Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Transformational Leadership Qualities Among Students Within Doctoral Higher Education Leadership Programs

Joshua Lee Howell
Old Dominion University, jhowell@odu.edu

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

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons, Higher Education Commons, and the Psychology Commons

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP QUALITIES AMONG STUDENTS WITHIN

DOCTORAL HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

by

Joshua Lee Howell
B.A. May 2005, Longwood University
M.A. December 2008, Old Dominion University

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

HIGHER EDUCATION

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

MAY 2020

Approved by:

Dennis E. Gregory (Director)

Mitchell R. Williams (Member)

Cherng-Jyh Yen (Member)

ABSTRACT

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP QUALITIES AMONG STUDENTS WITHIN
DOCTORAL HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

Joshua Lee Howell
Old Dominion University, 2020
Director: Dr. Dennis E. Gregory

Transformational Leadership Qualities Among Students Within Doctoral Higher
Education Leadership Programs is a mixed-method study utilizing program evaluation of course
descriptions and transformational leadership fostering activities, interviews with program chairs
surrounding transformational leadership fostering activities, and completion of the Multifactor
Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x™) survey results from doctoral higher education students
and their programs within the Commonwealth of Virginia. Researchers in the field of Higher
Education and Leadership indicated that Transformational Leadership was more apt for college
and university presidency, that doctoral degrees were more preferable for college and university
presidency, and as doctoral higher education programs provide students with curriculum geared
toward college and university leadership training, these programs may be seen as a training
ground for the nation's future college and university presidents.

Transformational Leadership is defined as "an exceptional form of influence that moves
followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them. It is a process that often
incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership" (Northouse, 2016, p. 161). This study aimed
to address not only current Transformational Leadership measurement of doctoral higher
education students through the MLQ-5x™, but also how their corresponding programs are seen
by program chairs in charge of these programs, and how the programs are described through
program websites. This study investigated the only five public doctoral higher education
programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia and surveyed a total of thirty students across these

programs. These individuals self-rated using the MLQ-5x and were peer-rated by colleagues to enhance validity of results. Themes surrounding how these programs are administered were collected, and findings suggest that while students are in fact above average regarding transformational leadership, there is no correlation between student transformational leadership scores and program offerings.

This dissertation is dedicated to all those who have passion for education and wish to leave the world more inspired. On your darkest days please find solace in providing light for so many eager minds.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to recognize and express my deep appreciation for the individuals below for their part in assisting me while completing this dissertation.

- Thank you, to my wife Erica Howell, for helping me survive this journey, and preparing me for the new journey that follows.

- Thank you, Dr. Dennis Gregory, for your guidance, your mentorship, and your compassion. You truly were the best chair I could ever ask for.

- Thank you, Dr. Mitchell Williams, for your unwavering guidance, support, and resolve.

- Thank you, Dr. Cherng-Jyh Yen, for your ability to walk me through statistics from beginning to end, and for cultivating a love of quantitative data analysis.

- Thank you, Dr. Chris Glass, for every moment you built me up, especially when I was sure I would never recover.

- Thank you, Dr. Kim Bullington, for everything, and I mean everything. I cannot even list how many times your selfless actions helped keep me on track.

- Thank you, Dr. Preston Reilly, for being a realist through this journey, and helping me find my center. I will never stop rooting for you.

- Thank you, Dr. Dean Roughton, for the motivation and the mentorship. You truly are an inspirational leader.

- Thank you, Dr. Caleb Marsh, for talking me off every ledge when it came to statistical analysis.

- Thank you, to Lynne Seagle, for providing me the opportunity to witness transformational leadership in action.

- Thank you, to Elena Montello, for providing me the opportunity to emulate your grace and poise.

- Thank you, to Hope House Foundation, for assisting individuals with exceptional strength and courage.

- Thank you, to friends and family, for supporting me through an expedition that I could not fathom was possible.

- Thank you, to President John Broderick, for inspiring my own leadership aspirations, and for being one of the best teachers I have ever had.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Presidents of colleges and universities across America are at the helm of their institutions, oftentimes leading their institutions with clear vision, purpose, and tenacity. However, as the role of American college and university presidents continues to expand, failures of a president, such as implementing new policy, organization of the budget, or introducing new initiatives can set the institution back in myriad ways. When failure occurs, college presidents can find themselves quickly removed from their respected positions, with governing boards scrambling to fill the void left in their absence.

Consequently, reports of college and university presidents not fulfilling the expectations of their constituents and boards have led to the ousting of these leaders. In 2018, Marymount California University president, Lucas Lamadrid was removed from the presidency, with Board of Trustees' member Brian Marcotte succeeding Lamadrid (Lederman, 2018). As Lederman (2018) reported,

> Marcotte said the board had chosen to appoint him as president (despite his lack of higher
> education management experience) out of a view that "maybe the most expeditious thing
> for us to do is to have a member of the board step in and take the reins to move us ahead.
> (para. 22)

Marymount California University is only one of many examples of abrupt presidential resignation occurring. Jimmie Williamson, former president of North Carolina's Community College System, has also been removed from his position (Smith, 2017). Williamson was removed without notice, and claimed "he didn't have any formal or informal reprimands before the board asked for his resignation" (Smith, 2017, para. 2).

In not only these scenarios, but unexpected incidents of college or university president removals and resignations across the United States, presidential leadership styles may be seen as a root cause. But, what is leadership, and how does a college or university make the right leadership choice? Hemphill and Coons (1957) defined leadership as "the behavior of an individual… directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (p. 7). Katz and Kahn (1978) added to this definition by stating that leadership consists of "influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization" (p. 528). In addition, Kouzes and Posner (1995) argued that leadership "is the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for the shared aspirations" (p. 30). Yet, leadership can take various forms, including a trait-based approach, a skill-based approach, a behavioral approach, a situational approach, a path-goal approach, a leader-member exchange approach, an authentic approach, an adaptive approach, a servant-leader approach, a transactional approach, or even a transformational approach. A timeline of when each leadership theory emerged can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Timeline of Leadership Style Theories

Decade	Emerging Theory of Leadership
1930s	Trait-based approach
1940s	Behavior-based approach
1950s	Skill-based approach
1960s	Situational-based approach
1970s	Path-goal approach; Leader-Member-Exchange approach; Transformational/Transactional Approach, Servant approach
1990s	Authentic approach
2000s	Adaptive approach

Note. Adapted from *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (7th ed.), by Peter. G. Northouse

Modern theories of leadership began in the 1930s, with focus placed first on the inherent traits within a given leader. Northouse (2016) stated that within a trait-approach, "People with determination are willing to assert themselves, are proactive, and have the capacity to persevere in the face of obstacles" (p. 25). Focusing solely on trait-based leadership can be difficult; however, as what traits are seen as successful for some may not fit every individual willing to take the mantle. Grant, Gino, and Hoffman (2011) argued that, "it is difficult for highly extraverted leaders to be the center of attention when employees are proactive, and it is equally challenging for proactive employees to advance bottom-up change when highly extraverted leaders impose their ideas" (p. 545). In the 1940s, a new theory of leadership soon emerged – the behavior approach. A behavioral approach to leadership has two main components: that

focusing on task behavior can facilitate goal accomplishment, and that focusing on relationship behavior can make followers feel comfortable (Northouse, 2016).

A new leadership theory emerged in the 1950s, when theorists pointed toward a skillset that leaders could employ. Skills such as human skill, which allow leaders to assist their followers, and conceptual skills, which assist with abstract dilemmas and formulating hypothetical decisions prior, could lead to achievement of shared goals and vision (Northouse, 2016). In the 1960s, situational leadership emerges in an effort to direct behavior toward "communication on goal achievement" (Northouse, 2016, p. 94). By being supportive when needed, but becoming hands-off in the day to day, leaders could empower their followers when needed. In a recent study by Martin, Liao, and Campbell (2013) stated, "Empowering, rather than directive, leaders serve to disambiguate how proactivity will be received. Empowering leaders' emphasis on participation and expression of confidence in staff may reduce the potential costs of being proactive" (p. 1386). For the situational leader, empowerment of staff occurs only when necessary, as providing freedom for the follower to achieve what they already may be sufficiently skilled to accomplish can be seen as supportive (Northouse, 2016).

