LEADERSHIP STYLES OF TECHNICAL COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN GEORGIA

by

PAUL R. CARTER

(Under the Direction of Delmer D. Dunn)

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were: (1) to identify the leadership styles of presidents of technical colleges in Georgia as indicated by the presidents, (2) to identify the leadership styles of presidents at these institutions as indicated by the vice presidents, (3) to determine whether the presidents and vice presidents perceive this leadership style differently, and (4) to discover whether demographic variables are associated with leadership styles. Data were collected using the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) survey instruments. A second questionnaire gathered personal and institution data.

Descriptive statistics were utilized to summarize the results from the LEAD instruments and questionnaires. The study utilized correlation analysis to determine relationships between the perceptions of the presidents' leadership style. An analysis of means was used to examine the differences between the presidents' leadership style self perception and demographic variables.

Selling (high levels of task and relationship behaviors) was the primary leadership style most frequently identified by the presidents. Participating (low level of task and high level of relationship behaviors) or a pairing of telling (high level of task and low level of relationship behaviors) and participating were identified as the presidents' most frequent secondary

leadership styles. The majority of the presidents rated their leadership style adaptability in the moderate range. The vice presidents most frequently perceived their presidents' primary and secondary leadership style as selling. The majority of the vice presidents rated their presidents' leadership style adaptability in the low range. Correlation analysis identified a strong positive relationship between the way presidents perceive their selling leadership style and the way vice presidents of instructions perceive the presidents' selling leadership style. Additional moderate relationships were identified involving the perceptions of the presidents and all categories of vice presidents, except for the vice presidents of student services. The research also found an association between the technical college presidents' perception of their leadership style and the following variables: gender, education, number of years at the current institution, previous position, number of years as president, size of the technical college, and location of the technical college.

INDEX WORDS: Leadership, Leadership Styles, Technical Colleges, Technical College Presidents

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF TECHNICAL COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN GEORGIA

by

PAUL R. CARTER

B.B.A., The University of Georgia, 1972

M.B.A, The University of Georgia, 1974

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2007

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF TECHNICAL COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN GEORGIA

by

PAUL R. CARTER

Major Professor:	Delmer D. Dunn
Committee:	Mel Hill
	Libby Morris
	Scott L. Thomas

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2007

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Janice, for her encouragement, patience, endurance, and support; to my children, Lee and Blair, for their unconditional love throughout this process; and to our faithful dog, Roxie, who was by my side for countless hours during the completion of this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The awarding of a doctorate represents the combined efforts of many people.

Thank you to Dr. Delmer Dunn whose patience, understanding, and guidance led to the completion of this study.

To Dr. Libby Morris, Mr. Mel Hill, Dr. Ed Simpson, and Dr. Scott Thomas, my committee, who provided insightful comments that helped shape this study.

To Dr. Craig McDaniel and Dr. Teresa Resch who helped balance career and school.

To Alex Wittig and Jan Whatley who provided encouragement from the beginning and mentoring and "badgering" through the dissertation process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a topic that has been discussed for centuries (Chemers and Ayman, 1993). Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership (1990) opens with the statement, "Leadership is one of the world's oldest preoccupations" (p. 3). Leadership was a topic discussed in Greek classics by Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch (Bass, 1990). Machiavelli's The Prince, written in the sixteenth century, is "still widely quoted as a guide to an effective leadership of sorts" (Bass, p. 4). There were over thirty thousand articles and books written on the topic of leadership during the twentieth century (DuBrin, 1998).

James MacGregor Burns (1978) defines leadership as "leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations – the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations – of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations" (p. 19). Burns' focus is on the relationship between leaders and followers. He also sees leadership as an exchange process, where the leader "induces" the follower to achieve goals. Burns' states, "The nature of these goals is crucial" (p. 425) in determining the type of leadership.

Leadership is crucial to the success of any organization (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). When we think of the success of Chrysler, we think of Lee Iacocca. General Electric's success gets intertwined with Jack Welch. For colleges to be successful, they also need effective

leaders to guide them toward their goals (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Effective leaders in higher education are often described as "flexible, decisive, moral, courageous, goal-directed, scholarly individuals who are willing to take risks and who have concern for others" (p. 132). There are many definitions that are associated with leadership. James MacGregor Burns' (1978) definition of leadership focuses on the interactive nature of leadership.

The world of higher education is becoming more complicated and uncertain (Cohen & Brawer, 1996) increasing the need for effective leadership. The issue of accountability, whether it pertains to graduation rates, student retention or job placements, has become a fact of life for publicly funded institutions. These ever changing accountability requirements make funding uncertain, constantly jeopardizing programs and even entire departments. Changing financial aid requirements impose an additional burden on the budgets of higher education institutions. Multiple accrediting agencies have different regulations and reporting requirements that must be addressed. It is in this environment that colleges, universities, community colleges and technical colleges exist. The leadership of these institutions of higher education must constantly utilize their experience in responding to these external challenges while providing positive, forward thinking educational leadership.

As the need for experienced leadership is being magnified because of the environment in which higher education operates, the perception of a leadership crisis in higher education, which was common in the 1980's (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989), could become a reality in the two-year sector of higher education. Shults (2001) and Barwick (2002) found that forty-five percent of the presidents of community colleges plan to retire by 2007. Although the community college concept has been around for more than a century (Vaughn & Weisman, 1998), the majority of the community colleges were founded in the 1960s and 1970s (Shults, 2001). Many

of the people who helped start these colleges and now fill senior administrator positions are also planning to retire. These impending retirements affect not only the current leadership of their colleges but also the leadership pipeline (p. 2).

Post-Secondary Technical Education in Georgia

This study will focus on leadership in the technical colleges in Georgia. Community and technical colleges in the United States can trace their origins to the early 20th century when "national and local leaders realized that a more skilled workforce was key to the country's continued economic strength – a need that called for a dramatic increase in college attendance" (American Association of Community Colleges, 2001, p. 10). At that time, three-quarters of high school graduates were not continuing their education because there were no colleges within commuting distance. To offset this factor, many of these newly established colleges were originally housed in local high schools (Monroe, 1972). The early leaders of these colleges were often developed from the faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 1996), given the title of dean, and reported to the local school superintendent (Twombly, 1995). Because of these factors, "The autocratic traditions of public school administration became the pattern of community college administration" (Monroe, 1972, p. 314).

The concept of post-secondary technical schools came to Georgia later in the 20th century with the creation of the first state supported schools in Clarkesville and Americus. This concept did not expand in Georgia until the late 1950s with the passage of federal and state legislation. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided funding for the creation of area technical schools while the Woodall Amendment provided an alternative for local governance (State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education, 1984). From 1958 to 1984, twenty-five area technical schools were established in the state (Breeden, 2001). The result was a system of

technical schools operating under a variety of governance arrangements. The problems associated with these different governance structures would eventually lead to the creation of what is now known as the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTAE).

The evolution of post-secondary technical education in Georgia started with the creation of the State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education by Gov. Joe Frank Harris in 1984. The mission of this State Board was to plan for, coordinate, and evaluate the State's public vocational-technical institutions and programs (Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education, 1984) with the goal of bringing the locally controlled technical schools under unified state governance. In 1988, state legislation changed the name of the State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education to the Board of Technical and Adult Education and established the Department of Technical and Adult Education.

Since its inception in 1988, the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTEA) has grown as locally controlled technical institutes converted to state governance and new institutions were established. The system currently consists of thirty-four colleges and thirty-one satellite campuses. The creation of the HOPE Scholarship program has seen enrollment grow from 55,994 students in 1993 to 145,492 a decade later (Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, 2005). In the 2000 legislative session, the Georgia general assembly passed the A+ Education Reform Act of 2000 (House Bill 1187). The passage of this bill allowed the technical institutes governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education to change their names from technical institutes to technical colleges. In reaction to this name change, Dr. Ken Breeden, Commissioner of GDTAE (2000) stated, "The change of the word "institute" to "college" will be one of the most significant changes in the history of Georgia's technical education system….it will put Georgia's technical education system on a

level playing field with the community and technical colleges of other states." To provide validation for this name change, schools developed associate degrees which were added to the diplomas and certificates that were in place. These schools have also applied for regional accreditation with the Commission on Colleges (COC) through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

The mission of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education is "to contribute to the economic, educational, and community development of Georgia by providing quality technical education, adult literacy education, continuing education, and customized business and industry workforce training to the citizens of Georgia" (Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, 2006). Students can receive technical certificates of credit, diploma, and associate degrees depending on their program of study. GDTAE colleges are preparing their students for the world of work by providing them with skills that enable them to succeed in a specified occupation. Institutional organizational structures tend to be hybrid in nature, reflecting the traditional academic governance structures found in four-year colleges as well as the bureaucratic hierarchies found in business and industry (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

The creation of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education in 1988 was the first step towards independence from the public school origins of the technical colleges in Georgia. In their study of leadership development and career pathways of community college leaders, Amey, VanDerLinden, and Brown (2002) found support for the idea of independence. They conducted a quantitative study of 1,700 community college administrators across 14 position codes using a survey instrument of 34 open-ended, closed-ended, and Likert scale questions. They presented the survey results by position of respondents, including presidents. First, college presidents were more likely than any other group to have public school teaching in

their backgrounds. However, the percentages dropped dramatically from 1985 to 2002. In 1985, almost sixty percent of the presidents reported working in secondary school environments. In 2002, only seventeen percent of the presidents reported working in secondary education (Amey et al, 2002). These results indicate a shift from earlier years when employment at a two year college followed a secondary school career pathway. This trend further signaled a shift from the autocratic leadership styles inherited by these colleges from their founders in public education.

The technical colleges governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education have evolved quickly from locally governed "trade" schools to accredited institutions of higher education. They have entered the uncertain environment of higher education and must compete for funding dollars and students. The presidents of these technical colleges will play an important role in the continued success of their institutions.

The Problem

The topic of presidential leadership in higher education has been researched extensively with the majority of this research focusing on four-year colleges and universities. There has, however, been limited research on presidential leadership at technical colleges in Georgia (Cannon, 2003; Shafer, 2001; McElvey, 1993). The post-secondary technical schools in Georgia have been considered technical colleges since 2000. This research study will benefit from the additional time that these schools have operated as colleges in this study of presidential leadership. McElvey and Cannon focused their research on the identification of leadership attributes of the presidents, the perceptions of other groups of these attributes, and the effect of demographic and institutional variables on these attributes. Shafer's research utilized the transformational leadership theory of Bernard Bass as he identified the leadership styles of the technical college presidents in the transformational - transactional leadership continuum. The

study population for Shafer's research consisted of the thirty-three presidents of the technical colleges in Georgia. His research depended on the self evaluation of the presidents to determine their leadership style. Where Shafer's research used transformational leadership theory to identify leadership styles, this research will utilize Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory in the research process. This study combined self-perception of the presidents with the perceptions of the vice presidents with whom they work. This is the same process that McElvey and Cannon used in their analysis of leadership attributes. This research will add to the body of research on presidential leadership at technical colleges in Georgia by providing different perspectives of the leadership styles of the presidents by utilizing feedback provided by the college presidents and vice presidents. It will also provide system-wide demographic information of current presidents and vice presidents.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is three-fold: (1) to identify the perceived leadership styles of presidents of technical colleges in Georgia, (2) to determine whether the presidents and vice presidents at these technical colleges perceive this leadership style differently, and (3) to discover whether personal and technical college demographic variables are associated with the leadership styles of the presidents.

Research Questions

1. What are the leadership styles of technical college presidents as indicated by the presidents?

2. What are the leadership styles of technical college presidents as indicated by the vice-presidents?

3. How do the responses of the two groups of respondents compare?
4. To what degree are differences in a technical college president's perception of his/her leadership style related to the following variables: gender, age, education, number of years at their current institution, previous position, number of years as president, size of technical college and location of technical college?

Significance of the Study

This research study has theoretical and practical significance. This study has theoretical significance in that it helps to fill a gap in educational leadership literature on leadership styles of technical college presidents in Georgia. As enrollment in technical education continues to grow (Breeden, 2000), research that addresses the specialized mission of technical education will be useful in understanding the leadership requirements of this sector of higher education.

The practical significance of this study could be felt at the state level of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTAE) and at the local college level. This research study will provide a detailed analysis of the leadership styles of the current presidents of the technical colleges from the perceptions of the presidents and vice presidents as well as the impact of personal and institutional variables on these leadership styles. This information could be useful as decisions are being made for the future of the system. At the local level, this information could assist the college presidents and vice presidents in their understanding of leadership behaviors.

The findings of this research could also have a significant impact on leadership programs offered at four-year colleges and universities. The Community and Technical College Leadership Initiative (formerly the Executive Leadership Initiative – ELI) at the University of Georgia is an example of a program that would benefit from the findings. The curriculum for

this program is designed to prepare students for an executive leadership position at a community or technical college. The findings of this research study could be incorporated into the curriculum. The students could also compare their leadership styles with established leaders within GDTAE by completing the survey instruments.

Theoretical Framework

There were several alternatives reviewed for the theoretical framework and data collection of this study. Leadership theories are commonly divided into four major categories: trait theories, behavior theories, contingency theories, and power and influence theories, (Yukl, 1989; Northouse, 2001). Bensimon et al (1989) identified some of the problems associated with the study of leadership in higher education as "dual control systems, conflicts between professional and administrative authority, unclear goals, and other special properties of normative, professional organizations" (p. 7). In conclusion, they stated, "Our review suggests that the application of some theories of leadership could provide academic leaders with insights into processes of leadership and organizational functioning that have not been captured in works that treat leadership as a set of personal characteristics or specified behaviors" (Bensimon et al, 1989, p. 69). The theories that they felt would be applicable in 1989 included contingency and power and influence theories. In 2001, Bess and Golden (2001) found the same two categories of theories to be relevant to their study of leadership in universities and K – 12 schools.

Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory was chosen as the theoretical framework for this study because it is based on contingency leadership. Contingency leadership theories place an emphasis on external (situational) variables that influence the behavior of leaders (Bensimon et al, 1989). In addition, the survey instruments created in association with Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory, LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other, met

the criteria established for this study. The survey selection criteria will be discussed in the methodology chapter.

Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory

The research questions will be explored within the theoretical framework of Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory. First introduced in 1969 as the Life-Cycle Theory of Leadership (Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H, 1969), it has been modified several times since then (Northouse, 2001). The basic premise of this theory is that leaders need to use different leadership styles depending on the situation. The appropriate leadership style is determined by the readiness of the followers to accomplish a specific task (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996; Northouse, 2001). These styles are classified according to the amount of task behavior and relationship behavior the leader engages in (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). Task behavior is defined as, "the extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers) and to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communications, and ways of getting jobs accomplished" (p. 134). The definition of relationship behavior is "the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, active listening, "psychological strokes", and facilitating behaviors" (p. 134-5).

The Hersey and Blanchard Situational Leadership Theory emphasizes the fact that leaders have to adapt their style to be effective in different situations. The leader must be able to diagnose the readiness of their followers to perform a specific task and then be able to use the leadership style that will be most effective. There is not one style that is appropriate in every

situation. Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory will be more thoroughly discussed in the review of literature.

Definition of Terms

For this study, the following terms were defined:

Leadership refers to "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts towards goal achievement in a given situation" (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996, p. 91).

Leadership style refers to "the behavior pattern, as perceived by others, that a person exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others" (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996, p. 134). Leadership style consists of a combination of task and relationship behavior (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996).

Task behavior is defined as, "the extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers) and to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communications, and ways of getting jobs accomplished" (p. 134).

Relationship behavior is defined as, "the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, active listening, "psychological strokes", and facilitating behaviors" (p. 134-5).

Primary leadership style refers to "the behavior pattern of the leader used most often when attempting to influence the activities of others, in other words, a favorite" (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996, p. 299).

Secondary leadership style is defined as "the leadership style that a person tends to use on occasion" (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996, p. 299). A leader "may have no secondary leadership style or up to three secondary leadership styles" (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996, p. 299).

Readiness refers to "the extent to which a follower demonstrates the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996, p. 193).

Leadership style adaptability is defined as the degree to which an individual is able to vary their leadership style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in specific situations (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996, p. 300).

Organization of the Study

This section provides an overview of the organization of this research study. Chapter One presents the research setting, the problem statement, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the significance of the study, the theoretical framework for the study, and the definition of key terms. Chapter Two presents a review of the literature related to this study in the areas of leadership theories, post-secondary technical education in Georgia, and two-year college presidential leadership. Chapter Three presents the methodology used in this research study including the design of the study, the study population, the survey instruments, the data collection techniques, and a description of analysis. Chapter Four presents the results including statistical analysis and data interpretation. A summary of the procedures and findings is presented in Chapter Five, as well as conclusions developed from the findings and recommendations for future research and practice. The Appendix includes copies of correspondence with the participants of the study as well as copies of the presidents' and vice presidents' questionnaires. The Center for Leadership Studies, Inc. requested that the Leadership

Effectiveness and Adaptability Description – LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other not be included in the Appendix.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section reviews leadership theories. Four major categories of leadership theories are reviewed with emphasis being placed on the theoretical framework for this study, Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory. The second section reviews post-secondary technical education in Georgia. The third section reviews two-year college presidential leadership. Finally, there is a review of previous doctoral dissertations that have focused on presidential leadership at the technical colleges that are governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education.

Leadership Theories

"Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns, 1978, p. 2). There were over thirty thousand articles and books written on the topic of leadership during the twentieth century (DuBrin, 1998) and "as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (Bass, 1990, p. 11). Leadership theories are usually divided into major categories to "provide a convenient way of organizing an otherwise overwhelming array of materials" (Bensimon et al, 1989, p. 7). Although leadership theories are commonly divided into four major categories: trait theories, behavior theories, contingency theories, and power and influence theories, (Yukl, 1989; Northouse, 2001), Bensimon et al (1989) said, "The boundaries of these categories are fluid and they are neither mutually exclusive nor consistent" (p. 7).

Trait Theory

Beginning in the early 1900s, trait theory was one of the first systematic approaches used in the study of leadership (Northouse, 2001). Trait theory studied the physical characteristics, personality characteristics, social background, or ability of individuals to explain leadership (Bensimon et al, 1989; Hoy & Miskel, 2005). It evolved from the "great man" theory which consisted of studying biographies of social, political and military leaders to identify the common qualities possessed by these individuals (Short & Greer, 1997). This theory also proposed that "people were born with these traits and only the 'great' people possessed them" (Northouse, 2001, p. 15).

An analysis of leadership studies conducted between 1904 and 1947 by Ralph Stogdill (1948) examined the validity of the trait approach to leadership. This research identified certain traits that differentiated leaders from non-leaders. Stogdill (1948) classified leader traits into the following categories:

1. Capacity – includes intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, and judgment
2. Achievement – includes scholarship, knowledge, and athletic accomplishments
3. Responsibility – includes dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, and desire to excel
4. Participation - includes activity, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, and humor
5. Status – includes socioeconomic position and popularity (p. 64).

Although Stogdill provided evidence that there are differences between leaders and non-leaders, he also stated that "a person does not become a leader by virtue of the mere possession of some traits" (p. 63). His research noted that individuals who were leaders in one situation may not

necessarily be leaders in other situations. Because of these findings, trait theory was found to be too narrow in its focus on leadership and that critical variables were excluded. One of the excluded variables is situation.

In 1974, Stogdill reviewed 163 leadership studies that were conducted between 1949 and 1970. This research led Stogdill to conclude that a leader is characterized by the following traits:

1. Drive for responsibility and task completion
2. Vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals
3. Venturesomeness and originality in problem solving
4. Drive to exercise initiative in social situations
5. Self-confidence and sense of personal identify
6. Willingness to accept consequences of decision and action
7. Readiness to absorb interpersonal stress
8. Willingness to tolerate frustration and delay
9. Ability to influence other persons' behavior
10. Capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand

(Northhouse, 2001, p. 17)

Although not a return to the trait approach to leadership, Stogdill's second study found that personality traits and situational factors played a part in leadership (Stogdill, 1974; Northouse, 2001). Stogdill also argued that the trait approach to leadership by itself was not able to predict effective leadership. The factors leading to this conclusion included: (1) difficulty in identifying traits in leaders; (2) inability to find traits that are effective in all situations; (3) inability to measure traits; and (4) the ability to develop traits in an individual (Stogdill, 1974).

