 and 5 responses, and the spread of 2 and 3 responses. This pattern indicates that while the majority of respondents felt that Charisma was an important behavior, there were also a number of respondents who either disagreed or were undecided. The same is true to a lesser extent for the constructs Entrepreneurism, Task vs Consideration and Culture/Symbols. One dimension, Cognitive Development had medium agreement that it was less important and two dimensions, Self-knowledge and Vision, had medium agreement that they were more important.

In conclusion, then, the ranked means indicated that urban education CEO's found the same constructs as indicated by the highly agreed-upon items in the above paragraph, i.e. Self-knowledge, Vision, Charisma, and Communication to be most important in effective leadership. The constructs considered least important were Entrepreneurism, Cognitive Development, Effective Organizational Structure, and Empowerment. When the mean scores of the variables within each construct (as identified in the factor analysis) were averaged and then ranked the results were the same.

Additionally, a t-test of related means was run between the lowest mean in the top third of the group of constructs and the highest mean of the lowest third of the group of constructs. It revealed that there was a significant difference between the two groups of means ($t \leq 2.4237$; $p = .05$). This statistical test indicated that the difference in means would not normally occur by chance. It can be concluded, then, that urban education CEO's believed that there was a difference in the importance of these two groups of constructs.

Ranking by standard deviation revealed those constructs upon which the CEO's most agreed. Comparison of the top and bottom thirds ranked by standard deviation revealed that CEO's agreed to the greatest degree on their perceptions of the behaviors of Empowerment, Effective Organization Structure, Intuition/Insight and Communication.

The patterns of importance and agreement point to the conclusion that urban education CEO's believe that effective leadership behavior should exhibit strong elements of Charisma, Vision, Self-knowledge, and Communication with much less emphasis on Entrepreneurism, Cognitive Development, Effective Organizational Structure and Empowerment. This may explain why colleges and universities are so slow to change; their leaders are not as concerned with behaviors which have them wandering in and out of campus environments, relying on the input of subordinates, taking risks, focusing on the long-term (10 - 20 years ahead), pushing decision-making down within the organization, aligning organizational structure to facilitate best use of employee skills, and providing opportunities for subordinates to take initiative and engage in risk-taking behaviors. Instead, they tend to believe that the important aspects of leadership would have them setting high expectations for subordinates, developing and carrying out institutional vision, encouraging training and continued education, engaging in intellectual discussions with colleagues, providing principled leadership, and continuing to pursue educational experiences for themselves. This is not to say that urban higher education CEO's differ drastically from their counterparts in the business world. They hold similar beliefs as indicated by the means reflecting agreement with all of the constructs but

empowerment. The differences between transformational leaders in the business arena and the respondents to this study is that business leaders tend to rate the identified behaviors in a higher and more consistent manner. Mean scores for business leaders on similar transformational leadership indices (Note: there are no existing transformational leadership indices which exactly correspond to this one) fall between 4.0 and 5.0 on all scales (Bass, 1985; Kouzous & Posner, 1987; Sashkin, 1985). Accordingly, variance from the mean is also less.

Factor analysis

Factor analysis with orthogonal transformation and varimax rotation was computed for the questionnaire data. Eleven factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than one. Their combined variance accounted for 76% of the common variance among the thirty-three questionnaire items.

In order to have highly stable outcomes on a factor analysis of 33 items, six times that number, or 198 respondents would have been needed. As discussed in Chapter 3, the entire population for this study had an n of 37 returned questionnaires. Factor analysis was pursued, however, because when both a principle components and a factor analysis were run, clear loadings appeared on the same factors that were derived from the literature. It is still necessary, however, to remain aware of the question of stability of the factor analysis.

Qualitative Analysis

Analysis of open-ended questions resulted in an executive summary of responses for each question. The executive summary in Chapter 4 lists the responses given. Since almost all of the respondents gave at least one answer to each question and many gave several, the researcher concluded that this was important information both to urban higher education CEO's and to this study. In question 34, respondents felt that the most important issues facing CEO's in the future would be in the areas of a) fiscal restraints/budgetary issues, b) faculty quality/recruitment issues, c) student enrollment/preparedness issues, and d) leadership skills of university administrators. Fiscal issues seemed to be a universal concern and ranged from lack of funds to need for better fiscal management to positioning urban institutions in the eyes of the public and the government. A strong concern was also expressed over lack of faculty quality and the issues surrounding recruitment. It appears that CEO's consider a strong faculty to still be a positive drawing card where students, funding and reputation are concerned. The future pool of students also requires a great deal of consideration and possibly some innovative approaches to attracting well prepared students. There is much concern over the quality of pre-college education which students are receiving. A final group of issues falls under the category of leadership skills of

university administrators. There seems to be a feeling that OJT (on the job training) will no longer be sufficient to prepare administrators for the variety of issues and changes which they will face in the future.