The 1970s saw a boom of leadership theories emerge, as the path-goal approach, the leader-member exchange (LMX) approach, the servant approach, and the Transformational/Transactional approach were all introduced. For the path-goal approach, leaders set high goals for their followers, which in turn boosts their confidence in reaching these goals (Northouse, 2016). By boosting the confidence of followers, leadership could potentially assist followers who are committed, proactive, and creative in their tasks. However, setting high goals can also be destructive, as Maruping, Venkatesh, Thatcher, and Patel (2015) argued, "when teams feel as though temporal constraints are too severe, they are likely to respond by

abandoning the very processes that are important for achieving objectives" (p. 1328). The leader-member exchange approach, or LMX, focuses on the relationships between leader and follower. As Northouse (2016) suggested, "when these relationships are of high quality, the goals of the leader, the followers, and the organization are all advanced" (p. 145). LMX theory urges leaders to be sensitive to favoritism among followers, to be fair, and to be respectful, as this assists in the development of trusting relationships (Northouse, 2016). The transactional approach also focuses on these exchanges between leaders and followers; however, it does not cater to the needs of followers, nor focuses on their own personal development (Northouse, 2016).

The servant-approach does focus on empowerment, as it provides followers with the confidence to handle the difficult tasks they are expected to complete (Northouse, 2016). If leaders are meant to inspire new leaders, then utilizing an empowering behavior seems practical. Greasley and Bocârnea (2014) claimed, "It fosters teaming arrangements that increase the speed of decision making, enables people to partner freely with others, and promotes personal and group creativity (p. 18). To provide a better organized and motivated team, empowering will assist in decision making, as smaller tasks and decisions will be handled by followers who understand why those decisions are vital.

In the 1990s the theory of authentic leadership emerged, focused on a leader's ability to practice self-awareness, moral aptitude, balancing of multiple items, and transparency (Northouse, 2016). As Northouse (2016) suggested, "authentic leadership is a lifelong developmental process, which is formed and informed by each individual's life story" (p. 200). What may be seen as authentic for one leader will be unique to others who have obtained the same role, or inhabit the same setting. In the 2000s the adaptive approach emerged, and while

one of the newest theories, it shares components with previous theories. The adaptive approach focuses on how leaders help others, but adapt to challenges as they surface (Northouse, 2016). Northouse (2016) suggested, "Some important adaptive leader behaviors are regulating distress, creating a holding environment, providing direction, keeping people focused on important issues, empowering people, and giving voice to those who feel unrecognized or marginalized" (p. 274). Adaptive leadership is utilized by leaders because it assists followers in learning new ways and methods in an effort to promote growth (Northouse, 2016).

While it emerged in the 1970s, the transformational approach is still strong to this day. As Northouse (2016) stated, "Transformational leadership involves an exceptional form of influence that moves followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them. It is a process that often incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership" (p. 161). Transformative leadership requires instilling responsibility and vision within a set of followers, and transformative presidents will rely heavily on their faculty and staff to assist in the tasks ahead. Hoch (2013) found that, "results indicated that vertical transformational and empowering leadership directly and indirectly, and integrity indirectly impacted team innovative behavior, and their associations with innovative behavior were explained by shared leadership (p. 170). By empowering followers, fresh creative and fresh critical methods could potentially arise, which may better the organization. Understanding when suggestions can be vital to the efficiency of the process can better serve the leader, as costly or unproductive will not only drag on the leader, but also the followers affected.

Whether president of a community college, a private college, or a public university, presidents of higher education institutions face trials and tribulations regularly, and must adapt to the ever changing climate of their institution in a way that encompasses and includes the

criticisms from all constituents, and potentially includes risk that they may be removed from office. The college or university president must be ready to lead despite social, political, or economic challenges that await, and his or her leadership can influence all individuals of the campus. A transformational approach may be a strong option, as the transformative elements of this leadership style assist in creating leaders out of followers. This study will focus on transformational leadership qualities.

Background of the Study

American college and university presidents are required to interact with a large number of constituents, and their effectiveness in these interactions relies on their relationship skills and levels of confidence (Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler, 1988). Additionally, transformational approaches assist leaders in becoming "social architects" who share their vision with the collective organization (Northouse, 2016). Thus, a college or university president can utilize transformational approaches to better increase their effectiveness in building relationships across constituent groups. While we do know that prospective presidents are being trained at the doctoral level regarding a wide range of higher education topics, the development of transformational leadership within doctoral student populations remains to be studied.

Additionally, since doctoral programs are often assessed through qualitative measures, quantitative inquiry of higher education doctoral programs is needed to assess how impactful these programs are in training their students (Robey & Bauer, 2013). By studying the transformational leadership qualities among doctoral student populations, this gap may be bridged within higher education and community college leadership programs. As aspiring college and university presidents are trained through these doctoral programs, transformational

qualities are honed through the curriculum of their program, through personal relationships, and through the programming of the department or program.

Overview of the Literature

Literature was collected from peer-reviewed journal articles, higher education newspapers, dissertations, and from books surrounding presidential leadership. The literature compiled is focused on four major components of this study. First, transformational leadership is defined, as well as contextualized, within the scope of doctoral higher education programs. Second, a coming leadership crisis for higher education is reported and analyzed. Third, a discussion is provided of how transformational leadership qualities are seen as exemplar from effective college and university presidents. Finally, a discussion of doctoral higher education programs occurs. These programs are seen as chief training for aspiring college and university presidents.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to identify whether transformational leadership skills are above average within students enrolled in doctoral programs in higher education and whether their respective programs are assisting in the development of these transformational leadership skills.

Problem Statement

Many studies in the literature indicate there is already a shortage of leaders for colleges and universities. Essentially, the United States will soon face a presidential leadership shortage for colleges and universities due to a retiring population of Baby Boomers. With a decline of these potential candidates holding doctoral degrees in education, college and university presidents may not be adequately trained to do these jobs. Although these applicants may have

experience as business leaders, military leaders, political leaders, or attorneys, they could lack

the knowledge of educational structures, which ultimately can lead to a derailing of their

appointment, or an inability to successfully fulfill their job requirements due to lack of

knowledge.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this research comes from the need to fill potential college and

university presidential-level vacancies in the future. It also comes from the need to adequately

train future college and university presidents through doctoral programs in higher education

(Brown, Martinez, & Daniel, 2002). College presidents who have not earned a doctoral degree

in higher education may find difficulty transitioning into the role. The results of this study will

be helpful for a number of parties, including faculty, students, curriculum builders, college and

university presidents, and governing bodies. By identifying their transformational leadership

values, students could be able to identify whether their growing transformational leadership

values or skills are related to the courses and programming within their doctoral programs in

higher education. Faculty participating in this study could be able to identify how

transformational leadership values are fostered within students of doctoral higher education

programs, and whether these values are fostered throughout the curriculum or co-curriculum. In

essence, faculty can not only identify which classes foster transformational leadership values, but

also identify how these values are fostered through alternative programming outside of the

classroom. College and university presidents can identify how transformational leadership

values are an underpinning of a doctoral program in higher education. Finally, governing bodies

will find that statistical data are collected on transformational leadership qualities, an important

trait of college and university presidents. For research, the results of the study will identify if

transformational leadership qualities exist within doctoral higher education students. The research will also identify how these traits are fostered through programming and development of student populations.

Research Question, Variables, and Hypotheses

This study will seek to examine the transformational leadership qualities within doctoral higher education students. This investigation seeks to answer the following research questions:

Research Questions and Hypotheses

1. Do above average transformational leadership qualities exist in doctoral higher education students? If so, to what extent?

- H_0 - Transformational leadership qualities are not above average in doctoral higher education students.

2. Is there a relationship between the frequency of transformational leadership qualities fostered through doctoral higher education programs and doctoral student scores of transformational leadership qualities taken from the MLQ-5x™?

- H_0 - There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership qualities scores among students within doctoral higher education programs and course offerings/programming intended to foster transformative qualities.

3. How are transformational leadership skills fostered through doctoral higher education leadership programs?

Variables

In this study there are two variables. The first variables will be transformational leadership qualities fostered through doctoral higher education programs within Virginia. The

second variable will be the scores from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x)™, a

measurement available through Mind Garden, Inc.