Since Stogdill's 1974 study, there have been several studies that focused on explaining the role of traits on leadership. Lord, DeVarder, and Alliger (1986) used meta-analysis to reassess the findings of the 1959 study of R. D. Mann. They identified three traits, intelligence, masculinity, and dominance that were "strongly associated with individuals' perceptions of leadership" (Northouse, 2001, p. 16). Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) found that "it is unequivocally clear that leaders are not like other people" (p. 59). They contend that leaders are different than non-leaders in "drive, the desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business" (Northouse, 2001, p. 17).

Although there have been many studies designed to identify the traits needed for leadership, there has not been a consensus of the traits needed for effective leadership (Bensimon et al, 1989; Yukl, 1989; Northouse, 2001) and that providing definitions for some of the traits like self-confidence is subjective and problematic (Stogdill, 1948; Bensimon et al, 1989). In addition the importance of these traits varies from person to person and situation to situation. Even though trait theories have been classified as "the most primitive of the theories of leadership in that they reduce the explanation of leadership to individual characteristics" (Bensimon et al, p. 24), research on this approach does lead to the conclusion that there are individual characteristics that can be identified which enable leaders to succeed in certain situations (Bass, 1990; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Northouse, 1997).

Behavior Theories

Until the 1950s, leadership research focused on the search for a set of universal leadership traits. At this time, researchers turned their attention to the study of the behaviors of leaders in an attempt to identify the behaviors that had an impact on effectiveness. This change represented a major shift in perspective "from thinking about leadership in terms of traits that

someone 'has' to the conceptualization of leadership as a form of activity" (Fleishman, 1973, p. 3). The researchers at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan developed the initial research methods that were used to study leader behavior (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

The Ohio State Studies

Leadership research was conducted after World War II at the Bureau of Business Research at the Ohio State University. A major objective of this research was to identify effective leadership behavior. To accomplish this objective, the researchers developed a list of more than 1,800 items that classified leadership behavior into nine dimensions. These dimensions were identified as:

1. Integration – acts which tend to increase cooperation among members or decrease competition among them.
2. Communication – acts which increase the understanding and knowledge about what is going on in a group.
3. Production emphasis – acts which are oriented toward volume of work accomplished.
4. Representation – acts which speak for the group in interaction with outside agencies.
5. Fraternization – acts which tend to make the leader a part of the group.
6. Organization – acts which lead to differentiation of duties and which prescribe ways of doing things.
7. Evaluation – acts which have to do with the distribution of rewards (or punishment).
8. Initiation – acts which lead to change in group activities.
9. Domination – acts which disregard the ideas or person who are members of the group (Hemphill & Coons, 1957, p. 8-9).

From this list, a questionnaire with 150 questions was created and named the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This questionnaire was administered in a variety of settings and the results identified two basic clusters of leadership behavior: initiating structure and consideration (Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2001).

Initiating structure relates to the leader's focus on completing tasks and is often identified as task behavior. This behavior clearly defines the relationship between leaders and subordinates. The leader initiates, organizes, defines and schedules the work activities of the group. Leaders who are described as high in initiating structure often emphasize deadlines, assign tasks to individuals, and maintain high performance standards. Leaders who are described as low in initiating structure often are hesitant to make decisions, slow to act, and offer advice only when asked.

Consideration behaviors focus on the relationship between the leader and his or her subordinates and are an indication of the concern the leader has for their welfare. Consideration behaviors are often identified as relationship behaviors. Leaders who are described as high in consideration behaviors are friendly and approachable. They are concerned about the job satisfaction of their subordinates. Leaders who are described as low in consideration behaviors will criticize subordinates in public, threaten their job security and refuse to accept their suggestions.

These two clusters of behavior, initiating structure and consideration, are the essence of what leaders do: they provide structure for and nurture their subordinates. The Ohio State researchers viewed these behaviors as distinct and independent of each other. These behaviors were not considered as parts of the same continuum, but as two different continuums (Northouse, 2001). This is illustrated by the four-quadrant model developed by these researchers to plot

leader behavior. The four quadrants show the combinations of initiating structure (task behavior) and consideration (relationship behavior) (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 1996). The leader can be high in initiating structure (task behaviors) and high or low in consideration (relationship behaviors). Conversely, the leader can be low in initiating structure (task behaviors) and high or low in consideration (relationship behaviors) (Northouse, 2001).

There have been many consistent findings derived from this research. They include: (1) most effective leaders are high in initiating structure and consideration; (2) subordinates prefer a leader who is high in consideration; (DuBrin, 1998) and (3) the situation will influence whether a leader should emphasize initiating structure or consideration (DuBrin, 1998; Robbins, 2001).

The University of Michigan Studies

The University of Michigan was conducting research on leadership behaviors at approximately the same time as the Ohio State leadership studies. The focus of this research was to "contrast the patterns of leadership behavior used by leaders of high-producing units with that of leaders from low-producing units" (DuBrin, 1998). Through interviews and questionnaires, the researchers categorized leader behaviors as job centered and employee centered. The two categories of leadership behaviors identified in the Ohio State, initiating structure and consideration, and University of Michigan studies, job centered and employee centered, are very similar.

Job centered leaders focus on procedures, productivity, performance, and completion of tasks (Likert, 1961). Leaders with this orientation view subordinates as tools to get work accomplished (Northouse, 2001; Hersey et al, 1996). Employee centered leaders use a humanistic approach with subordinates to achieve high levels of productivity and performance

(Likert, 1961). These leaders value the individuality of their subordinates and give special attention to their personal needs (Northouse, 2001; Hersey et al, 1996).

In their early studies, the University of Michigan researchers conceptualized leadership behaviors on one continuum with job centered behaviors and employee centered behaviors at opposite ends. With this one dimensional approach, a leader who was oriented toward job centered behaviors was less oriented to employee centered behaviors and visa versa. It was not until subsequent studies that they reconceptualized their research and identified the two categories of behaviors as independent (Northouse, 2001).

> Regarding the findings of the University of Michigan studies, Vroom (1976) suggests "First, more effective leaders tend to have relationships with their subordinates that are supportive and enhance the followers' sense of self-esteem than do less effective ones. Second, more effective leaders use more group rather than person-to-person methods of supervision and decision making than do the less effective ones. Third, more effective leaders tend to set higher performance goals than do less effective ones" (p. 269).

Blake and Mouton's Leadership Grid

Extending the work of the early behavioral studies conducted by the Ohio State and University of Michigan researchers, Blake and Mouton (1964) developed the Managerial Grid. (After modifications, it was renamed the Leadership Grid.) This grid provides a framework for understanding leadership behavior by dividing it into two attitudinal dimensions: concern for production and concern for people (Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2001). Sisk and Williams (1981) state, "These concerns for production and people are not merely additive; they interact with one another to produce a variety of leadership styles. In order to understand the nature of the interactions between the two primary dimensions, it must be understood that the two scales are

attitudinal in nature rather than behavioral; that is the styles refer to modes of thinking – to what leaders perceive to have value or to be important – rather than to what leaders actually do" (p. 367).

The term, *concern for production*, refers to a leader's concern with achieving organizational tasks. It could involve a variety of activities that could include sales volume, workload, new product development, process issues, etc. (Blake & Mouton, 1964). It is similar in meaning to Ohio State's "initiating structure" and University of Michigan's "job centered." The term, *concern for people*, refers to a leader's interactions with the people within the organization. This concern could include building trust and commitment, promoting the personal worth of employees, maintaining working conditions, providing a fair salary schedule, and insuring proper social relations (Blake & Mouton, 1964). It is similar in meaning to Ohio State's "consideration" and University of Michigan's "employee centered."

The Leadership Grid joins these two concerns, concern for production and concern for people, in a model with intersecting axes. "Each of the axes is drawn as a nine point scale on which a score of one represents minimum concern and nine represents maximum concern. By plotting scores from each of the axes, various leadership styles can be illustrated" (Northouse, p. 39). The scores are given in a two number sequence with the first number reflecting the score for the "concern for results" factor and the second number reflecting the score for the "concern for people" factor. The Leadership Grid portrays five major leadership styles: Authority-Compliance (9, 1), Country Club Management (1, 9), Impoverished Management (1, 1), Middle-of-the-Road Management (5, 5), and Team Management (9, 9). The Authority-Compliance (9, 1) style of leadership places heavy emphasis on task and job requirements and less emphasis on people, except to the extent that people are tools for getting the job done. Communicating with

subordinates is not emphasized except for the purpose of giving instructions about the task. This style is results-driven. The 9, 1 leader is often seen as controlling, demanding, hard-driving, and overpowering. The Country Club Management (1, 9) style represents a low concern for task accomplishment coupled with a high concern for interpersonal relationships. De-emphasizing production, 1, 9 leaders stress the attitudes and feelings of people by making sure their personal and social needs are being met. They try to create a positive climate by being agreeable, eager to help, comforting, and uncontroversial. The Impoverished Management (1, 1) style is representative of a leader who is unconcerned with both the task and interpersonal relationships. This type of leader goes through the motions of being a leader, but acts uninvolved and withdrawn. The 1,1 leaders have little contact with followers and could be described as indifferent, noncommittal, resigned, and apathetic. The Middle-of-the-Road (5, 5) style describes leaders who are compromisers, have an intermediate concern for the task and an intermediate concern for the people who do the task. They find a balance between the feelings of people while still emphasizing the work requirement. To arrive at equilibrium, the 5, 5 leader avoids conflict and emphasizes moderate levels of production and interpersonal relationships. This type of leader is often described as one who is expedient, prefers the middle ground, soft-pedals disagreement, and swallows convictions in the interest of "progress". The Team Management (9, 9) style places a strong emphasis on both tasks and interpersonal relationships. It promotes a high degree of participation and teamwork in the organization, and satisfies a basic need in employees to be involved and committed to their work. The following are some of the phrases that could be used to describe the 9, 9 leader: stimulates participation, acts determined, gets issues into the open, makes priorities clear, follows through, behaves open-mindedly, and enjoys working (Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2001).

There are two other styles that include multiple aspects of the Leadership Grid. "Paternalism/Maternalism refers to a leader who uses both 1, 9 and 9, 1 styles but does not integrate the two. This is the "benevolent dictator" who acts gracious but does so for the purpose of goal accomplishment. In essence, the paternalistic/maternalistic style treats people as if they were disassociated with the task (Northouse, p. 42). The final style is known as Opportunism. This style would refer to a leader who combines any of the five basic styles for their own advancement.

The emphasis of Blake and Mouton's Leadership Grid is that a leader needs to consider both dimensions of behavior, concern for production and concern for people, to be effective. Although the Team Management Style (9, 9) which emphasizes a high concern for production and people is "a more effective leadership orientation than the other grid styles (Blake, Mouton, & Williams, 1981, p. 341), situational variables need to be considered to determine appropriate leadership behavior.

Just as the trait theories failed to create a universal list of leadership traits, the behavioral theories developed by Ohio State University, University of Michigan, and Blake and Mouton failed to identify the "best" leadership style in all situations. These studies did determine that effective leadership required a balance of task and relationship behaviors (Northouse, 2001). Researchers began to examine the impact of various situational variables on leadership behavior.

Contingency Theories

Contingency leadership theories place an emphasis on the importance of situational factors. Bensimon et al (1989) say that contingency theories "assume that different situations require different patterns of traits and behaviors for a leader to be effective. Because effective behavior is contingent on the situation, they are collectively referred to as "contingency"

theories" (p. 14-15). Bensimon also says, "These theories essentially say that no single approach to leadership is the best but at the same time that not all approaches are equally effective. The answer to the question, 'what is effective leadership?' is 'it all depends'" (p. 15). The situational factors that determine effective leadership behavior will vary with each theory. Fiedler's Contingency Theory uses task structure, leader-member relationships and position power as situational variables (Bensimon et al, 1989; Yukl, 1989; Northouse, 2001). House's Path-Goal Theory uses nature of the task, the work environment, and subordinate characteristics as situational variables (Bensimon et al, 1989; Yukl, 1989; Northouse, 2001). The Vroom & Yetton Normative Decision Theory uses aspects related to decision making as the situation variables (Bensimon et al, 1989; Yukl, 1989). Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory uses subordinate readiness as the situational variable that determines effective leadership (Bensimon et al, 1989; Yukl, 1989; Northouse, 2001). Unlike behavioral theories that emphasize personal qualities of the leader - an internal variable - contingency theories emphasize external (situational) variables that influence task oriented and relationship oriented leadership behaviors (Bensimon et al, 1989).

Fiedler's Contingency Theory

Fiedler's (1967) contingency theory of leadership has been the most widely researched theory of leadership effectiveness (Bass, 1990). With research in a variety of settings, Fiedler found that effective leadership resulted when there is a match between the leader's style and the situation (Robbins & Coulter, 2001). Because of this assertion, it is been called a "leader-match" theory (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974).

In Fiedler's contingency theory, leadership styles are characterized as either task motivated or relationship motivated. The primary interest of a task motivated leader is the

accomplishment of the work at hand; while a relationship motivated leader's first concern involves the development of personal relationships. Fiedler developed the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale as a way to determine the leader's basic style. This style is viewed as an extension of the leader's personality and because of this fact, it is unalterable. To complete the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale, the leader was asked to identify the one co-worker that he or she had the greatest difficulty working with, their least preferred co-worker. Through a series of bipolar ratings, the leader described this worker. These ratings were converted to a numerical score, which placed the leader into the low-LPC leader or high-LPC leader group. Leaders who are in the low-LPC group are considered task motivated; while leaders in the high-LPC group are considered relationship motivated.

While the leadership style in Fiedler's theory is determined by the LPC scale, the effectiveness of this style is dependent on a variable he identified as situational favorability. Fiedler defines favorability as the amount of control a leader exercises over subordinates in a given situation. Fiedler proposed three situational factors that affect the control and influence of the leader:

1. *Leader-member relations* refer to the group atmosphere and to the degree of confidence, loyalty, and attraction that followers feel for their leader. If group atmosphere is positive and subordinates trust, like and get along with their leader, the leader –member relations are defined as good; on the other hand, if the atmosphere is unfriendly and friction exists within the group, the leader-member relations are defined as poor.

2. *Task structure* refers to the degree to which the requirements of a task are clear and spelled out. Tasks that are completely structured tend to give more control to the leader, whereas vague and unclear tasks lessen the leader's control and influence.

3. *Position power* refers to the amount of authority a leader has to reward or punish followers. It includes the legitimate power individuals acquire as a result of the position they hold in an organization. Position power is strong if an individual has the authority to hire and fire or give raises in rank or pay; it is weak if a leader does not have the right to do these things (Northouse, 2001, p. 76-77).

These three situational variables combine in unequal proportions to create situational favorableness in the following fashion; leader member relations is twice as important as task structure which is twice as important as position power. This combination of variables creates eight octants of decreasing situational favorableness. A highly favorable situation is characterized by good leader member relations, a structured task, and high leader position power; while a highly unfavorable situation is characterized by poor leader member relations, low task structure, and low position power for the leader (Fiedler, 1967).

Contingency theory research "suggests that the most effective way of improving leadership is not to change a person's style of leadership but to place leaders into positions suitable to their leadership orientation" (Bensimon, et al, 1989, p. 16). Leaders with low LPC scores who are considered task motivated are most effective in highly favorable situations or highly unfavorable situations. Leaders with high LPC scores who are considered relationship motivated are most effective in moderately favorable situations (Bensimon, et al, 1989; Fiedler, 1967; Northouse, 2001).

House's Path-Goal Theory

With its origins derived from expectancy theory (Georgopoulos et al, 1957; Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 2006), the path-goal theory "was developed to explain how leaders motivate subordinates to be productive and satisfied with their work" (Northouse, 2001, p. 108). House (1971) states, "The motivational function of the leader consists of increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment and making the path to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route" (p. 324). This theory has been refined and extended by various researchers (Evans, 1970; House, 1971; House & Dessler, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974).

The initial version of the Path-Goal Theory identified two leadership style behaviors: supportive leadership and directive leadership. These two behaviors are similar to the consideration and initiating structure behaviors described in the Ohio State Studies. Two additional leadership style behaviors were added by House and Mitchell (1974) in a later version of this theory. These behaviors are participative leadership and achievement-oriented leadership (Yukl, 2006). These four leadership style behaviors are defined as follows:

1. *Supportive leadership:* Giving consideration to the needs of subordinates, displaying concern for their welfare, and creating a friendly climate in the work unit.
2. *Directive leadership:* Letting subordinates know what they are expected to do, giving specific guidance, asking subordinates to follow rules and procedures, and scheduling and coordinating the work.
3. *Participative leadership:* Consulting with subordinates and taking their opinions and suggestions into account.
4. *Achievement-oriented leadership:* Setting challenging goals, seeking performance improvements, emphasizing excellence in performance, and showing confidence that subordinates will obtain high standards (Yukl, 2006, p. 219).

The leader's choice of leadership style behavior should provide the missing element for subordinates in a particular situation (Northouse, 2001). The leader can combine more than one style if needed (DuBrin, 1998; Northouse, 2001).

In the Path- Goal theory, the most effective leadership style behavior to motivate subordinates is contingent on two situational variables: subordinate and task characteristics. Researchers have identified four subordinate characteristics: need for affiliation, preferences for structure, desires for control, and self-perceived level of task ability, that impact effective

leadership style behavior. Subordinates who have a strong need for affiliation prefer supportive leadership. Subordinates who are authoritarian or who work in uncertain situations prefer directive leadership. Participative leadership is preferred by subordinates who have an internal locus of control while subordinates with an external locus of control prefer directive leadership. Subordinates who feel competent in performing tasks do not like directive leadership (Northouse, 2001).

The task characteristics that impact effective leadership behavior are the design of the subordinate's task, the formal authority system of the organization, and the primary work group of subordinates. Subordinates prefer supportive leadership if a task is repetitive or stressful while directive leadership is more effective if a task is unstructured and complicated. Participative leadership is preferred when a task is ambiguous (Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 2006).

The Path-Goal Theory was one of the first theories "to specify four conceptually distinct varieties of leadership, expanding the focus of prior research, which dealt exclusively with task and relationship behaviors" (Northouse, 2001, p. 97). In contrast to Fiedler's Contingency Theory, it shifted the focus away from the leader to the subordinates.

Vroom & Yetton's Normative Decision Theory

Building on earlier approaches that addressed decision procedures, Vroom and Yetton's Normative Decision Theory (1973) focused on what decision procedures would be effective within specific situations. The effectiveness of a decision is dependent on situational variables. These variables included the importance of quality, leader information, problem structure, importance of subordinate acceptance to implementation, subordinate acceptance expected if the decision is made independently, subordinate commitment to organizational goals, and likelihood of subordinate conflict (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006).

For decisions involving multiple subordinates, this theory identified five decision procedures. They included two autocratic decision procedures (AI and AII), two consultation decision procedures (CI and CII), and one joint decision procedure that involves the leader and the subordinates as a group (GII). Each of these decision procedures is defined as follows (Vroom & Yetton, 1973):

> AI. You solve the problem or make the decision yourself, using information available to you at the time.
>
> AII. You obtain the necessary information from your subordinates, then decide the solution to the problem yourself. You may or may not tell your subordinates what the problem is in getting the information from them. The role played by your subordinates in making the decisions is clearly one of providing necessary information to you, rather than generating or evaluating alternative solutions.
>
> CI. You share the problem with the relevant subordinates individually, getting their ideas and suggestions, without bringing them together as a group. Then you make the decision, which may or may not reflect your subordinates' influences.
>
> CII. You share the problem with your subordinates as a group, obtaining their collective ideas and suggestions. Then you make the decision, which may or may not reflect your subordinates' influence.
>
> GII. You share the problem with your subordinates as a group. Together you generate and evaluate alternatives and attempt to reach agreement (consensus) on a solution. Your role is much like that of a chairman. You do not try to influence the group to adopt your preferred solution, and you are willing to accept and implement any solution that has the support of the entire group (p. 13).

The Vroom and Yetton's Normative Decision Theory is prescriptive in nature (Bass, 1990) and utilizes a decision tree that incorporates the situational variables and a feasible set of decision styles that "limit various styles of leadership…to protect the quality of the solution and acceptance of the decision" (Bass, 1990, p. 465). If there is more than one alternative after working through the choices, the leader makes the choice based on the relative importance of each remaining alternative.

Vroom and Yetton's theory has been criticized as being to complex to practice on a day-to-day basis, and since its original formulation, more variables and another decision procedure (delegation) have been added (Vroom & Jago, 1984). Despite its complexity, it does supply a theoretical framework for determining the degree of participation in decision making that research supports (Bass, 1990).