Question 35 asked for a listing of skills or specific training which would have made the job of CEO easier. A variety of topics were listed with most falling into the categories of a) interpersonal and communication, b) financial, c) management and leadership, and d) law, legal and union-related. Over thirty-five skills were listed which indicates that there may be a real need for the development of a formal leadership training program to prepare educational administrators to run colleges and universities.

Question 36 requested information concerning past experiences that had been instrumental in preparing CEO's for their presidencies. Most had held professional positions which they felt were very beneficial. Many listed important life experience as preparation for senior management roles. A few were fortunate enough to have had active mentoring as their careers progressed. Six respondents mentioned various forms of formal training which had been important to them. On the whole, however, most CEO's had gained their training by the "learn-as-you-go" method. There was a clear lack of formal training experienced by these executives.

Summary of the Findings

The research question for this study asked if CEO's of urban higher education institutions hold the same values and beliefs as those attributed to business and industry CEO's through the literature. The analysis of urban higher education CEO's perceptions of critical leadership behaviors revealed very similar belief patterns. The primary discrepancies are in the degree to which critical behaviors are espoused and in the acceptance of transformational leadership as a proactive model for effective organizational change. Highly effective (transformational) CEO's in the business arena reported that they ranked the identified behaviors with a higher degree of agreement than did the urban CEO population (Bass, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Sashkin, 1985). The responses of this urban CEO research population indicate that they adhere more closely to traditional management theory and to highly structured organizational settings.

The Likert scale items revealed that urban CEO's espouse the transformation leadership concept yet are still tentative about actually empowering staff and aligning the organizational structure to facilitate a participative management model. This conclusion was drawn from the fact that urban CEO's ranked Empowerment and Effective Use of Organizational Structure as least important behaviors. Entrepreneurship and risk taking activities were embraced

somewhat tentatively also which would serve to inhibit creativity and innovation within the organization.

It was interesting to note that Cognitive Development received average agreement that it should be ranked third least important of the transformational leadership behaviors. There are several factors which could have impacted on this result, a) CEO's did not report very strong beliefs about the related questionnaire items, b) all respondents held terminal degrees which may indicate they believe they already have developed themselves cognitively, and c) time pressures may deter CEO's from practicing the behaviors cited in the questionnaire. Further research should be done to gain further insight into this dimension.

Charisma and Vision were the two most important behaviors according to mean rankings. Second to them in importance were Self-knowledge and Communication. These behavioral ratings reveal that the respondents recognize that a leader must carefully consider his/her own beliefs, values, strengths and weaknesses and then must articulate and act on them in a way that inspires organizational members to create "the dream." The traditional emphasis on academic culture, symbols and the president as leader may be instrumental in encouraging the belief that CEO's should be charismatic and visionary, yet without changing organizational structure and empowering employees, the concept of leadership in the urban higher education setting

remains in the traditional domain.

The responses to the open-ended portion of the questionnaire indicated that CEO's believe that four areas of difficulty must be addressed in the coming years; a) fiscal restraints and budgetary issues, b) faculty quality/recruitment issues, c) student enrollment/preparedness issues, and d) lack of specific leadership skills among university administrators. Secondly, they identified that the leadership skill needed were a) interpersonal and communication skills, b) financial skills, c) management and leadership skills, and d) law, legal and union related skills. Finally, respondents reinforced the fact that few of them had received formal training for their leadership positions. Most cited previous work and life experiences as the unique preparation they had for assuming the CEO position. Considering that over 35 skills were listed as training these executives would have liked to have had before becoming CEO's, further research should be conducted to determine if specialized training experiences should be offered to aspiring administrators.

Even though there is not total agreement between business leaders and urban university CEO's, this research has established that urban education CEO's do hold similar beliefs as their business counterparts. The literature search revealed that many of the environmental and business conditions which face these executives are also similar. It

is therefore recommended that further research be conducted to identify ways in which transformational leadership methods could best benefit urban higher education.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study should be duplicated by using a much larger N. It may be appropriate to include other institutions of higher education, as well as, research and development companies. Health care delivery systems could also be included as they are structurally and politically similar to institutions of higher education.

Further additions could be made to the literature by conducting research to determine the actual effectiveness of various types of leadership behavior within the higher education setting. It would be necessary to gather information from subordinates, peers and superiors concerning actual behaviors of CEO's in their work settings; it should be noted that the criteria to be used in such a project could be very problematic.

Additionally, research should be conducted on leadership training programs in the business and industry arenas. These programs should then be compared with the programs available to education administrators and used to help design appropriate training geared specifically to higher education.

Another area for further study would be to identify the specific need for and return on investment of a formal

leadership training program. A pilot program should be designed for the various stages of academic leadership with pre and post evaluations to determine effectiveness.

A scientific study could also be designed to determine if there are some indicators that an individual is predisposed to developing transformational leadership behaviors. This information could be used to provide career counseling and career management guidance.