Summary of the Research Design

For this study, a mixed-methods research design will be used. A purposeful sample will

be gathered by contacting department chairs or program directors of doctoral higher educational

programs in Virginia. A sample of students in doctoral higher education programs will be

assessed for their transformational leadership qualities. The sample of students in doctoral

higher education programs will be students who have completed at least one year of full time or

party time study in the doctoral higher education program. Transformational leadership qualities

will be assessed using the Multi Factor Leadership Questionnaire Rater Form (MLQ-5x)™ ™ to

determine the extent of transformational leadership qualities among student populations. Using

SPSS version 25, data will be analyzed through descriptive statistics, seeking the mean, median,

and standard deviation of scores among students within individual programs. Subsequently,

descriptive statistics will be taken based on student demographic information, including reported

gender and reported ethnicity. These descriptive statistics will then be used to determine an

average score of transformational leadership qualities across the multiple doctoral higher

education programs. Higher transformational leadership scores may suggest that these students

are better equipped for future presidential positions. Scores from the individual doctoral higher

education program will be provided to the corresponding program chair/director in an effort to

strengthen future programming.

Additionally, a program evaluation will be conducted for each doctoral higher education

program to determine its role in nurturing transformational leadership qualities among students

within each program. Program directors for these programs will also be contacted for a semi-

structured interview during which they will be asked how these transformational leadership qualities are fostered among students within their respective programs. By identifying how these transformational leadership qualities are fostered among students, the identification of exemplar practices from high scoring programs can potentially help assist low scoring programs fill the gaps within curriculum design and programming. While the focus of this study is to identify current levels of transformational leadership among student populations, as well as how often transformational leadership qualities are fostered with doctoral higher education programs, this study in no way claims that student data is a result of their doctoral higher education program, as transformational leadership qualities may be apparent prior to enrollment.

Delimitations and Scope

This study will be conducted within five doctoral higher education programs in Virginia. The study will be conducted on students within doctoral higher education programs. Students within these programs may be part-time or full-time, as many part-time doctoral students are also working professionals. Students must also be accepted into their respective programs; therefore, non-degree seeking students will not be included. While students (through the survey's demographic identifier) will be asked if they have aspirations to fill senior level higher education positions, students who do not have senior level aspirations will be included, though identified for lack of aspiration. The focus of this study is on doctoral higher education programs, as the literature review provided identifies a lack of doctoral degrees for college and university presidents.

There are approximately 57 doctoral-level higher education programs in the United States ("Graduate Program Directory", 2018). The study will only be conducted on doctoral students within higher education programs in Virginia. Participant sites include: George Mason

University, Old Dominion University, University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and The College of William and Mary. The five participant sites are all within Virginia, and are all public universities. The purpose of the study is to identify if transformational leadership qualities are apparent in students within doctoral programs in higher education, and how their respective programs foster transformational leadership qualities, in an effort to gauge the training of potential college or university presidents. A review of the literature did not find information about alternative higher education programs; for example, leadership retreats, seminars, workshops, etc. Descriptive statistics will be used to identify which doctoral higher education programs have students with higher transformational leadership qualities.

Definition of Key Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms are defined as follows:

- *Doctoral Higher Education Programs*. Programs within the United States that focus on senior level training in the field of Higher Education. These programs may be for either Community College Leadership or Higher Education Leadership.

- *Idealized Influence (II)*. Refers to learned behavior from role models or leaders within the field, oftentimes based on the observations and perceptions of the follower.

- *Individualized Consideration (IC)*. Refers to creating a supportive environment for followers based on emotional intelligence and respect.

- *Inspirational Motivation (IM)*. Refers to high expectations delivered intrinsically or directly by leaders to complete high level tasks in an efficient manner.

- *Intellectual Stimulation (IS)*. Refers to the aptitude of incorporating creative and critical approaches to assist with organizational issues and barriers.

- *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x™).* A measurement developed and produced by Mind Garden, Inc. which measures the transformational leadership qualities through characteristics of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

- *Program Chairs or Directors.* Faculty who head Doctoral Higher Education Programs for either Community College Leadership or Higher Education Leadership.

- *Rubric.* A tool used to measure how often themes or keywords are utilized in syllabi, program offerings, extracurricular activities, or interviews.

- *Syllabus.* A legal document utilized by higher education institutions to alert students of course requirements, course outcomes, and administrative responsibilities for both student and instructor.

- *Transformational Leadership (TL).* Transformational leadership is a style of leadership practice that involves the influence of followers to accomplish more than what is expected of them, and utilizes both charisma and vision to achieve high results.

Summary and Overview of the Chapters

In this chapter, the researcher introduced doctoral higher education leadership programs and transformational leadership. The researcher also highlighted the need for further quantitative exploration into how students within doctoral higher education leadership programs are measured. By reviewing the literature, doctoral higher education programs can be analyzed to identify the value of transformational leadership among enrolled students to better provide for these aspiring presidents.

In the following chapters, the researcher will present a more thorough discussion of the topics outlined in this chapter. In Chapter 2, the researcher will review the existing literature

related to the research of transformational leadership, college and university presidential

qualities, presidential vacancies, and doctoral presidential leadership preparation programs. This

review will help interpret the research surrounding these topics and illuminate the gap existing

between them, highlighting the relevance of this study. In Chapter 3, the researcher will establish

how the primary research question, presented in this chapter, will be answered using a mixed-

methods approach. This will involve utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-

5x™).

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In Chapter 1, the researcher presented a general outline for this study including a brief review of transformational leadership, an impending leadership crisis, transformational leadership qualities of an effective college or university president, and how doctoral higher education programs may assist with filling potential leadership vacancies. The purpose of this literature review is to address the research questions that were presented, as well as provide context to addressing the activity of fostering transformational leadership qualities within doctoral higher education programs. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™ is also investigated for its ability in identifying transformational leadership qualities of survey participants. The literature provided will not only focus on transformational leadership, but explore gaps within research conducted within doctoral higher education programs. This chapter concludes in a summary of how doctoral higher education programs may benefit from analyzing their own transformational leadership qualities as they prepare aspiring college and university presidents.

What is Transformational Leadership?

In 1978, leadership expert and political scientist James M. Burns set out to define the term *transformational leadership.* Burns theorized, "[T]he transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (p. 4). Essentially, a transformational leader will build up others around them for the good of the cause, and as Burns (1978) suggested, morality is a big part of strong leadership.

While Burns may have first defined the term transformational leadership, Bernard M. Bass would build upon the relationship between follower and leader. Bass (1985) believed that transformational leadership would instill a sense of trust, appreciation, allegiance, and admiration toward their respected leaders, and in turn would become more motivated to accomplish tasks they may have been hesitant to undertake.

Theoretically, transformational leadership can be seen as a selfless leadership style, as many leaders are essentially building up their followers for the sake of the organization, and as such these followers intrinsically become more focused on the betterment of the organization over their own self-interest (Harrison, 2000). Moreover, a transformational leadership style is more about using vision and persuasion over authority or power (Harrison, 2000). As such, transformational leadership has been more advantageous to leaders in industrial, military, business, and government settings (Harrison, 2000).

Transformational leadership can also be seen as a supportive leadership style for education institutions, as it "seeks to build the organization's capacity to select its purposes and to support the development of changes to practices of teaching and learning" (Hallinger, 2003, p. 330). Education institutions can thus push harder in creative and critical approaches when both the leader and the follower are more focused on the positive effects of the organization, and not of control or supervision (Hallinger, 2003).

Within higher education institutions, numerous disciplines coexist with one another, though these disciplines are often led by one college or university president. A college or university president who has attained transformational leadership qualities has the attributes required to work across their own discipline for the sake of the institution as a whole (Basham

2012). And, while working with a variety of disciplines, this central leader will be responsible for a homogenization of shared goals, i.e. providing a vision for the institution.

A vision statement from a transformational leader is critical, as it provides a model of organizational objectives, a strategy for meeting these objectives, and a motivation to implement wide-scale change (Basham, 2012). For a college or university president, it is of the utmost importance that these objectives are in fact obtainable, and that they energize the members of the institution to act (Basham, 2012). While this is a heavy task for a college or university president, to provide a uniform vision that can encapsulate all concerns from the numerous disciplines, transformational leadership may provide an edge over other leadership styles.