Transformational and Transaction Theory

Since the late 1970's, the transformational approach to leadership has been the focus of substantial academic research (Northouse, 2001). Its emergence as an important approach to leadership is connected to James MacGregor Burns (1978) and his distinctions between transactional and transformational leadership in a political setting. Building on Burns' ideas, Bass (1985) developed a more comprehensive model of transformational leadership that can be applied to organizational leadership in other settings. (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 2006).

Burns (1978) contends that there are two types of leadership, transactional and transformational. He defines transactional leadership in the following manner:

> Such leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature: a swap of goods or of one good for money; a trading of votes between candidate and citizen or between legislators; hospitality to another

> person in exchange for willingness to listen to one's troubles. Each party to the bargain is conscious of the power resources and attitudes of the other. Each person recognizes the other as a *person.* Their purposes are related, at least to the extent that purposes stand within the bargaining process and can be advanced by maintaining that process. But beyond this the relationship does not go. The bargainers have no enduring purpose that holds them together; hence they may go their separate ways. A leadership act took place, but it was not one that binds leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose (p. 19-20).

Transactional leadership can be perceived as a contractual relationship between leader and follower for the express purpose of advancing the goals of both. Ron White (2004) states, "Transactional leaders are assessed by exchanges that are easily identified and measured" (p. 35).

The second type of leadership, transforming leadership, is defined as:

> Such leadership occurs when one or more persons *engage* with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. The purposes, which might have started out separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, became fused. Power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for common purpose….transforming leadership ultimately becomes *moral* in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both….Transcending leadership is dynamic leadership in the sense that the leaders throw themselves into a relationship with followers who feel "elevated" by it and often become more active themselves, thereby creating new cadres of leaders (p. 20).

Transformational leadership can be perceived as appealing to followers' higher needs. Ron White (2004) states, "Transformational leaders realign the culture of a people or organization by creating a new vision that leads to a modification of shared assumptions, values, and norms. These leaders transform the culture in such a manner that followers willingly do more than they originally intended to do and even more than they thought possible" (p. 36).

Using the conceptual foundation provided by Burns, Bass (1985) expanded and refined the theory of transformational leadership (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 2006). Bass' (1985) model placed transactional and transformational leadership on the same continuum.

Hoy and Miskel (2005) state, “Bass views transformational leadership as an expansion of transactional leadership that goes beyond simple exchanges and agreements” (p. 397).

The leadership continuum used in Bass’ model contains three styles of leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership. Bass has identified leadership factors associated with each style which describes leader behavior (Bass, 1985). The transformational leadership factors are:

Factor 1: Idealized influence (Charisma): “It describes leaders who act as strong role models for followers; followers identify with these leaders and want very much to emulate them. These leaders usually have very high standards of moral and ethical conduct and can be counted on to do the right thing. They are deeply respected by followers, who usually place a great deal of trust in them. They provide followers with a vision and a sense of mission” (Northouse, 2001, p. 137).

Factor 2: Inspirational Motivation: “This factor is descriptive of leaders who communicate high expectations to followers, inspiring them through motivation to become committed to and a part of the shared vision in the organization. In practice, leaders use symbols and emotional appeals to focus group members’ efforts to achieve more than they would in their self-interest” (Northouse, 2001, p. 138).

Factor 3: Intellectual Stimulation: “It includes leadership that stimulates followers to be creative and innovative, and to challenge their own beliefs and values as those of the leader and organization” (Northouse, 2001, p. 138).

Factor 4: Individualized Consideration: “This factor is representative of leaders who provide a supportive climate in which to listen carefully to the individual needs of followers” (Northouse, 2001, p. 138).

The transactional leadership factors are:

Factor 5: Contingent Reward: "it refers to an exchange process between leaders and followers in which effort by followers is exchanged for specific rewards" (Northouse, 2001, p. 140).

Factor 6: Management-by-Exception: "Refers to leadership that involves corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. A leader using the active form of management-by-exception watches followers closely for mistakes or rule violations and then takes corrective action. A leader using the passive form intervenes only after standards have not been met or problems arise (Northouse, 2001, p. 140).

The laissez-faire leadership factor is:

Factor 7: Laissez-faire: "This leader abdicates responsibility, delays decisions, gives no feedback, and makes little effort to help followers satisfy needs (Northouse, 2001, p. 141).

Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory

First introduced in 1969 as the Life-Cycle Theory of Leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969), Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory has been revised several times since then (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Nelson, 1993; Blanchard, Zigarmi, and Zigarmi, 1985; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977, 1988). Goodson, McGee, and Cashman (1989) characterize Situational Leadership Theory as "similar to most other contingencies theories in its assumption that effective leadership depends upon the ability of the leader to accurately diagnose situational conditions and to respond with appropriate combinations of behaviors" (p. 446). Veechio (1987) is more expansive when he states that "Hersey and Blanchard achieved a synthesis of their

concepts with those contained in McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Y, Argyris's (1957) maturity-immaturity continuum, Likert's (1967) management systems, Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy, Hersberg's (1966) two-factor theory, McClelland's (1961) achievement theory, Schein's (1970) assumptions of human nature, transactional analysis (Berne, 1964; Harris, 1969), French and Raven's (1959) power bases, parent effectiveness training concepts (Gordon, 1970), Greiner's (1972) phases of organizational growth, Lewin's (1947) views of achieving behavioral change, behavior modification (Skinner, 1953), and force field analysis (Lewin, 1947)" (p. 444-445). Hambleton and Gumpert's (1982) explanation is much simpler when they state, "What makes Situational Leadership Theory a′ la Hersey and Blanchard particularly relevant for practitioners is that their theory is substantially simpler than other situational theories, involving fewer variables and therefore easier to apply" (p. 226). While being used by the majority of the Fortune 500 companies (Hersey et al, 1996), Northouse (2001) states that Situational Leadership is "perceived by corporations as offering a credible model for training individuals to become effective leaders" (p. 60).

Building on the concepts of leader behavior developed in the Ohio State studies, Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson (1996) state that, "situational leadership is based on an interplay among 1) the amount of guidance and direction (task behavior) a leader gives, 2) the amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader provides, and 3) the readiness level that followers exhibit in performing a specific task, function, or objective" (p. 189). Using this as the foundation, a leader needs to use a different leadership style depending on the situation. The appropriate leadership style is determined by the readiness of the followers (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996; Northouse, 2001). These styles are classified according to the amount of task behavior and relationship behavior in which the leader engages (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson,

1996). Task behavior is defined as, "the extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers) and to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communications, and ways of getting jobs accomplished" (p. 134). The definition of relationship behavior is "the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, active listening, 'psychological strokes', and facilitating behaviors" (p. 134-5).

Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory is best understood by looking at its components, leadership styles and the readiness level of followers (Northouse, 2001). An individual's leadership style involves a combination of task behavior and relationship behavior. A two dimensional graph can be created by placing task behavior and relationship behavior on separate axes. By plotting task behavior from low to high on the horizontal axis and relationship behavior from low to high on the vertical axis, the four quadrant graph that is formed can be used to identify the four leadership styles used in this theory (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996).

Style 1 (S1) is a leadership style that "is characterized by above average amounts of task behavior and below-average amounts of relationship behavior" (p. 191). This leadership style is described as *"telling"* (p. 201). A leader using this style would tell followers what to do, where to do it and how to do it by giving specific instructions.

Style 2 (S2) "is characterized by above average amounts of both task behavior and relationship behavior" (p. 192). "*Selling"* (p. 202) is the description given to this style. This style is different from the telling style in that it provides "the opportunity for dialogue and for

clarification. The follower can ask questions and get clarification, even though the leader has provided the guidance" (p. 202).

The third leadership style, Style 3 (S3), "is characterized by above average amounts of relationship behavior and below average amounts of task behavior" (p. 192). This style is termed *"participating"* (p. 203). A leader using this style would use discussion and two-way communication as a means of encouraging followers (p. 204).

Style 4 (S4) "is characterized by below average amounts of both task and relationship behavior" (p. 192). This leadership style is described as *"delegating"* (p.205). A leader using this style does not find it necessary to provide much direction or encouragement to his/her followers (p. 205).

Using this theory, the readiness level of a follower is determined by "the extent to which a follower demonstrates the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task" (p. 193). Readiness is not a personal characteristic or an evaluation of a person's traits, values or age. It shows how ready a person is to perform a specific task (p. 193). The two components of readiness are ability and willingness. Ability consists of "the knowledge, experience and skill that an individual or group brings to a particular task or activity" (p. 194). Willingness is defined as "the extent to which an individual or group has the confidence, commitment, and motivation to accomplish a specific task" (p. 195).

The readiness of followers is divided into four levels. Each level represents a different combination of ability and willingness (or confidence). Followers who are considered to be at Readiness Level 1 (R1) is described as unable and unwilling or unable and insecure. They would be unable to perform the specific task and would be lacking in commitment, motivation or confidence. Readiness Level 2 (R2) would describe followers who are unable but willing or

unable but confident. They would still be lacking the ability to perform the specified task but they would be motivated, making an effort and confident while the leader is present to provide guidance. Followers who are a Readiness Level 3 (R3) would be described as able but unwilling or able but insecure. These followers have the ability to perform the specific task but are unwilling to use that ability or are insecure or apprehensive about performing the task alone. Followers at Readiness Level 4 (R4) would be able and willing or able and confident. They have the ability to complete the task and they would be willing and confident in performing the task alone (p. 195 - 196).

For leaders to be effective, they must be able to diagnose the readiness level of their followers to perform a specific task. After their readiness level is determined, the appropriate leadership style should be used (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996; Northouse, 2001). If a follower is diagnosed as being R1, the most effective leadership style would be S1, Telling. This style would provide above average amounts of task behavior and below average amounts of relationship behavior. These followers need specific directions to build their confidence in performing a specific task. The most effective leadership style for followers who are determined to be R2 is S2, Selling. This style would provide above average amounts of task and relationship behavior. Although these followers are unable to perform specific tasks without the direction of the leader, their confidence is increasing. This confidence is supported by the increased amount of relationship behaviors that the leader provides. This increase will result in increased two-way communication between follower and leader allowing for clarification and questions. S1, Telling, and S2, Selling, are both considered leader-directed leadership styles. If a follower falls in the R3 range, the most effective leadership style is S3, Participating. This style requires below average amounts of task behavior and above average amounts of relationship behavior from the

leader. The followers have demonstrated that they are able to perform the specific task, thus the low amount of task behavior by the leader, but a drop in their motivation makes them unwilling to perform the task or they may lack confidence and feel insecure in performing the task on their own. This situation requires a high amount of relationship behavior from the leader who could use discussion and facilitating behaviors to overcome the motivation or apprehension problem. For followers who are diagnosed as R4, the most effective leadership style is S4, Delegating. The leader provides below average amounts of task and relationship behaviors. The followers have demonstrated that they are able and willing to complete the specified task with confidence. S3, Participating, and S4, Delegating, are considered follower-directed leadership styles (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996, p. 199 - 205).

Although Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory is frequently used in organizational leadership training (Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 2006), there has been limited empirical research of the theory (Graeff, 1997; Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 2006). The results of these studies (Blank, W., Weitzel, J. R., & Green, S. G., 1990; Goodson, J. R., McGee, G. W., & Cashman, J. F., 1989; Hambleton, R. K., & Gumpert, R., 1982; Norris, W. R., & Vecchio, R. L., 1992; Vecchio, R. L., 1987) have provided mixed support for the validity of the theory.

In their 1982 study that served as a test of the Situational Leadership Theory, Hambleton and Gumpert (1982) stated that their study "provides supporting evidence for the validity of the Hersey and Blanchard model" (p. 241). Data to support this result was gathered using two methods. Managers were asked to randomly select four employees to complete a survey instrument. For the managers who participated in this study, managerial ratings of employee maturity were coded with manager self-assessments of leadership style. From this coding, recommended matches were identified. Vecchio (1987) noted several concerns related to the

research design of this study. The managers who took part in this study provided self assessments of their leadership styles using an expanded version of the LEAD instrument. Vecchio questioned the accuracy of leader behaviors that are self-assessed. He also questioned the usage of the LEAD instrument instead of using a more widely accepted measurement of leader behaviors (p. 445).

Vecchio's 1987 study "represents one of the first comprehensive tests of the Situational Leadership Theory" (Vecchio,1987, p. 449). By being the first, it was "not possible to contrast the current findings with those obtained in other investigations" (p. 449). The results of Vecchio's study provided partial support for the theory in that the statistical tests that were performed "point to the theory being partially accurate in its prescriptions" (p. 449). The research findings supported the theory's leadership style prescription for employees in the low maturity/readiness level. The findings had mixed support for the leadership style prescriptions in the two moderate maturity/readiness levels. The findings did not provide any support for the prescriptions of high maturity/readiness level employees (p. 449 – 450). The participants in this research study consisted of 303 full-time high school teachers from 14 high schools and their principals. In response to his concerns about data collection in the Hambleton and Gumpert study, the participants in Vecchio's study completed different survey instruments. The teachers completed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L., 1969), Leader-Member Exchange (Liden & Graen, 1980), and Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ – XII) (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The Job Description Index measured the teachers' satisfaction with the principals. The Leader Member Exchange measured the quality of the leader-member relationship. The modified version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) was used to measure two dimensions of leader behavior, initiating

structure and consideration. The LBDQ – XII was "used in place of the LEAD instrument because of the relative psychometric advantages of the LBDQ – XII (ie: its reliability and construct validity has received more attention than the LEAD instrument, and it is a more widely accepted index of leader behavior than the LEAD instrument)" (p. 447). The principals completed the Follower Maturity Index (Hambleton, Blanchard, & Hersey, 1977). This instrument provided the principals' ratings for each teacher on two dimensions: follower maturity and performance. Vecchio provided this explanation for these ratings, "Maturity was assessed on items related to task-relevant and psychological maturity, whereas performance was assessed by summing ratings across dimensions of dependability, planning, know-how, present performance, and expected performance" (p. 447).

The purpose of Goodson, McGee, and Cashman's 1989 study was "to test the prescriptions for effective leadership as specified in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory" (Goodson, McGee, and Cashman, p. 446). Their analysis did not support the "major proposition" of interaction between leader behavior and follower readiness as presented in Situational Leadership Theory. Their analysis also could not support the predications of a best, second best, third best and worst leadership style for each readiness level (p. 458). The sample for this study consisted of 459 employees from a national retail chain, 85 store managers, 56 assistant managers, and 318 sales clerks. The participants in this study completed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) (Stogdill, 1963), Sense of Competence Scale (Wagner & Morse, 1975), Hoppock's 4-item scale (Hoppock, 1935), Organization Commitment Scale (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974), and Employees' Perception of Role Ambiguity (Rizzo, House, and Litzman, 1970). The modified version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) was used to measure two dimensions of

leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration. It was chosen to measure leader behavior since "it is a more strongly supported measure of leader behavior than the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instrument" (p. 449). The Sense of Competence Scale was used to measure follower readiness, while Hoppock's 4-item scale was used to measure job satisfaction. In addition to these instruments, two scales were developed specifically for this study. These scales measured satisfaction with supervision in two dimensions: assistance given while learning a task and the quality and timeliness of the information received from supervisors (p. 450 – 451).

The purpose of Blank, Weitzel, and Green's study (1990) was to examine the underlying assumptions regarding the relationship of leader task and relationship behaviors with indicants of leader effectiveness. The results of this study "reveal a lack of support for the basic assumptions that underlie SLT" (p. 593). In addition, "an examination of the more complex predictions of the theory also show little support" (p. 579). The sample for this study included 27 hall directors (ie: leaders) and 353 resident advisors (ie: subordinates) from two large universities. An educational setting was deemed appropriate because the Vecchio study of 1987 was conducted with high school teachers and principals as respondents. The participants completed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) (Stogdill & Coons, 1957) to measure two dimensions of leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration and Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L., 1969) to measure satisfaction with satisfaction with the supervisor. The LBDQ – XII was completed by the resident advisors. This instrument was chosen because of "their strong and direct link to SLT, and their use in previous research, and they were felt to provide a reasonable and appropriate test" (Blank, Weitzel, and Green's study, 1990, p. 586). A 12 item psychological maturity measure was developed for this study. This scale was completed

by each resident advisor who rated all of the other advisors in their hall. This "peer rating" was used to avoid any bias associated with self assessment. A measure of job maturity for the resident advisors was created by totaling the number of months in resident hall related work and the number of months in their present position (p. 586 – 588).

Norris and Vecchio's study (Norris and Vecchio, 1992) was a replication of Vecchio's 1987 study (Vecchio, 1987). Again, the purpose of the study was to examine the three-way interaction of leader task behaviors (initiating structure), leader relationship behaviors (consideration), and maturity/readiness levels of the followers. This study obtained results similar to the first Vecchio study. The respondents for this study consisted of 105 nurses and their seven supervisors. The nurses completed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L., 1969), Leader – Member Exchange (Liden & Graen, 1980), and Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ – XII) (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The Job Description Index measured the nurses' satisfaction with the supervisors. The Leader Member Exchange measured the quality of the leader-member relationship. The modified version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) was used to measure two dimensions of leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration. The head nurses "provided performance ratings for each nurse on a 4-point scale that was in use at the hospital" (Norris and Vecchio, 1992, p. 335) along with the completing the Follower Maturity Index (Hambleton, Blanchard, & Hersey, 1977) to measure task relevant and psychological forms of maturity.

The Hersey and Blanchard Situational Leadership Theory emphasizes the fact that leaders have to be flexible and adapt their behavior to be effective in different situations (Graeff, 1997; Northouse, 2001; Yukl, 2006). Yukl (2006) adds, "Hersey and Blanchard pointed out that it is essential to treat different subordinates differently, and to vary behavior as the situation

changes" (p. 225). The leader must be able to diagnose the readiness of their followers to perform a specific task and then be able to use the leadership style that will be most effective. There is not one style that is appropriate in every situation.

Post-Secondary Technical Education in Georgia

Community and technical colleges can trace their origins to the early 20th century when "national and local leaders realized that a more skilled workforce was key to the country's continued economic strength – a need that called for a dramatic increase in college attendance" (American Association of Community Colleges, 2001, p. 10). At that time, three-quarters of high school graduates were not continuing their education because there were no colleges within commuting distance. To offset this factor, many of these newly established colleges were originally housed in local high schools (Monroe, 1972). The early leaders of these colleges were often developed from the faculty (Cohen & Brawer, 1996), given the title of dean, and reported to the local school superintendent (Twombly, 1995). Because of these factors, "The autocratic traditions of public school administration became the pattern of community college administration" (Monroe, 1972, p. 314).

The first post-secondary technical schools in Georgia were started by the state in the 1940's with the creation of the first state supported schools in Clarkesville and Americus. This concept did not expand in Georgia until the late 1950s with the passage of federal and state legislation. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided funding for the creation of area technical schools while the Woodall Amendment provided an alternative for local governance (State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education, 1984). From 1958 to 1984, twenty-five area technical schools were established in the state (Breeden, 2001). Seven of these

schools were governed by independent boards of education while the remaining eighteen were governed by local boards of education (Breeden, 1977). The problems associated with these different governance structures would eventually lead to the creation of what is now known as the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTAE).

The evolution of post-secondary technical education in Georgia started with the creation of the State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education by Gov. Joe Frank Harris in 1984. The mission of this State Board was to plan for, coordinate, and evaluate the State's public vocational-technical institutions and programs (Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education, 1984) with the goal of bringing the locally controlled technical schools under unified state governance. In 1988, state legislation changed the name of the State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education to the Board of Technical and Adult Education and established the Department of Technical and Adult Education.