A final suggestion for further study would be to research the role of mentorship in the development of leadership behaviors. Several respondents of this study mentioned the importance of mentorship in their own developmental process. Is mentoring necessary for leadership development? Does mentoring speed the learning of behaviors? What about negative leadership behaviors? Are they passed on through the mentoring process? Do leaders need to learn mentoring skills? What are the most effective mentoring skills and how should they be taught/learned?

References

- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1989). The Leadership Challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Sashkin, M. (1986). How to Become a Visionary Leader. Bryn Mawr, PA: Organization Design and Development, Inc.

APPENDIX A

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1989 - 1990

Institution	Enrollment	Personnel	Budget
Atlantic Univ.	67	12	\$222,000
College of William & Mary	7,000	1259	108,000,000
E. VA Medical School	365	1206	87,000,000
Hampton University	5,300	956	51,000,000
Christopher Newport Col.	4,832	332	19,000,000
Norfolk State University	8,288	1242	64,393,190
Old Dominion University	16,239	3862	114,249,000
Regent University	787	170	12,000,000
Thomas Nelson C. C.	7,308	425	12,308,329
Tidewater C. C.	18,349	1114	30,262,025
VA Wesleyan College	1,280	230	11,460,000

Note: Chart includes only institution whose main campuses are
in Hampton Roads

Source: College public information officers

Reference: Hartman, S. K. (Ed.). Education: Opportunities Wide
Open For Students. Virginia Business Statistical Digest.
pp. 21-24.

APPENDIX B

TASK ORIENTATION VS CONSIDERATION

Blake and Mouton (1981, 1986)

Hersey and Blanchard (1977)

House and Baetz (1979)

Fiedler (1967)

Burns (1978)

Bennis (1984)

Keifer and Stroh (1983)

INTUITION/INSIGHT

Bass (1985)

Peters and Austin (1985)

Pinchot (1985)

Schein (1985)

Tichy and Devanna (1986)

MANAGE SYMBOLS/CULTURE

Deal and Kennedy (1984)

Tichy and Devanna (1986)

Peters and Austin (1985)

Peters (1987)

Sergiovanni (1984)

SELF-KNOWLEDGE

Bennis (1984)

Bellman (1986)

Sashkin (1985)

ENTREPRENEURSHIP/RISK-TAKING

Bellman (1986)

Bennis and Nanus (1985)

Pinchot (1985)

Kanter (1983)

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

Bennis and Nanus (1985)

Kanter (1983)

VISION

Peters and Austin (1985)

Bennis and Nanus (1985)

Bennis (1984)

Sashkin (1985)

Bellman (1986)

Schein (1985)

Kanter (1983)

Tichy and Devanna (1986)

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Bennis (1984)

Bass (1985)

Sashkin (1985)

Bennis and Nanus (1985)

EMPOWERMENT

Bennis (1984)
Keifer and Stroh (1983)
Bass (1986)
Peters and Waterman (1982)
Peters and Austin (1985)
Sashkin (1985)
Bellman (1986)
Berlew (1974)
Kanter (1983)

CHARISMA

Bass (1984)
Burns (1978)
Tichy and Devanna (1986)
Zaleznik (1977)
Kiechel (1983)
Sashkin (1985)
Berlew (1974)

EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Keifer and Stroh (1983)
Peters and Austin (1985)
Peters and Waterman (1982)
Kanter (1983)

APPENDIX C

May 23, 1989

Chancellor Donald H. Riddle
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle
Box 4348
Chicago, IL 60680

Dear Chancellor Riddle:

As a former university president, I know how very busy you are. However, I urge you to take twenty minutes to respond to the enclosed questionnaire. It is part of a doctoral study which we anticipate will result in significant information with regard to the role of the university president.

All survey participants will be provided with a synopsis of questionnaire results. Implications for further study will also be sent with the results.

Thank you for your time and interest in this study. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely,

Alfred B. Rollins, Jr.
Professor of History
Former President, Old Dominion University

April 18, 1989

Chancellor John B. Slaughter
University of Maryland, College Park
College Park, MD 20742

Dear Chancellor Slaughter:

Attached is a fairly brief questionnaire designed to provide important information for one of my doctoral students who is researching the question of executive leadership in urban universities.

As a former university president, I certainly know the problems created for you by the many questionnaires you receive each year. Nevertheless, I would appreciate it very much if you could give this one your personal attention. Its purpose is to gain information about presidents' personal feelings and judgments. A staff response would not be very helpful.

Since we need your quick, intuitive responses, the task should not take more than twenty minutes. Thanks for your support.

Sincerely,

Alfred B. Rollins, Jr.
Professor of History
Former President, Old Dominion University

4621 Dorchester Lane
Virginia Beach, VA 23464
April 18, 1989

Chancellor John B. Slaughter
University of Maryland, College Park
College Park, MD 20742

Dear Chancellor Slaughter:

As you know, there has been a tremendous amount of recent literature addressing various aspects of leadership in America's businesses and industries. Very little attention, however, has been turned toward leadership in our institutions of higher education, especially at the presidential level.