However, finding a transformational leader to fill every college or university presidential vacancy, may because not every aspiring college or university president may have the proper attributes. Hallinger (2003), argued that practicing transformational leadership requires personal attributes that may not be received through formal training. Thus, focusing on the training of aspiring college or university presidents in regards to transformational leadership qualities is worth investigation.

Doctoral higher education leadership programs may be seen as an avenue for fostering a transformational leadership approach. Northouse (2016) stated, "Transformational leadership involves an exceptional form of influence that moves followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them. It is a process that often incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership" (p. 161). Transformational leadership also focuses on the "motivations and morality in both the leader and the follower" leading to a change within the follower, from the leader (Northouse, 2016, p. 162). A student within a doctoral higher education leadership program may receive growth of their own transformational leadership attributes.

The Transformational Leadership Model

 To follow a transformational leadership framework, Northouse suggests that the most effective strategies contain the 4 I's: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

 Idealized Influence. Within the scope of transformational leadership theory, idealized influence requires emulation of effective leaders (Northouse, 2016). For the student within a doctoral program, mentorship from not only senior faculty who have had a history in leadership, but also from presidents both inside and outside of the institution can be seen as following this model. Idealized influence within a doctoral program may focus on mentorship, leadership emulation, building partnerships, or learning leadership behavior.

 Inspirational Motivation. For inspirational motivation, motivations of shared vision, high expectations, and high support are required (Northouse, 2016). Within the doctoral program, this can be achieved through a strong relationship both with faculty members and fellow students. Inspirational motivation within a doctoral program may focus on goal-setting, goal acquisition, understanding emotional intelligence, providing guidance on ethical considerations within higher education, or providing/achieving high expectations.

 Intellectual Stimulation. Intellectual stimulation requires critical and creative decision making that is innovative and thoughtful (Northouse, 2016). Doctoral students can be challenged through alternative projects outside of the traditional academic norms, such as building educational partnerships, or the more traditional norms, such as attending workshops or conferences. Intellectual stimulation within doctoral programs may focus on the development of critical thinking, the development of creative thinking, monitoring organizational issues, identifying organizational barriers, or providing support for innovation.

Individualized Consideration. Individualized consideration requires leaders to listen attentively, and offer support where needed (Northouse, 2016). The student can learn these principles through professional helping skills courses, peer mentorship, or outreach with their surrounding communities. Individualized consideration within a doctoral program may focus on cohorts, one-on-one support with faculty and staff, peer mentorship, or reviewing organizational charts found in higher education institutions.

While these 4 I's may assist the future college or university president within a doctoral program, a sense of purpose and vision should also be cultivated out of the student. As Northouse (2016) believed, "The vision is a focal point for transformational leadership. It gives the leader and the organization a conceptual map for where the organization is headed; it gives meaning and clarifies the organization's identity" (p. 176). Students in doctoral programs should be asked to discuss their goals and strategies for not only achieving a presidency, but also what they intend to do to further the entire field of education. For those not seeking presidencies, the transformational leadership qualities may benefit those seeking alternative executive level positions. By providing seeds of vision, a student can potentially blossom into the future leader of tomorrow.

Does a Leadership Crisis Exist?

In the world of higher education, many argue that an impending leadership crisis is on the horizon, while others doubt the warning. This crisis stems from a potential shortage of new leaders willing to fill presidencies. Cohen and Kisker (2010) stated, "As of 2006…the most fascinating figure was that 49 percent of all presidents were over age 60, up from 14 percent ten years earlier" (p. 518). With so many college and university presidents nearing retirement, new leaders will need to take up the mantle. However, another trend continues to increase: lack of

faculty experience for these presidencies. Eckel and Kezar (2011) reported, "In 2006, approximately 70 percent of presidents had served as a faculty member, a decrease from 75 percent in 1986. (p. 280). If faculty are not filling the role, who then? Eckel and Kezar's (2011) argument is warranted, as "The lack of interest in pursuing a presidency suggests that the traditional pipeline to the presidency may not be adequate to meet the expected demand for new presidents" (p. 301).

What could be seen as a crisis of leadership, could in fact be an opportunity (Cook, 2012). With the Baby Boomer generation retiring from higher education, leadership across American higher education could be diversified (Cook, 2012). More importantly, educational leadership programs can be a solution. Hackmann, Malin, and McCarthy (2017) claimed, "The numbers of educational leadership programs, faculty, and students that are housed in comprehensive institutions are increasing dramatically" (p. 158). While a shortage may be on the horizon, educational leadership programs may fill the vacancies generated in the upcoming years. However, whether or not these future leaders will be successful remains to be seen. Eckel and Kezar (2011) believed, "Effective presidential leadership in the future may depend on an individual's ability to leverage an integrated, shared leadership approach that encourages coordinated and synergistic leadership among many actors" (p. 304). Coordinated efforts between governing bodies, the president, and their constituents may help with a seamless transition for these impending departures. Thus, leadership preparation programs, specifically for college and university presidents, may avert any potential crisis of leadership.

Transformational Qualities of an Effective College/University President

In 2013 American Association of Community Colleges published a second edition of their core competencies for community college leaders. The AACC (2013) stated that new

CEOs that have been in their respective positions for longer than three years should focus on a toolkit for transformational leadership skills. While this toolkit is not inherently defined, the call for transformational leadership among community college presidents has been made, though presidents of public and private universities may also find benefit in developing their own toolkit.

In regards to making complex decisions, Gearin (2017) recommended presidents "work to achieve data familiarity" as it can assist in troubleshooting problems across campuses (p. 571). Knowing how to read the data behind enrollment, financial statements, budgets, retention, and more can further assist a college or university president in communicating potential solutions (Gearin 2017). Additionally, faculty, staff, students, trustees, and the greater community will expect well-researched solutions that are communicated clearly and effectively (Gearin, 2017).

While a new president may not necessarily have all the answers to the problems that circulate on a campus, Gearin (2017) also suggested that presidents be inducted through an onboarding developed by their trustees, as trustees will have a better understanding of specific problems and specific solutions that have worked in the past. While onboarding a president may be seen as helpful to the new president, there is also benefit for the trustees, as they become more aware of the new president's integration into the institution (Gearin, 2017). In time, a new president can thus incorporate their transformational leadership skills after this adjustment period.

As a college or university president, Bourgeois (2016) argued that a primary responsibility is to, "make sense out of circumstances that confront them, particularly during changing and uncertain times" (p. 18). As a transformational leader, the college or university president is expected to develop an organization that pushes individuals past their current

capabilities, and this can be achieved through developing a climate focused on learning and collaboration (Friedman & Kass-Shraibman 2017). However, as some individuals may be reluctant to change, the college or university president may have to enact silo busting, by merging academic departments in order to better facilitate collaboration (Friedman & Kass-Shraibman 2017). With stronger collaboration across campus, academic departments can learn from each other, and in turn, rely on each other toward a shared vision.

Friedman and Kass-Shraibman (2017) argued that, "the best institutions are those where students learn real skills and develop a passion for education and lifelong learning" (294). However, in order to help facilitate this lifelong learning, faculty must be engaged with their students, as well as their institution (Friedman & Kass-Shraibman, 2017). By doing so, the institutional climate can lead to stronger student satisfaction, which can in turn lead to student referrals for future applicants (Friedman & Kass-Shraibman, 2017).

To further elaborate on how transformational leadership from a college or university president can affect the student satisfaction, a study was conducted by Bastedo, Samuels, and Kleinman in 2014. Measurements of charisma were taken from video recordings of presidential speeches, whether commencement, convocation or inauguration (Bastedo, Samuels, & Kleinman, 2014). Raters were asked to complete a 12 question electronic survey measuring charisma through an adapted version of the MLQ-5x™ (Bastedo, Samuels, & Kleinman, 2015). With a total sample size of 86 non-profit, private colleges located in the United States, Bastedo, Samuels, and Kleinman (2014) found a strong correlation between the charisma of the president, college applications received, and financial giving from alumni. Additionally, Bastedo, Samuels, and Kleinman (2014) argued, "Measuring transformational leadership would require accounting for how each president has inspired and mentored the people they work with" (p. 405). While it

may prove difficulty to survey every student from each of these 86 colleges, the applicant referrals and alumni donations may highlight the success of these leaders.