Since its inception in 1988, the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education has grown as locally controlled technical institutes converted to state governance and new institutions were established. The system currently consists of thirty-four colleges and thirty-one satellite campuses. The creation of the HOPE Scholarship program has seen enrollment grow from 55,994 students in 1993 to 145,492 a decade later (Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, 2005). In the 2000 legislative session, the Georgia general assembly passed the A+ Education Reform Act of 2000 (House Bill 1187). The passage of this bill allowed the technical institutes governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education to change their names from technical institutes to technical colleges. In reaction to this name change, Dr. Ken Breeden, Commissioner of Georgia Department of Technical Adult Education (2000) stated, "The change of the word 'institute' to 'college' will be one of the most significant

changes in the history of Georgia's technical education system….it will put Georgia's technical education system on a level playing field with the community and technical colleges of other states." To provide validation for this name change, schools developed associate degrees which were added to the diplomas and certificates that were in place. These schools have also applied for regional accreditation with the Commission on Colleges (COC) through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

The mission of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education is "to contribute to the economic, educational, and community development of Georgia by providing quality technical education, adult literacy education, continuing education, and customized business and industry workforce training to the citizens of Georgia" (Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, 2006). Students can receive technical certificates of credit, diploma, and associate degrees depending on their program of study. GDTAE colleges are preparing their students for the world of work by providing them with skills that enable them to succeed in a specified occupation. Institutional organizational structures tend to be hybrid in nature, reflecting the traditional academic governance structures found in four-year colleges as well as the bureaucratic hierarchies found in business and industry (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

The creation of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education in 1988 was the first step towards independence from the public school origins of the technical colleges in Georgia. In their study of leadership development and career pathways of community college leaders, Amey, VanDerLinden, and Brown (2002) found support for the idea of independence. They conducted a quantitative study of 1,700 community college administrators across 14 position codes using a survey instrument of 34 open-ended, closed-ended, and Likert scale questions. They presented the survey results by position of respondents, including presidents.

First, college presidents were more likely than any other group to have public school teaching in their backgrounds. However, the percentages dropped dramatically from 1985 to 2002. In 1985, almost sixty percent of the presidents reported working in secondary school environments. In 2002, only seventeen percent of the presidents reported working in secondary education (Amey et al, 2002). These results indicate a shift from earlier years when employment at a two year college followed a secondary school career pathway. This trend further signaled a shift from the autocratic leadership styles inherited by these colleges from their founders in public education.

The technical colleges governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education have evolved quickly from locally governed "trade" schools to accredited institutions of higher education. They have entered the uncertain environment of higher education and must compete for funding dollars and students. The presidents of these technical colleges will play an important role in the continued success of their institutions.

Two-year College Presidential Leadership

The impact of the college presidency is addressed when Kauffman (1980) states that the president "occupies the key position in the institution; the link between the internal and external constituencies; the person who voices the values and purposes for which the institution stands" (pp. 2-3). In addition to being the most visible college representative, the president represents the mission, vision, and culture of the college (Michael, Swartz, and Batraj, 2001). To be effective in this position, the president influences people in a way to meet institutional goals, to support the mission and vision of the college, and to increase public awareness of the college (Birnbaum, 1992; Shaw; 1999). The president is viewed as the individual who is most responsible for the success of their institution (Lenington, 1996).

While many of the challenges facing the leaders of two-year colleges are the same as the ones facing their four-year counterparts, Vaughn and Weisman (1998) focused on the issues facing community colleges leaders in their Career and Lifestyle Survey. This 55-question survey was distributed to 680 community college presidents. The results of this survey were compared to the results of previous Career and Lifestyle Surveys that were conducted in 1984 and 1991. Issues of critical importance for the presidents were the need to address a lack of adequate funding as well as defining the role of technology in the educational process. Issues of lesser importance were the challenges of blending leadership with governance, accepting and incorporating change, addressing workforce development, and ensuring institutional accountability and mission achievement. Based on these challenges, Vaughn and Weisman identified the following prerequisites for a successful presidency:

1. Build consensus on the issues facing the college and ways to resolve these issues
2. Understand the role of technology in the college's future
3. Have a high tolerance for ambiguity
4. Play a major role in building coalitions with other community agencies and organizations in order to fulfill the college's mission

Vaughn (1989) states that "leading an institution of higher education is a complex and demanding undertaking, no matter the size, location, or type of institution" (p. 17). Balderston (1995) found that presidential leadership at a college is more complex than in other organizations because of its organizational structure. He associated five major functions of the presidency with other responsibilities being delegated. Balderston identified these functions as:

1. Clarifying the institutional mission and long-range goals
2. Allocating resources based on objectives

3. Selecting and evaluating personnel
4. Representing the institution to external constituencies
5. Planning strategically

While there are no typical community college presidents, there are clearly leadership traits, behaviors, roles, and styles that community college presidents share. While leadership studies that reflect a trait focus are no longer a major approach of organizational theorists, they "continue to be influential in developing images of effective leadership in higher education" (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989, p. 35).

On behalf of the National Institute for Leadership Development, Desjardins and Huff (2001) conducted research to identify core leadership traits that were needed in the community college setting. They identified twenty-two core leadership traits. These traits were divided into four categories: leadership fundamentals (including demonstrating high-involvement leadership and creating a shared vision), culture and climate (including creating cohesiveness and a student-centered learning environment), influence (including ensuring effective communication), and business management (including maintaining high standards and investing in staff development).

The intent of Campbell and Kachik's (2002) study was to develop a profile of a public community college president. A survey population of community college presidents and executive administrators completed the Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ) from 1996 to 2001. An analysis of the personality dimensions of the OPQ resulted in a list of nineteen traits that were then ranked as Essential, Important, or Other Relevant. Of these leadership traits, those rated essential were: "data rational" (judges on the basis of data and logic vs. judges on the basis of intuition), "critical" (critically evaluates ideas vs. accepts points without question), and "forward planning (enjoys forming short-term and long-term plans vs. operating without

preplanning). There was only one leadership trait that was rated as important. It was "traditional" (follows conventional approach vs. prefers nontraditional work culture).

Hood, Miller, and Pope (1999) surveyed ninety-six community college presidents to gain an understanding of their predominate roles as presidents as well as an assessment of challenges. Their research identified the dominate roles of the president as communicator, innovator, facilitator, and visionary. The least important roles of the presidents were identified as evaluator, fundraiser, mentor, and caretaker.

In a review of over 150 books, articles, and studies, Pierce and Pedersen (1997) identified the three preeminent traits of community college presidents. First, the president must be adaptable. This will allow the president to interact with a diverse group of constituents and community leaders. Second, the presidents must be flexible in their role to further collaboration and consensus among a variety of different audiences. Third, they must use sound judgment as an assurance that decisions are based on a thorough analysis of options and their impact on the college.

Funded by the Exxon Education Foundation, Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) surveyed two groups of presidents from higher education (two-year, four-year, public, and private). The first group of presidents was nominated by their peers as being effective and the second group was a representative sample selected from the remaining presidents. The focus of the study was to identify to identify the traits of effective presidents based upon leadership and management style, personal values, and professional experiences. Participants completed the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory as well as providing personal, professional and educational information. This research determined that effective college presidents are confident, modest, value the respect of others, believe in a strong work ethic, and take calculated risks. They also

have a vision, relate well to others, are bold decision makers, and have a positive self image. They prefer to be respected and they believe in the positive benefits of higher education for their communities.

Although the environment in which higher education exists is constantly changing, research has shown a consistency through the years and levels of higher education concerning the leadership provided by the presidents of these institutions. Hood, Miller, and Pope (1999) provide a summation: "Leaders are those who communicate effectively, and … the content of the communication has a great deal to do with the presidency. The primary leadership dimension identified by college presidents was an ability to transfer a vision to and throughout the institution" (p. 11).

Related Studies

There have been many doctoral dissertations devoted to topics related to presidential leadership in higher education. A very small number have focused on presidential leadership at the technical colleges in Georgia that are governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education.

McElvey (1993) prepared "Presidents' Perceptions of Their Individual Leadership Attributes and Their Faculties' Perceptions of the Presidents' Leadership Attributes in Technical Institutes in Georgia." Results from this study showed that the responses of the presidents and faculty members did not agree on the leadership attributes demonstrated by the presidents. The self perceptions of the presidents identified the following attributes as those attributes that they most often demonstrated: vision, achievement-oriented, assertive, enthusiastic, dependable, ethical, sensitive, delegating, and decision-making. The presidents also identified the following attributes as those attributes that they least often demonstrated: insightfulness, conflict

management, and tolerance of ambiguity, complexity, and frustration. The faculty members identified the attributes: being energetic, achievement-oriented, and assertive, as those most often demonstrated by their presidents. The faculty members felt that the presidents demonstrated the following attributes the least often: adaptable, tolerant of frustration, sensitive, motivating, coaching, and managing conflict.

Shafer (2001) researched "Presidents as Transformational Leaders in the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education Technical Colleges." The results of his study showed that all thirty-three presidents scored higher on transformational leadership factors than on transactional factors. The presidents rated themselves as "utilizing predominantly transformational leadership styles to lead their institutions" (p. 72). One transactional factor, contingent reward, was identified as often as the transformational factors for the group. Additionally, Shafer's research found that there was an inverse relationship between presidents' age and transformational scores and that presidents exhibited more transactional leadership factors as their tenure as president lengthened.

Finally, Cannon (2003) prepared a study of "Desired Leadership Attributes of Georgia Technical College Presidents." His descriptive study was designed to determine a ranked listing of desired leadership attributes as perceived by the technical college presidents, vice presidents, and members of the college's boards of directors and to determine if this ranking was independent of the gender of the respondent, the size of the technical college (based on credit enrollment), and technical college position (president, vice president or board member) held. The results of this study found six attributes that were categorized as highly descriptive of the presidents. They were: visionary, decision making, delegating, networking, ethical, and committed to the common good. Using a t-test for independent samples to determine if there

were differences in the rankings based on gender, the following leadership attributes were identified with statistically significant differences. They are: adaptable, open to change, visionary, confident accepting of self, personal integrity, intelligent with practical judgment, ethical, motivating others, networking, planning, and appropriate use of leadership style. One-way ANOVA and Post Hoc Tukey HSD tests were utilized to identify the leadership attributes with statistically different responses based on three credit enrollment sizes. The leadership attributes that were identified are enthusiastic optimistic, tolerant of frustration, and team building. One-way ANOVA and Post Hoc Tukey HSD tests were also utilized to compare the means of the respondents identified by the positions of president, vice president and board member. Statistically significant differences were found in the following leadership attributes: energetic with stamina, initiating, confident accepting of self, organizing, and time management.

Although the studies cited above deal with presidential leadership in the technical college in Georgia, only one focused on the leadership styles of these presidents. The Shafer (2001) study relied on the self-perceptions of the technical college presidents to identify leadership styles within the theoretical framework of transformational leadership. The present study, by contrast, utilized a 360-degree approach to identify leadership styles based on combining the self-perception of the presidents with the perceptions of the vice presidents with which they work within the framework of Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory.

While prior research on presidential leadership at the technical colleges in Georgia did not utilize Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory, this study is expected to confirm the findings of other studies on presidential leadership in higher education that used the same theoretical framework. Truschel (1997), Wen (1999) and Ates (2003) found that the self-perceived primary leadership styles of the presidents of colleges and universities in their studies

were selling (S2) and participating (S3). These are the most frequently identified leadership styles in countries "that have a high level of education and extensive industrial experience" (Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson, 1996, p. 319).

Summary

This chapter reviewed the major categories of leadership theory: trait theory, behavior theories, contingency theories, and power and influence theories. While there have been a variety of approaches to leadership, there has not been a consensus among theorists on the appropriate set of traits or behaviors for every environment and situation. A review of the evolution of post-secondary technical education was presented. The technical colleges governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education have evolved to become part of the higher education environment. A review of presidential leadership in the two-year environment of higher education was presented which illustrated the complexity of these positions.

Of importance to this study is the fact that the majority of research available on the topic of presidential leadership in higher education is focused on four-year colleges and universities or on two-year community colleges. As enrollment grows at the technical colleges because of the changing economy, this study may be valuable to the leaders in post-secondary technical education in Georgia and the rest of our country. Research developed by this study may help to fill the gap in research concerning the presidential leadership requirements of this sector of higher education.

Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) provide an appropriate conclusion:

> "Leaders are seen in roles ranging from all-powerful hero to illusion and symbol. Leaders are described in terms of who they are, what they do, how they think, their presumed effects, and how they are seen by others. They are considered as heads of bureaucratic organizations, peer groups, political structures, and systems of myth and

metaphor….A research agenda for leadership in higher education must recognize that leadership as in the case with other social constraints, is multidimensional and that its definition and interpretation will legitimately differ among different observers with different values whose assessment may be based on conflicting criteria, units of measurement, or time horizons: (p. 80).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceived leadership styles of presidents of technical colleges in Georgia and to determine whether the presidents and vice presidents at these technical colleges perceive this leadership style differently. This study was also designed to discover whether personal and technical college demographic variables are associated with the leadership styles of the presidents. This chapter addresses the methods used in this research.

Design of Study

This research study of perceived leadership styles of technical college presidents was a quantitative descriptive study. The focus of this research was on the perception of presidential leadership style by the presidents and vice presidents of technical colleges in the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (GDTAE). Self-reporting survey methodology was used to gather quantifiable information from the population of presidents and vice presidents in the GDTAE system. A cross-sectional approach was used to collect data for this study.

Descriptive research has been characterized by Neuman (2000) as "presenting a picture of the specific details of a situation" (p. 21-22) while Babbie (2001) emphasizes the measurement of characteristics of a phenomenon or population. This study was designed to accomplish both of these goals as it created a composite picture of the leadership styles of technical college presidents using statistical analysis of the information gathered through the surveys. In addition to the statistical analysis and the usage of surveys to gather data, there are other elements of this research study design that are consistent with quantitative research. The

research design was predetermined and structured (Merriam, 1998) following a linear research path with a fixed sequence of steps (Neuman, 2000). The usage of surveys also assured the detachment of the researcher which is another characteristic of quantitative research (Neuman, 2000).

Study Population

The population for this research study consisted of the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges that are governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. There are thirty-four colleges in the GDTAE system. The same organizational structure is used for all of the colleges in the system. Each college has a president and a vice president for each of the following departments: instructional services, student services, administrative services, and economic development. Each college has the discretion to combine two or more of these departments under the leadership of one vice president and to add additional vice presidential positions as determined by local college-level needs. In addition to the thirty-four colleges, there are thirty-one satellite campuses. Although each of these satellite campuses has an administrator in charge of the operations of that campus, all of these individuals do not hold the title of vice president of operations.

This study used a population census method since the entire population of GDTAE technical college presidents and vice presidents representing instructional services, student services, administrative services, economic development, satellite operations, and other vice presidential positions were included. The initial study population consisted of 183 individuals with the following breakdown: 34 presidents of technical colleges, 26 vice presidents of instructional services, 27 vice presidents of student services, 33 vice presidents of administrative services, 32 vice presidents of economic development, 10 vice presidents of satellite operations,

and 21 vice presidents whose job titles fall into the "other" category. The number of vice presidents listed for the basic organizational departments of instructional services, student services, administrative services, and economic development vary for several reasons. If an individual was identified as the vice president of one department and as an interim vice president of another department, this individual was included in the full-time position, not the interim position. If an individual was identified as being responsible for two or more of these departments on a full-time basis, this individual was included in the "other" category. Also, one college did not have an economic development department because of the specialized nature of its program offerings.

Survey Instruments

As noted earlier, this research study utilized the theoretical framework provided by Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory. The survey instruments developed in conjunction with this theory, Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description - LEAD - Self and LEAD – Other, and a self developed questionnaire were used to collect data. . The Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description - LEAD - Self and LEAD – Other instruments met the survey instrument selection criteria that were established for this study. The criteria were:

1. The instruments will be theory based "to assess qualities described in a particular model of leadership (Leslie & Fleenor, 1998, p.7).
2. The instruments will be designed to collect data from different perspectives. These types of instrument are commonly called multi-rater and are described as giving 360-degree feedback.

3. Technical and descriptive information including psychometric properties on the instruments will be available for review from various sources.
4. The psychometric properties of the instruments, reliability and validity, will meet test development guidelines. Velsor, Leslie, and Fleenor (1998) have divided reliability into three components, internal consistency, interrater agreement, and test-retest. They have suggested that internal consistency should have a reliability coefficient between .6 and .8. Interrater agreement should have a reliability coefficient between .4 and .7. Test-retest should have a reliability coefficient greater than .4 (p. 41). Validity can be evaluated by comparing scores on other instruments whose psychometric properties are already known (p. 42).

The Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) instruments contain twelve situations where the respondents select the leadership behavior which best represents the action of the leader in each situation. The presidents' responses to the LEAD – Self will reflect how they would react to these situations; while the vice presidents' responses to the LEAD – Other will reflect how they think their presidents will react to each situation. There are four alternate responses or behaviors for each situation. These four behaviors correspond to the four leadership styles of Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory: telling, selling, participating, and delegating. Each of these styles contains a different combination of task and relationship behavior. The twelve situations are worded to include an equal distribution of the different readiness levels of the followers (Hersey, et al, 1996).

Upon completion of the LEAD instruments, primary and secondary leadership styles were determined. In addition, a leadership style adaptability score, also known as a leadership

style effectiveness score, was determined by the responses to the situations. This score reflects the ability to select the appropriate leadership style for the situation.

Dr. John Greene addresses the issues of standardization, validity and stability of the LEAD instruments in the LEAD Self Manual (Greene, 1980). He states,

> "The LEAD Self was standardized on the responses of 264 managers constituting a North American sample. The managers ranged in age from 21 to 64; 30 percent were at the entry level of management; 55 percent were middle managers; 14 percent were at the high level of management. The 12 item validities for the adaptability score ranged from .11 to .52, and 10 of the 12 coefficients (83 percent) were .25 or higher. Eleven coefficients were significant beyond the .01 level and one was significant at the .05 level. Each response option met the operationally defined criterion of less than 80 percent with respect to selection frequency. The stability of the LEAD Self was moderately strong. In two administrations across a six-week interval, 75 percent of the managers maintained their dominant style and 71 percent maintained their alternative style. The contingency coefficients were both .71 and each was significant ($p<.01$). The correlation for the adaptability scores was .69 ($p<.01$). The LEAD Self scores remained stable across time, and the users may rely upon the results as consistent measures. The logical validity of the scale was clearly established. Face validity was based upon a review of the items, and content validity emanated from the procedures employed to create the original set of items.
>
> Several empirical validity studies were conducted. As hypothesized, correlations with the demographic/organismic variables of variables of sex, age, years of experience, degree and management level were generally low, indicating the relative independence of

the scales with respect to these variables. Satisfactory results were reported supporting the four style dimensions of the scale using a modified approach to factor structure. In 46 of the 48 item options (96 percent), the expected relationship was found. In another study, a significant correlation of .67 was found between the managers and the independent ratings of their supervisors. Based upon these findings, the LEAD-Self is deemed to be an empirically sound instrument" (p. 1).

Further evidence of the reliability and validity of the LEAD was provided in the study conducted by Walter, Caldwell, and Marshall (1980). To establish reliability, a group of 26 elementary school principals responded to the LEAD. Two measures of internal consistency produced reliability coefficients of .810 and .612. Using procedures for determining the congruent validity of an instrument, an additional 12 principals responded to the LEAD and 4 teachers from each of their schools responded to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ – XII). The assumption was that the task behaviors of the LEAD would relate to the initiating structures of the LBDQ – XII and that the relationship behaviors of the LEAD would relate to the consideration of the LBDQ – XII. As expected, principles perceived by teachers as "always" demonstrating initiating structure tended to choose the high task/low relationship style on the LEAD. The opposite also occurred as the principals who preferred the low task/high relationship style were perceived by their teachers as "seldom" or "never" demonstrating initiating structure. These findings verify the validity of the LEAD in assessing leadership style.

Pascarella and Lunenburg (1988) found Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory to be an effective method of conceptualizing the leadership behavior of administrators. In their opinion, the reliability of the LEAD instruments is moderately strong.

Additional survey instruments were considered for this study. They were the Leader Behavior Analysis (LBAII) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). These instruments were theory based; provided multi-rater feedback; and their psychometric properties were available for review.

The Leader Behavior Analysis (LBAII) survey instruments were developed in conjunction with Situational Leadership II, a contingency leadership theory developed by Ken Blanchard and others as a revised version of Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory. The LBAII instruments contained twenty situations with four responses that corresponded to the four leadership styles of Situational Leadership II. The internal consistency reliability coefficients of leadership style produced by the LBAII – Self and LBAII – Other met the guidelines that were established by Velsor, Leslie, and Fleenor in all areas except for the internal consistency of Style 4 on the LBAII – Self. A reliability coefficient to determine internal consistency for leadership style effectiveness (the equivalent of leadership style adaptability) was not established. Test-retest information was available for the flexibility scale of the LBAII – Self, but not for primary and secondary leadership styles (Leslie & Fleenor, 1998).