Since there are only a small number of Chief Executive Officers of urban institutions, your response is of great importance to the success of this effort to address the deficit of literature on executive leadership in higher education.. Please take about twenty minutes to respond to the enclosed questionnaire. Completed questionnaires should be returned to me in the enclosed envelope by MAY 1, 1989. The analyzed data will be made available to you, along with a brief conclusion of the findings and their implications.

I am engaged in this dissertation study to determine which leadership behaviors are critical to the role of Urban College/University president and what can be done to enhance the acquisition of those behaviors. You have been identified by your peers as a respected leader in urban higher education. Consequently, your expertise and insight will be a valuable asset in helping to determine:

- 1) What leadership behaviors are currently most exhibited by presidents of urban higher education institutions,
- 2) Which behaviors are most critical to institutional success,
- 3) How critical leadership behaviors can best be acquired, and
- 4) Do the identified critical behaviors correspond to those behaviors which have been deemed necessary for successful leadership in business and industry?

Your support of this research is essential to obtaining accurate and meaningful data. Thank you for your time and interest in our study.

Sincerely,

Linda F. Banis

APPENDIX D

BEHAVIORAL FACTORS ADDRESSED IN QUESTIONNAIRE

The following are critical behavioral factors as identified through the literature search and the factor analysis. The questionnaire items follow the rationale for each behavior.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Rationale.

The structure of colleges and universities varies from campus to campus. Weick (1976) contends that most universities can be organizationally described as an "adhocracy, organic organization, clan, decentralized structure, loosely coupled system, organized anarchy, garbage can, or situation of pooled interdependence. What all of these descriptions share is the specification that modest structure exists. Coordination and control are handled differently in universities than in other organizations. They are given less ongoing attention, fewer designated resources are committed to their accomplishment, resources flow toward people who worry about other things, and responsibilities for control and coordination are vested in very small sized units" (Weick, 1984, in Bess, p. 27-28).

Of course, there exists both a formal and informal organizational structure in higher education (as in other organizations). The formal structure would be represented by the organizational chart with clear reporting lines and

levels of authority. Informal structures are more difficult to identify but the use of sociometric techniques such as those employed by Astin and Scherrei (1980) help identify communication patterns.

In their study, Astin and Scherrei found that CEO's are relatively isolated and that most of their two-way communication occurs with their personal staff and vice-presidents (1980, p. 45). This closed-type of communication would tend to encourage transactional leadership in that it is not necessarily targeted at imbuing the larger organization with the leader's vision and future-oriented goals but rather seems to focus on the short-term, day-to-day operations of the institution.

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- Fluctuations in morale generally smooth themselves out over time with little intervention from the President.
- Subcultures within the organization undermine the effectiveness of the institution as a whole.
- It is generally better to procede directly to decision-making than to spend time gathering input from subordinates.

INDIVIDUAL/PERSONALITY FACTORS

INTUITION/INSIGHT

Rationale.

The use of intuition and insight are important skills

for the transformational leader. They allow a leader to consider large amounts of information at once without detailed analysis of each factor (Blakeslee, 1980). This is especially useful in a complex organization such as an urban university where there are often many constituencies, each with differing needs, varying amounts of data and expectations for timely decision-making.

These skills are also used to help articulate the integration of subordinates hopes, needs and values with organizational mission and goals (McClelland, 1975). In this way, leaders can unite followers behind common goals. They engage in well-timed moves and interactions because they have learned to trust "gut-feel" and to act when the climate is appropriate.

Intuition and insight are also valuable assets in the risk-taking/entrepreneurial aspect of transformational leadership. In a recent study on behaviors of effective college presidents, Fisher, Tack and Wheeler (1988) found that the ability to support creative dissonance is a characteristic of effective presidents (p. 71). They tend to encourage new and creative ideas and back those which their insight and intuition find workable.

Along with intuition and insight comes a "knowing" of what is possible, what is appropriate and what works. Consequently, leaders are able to capitalize on such things as recognizing unspoken needs of subordinates, responding

proactively to market indicators in advance of their peers and using symbolism and rituals to the advantage of their organization.

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- Symbolic events should be conducted to uphold old traditions rather than to start new ones.
- Strict adherence to rules and regulations ensures fair treatment of all employees.

VISION

Rationale.

The concept of creating a strategic vision is one addressed by almost all current researchers of transformational leadership. It is a basic skill exhibited by such leaders and can be described as the act of knowing where one's organization is going and articulating it clearly and concisely to the entire institution. It is not enough to simply set direction, an effective leader must be able to verbally paint a picture of the future state in such a way that employees at all levels willingly produce extra effort to achieve the vision. Peters and Austin (1985) state that vision must be shared through organization culture, values and philosophy but, most of all, must be role modeled by the president at every opportunity.