Lloyd M. Basham (2012) also sought to identify the effect of transformational leadership skills by college and university presidents. He invited 300 university presidents in both private and public institutions taken from the 25th Anniversary Higher Education Directory to determine if leadership had or could be seen as effective, receiving a total of 52 presidential responses. Measurement were conducted across 41 indicators including a list of concerns, issues, management practices and concepts, and effective leadership qualities, and were rated through three rounds of surveys to determine relative significance of each major concern (Basham, 2012). Basham (2012) found that, "Transformational leadership practices and concepts will have to be applied at an institution of higher education to ensure change due to the reluctance of tenured faculty and staff to consider changes due to personal impact (p. 346). In essence, transformational leadership can be seen as a tool to engage faculty set in their ways.

Additionally, Basham (2012) argued that colleges and universities "require critical application of transformational leadership practices and concepts to ensure that an institution of higher education achieves its purpose of learning" (p. 346). Transformational leadership practices from a college or university president can influence constituents to strive harder in achieving educational experiences. Finally, Basham (2012) believed, "A university president's competency in knowledge, leadership skills, and technical expertise is necessary to ensure the successful completion of a transformational effort" (p. 346). By being equipped with this transformational leadership toolkit, an aspiring president can effectively promote change in their new institution.

David T. Harrison (2000) studied forty-six North American community colleges, utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™ in an effort to measure the transformational leadership skills of community college presidents. Harrison found that transformational presidents are nurturing, more open to delegating tasks, and used coaching or mentoring regularly (Harrison, 2000).   Harrison (2000) also found that these transformational presidents, "strive to create a certain environment - a climate of open communication, shared vision, trust, and empowerment. (p. 170). Transformational presidents may seek to create these climates without tangible rewards, and in turn by focusing on the individual group's sense of accomplishment (Harrison, 2000).

By sharing a sense of pride in the institution with constituents, presidents can be successful as transformational leaders. And, this pride can be seen through Harrison's (2000) data analysis, within which he found that faculty and administrators are less likely to leave due to being treated fairly, friendly, and collaboratively.   In essence, transformational behaviors are seen as stronger than transactional behaviors in regard to positive organizational performance (Harrison, 2000).

Thus, transformational leadership can be seen as effective for college or university presidents, as it can assist them in meeting evolving economic and academic environments (Basham, 2012). And, coupled with a shortage of potential presidents, training programs for these aspiring leaders may be needed in an effort to provide the new presidents with the ability to integrate transformational leadership rapidly into their new institutions (Martin & Samels, 2004).

A Doctoral Higher Education Leadership Program

College and university presidents can be prepared in a number of ways. Degree programs at the doctoral level, may be seen as a strong option. Cooney's (2016) study on community

college presidents found that "almost 60% of the sample does not have a doctoral degree, it is important to know how community college presidents without the terminal degree navigate their careers" (p. 129). This conflicts with suggestions of Brown, Martinez, and Daniel's (2002) findings that for community college leaders, a doctoral degree is preferred. A doctoral higher education leadership program may offer the training needed, but the effectiveness of these programs is minimally studied. Many doctoral programs focus more on qualitative measuring of their programs, while data-driven results of candidate satisfaction or self-efficacy are less reported (Robey & Bauer, 2013). The lack of college and university presidents who hold doctoral degrees in higher education, coupled with an impending shortage of college and university presidents may provide an impetus for this study.

There is a need for research competency from a faculty teaching in doctoral programs, as these faculty members not only provide a foundational core for their students, but produce new knowledge for the field (Hackmann, Malin, & McCarthy, 2017, p. 161). However, Hackmann, Malin, and McCarthy (2017) asserted that for these faculty only, "one in 10 at comprehensive institutions cited research as a professional strength" (p. 161). While research is essential for doctoral faculty, the creation of future college and university presidents may rely on alternative strategies.

Gaps in Presidential Leadership Preparation Programs

Despite the rise in doctoral programs, program gaps can be connected to the major obstacles college and university president's face. Presidential turnover occurs often due to financial problems for the institution, with no easy fix or solution (Finney & Kelly, 2010; Tekniepe, 2014). Because of this, future presidents will be required to fundraise effectively,

working with strategic campaigns and donors (Helm, 2009).   Additionally, many college presidents are not prepared or experienced in fundraising efforts (Thomas, 2013).

Another major issue for college and university presidents is a deep understanding of quantitative analysis, which can serve a variety of purposes from writing their own research, to understanding assessment numbers which can impact accreditation (Bowers, 2017; Ewell, & Ikenberry, 2015)

Finally, a president's main job is to communicate vision. Effective presidents will utilize strong communication skills to share their visions, work with governing bodies, solicit donors, and/or tackle potential crises. Brown, Martinez, and Daniel's (2002) study revealed communication to be the most important skill for community college leaders. Effective and visionary presidents will need a confidence in their communication skills, focusing on human relations in order to inspire them toward the greater good (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler, 1988,). In addition, these communication skills will also be required for dealing with the press or media, and media training is often undertaken by college and university presidents (Nugent, 2009). Understanding how doctoral higher education programs train students in communication, confidence and compassion, can only provide a better sense of how efficient programs are at fostering transformational leadership qualities.

Basham (2012) stated that a transformational leader "is still a long way from being the leader for every situation and, as a result, few empirically documented case examples of capturing the transformational leaders' acumen exist" (p. 344). However, as doctoral higher education programs potentially prepare the next generation of college and university presidents, measuring the abilities of these aspiring leaders could not only help strengthen both the students in these programs, but the programs in which they are enrolled. In addition, these measurements

could later be used as a baseline comparison for those who choose to aspire toward a presidency. In essence, a future college or university president with a doctoral higher education background can compare their scores of transformational leadership qualities as a doctoral student, to their scores as a college or university president.

Summary and Overview of Chapter

The content of this chapter was meant to provide a groundwork of transformational leadership, an impending shortage of college or university presidents, the transformational leadership qualities of an effective president, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™, and how doctoral higher education programs may assist in closing the gap. Chapter 3 will explore how a doctoral higher education program can be measured for transformational leadership qualities among its students enrolled through a mixed-methods design. Subsequent chapters will present the findings of this mixed-methods design, specifically through measuring participant's transformational leadership qualities using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™, interviewing program chairs of their respected doctoral higher education programs, and by conducting a program evaluation of available course descriptions and program resources.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Research Overview

For this study, a non-experimental, mixed-methods research design will be used. A purposeful sample of students in doctoral higher education programs will be assessed for their transformational leadership qualities. Transformational leadership qualities will be assessed using the Multi Factor Leadership Questionnaire Rater Form (MLQ-5x™). Using SPSS version 25, data will be analyzed through descriptive statistics to determine the average scores of transformational leadership qualities across the sample.

This study will be completed utilizing a mixed-methods design. In addition to the MLQ-5x™, individual doctoral higher education programs will be investigated through a course audit which will identify both required and cognate courses that foster leadership values or promote leadership-building activities. A rubric for the document analysis of course descriptions and information found on the graduate program website can be found in Appendix D. The document analysis of each sample site will identify how transformational leadership qualities are fostered into student populations. A matrix of artifacts collected from the document analysis can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Document Analysis Artifacts Collected from the Program Websites

Term	Definition	Used to Identify
Personal Documents	Student testimonies	Personal perspective
Official Documents	Statistical data	Suggest trends, completion rates, describe values
	Mission statement	Describe values of program
	Course descriptions (Required/Core)	Official curriculum offerings
	Course descriptions (Cognate/Elective)	Suggested curriculum offerings
Objects	Newsletters	Suggest trends, describe values
	Application process	Describe requirements of applicants

Additionally, program chairs will be contacted for a semi-structured interview to determine how these transformational qualities may be fostered outside of the reported curriculum approaches. A scoring rubric found in Appendix E will identify which transformational leadership quality has the most frequency for each graduate program. Finally, programs will be investigated for common patterns through basic and interpretive coding to discover how these programs are effective in fostering transformational leadership qualities. Appendix F will be used as a scoring rubric to find which transformational leadership quality occurred with the most frequency across both the interviews and program evaluation.