The instruments that were used to establish validity for LBAII were Wilson's Multi-Level Management Survey (MLMS) and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Zigarmi, Edeburn and Blanchard (1993) found that a significant relationship was found between the MLMS and the LBAII – Other. Jacobson's investigation of the relationship between the LBAII and the LBDQ led to the following conclusion, "the results indicate that similar constructs on the two instruments are not only theoretically related but are also empirically related' (Leslie & Fleenor, 1998, p. 117).

Survey research can fail to achieve its objectives because of non-response error (Dillman, 2000). Since the study population for this research was small, a high response rate was important. To address the issue of non-response, a survey of twenty-four co-workers was conducted. The co-workers were approached with the following premise: You have been asked to participate in dissertation research for a colleague. Which of these two surveys, the LEAD and LBAII, would you more likely complete and return? Nineteen of the twenty-four people (79 percent) surveyed picked the LEAD. When asked why they picked the LEAD, their responses included: it looked like something that could be completed in a few minutes; it was short; the use of color on the first page; and it was to the point, not wordy. When asked why they did not choose the LBAII, their comments focused on the length of the assessment (12 pages) and because of this length it would be something that they would place in the "To Do Stack" for later.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) survey instruments were developed by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio in conjunction with Bass' Theory of Transformational Leadership, a power and influence leadership theory, to gather information on transformational, transactional and non-transactional/non-leadership leadership behavior. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X (MLQ 5X) contains forty-five statements that are answered using a Likert scale from 0 to 4. While the internal consistency and test-retest reliability coefficients of the MLQ instruments met the guidelines established by Velsor, Leslie, and Fleenor, the interrater correlations fell below these guidelines (Leslie & Fleenor, 1998). Validity of the MLQ instruments had been developed by analysis of the many research studies conducted using the instrument not by comparing scores on other instruments whose psychometric

properties are already known. Although the results of the studies provided consistency, the usage of these studies could be problematic in proving validity.

In addition to Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD instruments, the presidents and vice presidents completed a questionnaire developed for this study. There was a separate questionnaire for the presidents and vice presidents. Both questionnaires were broken down into two parts, personal demographics and technical college demographics. The personal demographics section of the presidents' questionnaire asked for responses to questions pertaining to gender, age, education (highest degree received), number of years at the current institution, position held before becoming president at the current institution, and number of years as president of the current institution. The technical college demographic questions asked for Fall 2005 credit enrollment and the geographic location of the college. The personal demographics section of the vice presidents' questionnaire asked for responses to questions pertaining to gender, age, position, number of years in the current position, education (highest degree received), and number of years at the current institution. The technical college demographic questions were the same as asked on the presidents' questionnaire.

Data Collection

The procedures established for the collection of data have a large impact on the success of a research study (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). In preparing to collect the data for this study, these steps were followed:

1. The names and addresses of the presidents and vice presidents of the colleges operating under the governance of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education were obtained from the presidents of the technical colleges, the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education website (www.dtae.org), and the websites of the technical colleges.

2. Support for this research study was requested from the Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, Mr. Michael Vollmer.

3. A research proposal was submitted to the University of Georgia Institutional Research Board.

The Tailored Design Method developed by Don Dillman (2000) was utilized in developing the implementation procedures for this research study. The Tailored Design Method is grounded in a social exchange perspective to reduce survey error. Survey research can fail to achieve its objectives because of sampling error, coverage error, measurement error, and non-response error (Salent and Dillman, 1994; Dillman, 2000). Since a population census method was used to determine the study population, sampling and coverage errors were not factors. The issues of measurement error and non-response error were addressed through the "careful design of questions, questionnaires, and implementation methods" (Dillman, p. 10).

Research has shown that the primary factor in increasing response rates to surveys is multiple contacts (Dillman, 2000). The implementation methods recommended in Dillman's Tailored Design Method suggest using up to five contacts to maximize response rates. Each participant in the study received a minimum of three contacts. These contacts were personalized, contained respondent-friendly questionnaires, and included stamped return envelopes to maximize survey responses (p. 150-152).

Upon approval by the University of Georgia Institutional Research Board, a prenotice letter was sent to the 183 presidents and vice presidents identified in the initial study population. Dillman states, "The purpose of a prenotice letter is to provide a positive and timely notice that the recipient will be receiving a request to help with an important study or survey" (p. 156). This

letter briefly described the study, created a foundation for its significance, and thanked the presidents and vice presidents in advance for participating in this research.

One week later, a questionnaire/survey packet was mailed to these presidents and vice presidents. The packets sent to the presidents included a personalized cover letter, a copy of the Presidents' Questionnaire, a copy of Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD – Self, and a stamped return envelope. The packets mailed to the vice presidents also contained a personalized cover letter and a stamped return envelope, but they received a copy of the Vice Presidents' Questionnaire and a copy of Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD – Other. The cover letter included a description of the study and the significance of this research. It also stated that the questionnaires were coded with an identification number for response purposes only. A confidentiality statement was included that stated that responses to the questionnaires would be aggregated and that no schools or individuals would be identified in this research study.

A postcard was sent to all of the presidents and vice presidents one week after the questionnaire/survey packets were mailed. This postcard had a dual purpose. It thanked those who had returned the questionnaires, and it also served as a reminder for those who had not completed and returned these documents. This is the last mailing that was sent to the entire study population.

Two weeks later, the sixty-seven non-respondents received a fourth mailing. This mailing was a replacement questionnaire/survey packet. It included the appropriate questionnaire (presidents or vice presidents) and Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD instrument (Self or Other) as well as a revised cover letter and stamped envelope. The questionnaire and Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD instrument had the same identification code as those sent previously to the non-respondents to avoid any duplication of data.

The fifth and final contact was mailed to the forty-six non-respondents two weeks later. This mailing included a cover letter emphasizing the importance of their involvement along with the appropriate questionnaire (presidents or vice presidents), Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD instrument (Self or Other), and stamped return envelope. The questionnaire and Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD instrument had the same identification code as those sent previously to the non-respondents to avoid any duplication of data.

Description of Analysis

Data for this study was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 10.0. The responses from the LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other were scored according to the procedures presented in *LEAD Directions: Directions for Self-Scoring and Analysis* (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc, 2005). The demographic information collected on the presidents' and vice presidents' questionnaires was categorized and described. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the results from the LEAD instruments and the questionnaires. These statistics included frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Correlation analysis was used to determine relationships between the presidents' and vice presidents' responses. An analysis of means was used to examine the differences between the college presidents' self perception of his/her leadership style and the variables of gender, age, education (highest degree received), number of years at the current institution, previous position, number of years as president at current institution, size of technical college, and location of technical college.

Limitations

The small number of respondents coupled with missing cells on the responses limited the kinds of statistical tests that can be used reliably in this study. However, the respondents

represented a census of the study population. This made tests of significance less important in analyzing the data.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was three-fold: (1) to identify the perceived leadership styles of presidents of technical colleges in Georgia, (2) to determine whether the presidents and vice presidents at these technical colleges perceive this leadership style differently, and (3) to discover whether personal and technical college demographic variables are associated with the leadership styles of the presidents. The population for this study consisted of the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges operating under the governance of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. Self-reporting survey methodology was used to gather quantifiable information from this population. The Hersey and Blanchard – Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) - Self and LEAD - Other instruments were used to identify presidential leadership styles and self-developed questionnaires were used to obtain demographic information.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents the response rates to the surveys. The second section presents personal and technical college demographic information obtained from the presidents' and vice presidents' responses to the questionnaire. The third section presents analysis of the responses to the LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other as related to the research questions presented in this study.

Survey Responses

This study used a population census method surveying all identified Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education technical college presidents and vice presidents.

The initial study population consisted of 183 individuals, 34 presidents and 149 vice presidents. The vice presidents were divided into the following categories: 26 vice presidents of instructional services, 27 vice presidents of student services, 33 vice presidents of administrative services, 32 vice presidents of economic development, 10 vice presidents of satellite operations, and 21 vice presidents whose job titles fall into the "other" category. The population was adjusted during the data collection phase due to positions being vacant and individuals being misidentified as vice presidents. The final study population consisted of 179 individuals, 34 presidents and 145 vice presidents. This adjustment affected the following categories: the number of vice presidents of economic development was reduced to 31; the number of vice presidents of satellite operations was reduced to 9; and the number of vice presidents – other was reduced to 19.

The presidents received a questionnaire/survey packet that contained a copy of Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD – Self and a copy of the Presidents' Questionnaire. The presidents' responses to the LEAD – Self reflected how they would react to the situations included in the instrument. These responses correspond to the four leadership styles included in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory: telling, selling, participating, and delegating. The Presidents' Questionnaire was broken down into two parts, personal demographics and technical college demographics. The personal demographics section of the questionnaire asked for responses to questions pertaining to gender, age, education (highest degree received), number of years at the current institution, position held before becoming president at the current institution, and number of years as president of the current institution. The technical college demographic questions asked for Fall 2005 credit enrollment and geographical location of the college.

The vice presidents received a questionnaire/survey packet that contained a copy of Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD – Other and a copy of the Vice Presidents' Questionnaire. The vice presidents' responses to the LEAD – Other reflected how they thought their presidents would react to the situations included in the instrument. The situations are the same in the LEAD – Self and – Other. Again, these responses correspond to the four leadership styles included in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory: telling, selling, participating, and delegating. The Vice Presidents' Questionnaire was also broken down into two parts, personal demographics and technical college demographics. The personal demographics section asked for responses to questions pertaining to gender, age, position, number of years in the current position, education (highest degree received), and number of years at the current institution. The technical college demographic questions were the same questions that were included on the presidents' questionnaire.

Table 1 indicates that responses were received from 142 individuals, 29 presidents and 111 vice presidents, representing 79 percent of the final study population. Four of these responses were determined to be unusable since both portions of the questionnaire/survey packet, the LEAD instrument and questionnaire, were not completed and returned. The remaining 138 responses (77 percent) were included in the analysis for this study. Eighty-two percent of the presidents and seventy-five percent of the vice presidents returned usable responses. While the response rates varied by vice presidential category, the responses from the vice presidents of instruction (88 percent) and vice presidents of satellite operations (100 percent) exceeded the response rate of the presidents.

Table 1

Survey Response Rates

Position	Initial Study Population Size	Adjusted Study Population Size	Total Responses	%	Usable Responses	%
President	34	34	29	85%	28	82%
Vice President of Instruction	26	26	24	92%	23	88%
Vice President of Student Services	27	27	20	74%	19	70%
Vice President of Adm. Services	33	33	22	66%	22	66%
Vice President of Economic Development	32	31	25	80%	24	77%
Vice President of Satellite Operations	10	9	9	100%	9	100%
Vice President - Other	21	19	13	68%	13	68%
Totals	183	179	142	79%	138	77%

Respondent Demographics

Demographic Profile of the Presidents

Table 2 indicates the demographic characteristics of the technical college presidents as determined by their responses to the Presidents' Questionnaires. The questionnaires revealed that 67.9 percent of the respondents were male and 32.1 percent were female. Although the age of the responding presidents ranged from 35 to 68, the average age was 53 with 66.7 percent of the presidents reporting their age to be from 50 to 59. All of the presidents held graduate degrees with twenty having Doctorate degrees (71.4 percent), three having Specialist degrees (10.7 percent), and five having Master's degrees (17.9 percent). While two of the presidents (7.7 percent) had served for twenty or more years at their current institution, the average tenure as president was six years. The data revealed that 19.2 percent of the presidents had experience of one year or less at their current institution with 61.5 percent of the presidents reported service of five years or less. Thirteen of the presidents (48.2 percent) had held the position of Vice President of Instruction/Academic Affairs prior to being president, while one president had served as Vice President of Student Services (3.7 percent), four presidents had served as Vice President of Economic Development (14.8 percent), and two presidents had served as Vice President of Campus/Center Operations (7.4 percent). None of the responding presidents had held the position of Vice President of Administrative Services. Over twenty-five percent of the presidents had held another position prior to being president besides those mentioned above. While the presidents reported Fall 2005 credit enrollment of their colleges from two hundred and fifty to over seven thousand students, the average enrollment was 2716. Thirteen of the presidents (46.4 percent) identified their colleges as being in a rural location while the remaining fifteen presidents (53.6 percent) reported that their colleges were in a non-rural environment.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Technical College Presidents in Georgia

	f		percent
Personal Demographics:			
Gender (N=28)			
Male	19		67.9%
Female	9		32.1%
Age (N=27)			
30 -39	1		3.7%
40 – 49	5		18.5%
50 – 59	18		66.7%
60 – 69	3		11.1%
Education (N=28)			
Undergraduate Degree	0		
Master's Level Graduate Degree	5		17.9%
Specialist Level Graduate Degree	3		10.7%
Doctorate Level Graduate Degree	20		71.4%
Number of Years at Current Institution (N=27)			
0 – 9	16		59.3%
10 – 19	4		14.8%
20 – 29	5		18.5%
30 – 39	2		7.4%
Number of Years as President at Current Institution (N=26)			
0 – 9	21		80.8%
10 – 19	3		11.5%
20 – 29	2		7.7%
Position Prior to Presidency (N=27)			
Vice President of Instruction/Academic Affair	13	48.2%	
Vice President of Student Services	1		3.7%
Vice President of Administrative Services	0		0.0%
Vice President of Economic Development	4		14.8%
Vice President of Campus/Center Operations	2	7.4%	
Other	7		25.9%
Technical College Demographics:			
Enrollment (N=26)			
Less Than 2500	13		50.0%
2500 or Larger	13		50.0%
Location (N=28)			
Rural	13		46.4%
Suburban	12	42.9%	
Urban	3		10.7%

Note. f = frequency

Demographic Profile of the Vice Presidents

Table 3 indicates the demographic characteristics of the technical college vice presidents as determined by their responses to the Vice Presidents' Questionnaires. The questionnaires revealed that 58.2 percent of the respondents were male and 41.8 percent were female. The ages of the responding vice presidents ranged from 28 to 66 with an average age of 51. Forty-four percent of the vice presidents reported their age to be from 50 to 59. Eighty percent of the responding vice presidents held graduate degrees with thirty-two having Doctorate degrees (29.1 percent), eight having Specialist degrees (7.3 percent), and forty-eight having Master's degrees (43.6 percent). The data revealed that almost fifty percent of the vice presidents had been employed at their current technical college for over ten years with the average employment being over eleven years. In contrast, eighty-four percent of the vice presidents had served in their current capacity for less than ten years with the average tenure as vice president being under six years. While the vice presidents reported Fall 2005 credit enrollment of their college from two hundred and forty-eight to over nine thousand students, the average enrollment was 2719. Fifty-four of the vice presidents (50.0 percent) identified their colleges as being in a rural location while the remaining fifty-four vice presidents (50.0 percent) reported that their colleges were in a non-rural environment.

Responses were received from six categories of vice presidents. While the demographic profile of each category was very similar to the profile of the population of vice presidents, there are exceptions that deserve mention. The gender composition of four categories was significantly different. The vice presidents of instruction respondents were 47.8 percent male and 52.2 percent female. The respondents in the vice presidents – other category were also predominately female (53.8 percent). Two categories were overwhelmingly male dominated

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of the Vice Presidents at Technical College in Georgia

	f	%
Personal Demographics:		
Gender (N=110)		
Male	64	58.2%
Female	46	41.8%
Age (N=103)		
20 – 29	1	1.0%
30 -39	11	10.7%
40 – 49	31	30.1%
50 – 59	44	42.7%
60 – 69	16	15.5%
Education (N=110)		
Undergraduate Degree	22	20.0%
Master's Level Graduate Degree	48	43.6%
Specialist Level Graduate Degree	8	7.3%
Doctorate Level Graduate Degree	32	29.1%
Number of Years at Current Institution (N=107)		
0 – 9	54	50.4%
10 – 19	34	31.8%
20 – 29	17	15.9%
30 – 39	2	1.9%
Number of Years as Vice President at Current Institution (N=107)		
0 – 9	90	84.1%
10 – 19	13	12.2%
20 – 29	3	2.8%
30 – 39	1	0.9%
Technical College Demographics:		
Enrollment (N=104)		
Less Than 2500	52	50.0%
2500 or Larger	52	50.0%
Location (N=108)		
Rural	54	50.0%
Suburban	31	28.7%
Urban	23	21.3%

Note. f = frequency

with 75 percent of the respondents in the vice presidents of economic development and 66.7 percent of the vice presidents of satellite operations reporting their gender as male. One hundred percent of the respondents in two categories, vice presidents of instruction and satellite operations, had graduate degrees with 69.6 percent of the vice presidents of instruction and 55.6 percent of the vice presidents of satellite operations possessing doctorate degrees. While the average tenure of vice presidents is 5.7 years, the vice presidents of instruction' average tenure is 3.39 years.

Analysis of Research Questions

Four major research questions addressed the purpose of the study. Respondents included the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges operating under the governance of the Georgia Department of technical and Adult Education. The findings related to each question follow.

Research Question One

What are the leadership styles of technical college presidents as indicated by the presidents?

The presidents of the Georgia's technical colleges were asked to respond to the LEAD – Self survey instrument. The responses of twenty-eight presidents are included in this study. The LEAD – Self contains twelve situations with four alternative behavior choices for each item. The presidents' responses reflected how they would react to the situations and are used to determine their perceived leadership styles. These responses correspond to the four leadership styles included in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory: telling, selling, participating, and delegating.

The responses to the LEAD – Self were used to determine the presidents' leadership style profile, which includes primary leadership style and secondary leadership style, and leadership

style adaptability. Primary leadership style is the style that is selected most often in responding to the twelve situations in the LEAD – Self. The primary leadership style is the style that would be used most frequently. A secondary leadership style can include any style other than the primary style and must receive at least two responses to the situations in the LEAD – Self. Secondary leadership styles are considered to be supporting or "backup" styles when the primary leadership style is not being used. Leadership style adaptability reflects the degree to which an individual is able to vary their leadership style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in specific situations. It is expressed as a score from 0 to 36 and is divided into three ranges, low (0 – 23), moderate (24 – 29), and high (30 – 36). A score in the low range (0 – 23) indicates a need to improve the ability to diagnose readiness and to use appropriate leadership behaviors. A score in the moderate range (24 – 29) is usually an indication of a pronounced primary leadership style with less flexibility into a secondary style. A score in the high range (30 – 36) indicates a leader who accurately diagnoses the readiness of followers for a situation and who adjust leadership styles accordingly (Center for Leadership Studies, Inc., 2005).

Table 4 contains summaries of the frequencies and percentages of the self perceived primary leadership styles of the technical college presidents. Table 5 contains summaries of the frequencies and percentages of the self perceived secondary leadership styles of the presidents. Table 6 contains summaries of the frequencies and percentages of the self perceived leadership style adaptability of the presidents.

Table 4 indicates the self perceived primary leadership styles of the technical college presidents as determined by data from the LEAD-Self. This data revealed that 17 of the responding technical college presidents (60.7 percent) identified their primary leadership style as selling (S2). Eight of the presidents (28.6 percent) identified participating (S3) as their primary

Table 4

Self Perceived Primary Leadership Styles of Technical College Presidents in Georgia

	f	%
Telling (S1)	0	
Selling (S2)	17	60.7%
Participating (S3)	8	28.6%
Delegating (S4)	0	
Multiple Styles Selling and Participating	3	10.7%

N=28

Note. f = frequency

leadership style while the remaining two presidents (10.7 percent) identified a multiple primary leadership style that consisted of selling (S2) and participating (S3). None of the presidents identified telling (S1) or delegating (S4) as their primary leadership style. Both selling (S2) and participating (S3) are defined as having an above average amount of relationship behavior. The amount of task behavior associated with these two style varies from an above average amount for selling (S2) to a below average amount for participating (S3).

Table 5 indicates the self perceived secondary leadership styles of the technical college presidents as determined by data from the LEAD-Self. Data from the LEAD – Self revealed that twelve of the responding presidents (44 percent) had one secondary style while fifteen of the presidents (55 percent) had multiple secondary leadership styles. The data from one of the presidents revealed no secondary leadership style. Participating (S3) was used as a secondary leadership style by seven presidents (25.9 percent). The data from eight presidents (29.7 percent) revealed the usage of two secondary leadership styles, telling (S1) and participating (S3).