The substance of the vision is less important than actually having a vision for the organization which is

communicated with enthusiasm and passion (Peters & Austin, 1985). According to Greenleaf (1977), a leader must have a vision for leadership actually to take place. Peck (1984) studied successful small college presidents and found that they have "their eyes focused on the pot of gold: a clear sense of what their institutions are, what they ought to be doing, where they are headed, and what they are to become" (p. 18).

Since the concept of transformational leadership is synonymous with moving an organization forward into what is possible, it is clear that they differ from transactional leaders who focus on how to maintain the status quo: how to keep their system running. Transformational leaders set forth their vision and mobilize the energy of their organizations to meet the challenge (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- Risk taking often results in failure.
- Hiring executives with divergent viewpoints creates difficulty in problem solving.
- Because many employees cannot grasp the large picture and need to understand their own importance in narrow, immediate terms, it is a mistake to try to educate them on institutional goals.
- Since no one can get along with all constituencies, the President can be expected to articulate the

institutional vision only to those groups with whom he/she feels comfortable.

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Rationale.

Cognitive development takes on two aspects in the literature which discusses effective leadership. One, of course, is the constant quest for knowledge of the intellectually curious (Bass 1986). Such individuals engage in formal as well as informal educational experiences as part of a lifelong fascination with learning new things.

The second aspect refers to the leaders who focus their attention on longer time span (10-20 years). This ability to "see" over extended periods of time requires a higher level of cognitive development (Sashkin, 1985). Rather than focusing on short-term operational functions, these leaders concentrate on strategic planning activities. They are successful in engaging their subordinates in identifying issues and solutions in using creativity and innovation to devise plans of action and in attending to and developing values and beliefs (Bass, 1984). In this way, employees are developed and lead rather than forced into reactive change as characterizes many unsuccessful organizations. The result of positive transformation through cognitive development is a vitality and self-empowerment of staff resulting in greater creativity, innovation and risk-taking (Bass, 1984).

The questions which evolved out of this rationale were:

- The rational approach to decision-making requires one to resist "gut-feeling".

- The Presidential role is one of problem solving as opposed to listening and synthesizing subordinates' concerns.

- Presidents who show up on campus at unexpected places and unpredictable times are often seen as disruptive, but that is justified by the first hand information gained.

CHARISMA (inspires trust)

Rationale.

Webster's New World Dictionary, 2nd College Edition, (1974) defines charisma as a special quality of leadership that captures the popular imagination and inspires unswerving allegiance and devotion.

In transformational leaders charisma goes hand-in-hand with vision. Not only must a successful leader be able to develop and articulate an inspiring vision for their organization, they must also be able to rally employees behind their call to action. Often this is accomplished through an individual's ability to command the respect of followers. This is especially relevant to a higher education environment where the concepts of collegiality are so important. The charismatic leader must combine the ability to command respect with the ability to operate according to strength of conviction and with skill in making

hard decisions.

Bass (1984) found that the emotional bonding which is forged between charismatic leaders and their followers allows the leader to "play the role of teacher, mentor, coach, reformer, or revolutionary" (p. 31). Often these leaders are able to structure and verbalize problems/issues for their followers in such a way that followers can more readily grasp the idea and devise workable solutions.

In complex organizations such as institutions of higher education, Bennis (1985) found that charismatic leaders were able to share their vision with their multiple constituencies while urging them to commit their energies to moving the organization ahead.

In essence, the charismatic leader does not hold followers to merely completing the task or doing the job. They expect superior effort and loyalty from others and they use their interpersonal skills to direct that effort and loyalty.

The questions which evolved out of this rationale were:

- It is important that employees have the opportunity to exceed their specified roles.
- It is the responsibility of the Preseident to develop his/her own long term vision for the institution.

ORIENTATION - TASK VS CONSIDERATION

Rationale.

Many researchers have pointed out the importance of

consideration in the leader's orientation toward their followers. Consideration has consistently related positively with followers job-satisfaction and, in many instances, with their productivity. Japanese leadership methodologies have focused on the significance of consideration in participative management since it allows employee's to express their needs and concerns and to maintain a degree of control over their work and its outcomes. Consideration has been defined as "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff" (Halpin, 1959, p.4) as opposed to task orientation which refers to "the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization channels of communication and methods of procedure" (Stogdill & Coors, 1957, p. 8).

In a higher education environment, consideration behavior often takes the form of a nurturing (developmental) (Fisher, et al., 1988) approach which includes providing developmental opportunities, delegation of responsibilities, promoting familiarity and contact, informal as well as formal communication patterns, providing full (needed and wanted) information concerning relevant issues, attending to differences among subordinates, engaging in individual counseling and extending mentoring relationships where

appropriate (Bass, 1984).

The questions which evolved out of this rationale were:

- The President's task is to lead the institution politically and socially, leaving the academic and business management to specialized subordinates.

- Formal leadership training is not an appropriate use of the President's time.

- Acceptance of change is a highly individual process.

- Acknowledging employee's personal lives is generally seen as an intrusion.