Rationale for Methodology Section

A mixed-methods approach was chosen as the basis for the methodology for this study due to the ability of this approach to answer the research questions. As the research questions investigate the transformational leadership qualities among students in doctoral higher education programs, the measurement of student transformational leadership qualities will be calculated through the MLQ-5x™. A quantitative component of this methodology will be identifying the descriptive statistics of scores from the MLQ-5x™ across five doctoral higher education sites in Virginia. Descriptive statistics will be utilized to find the average score for a student within a doctoral higher education program, as well as the standard deviation and median scores. Standard deviation and median scores will be identified to find a baseline score among doctoral students, as well as to identify which participant sites deviate most from the baseline. The scores from this study will then be cross compared to other programs in Virginia in order to identify which participant sites had the highest frequency of each transformational leadership quality. The scores from this study will also be grouped by gender in order to identify disparities between male and female participants. The scores will also be cross matched with results from both the research team rubric findings and the matrices in order to identify if scores match the intended transformational leadership quality fostered. In addition, a program evaluation will be conducted from these sites in order to gauge how frequent transformational leadership qualities are fostered in doctoral student populations. Finally, semi-structured interviews with program chairs will assist in identifying any areas outside of the traditional curriculum that assist in fostering transformational leadership qualities.

Data Collection and Analyses

As the design of this study is mixed-method, four research questions have been postulated. Data collection will be completed through three methods. First, data will be collected through a program evaluation of doctoral higher education programs in both required and cognate course descriptions, as well as through doctoral program information found on the participant site's corresponding website. The content/document analysis is an effort to identify transformational leadership qualities across the artifacts provided to doctoral students. Second, data will be collected through semi-structured interviews with doctoral higher education program directors or chairs. Finally, data will be collected from students of doctoral higher education programs completing the MLQ-5x™.

Participant Selection

Participants will be chosen through five current doctoral higher education programs in Virginia. Participant sites include: George Mason University, Old Dominion University, University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and The College of William and Mary. The participant selection is through purposeful sampling. These five participant sites are the only public universities in the commonwealth of Virginia who offer doctoral higher education programs. A purposeful sample within the commonwealth of Virginia may be helpful with future replication in other states across the United States. Chairs or program directors of doctoral higher education programs will be contacted about the logistics and procedures of collection efforts, with information on the study. The researcher will work with the chair of the department or the director of the program (depending on which is more applicable) to distribute the questionnaire to students within the chosen doctoral higher education program. Students within the doctoral higher education program will have been enrolled in the program for at least one calendar year. A participation rate of five students is expected from each institution.

Participants will be given a participant letter prior to completing the survey. The participant letter can be found in Appendix G. The department chair or director of the program will also be notified of the semi-structured interview protocol, in order to assist with identifying transformational leadership qualities within the program. Participant sites will be notified of the document analysis, and may be asked to provide required and cognate course descriptions if they are not easily located through a search of the doctoral program website.

Measures

Transformational leadership qualities of participants will be measured through the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x™). Transformational leadership theory was first developed by Burns (1978), with later revisions made by Bass and Avolio (2000). The survey can be purchased through the Mind Garden, Inc. website. Mind Garden, Inc. states that the measurement identifies, "the characteristics of a transformational leader and helps individuals discover how they measure up in their own eyes and in the eyes of those with whom they work" ("Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire", 2018).

The Survey Instrument

Students enrolled in doctoral higher education programs will be asked to complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form-5X. The MLQ-5x™ was developed by Bass and Avolio (1997) to measure four attributes of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. All items will be self-rated by the student participant on five-point Likert type scales ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Frequently, if not always). The MLQ-5x™ has been tested heavily for validation and reliability (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The MLQ-5x™ is also one of the most validated ways to identify transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

In 2003 Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam tested the validity and reliability of the MLQ-5x™ in a 2-part study. In the first part of their study, Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003) tested the MLQ-5x™ through a confirmatory factor analysis using gender as the contextual factor. With a total of 3368 respondents (1079 female, 2289 male), equivalence was tested through pooled and grouped (by gender) data to conclude that all 9 leadership factors were partially metrically invariant across rater gender (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). In the second part of their study, Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003) tested factor-level data taken from 5 independent studies which reported all 9 MLQ factors of leadership. Studies were coded through 3 contextual categories: risk conditions/environmental uncertainty, leader hierarchical level, and leader-follower gender (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). Although patterns in study two varied by contextual category, results were stable and supported the 9 factor model (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003).

Mind Garden, Inc. is responsible for the publication rights of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™. As such, Mind Garden, Inc. has made it explicitly clear that only five items from the instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal (Bass & Avolio, 2000). The full instrument contains forty-five descriptive statements to be rated by the five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Frequently, if not always) (Bass & Avolio, 2000). A sample item from the MLQ-5x™ includes: "I articulate a compelling vision of the future" which focuses on inspirational motivation (Bass & Avolio, 2000).

Data Collection and Analysis

As the design of this study is mixed-method, four research questions have been postulated. Analysis will triangulate the findings of each method in a final rubric (found in

Appendix F) focused on the transformational leadership qualities within doctoral higher

education programs.

Research Question 1

Research question one states: Do above average transformational leadership qualities

exist in doctoral higher education students? If so, to what extent? A null hypothesis indicates

that transformational leadership qualities are not above average in doctoral higher education

students.

Data Collection

First, the researcher will secure the MLQ-5x™ from Mind Garden, Inc. in digital format.

Once the measurement has been obtained, the researcher will contact chairs or directors of

doctoral higher education programs in Virginia, requesting student participation. Once the

researcher has identified potential sites, the researcher will provide instructions to the

participants via email. A total of six students will be requested for each participant site. It is the

goal of the researcher to survey students who have been in the doctoral program for at least one

calendar year. Next, the researcher will administer the MLQ-5x™ to the students through the

Mind Garden, Inc. website. Once in the Mind Garden, Inc. site, participants will agree to a

consent form that provides the purpose of research, procedure, risks and benefits, measures of

confidentiality, and contact information of the researcher. Demographic information of the

participant will be identified through the Mind Garden, Inc. website, specifically focused on the

career aspirations of the doctoral student, their full-time/part-time status, employment status of

the participant, age of the participant, ethnicity of the participant, and gender of the participant.

The informed consent form can be found in Appendix B. Students will be asked to complete the

survey for both themselves and fellow students within the program that are participating in the

survey. Participants will be reminded of the survey on the first of the month with subsequent reminders weekly for a total of four weeks. At the end of the allotted time, data will be collected electronically for analysis. Mind Garden, Inc. provides analysis for MLQ-5x™ scores. This will ensure further validity and reliability of the results. After completion of the MLQ-5x™ students will be awarded a $20 Amazon gift card and be given their scores from the survey.

Data Analysis

The scores for MLQ-5x™ will be generated through both the individual and outside raters (self-rate, cross-rating of other participants). These scores will be provided Mind Garden, Inc., who provides an analytical report of survey respondents, and the null hypothesis can be rejected if transformational leadership qualities exist within the population sample. The null hypothesis will be tested for significance by conducting a *t*-test with a degree of freedom of 28 as the sample size of student MLQ-5x™ scores is 30. While this is all that is needed for research question one, alternative measurements will be conducted to provide a snapshot of doctoral higher education students. Essentially, the mean will be found for student MLQ-5x™ scores, means will be averaged for individual programs, and scores of other participant sites will be compared in an attempt to identify an average student score. Scores will also be categorized by both gender and ethnicity to identify disparities between male vs. female, and white vs. non-white. These averages will then be used to find how participants scores stray from the mean through standard deviation. Both mean scores and standard deviation scores will be found through SPSS version 25. These descriptive statistics will assist in providing a narrative of to what extent transformational qualities exist in doctoral higher education students through specific program, gender, and ethnicity. As MLQ-5x™ scores are between 0 to 4, a baseline of 3 will be used. Hypothetically, while using 3 as a baseline, student MLQ-5x™ scores should be

higher than 3 (above average). The Mind Garden Manual developed by Avolio & Bass (2004) indicates that MLQ-5x scores higher than three are above the 50th percentile, and thus, above average. Peer-rated scores, which show stronger validity, will be averaged into a population mean by each of the four categories (4 I's). The null hypothesis can be rejected if $\mu > 3$. To test significance, a t-test will be conducted using the mean scores of each college/university.