Table 6 indicates the self perceived leadership style adaptability of the technical college presidents as determined by data from the LEAD-Self. Leadership style adaptability reflects the degree to which an individual is able to vary their leadership style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in specific situation. The possible leadership adaptability scores range from 0 to 36. The leadership adaptability scores of the responding presidents ranged from 19 to 31 with an average score of 25.79. The data revealed that the majority, sixteen or 57.1 percent, of the responding presidents fell in the category of moderate adaptability of leadership style. Eight of the presidents (28.6 percent) fell in the low category of needs improvement with four presidents (14.3 percent) in the high adaptability category.

Table 5

Self Perceived Secondary Leadership Styles of Technical College Presidents in Georgia

	f	percent
Telling (S1)	2	7.4%
Selling (S2)	3	11.1%
Participating (S3)	7	25.9%
Delegating (S4)	0	
Multiple Styles		
Telling (S1) and Selling (S2)	3	11.1%
Telling (S1) and Participating (S3)	8	29.7%
Telling (S1) and Delegating (S4)	1	3.7%
Selling (S2) and Delegating (S4)	1	3.7%
Telling (S1), Selling (S2), and Delegating (S4)	1	3.7%
Telling (S1), Participating (S3), and Delegating (S4)	1	3.7%

N = 27
One President did not have a self perceived secondary leadership style

Note. f = frequency

Table 6

Self Perceived Leadership Style Adaptability of Technical College Presidents in Georgia

	f	%
Low (0 – 23)	8	28.6%
Moderate (24 – 29)	16	57.1%
High (30 – 36)	4	14.3%

N=28

Note. f = frequency

Research Question Two

What are the leadership styles of technical college presidents as indicated by the vice-presidents?

The vice presidents of the Georgia's technical colleges were asked to respond to the LEAD – Other survey instrument. The responses of one hundred and ten vice presidents are included in this study. The LEAD – Other contains twelve situations with four alternative behavior choices for each item. The vice presidents' responses reflected how they thought their presidents would react to the situations and are used to determine their perception of their presidents' leadership styles. These responses correspond to the four leadership styles included in Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory: telling, selling, participating, and delegating.

The responses to the LEAD – Other were used to determine the vice presidents' perception of their presidents' leadership style profile, which includes primary leadership style and secondary leadership style, and leadership style adaptability. Primary leadership style is the style that is selected most often in responding to the twelve situations in the LEAD – Self. The primary leadership style is the style that would be used most frequently. A secondary leadership style can include any style other than the primary style and must receive at least two responses to the situations in the LEAD – Self. Secondary leadership styles are considered to be supporting or "backup" styles when the primary leadership style is not being used. Leadership style adaptability reflects the degree to which an individual is able to vary their leadership style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in specific situation. It is expressed as a score from 0 to 36 and is divided into three ranges, low (0 – 23), moderate (24 – 29), and high (30 – 36). A score in the low range (0 – 23) indicates a need to improve the ability to diagnose

readiness and to use appropriate leadership behaviors. A score in the moderate range (24 – 29) is usually an indication of a pronounced primary leadership style with less flexibility into a secondary style. A score in the high range (30 – 36) indicates a leader who accurately diagnoses the readiness of followers for a situation and who adjust leadership styles accordingly.

Table 7 contains summaries of the frequencies and percentages of the vice presidents' perception of the primary leadership styles of the technical college presidents. Table 8 contains summaries of the frequencies and percentages of the vice presidents' perception of the secondary leadership styles of the presidents. Table 9 contains summaries of the frequencies and percentages of the vice presidents' perception of the leadership style adaptability of the presidents.

Table 7 indicates the primary leadership styles of the technical college presidents as perceived by the vice presidents as determined by data from the LEAD-Other. This data revealed that the vice presidents perceived their presidents as predominantly using selling (S2), (44.5 percent) as their primary leadership style followed by participating (S3), (19.1 percent). Almost one quarter of the vice presidents (24.6 percent) identified telling (S1), (17.3 percent) and delegating (S4), (7.3 percent) as the presidents' primary leadership style. Thirteen percent of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as having multiple styles of primary leadership with all of the multiple leadership styles including selling (S2).

Table 8 indicates the secondary leadership styles of the technical college presidents as perceived by the vice presidents as determined by data from the LEAD-Other. This data revealed that forty-five of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as using one secondary leadership style, fifty-five of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as using multiple secondary leadership styles, and ten of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as not

Table 7

Primary Leadership Styles of Technical College Presidents in Georgia as Perceived by the Vice Presidents of the Technical Colleges in Georgia

	VPI		VPSS		VPA		VPED		VPSO		VPO		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Telling (S1)	3	13.0%	1	5.3%	5	22.7%	4	16.7%	3	33.3%	3	23.0%	19	17.3%
Selling (S2)	10	43.5%	12	62.2%	9	40.9%	10	41.7%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	49	44.5%
Participating (S3)	5	21.7%	3	15.8%	2	9.1%	5	20.8%	1	11.1%	5	38.5%	21	19.1%
Delegating (S4)	2	8.7%	1	5.3%	2	9.1%	2	8.3%	1	11.1%			8	7.3%
Multiple Styles														
S1 & S2					2	9.1%	2	8.3%					4	3.6%
S2 & S3	3	13.0%	2	10.5%	1	4.5%	1	4.2%	1	11.1%			8	7.3%
S2 & S4					1	4.5%							1	0.9%

VPI – Vice Presidents of Instruction/Academic Affairs (N=23)
VPSS - Vice Presidents of Student Services (N=19)
VPA - Vice Presidents of Administrative Services (N=22)
VPED – Vice Presidents of Economic Development (N=24)
VPSO – Vice Presidents of Satellite Operations (N=9)
VPO – Vice Presidents – Other (N=13)
Total – All Vice Presidents (N=110)

Note. f = frequency

Table 8

Secondary Leadership Styles of Technical College Presidents in Georgia as Perceived by the Vice Presidents of the Technical Colleges in Georgia

	VPI		VPSS		VPA		VPED		VPSO		VPO		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Telling (S1)	3	15.0%	1	5.9%	3	15.8%	1	4.3%	1	11.1%			9	9.0%
Selling (S2)			2	11.8%	3	15.8 %	7	30.4%			2	16.7%	15	15.0%
Participating (S3)	3	15.0%	3	17.6%	2	10.5%	5	21.7%	1	11.1%	1	8.3%	14	14.0%
Delegating (S4)	2	10.0%	1	5.9%	3	15.8%	5	21.7%	1	11.1%			7	7.0%
Multiple Styles														
S1 & S2	5	25.0%	1	5.9%	1	5.3%					3	25.0%	10	10.0%
S1 & S3	2	10.0%	8	47.1%	5	26.3%	2	8.7%	1	11.1%	3	25.0%	21	21.0%
S1 & S4	1	5.0%	1	5.9%	1	5.3%	2	8.7%					5	5.0%
S2 & S3					1	5.3%	2	8.7%	3	33.3%			6	6.0%
S2 & S4	2	10.0%					1	4.3%	1	11.1%	1	8.3%	5	5.0%
S3 & S4							2	8.7%			1	8.3%	3	3.0%
S1, S3 & S4	2	10.0%					1	4.3%	1	11.1%			4	4.0%
S2, S3 & S4											1	8.3%	1	1.0%

VPI – Vice Presidents of Instruction/Academic Affairs (N=20) Three VPs did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPSS - Vice Presidents of Student Services (N=17) Two VPs did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPA - Vice Presidents of Administrative Services (N=19) Three VPs did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPED – Vice Presidents of Economic Development (N=23) One VP did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPSO – Vice Presidents of Satellite Operations (N=9)
VPO – Vice Presidents – Other (N=12) One VP did not perceive his/her President as having a secondary leadership style
Total – All Vice Presidents (N=100)

Note. f = frequency

having a secondary leadership style. Selling (S2), (15 percent) and participating (S3), (14 percent) were identified as the most frequently identified individual secondary leadership styles. Twenty-one percent of the vice presidents identified their presidents as utilizing telling (S1) and participating (S3) as secondary leadership styles. The leadership styles of telling (S1) and/or selling (S2), both characterized by an above average amount of task behavior, are identified as secondary leadership styles in ninety-four percent of the multiple secondary leadership style situations.

Table 9 indicates the leadership style adaptability of the technical college presidents as perceived by the vice presidents as determined by data from the LEAD-Other. Leadership style adaptability reflects the degree to which an individual is able to vary their leadership style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in specific situation. The possible leadership adaptability scores range from 0 to 36. The data revealed that the majority of the vice presidents (52.7 percent) perceived their presidents' leadership style adaptability to be in the low category of needs improvement. Forty-six of the vice presidents (41.8 percent) identified their presidents' leadership style adaptability in the moderate range while only 6 vice presidents (5.5percent) identified their presidents in the high category.

Research Question Three

How do the responses of the two groups of respondents compare?

The results of the LEAD – Self and LEAD - Other were combined to determine relations between the presidents' and vice presidents' perceptions regarding presidential leadership style and leadership style adaptability. All of the responding presidents and vice presidents are included in this portion of the analysis. Table 10 contains the comparison of the primary leadership styles of the presidents from the presidents' and vice presidents' responses to the

Table 9

Leadership Style Adaptability of Technical College Presidents in Georgia as Perceived by the Vice Presidents of the Technical Colleges in Georgia

	VPI		VPSS		VPA		VPED		VPSO		VPO		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Low (0 – 23)	12	52.2%	6	31.6%	16	72.7%	12	50.0%	8	88.9%	4	30.8%	58	52.7%
Moderate (24 - 29)	11	47.8%	11	57.9%	5	22.7%	11	45.0%	1	11.1%	7	53.8%	46	41.8%
High (30 – 36)	0		2	10.5%	1	4.5%	1	5.0%			2	15.4%	6	5.5%

VPI – Vice Presidents of Instruction/Academic Affairs (N=23)
VPSS - Vice Presidents of Student Services (N=19)
VPA - Vice Presidents of Administrative Services (N=22)
VPED – Vice Presidents of Economic Development (N=24)
VPSO – Vice Presidents of Satellite Operations (N=9)
VPO – Vice Presidents – Other (N=13)
Total – All Vice Presidents (N=110)

Note. f = frequency

LEAD instruments. The vice presidents' responses are divided by category as well as totaled. Table 11 contains the comparison of the secondary leadership styles of the presidents from the presidents' and vice presidents' responses to the LEAD instruments. The vice presidents' responses are divided by category as well as totaled. Table 12 contains the comparison of the leadership style adaptability of the presidents from the presidents' and vice presidents' responses to the LEAD instruments. The vice presidents' responses are divided by category as well as totaled.

In addition, a series of correlation analyses were calculated as a means of evaluating if there was a significant relationship between the presidents' self-perception of leadership style and the vice presidents' perception of the presidents' leadership style. The twenty-eight presidents and the vice presidents from their colleges are included in these calculations. The resulting sets of correlations are summarized in Table 13.

Table 10 indicates the comparison of primary leadership styles of technical college presidents by the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges in Georgia. The data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD - Other revealed that both the presidents and vice presidents identified selling (S2) as the most frequently used primary leadership style of the presidents with participating (S3) next. While 60.7 percent of the presidents chose selling (S2) most frequently, only 44.5 percent of the vice presidents made this choice. While none of the presidents identified either of the "low relation" leadership styles, telling (S1) or delegating (S4) as their primary leadership style, 17.3 percent of the vice presidents chose telling (S1) and 7.3 percent of the vice presidents chose delegating (S4) as their perceptions of presidential leadership style. Over 20 percent of the vice presidents of administrative services and "other" and over 30 percent of the vice presidents of satellite operations choose telling (S1) as the presidents' primary

Table 10

Comparison of Primary Leadership Styles of Technical College Presidents in Georgia by the Presidents and Vice Presidents of the Technical Colleges in Georgia

	VPI		VPSS		VPA		VPED		VPSO		VPO		Total VPs		Presidents	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Telling (S1)	3	13.0%	1	5.3%	5	22.7%	4	16.7%	3	33.3%	3	23.0%	19	17.3%		
Selling (S2)	10	43.5%	12	62.2%	9	40.9%	10	41.7%	3	33.3%	5	38.5%	49	44.5%	17	60.7%
Participating (S3)	5	21.7%	3	15.8%	2	9.1%	5	20.8%	1	11.1%	5	38.5%	21	19.1%	8	28.6%
Delegating (S4)	2	8.7%	1	5.3%	2	9.1%	2	8.3%	1	11.1%			8	7.3%		
Multiple Styles																
S1 & S2					2	9.1%	2	8.3%					4	3.6%		
S2 & S3	3	13.0%	2	10.5%	1	4.5%	1	4.2%	1	11.1%			8	7.3%	3	10.7%
S2 & S4					1	4.5%							1	0.9%		

Presidents (N=28) Total Vice Presidents (N=110)
VPI – Vice Presidents of Instruction/Academic Affairs (N=23)
VPSS - Vice Presidents of Student Services (N=19)
VPA - Vice Presidents of Administrative Services (N=22)
VPED – Vice Presidents of Economic Development (N=24)
VPSO – Vice Presidents of Satellite Operations (N=9)
VPO – Vice Presidents – Other (N=13)

Note. f = frequency

leadership style. Multiple primary leadership styles were chosen by the same percentage of presidents and vice presidents but several of the vice presidents included telling (S1) and delegating (4), "low relation" leadership styles, in their combinations.

Table 11 indicates the comparison of secondary leadership styles of technical college presidents by the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges in Georgia. The data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other revealed that approximately the same percentages of presidents and vice presidents (45 percent) felt that the presidents used one secondary leadership style while the remaining presidents and vice presidents (55 percent) felt that the presidents used multiple secondary leadership styles. There was one president and ten vice presidents who did not identify a secondary presidential leadership style. In the cases where one secondary leadership style was identified, 25.9 percent of the presidents identified the style as participating (S3) followed by selling (S2) and telling (S1). None of the presidents identified delegating (S4) as their only secondary leadership style. The data from the vice presidents' responses revealed selling (S2), (15.0 percent) most frequently with participating (S3), telling (S1), and delegating (S4) following. When multiple styles were identified, both presidents and vice presidents identified a combination of selling (S1) and participating (S3) most frequently.

Table 12 indicates the comparison of leadership style adaptability of technical college presidents by the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges in Georgia. The data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other revealed different perspectives. Over fifty percent (52.7 percent) of the vice presidents perceived their presidents to be in the low range while only 28.6 percent of the presidents perceived themselves in this range. Two categories of vice presidents, administrative services (72.7 percent) and satellite operations (88.9 percent), overwhelmingly identified their presidents in the range.

Table 11

Comparison of Secondary Leadership Styles of Technical College Presidents in Georgia by the Presidents and the Vice Presidents of the Technical Colleges in Georgia

	VPI		VPSS		VPA		VPED		VPSO		VPO		Total VPs		Presidents	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Telling	3	15.0%	1	5.9%	3	15.8%	1	4.3%	1	11.1%			9	9.0%	2	7.4%
Selling			2	11.8%	3	15.8 %	7	30.4%			2	16.7%	15	15.0%	3	11.1%
Participating	3	15.0%	3	17.6%	2	10.5%	5	21.7%	1	11.1%	1	8.3%	14	14.0%	7	25.9%
Delegating	2	10.0%	1	5.9%	3	15.8%	5	21.7%	1	11.1%			7	7.0%		
Multiple Styles																
S1 & S2	5	25.0%	1	5.9%	1	5.3%					3	25.0%	10	10.0%	3	11.1%
S1 & S3	2	10.0%	8	47.1%	5	26.3%	2	8.7%	1	11.1%	3	25.0%	21	21.0%	8	29.7%
S1 & S4	1	5.0%	1	5.9%	1	5.3%	2	8.7%					5	5.0%	1	3.7%
S2 & S3					1	5.3%	2	8.7%	3	33.3%			6	6.0%		
S2 & S4	2	10.0%					1	4.3%	1	11.1%	1	8.3%	5	5.0%	1	3.7%
S3 & S4							2	8.7%			1	8.3%	3	3.0%		
S1, S2, & S4															1	3.7%
S1, S3 & S4	2	10.0%					1	4.3%	1	11.1%			4	4.0%	1	3.7%
S2, S3 & S4											1	8.3%	1	1.0%		

VPI – Vice Presidents of Instruction/Academic Affairs (N=20) Three VPs did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPSS - Vice Presidents of Student Services (N=17) Two VPs did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPA - Vice Presidents of Administrative Services (N=19) Three VPs did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPED – Vice Presidents of Economic Development (N=23) One VP did not perceive a secondary leadership style
VPSO – Vice Presidents of Satellite Operations (N=9)
VPO – Vice Presidents – Other (N=12) One VP did not perceive his/her President as having a secondary leadership style

Note. f = frequency

Table 12

A Comparison of Leadership Style Adaptability of Technical College Presidents in Georgia by the Presidents and the Vice Presidents of the Technical Colleges in Georgia

	VPI		VPSS		VPA		VPED		VPSO		VPO		Total VPs		Presidents	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Low (0 – 23)	12	52.2%	6	31.6%	16	72.7%	12	50.0%	8	88.9%	4	30.8%	58	52.7%	8	28.6%
Moderate (24 - 29)	11	47.8%	11	57.9%	5	22.7%	11	45.0%	1	11.1%	7	53.8%	46	41.8%	16	57.1%
High (30 – 36)	0		2	10.5%	1	4.5%	1	5.0%			2	15.4%	6	5.5%	4	14.3%

Presidents (N=28) Total Vice Presidents (N=110)
VPI – Vice Presidents of Instruction/Academic Affairs (N=23)
VPSS - Vice Presidents of Student Services (N=19)
VPA - Vice Presidents of Administrative Services (N=22)
VPED – Vice Presidents of Economic Development (N=24)
VPSO – Vice Presidents of Satellite Operations (N=9)
VPO – Vice Presidents – Other (N=13)

Note. f = frequency

Table 13 indicates a summary of correlations of the presidents' and vice presidents' appraisal of leadership styles and leadership adaptability. A series of correlation analyses were calculated using the data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD - Other for the twenty-eight presidents and the eighty-eight vice presidents from their colleges. There was a strong positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the selling (S2) leadership style with the vice presidents of instruction's perception of the presidents' selling leadership style. The magnitude of other correlation coefficients suggested moderate relationships (Hopkins, 2002). There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the telling (S1) leadership style and leadership adaptability with the vice presidents of instruction's perception of the presidents' telling leadership style and leadership adaptability. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the participating (S3) leadership style with the vice presidents of administrative services' and the vice presidents of economic development's perception of the presidents' participating leadership style. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the delegating (S4) leadership style with the vice presidents of satellite operation's perception of the presidents' delegating leadership style but there was a moderate negative relationship in their perception of leadership adaptability. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the telling (S1) leadership style and leadership adaptability with the vice presidents –other's perception of the presidents' telling leadership style and leadership adaptability but there was a moderate negative relationship in their perception of the participating (S3) leadership style.

Table 13

Summary Table of Correlations of Presidents' and Vice Presidents' Appraisal of Leadership Styles and Leadership Style Adaptability

	Presidents (N=28)				
Vice Presidents	Telling	Selling	Participating	Delegating	Adaptability
Vice Presidents of Instruction (N=19)	.359	.522	.045	.178	.414
Vice Presidents of Student Services (N=15)	.080	.216	.106	.306	.182
Vice Presidents of Adm. Services (N=18)	-.055	-.214	.364	-.004	.102
Vice Presidents of Economic Develop. (N=19)	-.162	-.023	.326	.121	.142
Vice Presidents of Satellite Operations (N=7)	.147	.179	-.067	.431	-.397
Vice Presidents Other (N=10)	.388	.203	-.438	.000	.468

Research Question Four

To what degree are differences in a technical college president's perception of his/her leadership style related to the following variables: gender, age, education, number of years at their current institution, previous position, number of years as president, size of technical college and location of technical college?

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on gender. Table 14 lists the mean scores of the male and female respondents by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there were two leadership styles whose means displayed a meaningful difference. There was a meaningful difference between the means of male and female respondents to the leadership style, selling (S2), which indicated that women were more likely than men to use selling (S2) as a leadership style. There was also a meaningful difference between the means of male and female respondents to the leadership style, delegating (S4), which indicated that women were less likely than men to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style (See Table 14).

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on age. Table 15 lists the mean scores of the respondents under the age of fifty-five and those respondents who are fifty-five and older by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there were no meaningful differences in the means of the leadership styles or leadership style adaptability which indicated that age did not have an impact on the presidents' leadership style or style adaptability (See Table 15).