MANAGE SYMBOLS/CULTURE

Rationale.

"An organization's culture consists of its core values, its basic philosophy and its technical, financial and humanistic concerns. The forms of its culture can be seen in its jargon, stories, humor, role models, and ceremonies. The culture makes for a shared interpretation of events. It maintains the organization's boundaries, and provides members with a sense of community, loyalty and commitment" (Siehl & Martin, 1982, in Bess, 1985, p. 24). More specifically, Schein defines culture as "a pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration - that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and

feel in relation to these problems" (Schein, 1985, p. 9). In higher education, values, traditions and philosophy are often very strong forces and fairly unified in nature. Examples are Agnes Scott College, MIT, Baylor, and Howard University. The culture at such institutions is a dominant and obvious force. Other campuses may have less visible cultures because of differences in opinion between various university factions. It is also probable that there are subcultures operating within various units and departments which inter-complement or oppose the overall organizational culture.

According to Bass (1985) the transactional leader accepts the organizational culture as is and attempts to work within it. This CEO uses the traditions, role models and stories of the past and present to communicate values within the culture. Work group norms, philosophy, authority and communication patterns are encouraged to remain constant.

The opposite is true for transformational leaders. They seek to shape corporate culture by inventing new traditions, role models and stories to establish values. Organizational structure is aligned with culture by transformational CEO's (Tichy & Devanna, 1986) which may include redesigning authority and reporting lines and influencing work-group norms. Transformational leadership would also seek to encourage subcultures to interact with

one another in ways which benefit the institution's overall mission.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines culture as "the integrated patterns of human behavior that includes thought, speech, action and artifacts and depends on man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations" (1974, p. 240).

In essence, organizational culture determines how individuals and groups in an organization interpret their shared experiences... "the idea of culture focuses attention on the expressive, nonrational qualities of the experience of organization. It legitimizes attention to the subjective, interpretive aspects of organizational life" (Smircich, 1983, p. 355).

Often, culture provides a kind of map for organizational functioning. It instructs individuals on accepted and expected behavior beyond that which is formally set out in policies, procedures and the like. Culture can be expressed through the business environment, metaphors, rites and rituals, heroes, values, symbols and the cultural network (Deal & Kennedy, 1984). Corporate cultures not only instruct people in how to behave; if they are strong, they also give people a positive feeling about themselves, their jobs and the organization. This often results in increased productivity (Deal & Kennedy, 1984). Consequently, effective leaders consciously manage the culture by

attending to its elements in a way which furthers the mission of the institution through encouraging the productivity of its employees. This includes infusing activities and stories into the culture which help create meaning in the workplace and which help shape it to "fit the shifting needs of the marketplace" (Deal & Kennedy, 1984, p. 18).

Additionally, transformational leaders tend to utilize symbols such as rites, rituals and representations/emblems to emphasize the fact that they are leading. Such activities provide a focal point, "the area in which leading ideas come together with leading institutions" (Bass, 1984, p. 109).

Further, Bass (1984) reports that the transformational leader is able to utilize "old, already available, symbols and ideas" (p. 109) which refer to old belief systems and relate them to new ideas they wish to convey and promote. This is a useful process because it creates points of association whereby organizational members can identify with new ideas and incorporate them into the corporate culture. In other words, symbolism can become a rallying point around which change takes place (Bass, 1984).

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- Individuals can be expected to serve their own self-interest, and it is fruitless to expect loyalty, except as a

matter of survival when dealing with one's boss.

- Attention to such things as logos and letterhead detract from the true purpose of the institution.

- Universities are market-driven organizations.

SELF-KNOWLEDGE

Rationale.

A leader's knowledge of his own strengths and ability to compensate for weaknesses is a skill cited by several researchers. Bennis and Nanus (1985) felt that this ability was foundational to cultivating positive self-esteem. They found that leaders who had positive self-esteem were able to develop their areas of strength through seeking nurturing experiences and encouraging constructive feedback on their performance. Additionally, such leaders identified clearly the relationship between their own skills and the requirements of a particular job and were able to turn down positions where they did not perceive good job fit and/or seek subordinates and peers who complimented their weaknesses so that strong management teams could be developed (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Warren Bennis (1989) found that charismatic leaders in his study engaged in a continuous search for self-knowledge and an application of their skills to benefit their organizations. Such leaders not only sought out opportunities for personal growth but also welcomed feedback on their behaviors from a variety of sources.

Peter Drucker (1985) found that the self-development of executives was essential to the growth of their organizations. He observed that effective executives were able to build on strengths by being keenly aware of them and by integrating them into the organization. That in turn encouraged others to grow and develop which was an important aspect of attracting high caliber staff.

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- The President must encourage development of new ideas and programs in anticipation of demographic and market trends.

- Institutions and society change so rapidly that the President must be a life-long learner, changing both technique and style to fit the moment.

- Formal leadership training is not an appropriate use of the President's time.

- The community expects leadership from the President which is consistent with firm commitment to principle.