Research Question 2

The second research question states: Is there a relationship between the frequency of transformational leadership qualities fostered through doctoral higher education programs (taken from Appendix E and Appendix F) and doctoral student scores of transformational leadership qualities taken from the MLQ-5x™? A null hypothesis indicates that there is no significant relationship between transformational leadership qualities scores among students within doctoral higher education programs and course offerings/programming intended to foster transformative qualities.

Data Collection

Once the participant site has agreed to take place in the study, the researcher will contact the graduate program chair/director to identify a time to participate in the interview, as well as provide the questions for them to review prior. The researcher will then contact the graduate program chair/director during the scheduled time to ask the questions found on the Interview Protocol found in Appendix C. The interview will be recorded, transcribed, and then sent back to the graduate program chair/director to member-check. The semi-structured interview with the program or department chair will be conducted during the month the survey is available for participants. The semi-structured interviews will first be mentioned through participation letters sent to graduate program chairs/directors at the start of the study.

To ensure content validity of interview results, a research team will be established. The research team will consist of three members: Dr. Kim Sibson, Dr. Dean Roughton, and Mr. Preston Reilly. One of the research team members is a graduate of a Ph.D. in Higher Education program, one of the research team members is a graduate of a Ph.D. in Community College Leadership program, and one team member is a current member of a Ph.D. in Higher Education program. The research team members have been chosen due to their familiarity with Leadership Theories, the field of Higher Education, knowledge of qualitative and quantitative methods, and their proximity to the researcher. The research team will conduct a peer debriefing session prior to program evaluation and interviews to review Appendix D, Appendix E, and Appendix F. The peer debriefing session will determine if the keywords are appropriate for the Appendix D rubric in relation to the program evaluation. The peer debriefing session will determine the range of frequency for the Appendix E rubric focused on the semi-structured interview results, i.e. what is considered 0 (not at all), 1 (briefly), 2 (sometimes), 3 (fairly often), and 4 (frequently). The peer debriefing session will also discuss the procedures for tallying Appendix D and Appendix E results into a compilation rubric found in Appendix F

Once the graduate program chair/director has agreed to the results of the interview, the researcher will then present them to the research team. The research team will identify common themes in regard to idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration utilizing the rubric found in Appendix E. Once the findings have been compiled, the researcher will also identify common themes of transformational leadership within the transcripts, and then match the themes with the research team's findings. The researcher has identified little to no risk for subjects participating in this study. The researcher

will receive approval from the Darden College of Education & Professional Studies and the Human Subjects Committee prior to conducting the study.

A program evaluation will be conducted for each participant site, focusing on how transformational leadership qualities are introduced through curriculum and programming. A rubric will be utilized to identify transformational leadership elements in required courses, cognate courses, and the program website. Both the researcher and the research team will evaluate core curriculum courses, cognate courses, and extracurricular programming found on the institution's website for transformational leadership development utilizing the Appendix D rubric.

After compiling data associated with RQ1, the researcher will then identify which transformational leadership attributes were found to have the highest frequency for the rubrics collected from the research team. Sample matrices can be found in Appendix D (from the program evaluation of online course descriptions and extracurricular activities) and Appendix E (from the semi-structured interviews with department/program chairs). The matrix from Appendix F will identify which transformational leadership attribute had the highest frequency on the program website, through required course descriptions, through cognate course descriptions, and through the rubrics of program chair/director interview responses. The researcher will then identify which transformational leadership attribute was highest for each college/university, as well as calculate total frequency of activities fostering transformational leadership qualities.

Data Analysis

Interviews with program chairs will be coded using a rubric developed by the researcher, available in Appendix E. The researcher will provide the research team with the rubric and the

transcripts prior to analysis. The interviews conducted will be coded for common themes, and a comparative analysis will be conducted after all data has been obtained to identify the performance of a doctoral higher education program in regards to transformational leadership development.

In addition to the interviews, a program evaluation will attempt to identify course offerings, program offerings, and extracurricular activities that help foster transformational leadership qualities among doctoral student populations. The researcher and the research team will conduct a content analysis utilizing the attached rubric found in Appendix D. The rubric used by the researcher and research team will identify keywords for the four attributes of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Keywords used to identify the presence of idealized influence will be: mentorship, leadership, partnerships, and behavior. Keywords used to identify the presence of inspirational motivation will be: goal-setting or goal acquisition, high expectations, emotional intelligence, and social ethics. Keywords used to identify the presence of intellectual stimulation will be: creative thinking, critical thinking or approach, organizational issues or barriers, and innovation. Keywords used to identify the presence of individualized consideration will be: cohort, one-on-one support, organizational culture, and peer-mentor.

Once the interviews and program analysis has occurred, a total frequency of fostered transformational leadership values (whether in coursework or in extracurricular activities) will be calculated using Appendix F. The frequency results from Appendix F will assist with RQ 3, as well as provide a snapshot of how often transformational leadership values are fostered within each participant site.

To reject the null hypothesis, both scores from Appendix D, Appendix E, and Appendix F will be compared to the mean student MLQ-5x™ scores. Next SPSS version 25 will be used to conduct a bivariate correlation. The Pearson *r* should be identified between -1.00 and +1.00. The closer the Pearson *r* score is to -1.00 or +1.00, the more significance the relationship is. A bivariate correlation will be conducted in three parts. First a correlation will be conducted between the scores of Appendix D and the MLQ-5x™ scores. This correlation will be conducted between each of the 4 I's found through the Appendix D rubric and the 4 I's indicated from the population mean of student MLQ-5x™ scores. A second correlation will be conducted between the scores of the Appendix E and the student MLQ-5x™ scores. This correlation will be conducted between each of the 4 I's found through the Appendix E rubric and the 4 I's indicated from the population mean of student MLQ-5x™ scores. A final correlation will be conducted between the scores of the compilation rubric found on Appendix F and the student MLQ-5x™ scores. This correlation will be conducted between each of the 4 I's found through the Appendix F rubric and the 4 I's indicated from the population mean of student MLQ-5x™ scores. The correlation design assists in finding whether a relationship exists between transformational leadership qualities stated in the artifacts and interviews with the MLQ-5x student scores.

Correlation was chosen as the basis for the methodology due to its ability to predict significance between an independent variable and the dependent variable. As Sprinthall (2012) stated, "If two events are correlated, then a knowledge of one of those events allows a researcher to predict the occurrence of the other, regardless of what might have caused what" (p. 289). While correlation does not mean causation, correlation can be a useful tool for predicting whether a relationship exists (Sprinthall, 2012, p. 290). Correlation can be found by locating the Pearson *r*. As Sprinthall (2012) stated, "The Pearson *r* is a more sensitive test than the r_s. For a

given sample size, an *r* of a certain value is more apt to be significant than is an r_s of the same

value (p. 321). To locate significance, an alpha level of .05 will be selected to indicate

significance. A null hypothesis would state there is no statistically significant relationship

between intended transformational leadership qualities and student MLQ-5x scores. If the

significance level for each test falls below the alpha level of .05 then the null hypothesis can be

rejected. If all three bivariate correlations indicate there is a significant relationship between

transformational leadership fostering activities and student MLQ-5x™ scores, then the null

hypothesis can be rejected, and it can be stated that there is a relationship between

program/course offerings and student transformational leadership scores.

Research Question 3

Research question three states: How are transformational leadership skill fostered through

doctoral higher education leadership programs? No null hypothesis is given.

Data Collection

Results from both the semi-structured interviews with program chairs/directors, as well as

the program evaluation of course offerings, program offerings, and extracurricular activities that

help foster transformational leadership qualities among doctoral student populations will be

taken from RQ2.