Table 14

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Gender

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Male	19	1.63	1.116	-.457	26
	Female	9	1.44	.726		
Selling (S2)	Male	19	4.63	1.739	2.330	26
	Female	9	6.22	1.563		
Participating (S3)	Male	19	4.68	1.827	-1.142	26
	Female	9	3.89	1.453		
Delegating (S4)	Male	19	1.00	.816	-1.856	26
	Female	9	.44	.527		
Adaptability	Male	19	25.47	3.204	.743	26
	Female	9	26.44	3.283		

Note. A census of the presidents of technical colleges was used to determine the calculations in Tables 14 – 21. Because of the small size of this population, tests of significance will not be reported.

Table 15

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Age

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Age	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Less than 55	15	1.47	.834	.979	25
	55 and Older	12	1.83	1.115		
Selling (S2)	Less than 55	15	5.40	1.920	-.461	25
	55 and Older	12	5.08	1.564		
Participating (S3)	Less than 55	15	4.33	1.397	-.13	25
	55 and Older	12	4.25	1.913		
Delegating (S4)	Less than 55	15	.73	.704	.338	25
	55 and Older	12	.83	.835		
Adaptability	Less than 55	15	26.80	3.005	-1.532	25
	55 and Older	12	25.08	2.746		

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on education. Since all of the presidents had graduate degrees, they were divided into two groups, those with a doctorial degree and those with specialists or masters degrees. Table 16 lists the mean scores of the respondents of these two group, those with doctorates and those with specialists or masters degrees, by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there was one leadership style whose means displayed a meaningful difference. There was a meaningful difference between the means of respondents with doctorial degrees and those with specialists or masters degrees to the leadership style, delegating (S4), which indicated that presidents with doctorial degrees were more likely than presidents with specialists or masters degrees to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style (See Table 16).

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on the number of years at the current institution. The responding presidents were divided into two groups, those who had been at their current institution less than ten years and those who had been at their current institutions for ten years or longer. Table 17 lists the mean scores of the respondents of these two groups, those with less than ten years and those with ten years or more at their current institution, by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there was one leadership style whose means displayed a meaningful difference. There was a meaningful difference between the means of respondents who had been at their current institutions less than ten years and those who had been at their current institutions for ten years or more to the leadership style, telling (S1), which indicated that presidents who had been at their current institutions less than ten years were more likely than presidents who had been at

Table 16

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Education

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Education	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Doctorate	20	1.60	.995	.235	26
	Specialist or Master	8	1.50	1.069		
Selling (S2)	Doctorate	20	5.10	1.804	-.193	26
	Specialist or Master	8	5.25	1.982		
Participating (S3)	Doctorate	20	4.35	1.725	-.374	26
	Specialist or Master	8	4.63	1.847		
Delegating (S4)	Doctorate	20	.90	.788	.847	26
	Specialist or Master	8	.63	.744		
Adaptability	Doctorate	20	26.10	2.882	.816	26
	Specialist or Master	8	25.00	4.00		

Table 17

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Number of Years at Current Institution

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Years	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Less than 10 years	16	1.81	.834	-1.195	25
	10 Years or Longer	11	1.36	1.120		
Selling (S2)	Less than 10 years	16	5.25	1.844	.033	25
	10 Years or Longer	11	5.27	1.679		
Participating (S3)	Less than 10 years	16	4.13	1.025	.658	25
	10 Years or Longer	11	4.55	2.252		
Delegating (S4)	Less than 10 years	16	.75	.577	.228	25
	10 Years or Longer	11	.82	.982		
Adaptability	Less than 10 years	16	26.31	2.726	-.574	25
	10 Years or Longer	11	25.64	3.384		

their current institutions for ten years or more to use telling (S1) as a leadership style (See Table 17).

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on the previous position held by the presidents. The responding presidents were divided into two groups, those who had been vice presidents of instruction prior to being president and those who had held other positions. Table 18 lists the mean scores of these two groups of respondents by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there were two leadership styles whose means displayed a meaningful difference. There was a meaningful difference between the means of respondents who had been vice presidents of instruction prior to being president and those who had held other positions to the leadership style, selling (S2), which indicated that presidents who had held been vice presidents of instruction prior to being president were more likely than presidents who held other positions prior to being president to use selling (S2) as a leadership style. There was also a meaningful difference between the means of these two groups of respondents to the leadership style, participating (S3), which indicated that presidents who had been vice presidents of instruction prior to being presidents were less likely than presidents who had held other positions prior to being president to use participating (S3) as a leadership style (See Table 18).

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on the number of years as president at the current institution. The responding presidents were divided into two groups, those who had been president at their current institution less than five years and those who had been president at their current institutions for five years or longer.

Table 18

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Previous Position Prior to Being President

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Position	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Vice President of Instruction	13	1.54	.967		
					.465	25
	Other	14	1.71	.994		
Selling (S2)	Vice President of Instruction	13	6.00	1.414		
					-2.293	25
	Other	14	4.57	1.785		
Participating (S3)	Vice President of Instruction	13	3.62	1.044		
					2.278	25
	Other	14	4.93	1.817		
Delegating (S4)	Vice President of Instruction	13	.77	.832		
					.056	25
	Other	14	.79	.699		
Adaptability	Vice President of Instruction	13	27.31	2.926		
					-2.317	25
	Other	14	24.86	2.568		

Table 19 lists the mean scores of the respondents of these two groups, those with less than five years and those with five years or more as president at their current institution, by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there was one leadership style whose means displayed a meaningful difference. There was a meaningful difference between the means of respondents who had been presidents for less than five years and those who had been presidents for five or more years to the leadership style, delegating (S4), which indicated that respondents who had been presidents for five years or more were more likely than respondents who had been presidents for less than five years to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style (See Table 19).

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on the size of the technical college. The technical colleges were divided into two groups based on student enrollment, colleges with less than 2500 students were classified as small colleges, and colleges with 2500 or more students were classified as large colleges. Table 20 lists the mean scores of the small colleges and large colleges by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there was one leadership style whose means displayed a meaningful difference. There was a meaningful difference between the means of respondents from small colleges and those from large colleges to the leadership style, delegating (S4), which indicated that presidents from large colleges were more likely than presidents from small colleges to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style (See Table 20).

A comparison of means was used to determine if there were differences in the leadership styles of telling, selling, participating, and delegating and leadership style adaptability based on the location of the technical college. The technical colleges were divided into two groups based

Table 19

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Number of Years as President at Current Institution

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Years	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Less than 5 years	13	1.62	.870	.416	24
	5 years or longer	13	1.77	1.013		
Selling (S2)	Less than 5 years	13	5.62	1.758	-1.251	24
	5 years or longer	13	4.77	1.691		
Participating (S3)	Less than 5 years	13	4.00	.816	.833	24
	5 years or longer	13	4.54	2.184		
Delegating (S4)	Less than 5 years	13	.69	.630	.779	24
	5 years or longer	13	.92	.862		
Adaptability	Less than 5 years	13	26.69	3.146	-1.344	24
	5 years or longer	13	25.15	2.672		

Table 20

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Size of Technical College

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Enrollment	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Small Colleges	13	1.77	.927	-.953	24
	Large Colleges	13	1.38	1.121		
Selling (S2)	Small Colleges	13	5.23	1.536	-.102	24
	Large Colleges	13	5.15	2.230		
Participating (S3)	Small Colleges	13	4.46	1.127	-.107	24
	Large Colleges	13	4.38	2.329		
Delegating (S4)	Small Colleges	13	.54	.660	1.788	24
	Large Colleges	13	1.08	.862		
Adaptability	Small Colleges	13	26.69	2.359	-1.701	24
	Large Colleges	13	24.69	3.521		

on location, rural and non-rural. Colleges that were considered to be either suburban or urban were combined into the non-rural grouping. Table 21 lists the mean scores of the rural and non-rural colleges by leadership style and style adaptability. Examination of the data revealed that there was one leadership style whose means displayed a meaningful difference. There was a meaningful difference between the means of respondents from rural locations and those from non-rural locations to the leadership style, delegating (S4), which indicated that presidents from colleges with non-rural locations were more likely than presidents from colleges with rural locations to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style (See Table 21).

Summary

This chapter presented the findings and an analysis of the research data gathered from the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. Statistical tests were applied to the data provided by the respondents to the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) - Self and LEAD – Other. Selling (S2) was the primary leadership style must frequently identified by the presidents. The presidents also identified participating (S3) or a pairing of telling (S1) and participating (S3) as their most frequent secondary leadership styles. The majority of the presidents rated their leadership style adaptability in the moderate range, which is usually an indication of a pronounced primary leadership style with less flexibility into a secondary style. The vice presidents chose selling (S2) as the most frequently chosen presidential primary leadership but 24.6 percent of the vice presidents identified telling (S1) and delegating (S4) as their president's primary leadership style. The vice presidents chose selling (S1) most frequently as the single secondary leadership style but over fifty percent of the vice presidents identified multiple secondary leadership styles for their presidents. In addition, the vice presidents chose

Table 21

Presidents' Leadership Style and Adaptability Differences by Location of Technical College

Leadership Style And Adaptability	Location	N	Mean	SD	t	df
Telling (S1)	Rural	13	1.77	.725	-.976	26
	Non-rural	15	1.40	1.183		
Selling (S2)	Rural	13	5.31	1.109	-.439	26
	Non-rural	15	5.00	2.299		
Participating (S3)	Rural	13	4.15	1.463	.776	26
	Non-rural	15	4.67	1.952		
Delegating (S4)	Rural	13	.69	.855	.818	26
	Non-rural	15	.93	.704		
Adaptability	Rural	13	26.54	2.787	-1.166	26
	Non-rural	15	25.13	3.482		

the combination of telling (S1) and participating (S3) as the most frequent multiple secondary leadership style. The majority of the vice presidents rated their presidents' leadership style adaptability in the low range which indicates a need to improve the ability to diagnose readiness and to use appropriate leadership behaviors. Correlation analysis identified a strong positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception related selling (S2) leadership style with the vice presidents' of instruction perception of the presidents' selling (S2) leadership style. The magnitude of other correlation coefficients suggested moderate relationships (Hopkins, 2002). There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the telling (S1) leadership style and leadership adaptability with the vice presidents of instruction's perception of the presidents' telling leadership style and leadership adaptability. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the participating (S3) leadership style with the vice presidents of administrative services' and the vice presidents of economic development's perception of the presidents' participating leadership style. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the delegating (S4) leadership style with the vice presidents of satellite operation's perception of the presidents' delegating leadership style but there was a moderate negative relationship in their perception of leadership adaptability. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the telling (S1) leadership style and leadership adaptability with the vice presidents – other's perception of the presidents' telling leadership style and leadership adaptability but there was a moderate negative relationship in their perception of the participating (S3) leadership style. Personal and institutional demographic variables were associated with a technical college president's perception of his/her leadership style in all categories, except age.

The data from the responding presidents revealed the following in regards to personal and institutional demographic variables. Female presidents were more likely to use selling (S2) and less likely to use delegating (S4) as leadership styles than male presidents. Presidents with doctorial degrees were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents with other graduate degrees. Presidents who had been at their current institutions less than ten years were more likely to use telling (S1) as a leadership style than presidents who had been at their current institutions for ten years or more. Presidents who had been vice presidents of instruction prior to being presidents were more likely to use selling (S2) and less likely to use participating (S3) as leadership styles than presidents who had held other positions prior to being president. Presidents who had held the position for five years or more were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents who had held the position for less than five years. Presidents from large colleges were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents from small colleges. Presidents from colleges with non-rural locations were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents from colleges with rural locations.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMEDATIONS

The purpose of this study was three-fold: (1) to identify the perceived leadership styles of presidents of technical colleges in Georgia, (2) to determine whether the presidents and vice presidents at these technical colleges perceive this leadership style differently, and (3) to discover whether personal and technical college demographic variables are associated with the leadership styles of the presidents. The population for this study consisted of the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges operating under the governance of the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. The final study population consisted of 179 individuals, 34 presidents and 145 vice presidents. Responses were received from 29 presidents and 111 vice presidents, representing 79 percent of the final study population. Self-reporting survey methodology was used to gather quantifiable information from this population. The Hersey and Blanchard – Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) - Self and - Other instruments and a self-developed questionnaire were used to identify presidential leadership styles and to obtain demographic information.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The sections include Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

Summary of Findings

Four research questions guided this study. The following summaries were based on an analysis of the data from the responses to the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) – Self and – Other and presidents' questionnaire.

Research Question One

What are the leadership styles of technical college presidents as indicated by the presidents?

The presidents' responses to the LEAD – Self were analyzed to determine their leadership profile which includes primary leadership style, secondary leadership style, and leadership style adaptability.

Data from the LEAD-Self revealed that 17 of the responding technical college presidents (60.7 percent) identified their primary leadership style as selling (S2). Eight of the presidents (28.6 percent) identified participating (S3) as their primary leadership style while the remaining two presidents (10.7 percent) identified a multiple primary leadership style that consisted of selling (S2) and participating (S3). None of the presidents identified telling (S1) or delegating (S4) as their primary leadership style. Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (1996) state that selling (S2) and participating (S3) are the most frequently identified leadership styles in countries "that have a high level of education and extensive industrial experience" (p. 319). These two leadership styles, selling (S2) and participating (S3), were identified as the dominant primary leadership styles of African-American community college presidents (Ates, 2003), community college presidents (Wenn, 1999), and university presidents in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (Truschel, 1997).

Data from the LEAD – Self revealed that twelve of the responding presidents (44 percent) had one secondary style while fifteen of the presidents (55 percent) had multiple secondary leadership style. The data from one of the presidents revealed no secondary leadership style. Participating (S3) was used as a secondary leadership style by seven presidents (25.9 percent). The data from eight presidents (29.7 percent) revealed the usage of two secondary leadership styles, telling (S1) and participating (S3). These findings were consistent

with the secondary leadership styles of African-American presidents of community colleges (Ates, 2003).

The leadership adaptability scores of the responding presidents ranged from 19 to 31 with an average score of 25.79. The data revealed that the majority, sixteen or 57.1 percent, of the responding presidents fell in the category of moderate adaptability of leadership style. Eight of the presidents (28.6 percent) fell in the low category of needs improvement with four presidents (14.3 percent) in the high adaptability category. A lower percentage of community college presidents were identified in the low category (Wenn, 1999; Ates, 2003) while a higher percentage of university presidents (Truschel, 1997) were identified in the same category.

Research Question Two

What are the leadership styles of technical college presidents as indicated by the vice-presidents?

The vice presidents' responses to the LEAD – Other were analyzed to determine their perceptions of the presidents' leadership profile which includes primary leadership style, secondary leadership style, and leadership style adaptability.

Data from the LEAD – Other revealed that the vice presidents perceived their presidents as predominantly using selling (S2), (44.5 percent) as their primary leadership style followed by participating (S3), (19.1 percent). Almost one quarter of the vice presidents (24.6 percent) identified telling (S1), (17.3 percent) and delegating (S4), (7.3 percent) as the presidents' primary leadership style. Thirteen percent of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as having multiple styles of primary leadership with all of the multiple leadership styles including selling (S2). Truschel's (1997) study reveals similar findings.

A review of the data from the LEAD – Other revealed that forty-five of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as using one secondary leadership style, fifty-five of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as using multiple secondary leadership styles, and ten of the vice presidents perceived their presidents as not having a secondary leadership style. Selling (S2), (15 percent) and participating (S3), (14 percent) were identified as the most frequently identified individual secondary leadership styles. Twenty-one percent of the vice presidents identified their presidents as utilizing telling (S1) and participating (S3) as secondary leadership styles. The leadership styles of telling (S1) and/or selling (S2), both characterized by an above average amount of task behavior, are identified as secondary leadership styles in ninety-four percent of the multiple secondary leadership style situations.

The data revealed that the majority of the vice presidents (52.7 percent) perceived their presidents' leadership style adaptability to be in the low category of needs improvement. Forty-six of the vice presidents (41.8 percent) identified their presidents' leadership style adaptability in the moderate range while only 6 vice presidents (5.5 percent) identified their presidents in the high category. These findings are consistent with Truschel's (1997) finding in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education

Research Question Three

How do the responses of the two groups of respondents compare?

A comparison of the data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other revealed that both the presidents and vice presidents identified selling (S2) as the most frequently used primary leadership style of the presidents with participating (S3) next although these styles were selected by a lower percentage of the vice presidents. While no president identified telling (S1) or delegating (S4) as their primary leadership style, these two "low relation" leadership styles were

selected as the presidents' primary leadership style by 24.6 percent of the vice presidents with 17.3 percent of the vice presidents choosing telling (S1) and 7.3 percent choosing delegating (S4). Multiple primary leadership styles were chosen by the same percentage of presidents and vice presidents but several of the vice presidents included telling (S1) and delegating (4), "low relation" leadership styles, in their combinations.

A review of the data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other pertaining to secondary presidential leadership style revealed that approximately the same percentages of presidents and vice presidents (45 percent) felt that the presidents used one secondary leadership style while the remaining presidents and vice presidents (55 percent) felt that the presidents used multiple secondary leadership styles. There was one president and ten vice presidents who did not identify a secondary presidential leadership style. In the cases where one secondary leadership style was identified, 25.9 percent of the presidents identified the style as participating (S3) followed by selling (S2) and telling (S1). The data from the vice presidents' responses revealed a slightly different order with selling (S2), (15.0 percent) identified most frequently with participating (S3), telling (S1), and delegating (S4) following. None of the presidents identified delegating (S4) as their only secondary leadership style. When multiple styles were identified, both presidents and vice presidents identified a combination of selling (S1) and participating (S3) most frequently.

The data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD – Other involving the presidents' and vice presidents' evaluation of the presidents' leadership style adaptability revealed different perspectives. Over fifty percent (52.7 percent) of the vice presidents perceived their presidents to be in the low range while only 28.6 percent of the presidents perceived themselves in this

range. Two categories of vice presidents, administrative services (72.7 percent) and satellite operations (88.9 percent), overwhelmingly identified their presidents in the range.

A series of correlation analyses were calculated using the data from the LEAD – Self and LEAD - Other for the twenty-eight presidents and the eighty-eight vice presidents from their colleges. There was a strong positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the selling (S2) leadership style with the vice presidents of instruction's perception of the presidents' selling (S2) leadership style. There were several moderate relationships. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the telling (S1) leadership style and leadership adaptability with the vice presidents of instruction's perception of the presidents' telling leadership style and leadership adaptability. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the participating (S3) leadership style with the vice presidents of administrative services' and the vice presidents of economic development's perception of the presidents' participating leadership style. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the delegating (S4) leadership style with the satellite operations vice presidents' perception of the presidents' delegating leadership style but there was a moderate negative relationship in their perception of leadership adaptability. There was a moderate positive relationship between the presidents' self-perception of the telling (S1) leadership style and leadership adaptability with the vice presidents –other's perception of the presidents' telling leadership style and leadership adaptability but there was a moderate negative relationship in their perception of the participating (S3) leadership style.

Research Question Four

To what degree are differences in a technical college president's perception of his/her leadership style related to the following variables: gender, age, education, number of years at

their current institution, previous position, number of years as president, size of technical college and location of technical college?

An analysis of the data provided by the presidents' responses to the LEAD – Self and presidents' questionnaire revealed that there was an association between the technical college president's perception of his/her leadership style and all of the variables, except age. Female presidents were more likely to use selling (S2) and less likely to use delegating (S4) as leadership styles than male presidents. Presidents with doctorial degrees were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents with other graduate degrees. Presidents who had been at their current institution less than ten years were more likely to use telling (S1) as a leadership style than presidents who had been at their current institution for ten years or more. Presidents who had been vice presidents of instruction prior to being presidents were more likely to use selling (S2) and less likely to use participating (S3) as leadership styles than presidents who had held other positions prior to being president. Presidents who had held the position for five years or more were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents who had held the position for less than five years. Presidents from large colleges were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents from small colleges. Presidents from colleges with non-rural locations were more likely to use delegating (S4) as a leadership style than presidents from colleges with rural locations.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been drawn based upon the findings of this study:

1. Technical college presidents and vice presidents in Georgia had an interest in educational leadership at the colleges governed by the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education as evidenced by the high response rate to this study.

Eighty-two percent of the presidents and seventy-five percent of the vice presidents returned usable responses.