EMPOWERMENT OF OTHERS

Rationale.

Empowerment of others is a behavior related to self-development in that it generally is easier for a leader who is comfortable with his/her own strengths, weaknesses and self-esteem to be able to give others the opportunity to take responsibility and authority upon themselves.

Empowerment of others refers to the act of enabling or giving power and authority to others, i.e., giving them the power to get their work done. Bennis found that, in organizations, empowerment resulted in subordinates who felt a) significant/important, b) that learning and competence were valued, c) part of a team, family unit and d) excited about work (Bennis, 1989).

In his research on transformational leadership, Marshall Sashkin (1985) found that effective leaders sought to gain power so that they could empower others. In so doing, they clearly articulated their vision and then developed subordinates' belief in their own efficacy through expressing a high level of confidence in them, providing decision making opportunities, removing organizational constraints, setting meaningful goals, designing systems which reward innovative performance and high incentive values (Kanter, 1979).

Keller (1983) found that the concept of empowerment was especially appropriate in the academic setting "In an organization with many highly educated professionals with considerable expertise of their own the president needs to.. ..help each professional be his or her own planner and innovator" (p. 124).

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- Generally, employees do not have the ability to

design appropriate risk taking ventures.

- Subordinates should show more initiative in gaining resources to enhance problem solving.

- Most decision-making responsibility and authority should rest with the executive team of the institution.

ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTION/RISK TAKING

Rationale.

Empowerment, as defined in the last section, is a means by which leaders encourage innovation/entrepreneurial action/risk taking. This section addresses the activity of entrepreneurship: the act of organizing a business undertaking while assuming the risk involved to make it profitable. A related concept often discussed in the literature is intrapreneurship, i.e., entrepreneurship focused within the organization (Pearlman, Gueths, & Weber, 1988). The later concept is important to encourage because organizations do not want workers who have good ideas to leave and develop them as direct competitors or to join competing institutions which may be more open to supporting intrapreneurial activities. Peter Drucker stated that higher education needs to be as innovative as any other organization. "Indeed, they may need it more. The rapid changes in today's society, technology, and economy are simultaneously an even greater threat to them and an even greater opportunity" (Drucker, 1985, p. 177).

Peters and Austin (1985) agree that innovation is

essential to organizational vitality. They found that effective organizations were driven by leaders engaged in constant innovation. They cited continual innovation as one of three elements required for organizational success.

Kanter (1983) studied leaders who were adept at guiding organizational transformation and found that they were skilled at 1) anticipating the need for change and 2) leading the change process in a productive manner.

Of course, constant innovation and change carries with it a degree of risk. Most current students of transformational leadership concur that risk taking is an important aspect of entrepreneurial leadership. Bennis and Nanus (1985) found "effective leadership takes risks - it innovates, challenges, and changes the basic metabolism of the organizational culture" (p. 52).

Bass' (1984) research supports this view of intrapreneurship/innovation. He found that the transformational leader "may be less willing to be satisfied with partial solutions, or to accept the status quo, or to carry on as before. He is more likely to be seeking new ways, change for its own sake, taking maximum advantage of opportunities despite the higher risks" (p. 105).

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- Since Presidents face constant demands for results, they are required to concentrate on the immediate gains and

losses over the short-term budget cycle.

- If a President adjusts leadership styles to changing situations, he/she will be considered weak and "wishy-washy".

- The principal function of a President must be to see that the institution runs smoothly, and to identify a small number of significant changes which he/she may be able to sell to the community.

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

Rationale.

A final behavior is that of effective communication. Effective communication takes place when a leader listens to (receives and understands) information from others and provides responses in the form of data, information and decisions in an open and direct manner.

Effective communication for transformational leaders consists of a) speech and articulation skills and b) interpersonal sensitivity skills (Conger, 1988). These two skills work together when a leader can clearly articulate his/her vision in a manner which addresses follower's needs and creates a sense of meaning for organizational members. As Bennis and Nanus (1985) found:

A vision cannot be established in an organization by edict or by the exercise of power or coercion. It is more an act of persuasion, of creating an enthusiastic and dedicated commitment to a vision because it is right for the

times, right for the organization, and right for the people who are working in it (p. 107).

Kanter (1983) also found that communication was central to innovative organizations. She lists open communication systems as one of three essential ingredients which aid power circulation and power access in innovative companies.

The second communication area, interpersonal sensitivity skills, is comprised of abilities to relate to subordinate's work motivation and their ability to help achieve the leader's vision. These skills are primarily made up of listening skills and feedback skills (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) found that good active listening skills could improve a leader's ability to scan the environment in a more realistic fashion.

The questionnaire items which evolved out of this rationale were:

- Presidential time is better spent on business and political issues than in meeting with various on-campus constituencies.

- Training accelerates acceptance of change.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. & Scherrei, R. A. (1980). Maximizing Leadership Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bass, B. (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Bess, J. L., (Ed.). (1984). College and University Organization: Insights from the Behavioral Sciences. New York: New York University Press.
- Berlew, D. E. (1974). Leadership and Organizational Excitement. California Management Review, 17(2), 21-30.
- Blakeslee, T. R. (1980). The Right Brain. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Charismatic Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Drucker, P. F. (1985). Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practices and Principles. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Fisher, J. L., Tack, M. W., & Wheeler, K. J. (1988). The Effective College President. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). Servant Leadership. New York: Paulist Press.
- Halpin, A. W. (1959). The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.
- Kanter, R. M. (1979). Power Failure in Management Circuits. Harvard Business Review. 57, 65-75.
- Kanter, R. M. (1983). The Change Masters. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Keller, G. (1983). Academic Strategy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- McClelland, D. C. (1975). Power: The Inner Experience. New York: Irvington Press.
- Peck, R. D. (1984). Entrepreneurship as a Significant Factor in Successful Adaptation. Journal of Higher Education. 55 (2), 269-285.
- Perlman, B. Gueths, J. & Weber, D. (1988). The Academic Entrepreneur. New York: Praeger.
- Peters, T. & Austin, N. (1985). A Passion for Excellence. New York: Random House.
- Sashkin, M. & Fulmer, R. (July, 1985). A New Framework for Leadership. A paper presented at the Biennial Leadership Symposium held by Texas Tech University.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Smircich, L. (1983) Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly. 28, 339-358.
- Stogdill, R. M. & Coors, A. E. (Eds.). (1957). Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Research Monograph No. 88. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University.
- Tichy, N. M, & Devanna, M. A. (1986). The Transformational Leader, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 2nd College Edition. (1974). New York: Wm. Collins & World Publishing Co., Inc.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Education Organizations as Loosly-Coupled Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly. 21, 1-19.

APPENDIX E

Questionnaire

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. It is important that employees have the opportunity to exceed their specified roles.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Most major decisions for the University are best made through the informal organizational structure.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The President must encourage the development of new ideas and programs in anticipation of demographic and market trends.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Fluctuations in morale generally smooth themselves out over time with little intervention from the President.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Risk taking often results in failure.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Hiring executives with divergent viewpoints creates difficulty in problem solving.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Presidential time is better spent on business and political issues than in meeting with various on-campus constituencies.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Individuals can be expected to serve their own self-interest, and it is fruitless to expect loyalty, except as a matter of survival when dealing with one's boss.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Most decision-making responsibility and authority should rest with the executive team of the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Sub-cultures within the organization undermine the effectiveness of the institution as a whole.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
11. Generally, employees do not have the ability to design appropriate risk taking ventures.	1	2	3	4	5
12. It is generally better to procede directly to decision-making than to spend time gathering input from subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Attention to such things as logos and letterheads detract from the true purpose of the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
14. It is the responsibility of the President to develop his/her own long term vision for the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The President's task is to lead the institution politically and socially, leaving the academic and business management to specialized subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Institutions and society change so rapidly that the President must be a life-long learner, changing both technique and style to fit the moment.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Since Presidents face constant demands for results, they are required to concentrate on the immediate gains and losses over the short-term budget cycle.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Because many employees cannot grasp the large picture and need to understand their own importance in narrow, immediate terms, it is a mistake to try to educate them on institutional goals.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Training accelerates acceptance of change.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Formal leadership training is not an appropriate use of the President's time.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
21. Since no one can get along well with all constituencies, the President can be expected to articulate the institutional vision only to those groups with whom he/she feels comfortable.	1	2	3	4	5
22. The community expects leadership from the President which is consistent with firm commitment to principle.	1	2	3	4	5
23. The rational approach to decision-making requires one to resist "gut feelings".	1	2	3	4	5
24. If a President adjusts leadership styles to changing situations, he/she will be considered weak and "wishy-washy".	1	2	3	4	5
25. Employees should show more initiative in gaining resources to enhance problem solving.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Acceptance of change is a highly individual process.	1	2	3	4	5
27. The Presidential role is one of problem solving as opposed to listening and synthesizing subordinates' concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
28. The principal function of a President must be to see that the institution runs smoothly, and to identify a small number of significant changes which he/she may be able to sell to the community.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Symbolic events should be conducted to uphold old traditions rather than to start new ones.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Acknowledging employees' personal lives is generally seen as an intrusion.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Strict adherence to rules and regulations ensures fair treatment of all employees.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	----------------------	----------	-----------	-------	-------------------

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32. Presidents who show up on campus at unexpected places and unpredictable times are often seen as disruptive, but that is justified by the first hand information gained. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. Universities are market-driven organizations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. What do you consider to be the major leadership obstacle(s) facing Presidents of urban institutions of higher education as they move toward the year 2000? | | | | | |
| 35. What leadership skills, abilities and/or training would you like to have had before you became a college/university president? | | | | | |
| 36. What are some experiences you have had which uniquely prepared you for the presidency? | | | | | |