There have been three previous research studies that involved the presidents of the technical colleges in Georgia (Cannon, 2003; Shafer, 2001, McElvey, 1993) and one that involved the vice presidents (Cannon, 2003). The presidents' responses to these studies varied from one hundred percent (Shafer, 2001) to ninety-one percent (Canon, 2003). The impending retirement of three of the technical college presidents might have impacted the return rate of the presidents (82 percent) of this study. The seventy-five percent response rate of the vice presidents in this study compared favorably with the seventy-one percent response rate in Cannon's (2003) study.

2. The self-perceived primary leadership styles of technical college presidents are selling (S2) and participating (S3), which confirmed the expectations of this research.

Seventeen of the responding technical college presidents (60.7 percent) identified their primary leadership style as selling (S2) while eight of the technical college presidents (28.6 percent) identified participating (S3) as their primary leadership style. The remaining two presidents identified a multiple primary leadership style that consisted of selling (S2) and participating (S3). These findings are consistent with the dominant primary leadership styles of African-American community college presidents who identified selling (S2) 54 percent of the time and participating (S3) 36 percent of the time (Ates, 2003), community college presidents who identified selling (S2) 50.3 percent of the time and participating (S3) 35.6 percent of the time (Wenn, 1999), and university presidents in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education who identified selling (S2) 48.3 percent of the time and participating (S3) 36.7 percent of the time (Truschel, 1997).

3. The leadership ability of the technical college presidents could be further developed through utilization of more varied leadership styles.

The data from the LEAD – Self revealed that the presidents perceive their primary leadership style as being selling (S2), participating (S3), or a combination of these two styles. None of the presidents perceived telling (S1) or delegating (S4) as a primary leadership style and a low percentage of presidents viewed either style as a secondary leadership style. According to Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (1996), "People who are perceived as using predominantly S2 and S3 tend to do well working with people of average levels of readiness. However, they find it difficult to delegate with competent people to maximize their development" (p. 319).

4. Personal and institutional demographic variables had an impact on the leadership styles of the presidents.

An analysis of the data provided by the presidents' responses to the LEAD – Self and presidents' questionnaire revealed that the following personal and institutional demographic variables were associated with the presidents' perception of his/her leadership style: gender, education, number of years at their current institution, previous position, number of years as president, size of technical college and location of technical college.

5. The position of vice president of instruction appeared to be a springboard to the presidency of a technical college in Georgia.

Forty-eight percent of the responding presidents reported that they had been a vice president of instruction prior to being president. This trend appears likely to continue since this is the only vice presidential category that compares with the presidents in percentage of doctorial degrees, which is rapidly becoming a requirement for the presidents of the technical colleges. What

changes can be anticipated if this trend continues? Since the majority of vice presidents of instruction are female, we should expect to see the percentage of female presidents to increase.

Recommendations

Findings and conclusions from this study lead the researcher to recommend the following:

Recommendations for future study

1. The study population could be expanded to include faculty perceptions of presidential leadership style.
2. The study population could be altered to identify the leadership styles of the vice presidents of instruction of the technical colleges in Georgia with the vice presidents of instruction completing the LEAD – Self and directors of instruction and faculty completing the LEAD – Other.
3. This study could be replicated in the two-year colleges who are part of the University System of Georgia.
4. This study could be replicated in the technical college systems in other states.

Recommendations for practice

1. The LEAD – Self could be utilized as an evaluation tool during the interview process for presidential positions at the technical colleges in Georgia. This study could be used as a benchmark for comparing responses with the current leadership styles of the presidents in this study.
2. Leadership seminars involving the presidents and vice presidents of the technical colleges in Georgia could be established with a focus on awareness of leadership

styles. Discrepancies in perceptions could be examined along with strategy development to enhance leader effectiveness.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2001). *America's community colleges: A century of innovation.* Washington, D. C.: The Community College Press.

Amey, M. J., VanDerLinden, K. E., & Brown, D. F. (2002). Perspectives on community college leadership: Twenty years in the making. C*ommunity College Journal of Research and Practice,* 26(7-8), 573-589.

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization.* New York: Harper & Row.

Ates, C. E. (2003). *The perceptions of African American community college presidents concerning their leadership styles and use of power.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Balderston, F. E. (1995). *Managing today's university.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stodgill's handbook of leadership.* New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd Ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of Administrative Leadership: The "L" word in higher education.* Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Berne, E. (1964). *Games people play*. New York: Groove Press.

Bess, J. L. & Goldman, P. (2001). Leadership ambiguity in universities and K – 12 schools and the limits of contemporary leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly,* 12(4), 419 – 451.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston, Tx: Gulf Publishing.

Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S. & Williams, M. (1981). *The academic administrator grid*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Blank, W., Weitzel, J. R., & Green, S. G. (1990). A test of the situational leadership theory. *Personnel Psychology,* Autumn 1990. 43(3), 579 – 597.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. (1993). Situational leadership after 25 years: A retrospective. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* 1(1), 22-36.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager: Increasing effectiveness through situational leadership.* New York: William Morrow.

Breeden, K. (2001). *Foundations and defining principles of Georgia's technical college system.* Retrieved October 3, 2005 from http://www.dtae.org/public/foundation/foundation.html.

Breeden, K. (2000). Technical institutes go to college. *Results,* 3(1), 24-25.

Breeden, K. H. (1977). *Roles of directors of Georgia's postsecondary vocational technical schools under local school districts and independent area boards.* Doctoral Dissertation. Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Campbell, D. F., & Kachik, C. (2002). Leadership profile research and consortium. In D. F. Campbell (Ed.), *The leadership gap.* Washington, D. C.: Community College Press.

Cannon, D. G. (2003). *Desired leadership attributes of Georgia technical college presidents.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Center for Leadership Studies, Inc. (2005). *LEAD Directions: Directions for Self-Scoring and Analysis.* Escondido, CA.: Center for Leadership Studies, Inc.

Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American Community College* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Desjardins, C., & Huff, S. (2001). *The leading edge: Competencies for community college leadership in the new millennium.* Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.

DuBrin, A. J. (1998). *Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Evans, M. G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 5, 277-298.

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 149 – 190) New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw – Hill.

Fiedler, F. E. & Chemers, M. M. (1974). *Leadership and effective management*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Fisher, J. L., Tack, M. W., Wheeler, k. J. (1988). *The effective college president.* New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Fleisman, E. A. (1973). Twenty years of consideration and structure. In E. A. Fleishman & J. G. Hunt (Eds.), *Current development in the study of leadership,* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

French, J. R. P., & and Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (2006). *Mission, Vision, Values, and Strategic Goals*. Retrieved August 27, 2006 from http://www.dtae.org/mission.html.

Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (2005). *Knowledge management system* (Enrollment reports). Retrieved January 16, 2005 from http://kms.dtae.org.

Georgopolos, B. S., Mahoney, G. M., & Jones, N. W., Jr. (1957). A path-goal approach to productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 41, 345-353.

Goodson, J. R., McGee, G. W., & Cashman, J. F. (1989). Situational leadership theory: A test of leadership prescription. *Group and Organization Studies,* December 1989. 14(4), 446 – 448.

Gordon, T. (1970). *Parent effectiveness training.* New York: P. H. Wyden.

Graeff, C. L. (1997). Evolution of situational leadership theory: A critical review. *Leadership Quarterly,* Summer 1997, 8(2), 153-171.

Greiner, L. E. (1972). Evolution and revolution as organizations grow. *Harvard Business Review,* (July-August, 1972), 37-46.

Green, J. F. (1980). *Executive Summary for the lead-self manual.* Escondido, CA.: Center for Leadership Studies, Inc.

Hambleton, R. K., Blanchard, K.H., & Hersey, P. (1977). *Maturity scale: Self-rating form.* San Diego, CA: Learning Resources Corporation.

Hambleton, R. K., & Gumpert, R. (1982). The validity of Hersey and Blanchard's theory of leader effectiveness. *Group and Organization Studies,* 7(2), 225 – 242.

Harris, T. (1969). *I'm OK – You're OK: A practical guide to transactional analysis.* New York: Harper & Row.

Hemphill, J. K. & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R. M. Stofdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement,* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, College of Administrative Science.

Hersberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man.* New York: World Publishing.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal,* 23, 26-34.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard,K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Hersey, P., & Blanchard,K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H. & Johnson, D. E. (1996). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (7th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Hood, J. A., Miller, M. T., & Pope, M. L. (1999). *Challenges, roles, and the future of 2-year college presidents.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED437073)

Hopkins, W. G. (2002). A scale of magnitudes for effect statistics. In *A new view of statistics.* Retrieved January 6, 2007 from http://www.sportsci.org/resources/stats/effectmag.html.

Hoppock, D. C. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper & Row.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 16, 321-328.

House, R. J., & Dressler, G. (1974). The path-goal theory of leadership: Some post hoc and a priori tests. In J. Hunt & L. Larson (eds.), *Contingency approaches in leadership* (pp. 29-55). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Mitchell,R. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business,* 3, 81-97.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2005). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kauffman, J. F. (1980). *At the pleasure of the board.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *The Executive*, 5, 48-60.

Lenington, R. L. (1996). *Managing higher education as a business*. Phoenix: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

Leslie, J. B. & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). *Feedback to managers: A review and comparison of multi-rater instruments for management development* (3rd Ed.). Greensboro, NC: Center for

Creative Leadership.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method, and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1, 5-41.

Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. (1980). Generalization of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal,* 23, 451 – 465.

Likert, R. (1961). *New Patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lord, R. G., DeVader, C. L., & Alliger, E. A. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationship between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 71, 402-410.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper & Row.

McElvey, R. H. (1993). *Presidents' perceptions of their individual leadership attributes and their faculties' perceptions of the presidents' leadership attributes in technical institutes in Georgia.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society.* Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Michael, S. O., Schwartz, M., & Balraj, L. (2001). Indicators of presidential effectiveness: A study of trustees of higher education institutions. *The International Journal of Educational Management,* 15, 332-346.

Monroe, C. R. (1972). *Profile of the community college: A handbook.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Norris, W. R., & Vecchio, R. L. (1992). Situational leadership theory: A replication. *Group and Organization Management,* September 1992. 17(3), 331 - 342.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership theory and practice* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pascarella, S. V., & Lunenburg, F. C. (1988). A field test of Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership theory in a school setting. *College Student Journal*, 22 (1), 33-37.

Pierce, D. R., & Pedersen, R. P. (1997). The community college presidency: Qualities for success. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 25(2), 13-20.

Porter, L. W., Steeers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. R. (1974). Organizational

commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 59, 603 – 609.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 15, 150 – 163.

Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior* (9th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Robbins, S. & Coulter, M. (2001. *Management* (7th Ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.

Schein, E. H. (1970). *Organizational psychology* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shafer, R. D. (2001). *Presidents as transformational leaders in the Georgia Department of technical and adult education technical colleges.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA.

Shaw, K. A. (1999). *The successful president.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

Short, P., & Greer, J. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts.* Upper Saddle River: Merrill.

Sisk, H. L. & Williams, J. C. (1981). *Management and organization*. Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern Publishing Co.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior.* New York: MacMillan.

Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement.* Chicago: Rand-McNalley.

State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education (1984). *Board Minutes* [Including a report by Dr. John Lloyd]. Atlanta: Author.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature.* New York: Free Press

Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire – Form XII.* Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Stogdill, R., & Coons, A. (1957). *Leader behavior; Its description and measurement* (Research Monograph No. 88). Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology* 25, 35-71.

Truschel, J. (1997). *A comparative study of perceived leadership styles of the Pennsylvania state*

system of higher education university presidents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Twombly, S. B. (1995). Gendered images of community college leadership: What messages they send. In B. K. Townsend (Ed.), *Gender and power in the community college* (Vol. 89, pp. 67-77). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Van Velsor, E., Leslie, J. B., & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). *Choosing 360: A guide to evaluating multi-rater feedback instruments for management development.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Vaughn, G. B. & Weisman, I. (1998). *The community college presidency at the millennium.* Washington, D. C.: Community College Press.

Vaughn, G. B. (1989). *Leadership in transition: The Community college presidency.* New York: Macmillan

Vecchio, R. L. (1987). Situational leadership theory: An evaluation of a prescriptive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* August 1987. 72(3), 444 – 451.

Vroom, V. H. (1976). Leadership. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.) *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. (pp. 1527-1551). Chicago: Rand McNalley.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1978). On the validity of the Vroom-Yetton model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 151-162.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making.* Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.

Wagner, F. R., & Morse, J. J. (1975). A measure of individual sense of competence. *Psychological reports,* 36, 451 – 459.

Walter, J. E., Caldwell, S. D., & Marshall, J. (1980). Evidence for the validity of situational leadership theory. *Educational Leadership,* May, 1980, 618 – 621.

Wenn, H. D. (1999). *A profile of community college presidents' leadership styles.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS.

White, R. G. (2004). *Trustee competence, executive leadership styles, and institutional performance.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management,* 15(2), 251 – 289.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ.: Pearson Prentice Hall.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY LETTERS

319 East Third Avenue
Rome, GA 30161 – 3225
Month Day, Year

Dr./Mr./Ms. _____
President/Vice President
_____ _____ Technical College
Street Address
City, GA/Zip Code

Dear _____,

In a few days you will receive a request to complete a questionnaire that will be used as part of my dissertation research at the University of Georgia.

My research deals with presidential leadership at the technical colleges in the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. This research will be useful in increasing understanding of the leadership requirements that are needed to address the specialized mission of technical education in Georgia.

I am writing in advance since many people like to know ahead of time that they will be contacted. This is a system-wide study involving the presidents and vice presidents at all of the technical colleges in the system.

Thank you for your time and consideration in assisting with my research.

Sincerely,

Paul Carter

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

319 East Third Avenue
Rome, GA 30161 – 3225
Month Day, Year

Dr./Mr./Ms. _____
President/Vice President
_____ _____ Technical College
Street Address
City, GA/Zip Code

Dear _____,

The leadership provided by the presidents of Georgia's technical colleges is critical to continue the success these schools have experienced over the past decade. Since the name change from "institutes" to "colleges", limited research has been completed on the topic of presidential leadership at these schools. You are in a unique position to help with this research because of your experience with technical colleges. I ask your help as I explore this topic by completing the attached questionnaires.

I am a Higher Education doctoral student at the University of Georgia working on my dissertation under the direction of Dr. Delmer Dunn. The purpose of my research study is to examine presidential leadership at the technical colleges in Georgia by combining the self-perceptions of the presidents with the perceptions of the vice presidents with which they work. You have been selected because your title indicates that are either a president or vice president at one of these schools. The information supplied by this research will provide current and aspiring presidents of technical colleges with up to date knowledge of leadership from both a presidential and vice presidential point of view. A comparison of self ratings with observer ratings will emphasize discrepancies in perception which may initiate increased awareness of leadership behaviors. This is a system-wide study and therefore, a high rate of return is important to make valid inferences from the results.

Your responses to these questionnaires will be confidential. The responses will be aggregated, and will not identify any individual or institution. All questionnaires have been numerically coded for follow-up purposes only and the code list will be destroyed as soon as the data is collected. The questionnaires should take approximately 20 minutes to complete and a self-addressed postage paid return envelope is provided.

Thank you for your time. I know that you are busy, and appreciate your help with this research. If you have any questions, please contact me at 706-295-6952 or carterprcarter@aol.com.

Sincerely,

Paul Carter

Enclosures

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

Month Day, Year

Dear (Title) (Last Name),

Last week you were sent a questionnaire which dealt with presidential leadership at Georgia's technical colleges. Your name was selected because of your leadership position at one of these institutions.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, thank you for taking the time to support this study. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so today or at your earliest convenience. It is important that I hear from as many as possible so that the results of this study will be representative of all of the technical colleges in Georgia.

If you did not receive the questionnaire, or it has been misplaced, please call (706-295-6952) or email (carterprcarter@aol.com) and another copy will be sent.

Sincerely,

Paul Carter

319 East Third Avenue
Rome, GA 30161 – 3225
Month Day, Year

Dr./Mr./Ms. _____
President/Vice President
_____ _____ Technical College
Street Address
City, GA/Zip Code

Dear _____,

About three weeks ago I sent a questionnaire to you that involved presidential leadership at Georgia's technical colleges. If your response has been completed and mailed, please accept my thanks for taking time to respond. If you have not responded, I hope that you will take this opportunity to complete and mail the questionnaire. Your response is important to this study so that the results will be representative of the entire technical college system in Georgia.

As I mentioned in an earlier letter, your response will help provide current knowledge pertaining to leadership to current and aspiring presidents of technical colleges from both a presidential and vice presidential point of view. This comparison of self ratings with observer ratings will emphasize discrepancies in perception which may initiate increased awareness of leadership behaviors.

If your questionnaire has been misplaced, another is enclosed. Your responses to these questionnaires will be confidential. The responses will be aggregated, and will not identify any individual or institution. All questionnaires have been numerically coded for follow-up purposes only and the code list will be destroyed as soon as the data is collected. The questionnaires should take approximately 20 minutes to complete and a self-addressed postage paid return envelope is provided.

Thank you for your time. I know that you are busy, and appreciate your help with this research. If you have any questions, please contact me at 706-295-6952 or carterprcarter@aol.com.

Sincerely,

Paul Carter

Enclosures

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

319 East Third Avenue
Rome, GA 30161 – 3225
Month Day, Year

Dr./Mr./Ms. _____
President/Vice President
_____ _____ Technical College
Street Address
City, GA/Zip Code

Dear _____,

I am writing about my study on presidential leadership at technical colleges in Georgia. To date, I have not received your completed questionnaire.

I am encouraged by the large number of questionnaires that have been received. But I also need your completed questionnaire to make the results of this study representative of all of the technical colleges in Georgia.

If you have already completed and mailed the questionnaire, thank you for taking the time to assist with this study. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so today or at your earliest convenience.

A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed in case the previous copies have been misplaced. If you have any questions, please contact me at 706-295-6952 or carterprcarter@aol.com.

Sincerely,

Paul Carter

Enclosures

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

ID Number _____

TECHNICAL COLLEGE LEADERSHIP STUDY
Presidents' Questionnaire

This two part questionnaire and the LEAD–Self should take less than twenty minutes to complete. Please respond to each of the numbered items on this questionnaire and follow the instructions included with the LEAD–Self.

PART I PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Gender:
   ____ Male
   ____ Female
2. Age: ____
3. Education (highest degree received)
   ____ undergraduate degree
   ____ master's level graduate degree
   ____ specialist level graduate degree
   ____ doctorate level graduate degree
4. Number of years at current institution: _____
5. Identity the position you held before becoming president at your current institution:
   ____ Vice President of Administrative Services/Business Operations
   ____ Vice President of Instruction/Academic Affairs
   ____ Vice President of Economic Development
   ____ Vice President of Student Services
   ____ Vice President of Campus/Center Operations
   ____ Other (Please list:_____)
6. Number of years you have served as president at your current institution: ____

PART II TECHNICAL COLLEGE DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Fall 2005 credit enrollment for your technical college: _____
2. What geographical description best describes the location of your technical college:
   ____ rural
   ____ suburban
   ____ urban

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY

Please return this questionnaire and LEAD-Self in the enclosed self-addressed envelope to:

Paul Carter
319 East Third Avenue
Rome, GA 30161-3225

ID Number _____

TECHNICAL COLLEGE LEADERSHIP STUDY
Vice Presidents' Questionnaire

This two part questionnaire and the LEAD–Other should take less than twenty minutes to complete. Please respond to each of the numbered items on this questionnaire and follow the instructions included with the LEAD–Other.

PART I PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Gender:
   ____ Male
   ____ Female
2. Age: ____
3. Position:
   ____ Vice President of Administrative Services/Business Operations
   ____ Vice President of Instruction/Academic Affairs
   ____ Vice President of Economic Development
   ____ Vice President of Student Services
   ____ Vice President of Campus/Center Operations
   ____ Vice President - Other
4. Number of years in current position: ____
5. Education (highest degree received)
   ____ undergraduate degree
   ____ master's level graduate degree
   ____ specialist level graduate degree
   ____ doctorate level graduate degree
6. Number of years at current institution: ____

PART II TECHNICAL COLLEGE DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Fall 2005 credit enrollment for your technical college: _____
2. What geographical description best describes the location of your technical college:
   ____ rural
   ____ suburban
   ____ urban

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY

Please return this questionnaire and the LEAD-Other in the enclosed self-addressed envelope to:

Paul Carter
319 East Third Avenue
Rome, GA 30161-3225