Data Analysis

A descriptive narrative will indicate a variety of results. As frequency of

transformational leadership attributes will be calculated in RQ2, a narrative will identify which

attributes are most common within the semi-structured interviews, the course offerings, the

program offerings, the extracurricular activities, and which attributes reside most heavily within

student populations. This narrative will categorize each attribute through participant site, gender,

ethnicity, and whether the participant has presidential aspirations. Using results from the semi-structured interview, the researcher will be able to identify which transformational leadership fostering activities are the most common within doctoral higher education programs. Using the program evaluation from the required courses the researcher will be able to identify curriculum trends. Using the program evaluation from cognate courses the researcher will be able to identify transformational leadership fostering opportunities outside of the required. Finally, using the program evaluation of websites, the researcher will be able to identify which extracurricular activities are most common for all doctoral higher education programs, as well as identify opportunities that are unique to particular institution.

Validity and Reliability

Validity must be established to determine whether the study is appropriate. Essentially, does the measurement of transformational leadership quality contain content, criterion, and construct validity? As Bass was instrumental in the development of transformational leadership theory and the MLQ-5x™, a claim of validity can be made. The MLQ-5x™ can also be established as valid, as over 50 studies have been conducted using the instrument. Bass and Avolio (2004) conducted 14 samples for a total of 3,786 respondents to identify the validity and reliability of the MLQ-5x™. Bass and Avolio (2004) also found reliability through their leadership factor scale. Reliability will be identified through conducting the study at the five doctoral higher education programs as this creates or provides a level of standardization. Justification for choosing five doctoral higher education programs can be found in Chapter 2 of this study. Reliability can also be strengthened by Mind Garden, Inc. generating the scores for the MLQ-5x™. Reliability in MLQ-5x™ scores can also be found in that 30 students will be surveyed, which is grounds for the central limit theorem.

Validity and reliability measure will also be conducted for the interview component of the study. Prior to solicitation of interview questions to doctoral program chair/directors, research team members will be given the opportunity to review the Interview Protocol found in Appendix C, as well as the Interview Rubric found in Appendix E. Research team members will be given two weeks to provide any feedback related to either document prior to contacting the doctoral program chair/director. A peer debriefing session will be conducted by the research team to determine frequency scoring found in Appendix E. To ensure validity of the interview protocol, department or program chairs participating will be given a chance to review their responses, providing a member-check of the data. Member checking is important because it allows the participant to check the accuracy of their responses (Birt et al., 2016). Reliability of the interview protocol will come from providing the interview to multiple sites, to ensure that findings are similar. To strengthen content validity of interview results, a research team will be established. Establishing a research team will also provide inter-rater reliability (Creswell 2013). The research team will meet with the researcher prior to interviews in an effort to check the validity of the interview questions. In addition, the research team will be consulted prior to the interview to assess the validity of the scoring rubric. Validity will be ensured through triangulation of findings from a research team (Creswell 2013). The research team will score each interview transcript based on the four items investigated within transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transformational leadership will be determined to be fostered at a participant site if both the researcher, and the majority of the members of the research team found scores indicative of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and

individualized consideration. Triangulation will occur using MLQ-5x™ scores, interview

findings, and program evaluation of curriculum.

Construct validity and reliability will also be ensured for the program evaluation

component of this study. As Weiss (1998) stated, "to produce evidence about construct validity,

the evaluator proposes theoretical relationships between the measure of the concept and

measures of other" (p. 145). Construct validity of the program evaluation will come through

identifying keywords of the four attributes of transformational leadership within course syllabi,

program offerings, and extracurricular activities. The attributes of transformational leadership

(idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized

consideration) will be identified as influencing transformational leadership if keywords related to

each attribute occur three or more times across syllabi, program offerings, and extracurricular

activities. To ensure validity, the research team will be given the opportunity to provide

feedback of the rubric prior to the study. To ensure reliability, the program evaluation will be

strengthened by investigating a total of five sites.

Limitations

There are several limitations associated with this study, with the most notable being

sample size. Due to the limited number of doctoral higher education programs in Virginia, few

data collection sites exist. Also, as these programs are competitive to gain admittance, the

sample size within these sites may also be small. Additionally, the survey relies on subjective

data collected from participants, influencing both the self-reporting, and reporting of student

counterparts. Also, due to the nature of the study, only a one-month period will be offered for

submission of the MLQ-5x™, which may present time constraints for individuals, or their larger

departments. The researcher will take steps to provide confidentiality and anonymity of participants through password-encrypted files, only accessible to the researcher.

Summary and Overview of Chapter

The need to study doctoral presidential leadership preparation programs is apparent. However, understanding the transformational leadership qualities that exist among students within these programs, and how they are fostered through curriculum and programming, can assist higher education program development. As the students within doctoral higher education programs are prepared for future college and university presidency appointments, understanding their transformational leadership values can assist with self-identity of leadership style.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In Chapter 3, the methodology included a description of how data would be both collected and analyzed to identify transformational leadership qualities, as well as these scores' correlation to doctoral programs, and provided a narrative of transformational leadership skills fostered through doctoral higher education programs. After the researcher contacted each participant site and interviews were conducted with program chairs, a program evaluation was conducted of online materials. A total of thirty students were contacted and completed the MLQ-5x ™ survey instrument and were peer-rated by colleagues. Diversity was a motivation for the researcher, as the snapshot meant to provide an accurate portrayal of the current doctoral student population across the Commonwealth of Virginia. Participants came from both Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs, with focus in both researcher and practitioner curriculum paths. Doctoral student participants also were diverse in age, gender, ethnicity, and career aspiration. Below, the results of the analysis are provided, and sorted by corresponding research question.

Research Question One

Research Question One states: *Do above average transformational leadership qualities exist in doctoral higher education students? If so, to what extent?* A null hypothesis indicates that transformational leadership qualities are not above average in doctoral higher education students.

Analysis. After doctoral student participants were surveyed, and corresponding peer-ratings occurred, the mean and standard deviation was calculated for both self and peer-rated scores. For both the self-rated and peer-rated scores, means and standard deviations of scores were calculated overall, by gender, by ethnicity, and by each participant site. In both the self-

rated and peer-rated scores, means and standard deviations of scores were calculated by Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration overall, by gender, by ethnicity, and by each participant site. All analyses were conducted through SPSS version 25.

Hypothetically, when using 3 as a baseline, student MLQ-5x™ scores should be higher than 3 (above average). The null hypothesis can be rejected if $\mu > 3$. To test significance, a *t*-test was conducted using the mean scores of each college/university.

Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores. Self-reported Transformational Leadership Scores were collected overall, by gender, by ethnicity and by site. Results can be found in Table 3. The mean of overall Transformational Leadership Scores was 3.14, the mean of Idealized Influence (II) scores was 3.04 for IIA and 3.16 for IIB, the mean of Inspirational Motivation (IM) scores was 3.15, the mean of Intellectual Stimulation (IS) scores was 3.06, and the mean of Individualized Consideration scores was 3.30.

Table 3

Transformational Leadership Scores Self-Reported on the MLQ-5x™

	M (*SD*) N=30	Male N=8	Female N=22	White N=22	Non-White N=8	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5
Overall	3.14 (.38)	3.11	3.15	3.19	3.03	3.18	3.28	2.90	3.10	3.25
Idealized Influence (IIA)	3.04 (.55)	3.11	3.01	3.09	2.90	3.02	3.20	2.90	2.85	3.22
Idealized Influence (IIB)	3.16 (.51)	3.24	3.13	3.17	3.13	3.23	3.27	2.82	3.20	3.28
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	3.15 (.57)	3.10	3.17	3.23	2.94	3.23	3.42	2.60	3.15	3.37
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3.06 (.47)	3.03	3.07	3.05	3.09	3.20	2.93	3.17	3.08	2.92
Individualized Consideration (IC)	3.30 (.48)	2.99	3.42	3.40	3.05	3.27	3.52	3.07	3.23	3.43

Note. Mind Garden scores Idealized Influence as two categories IIA (Attributive) and IIB (Behavior)

Eight male participants and twenty-two female participants self-reported. The male participant mean scores indicated 3.11 for overall, 3.11 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.24 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.10 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.03 for Intellectual

Stimulation (IS), and 2.99 for Individualized Consideration (IC). The female participant mean scores indicated 3.15 for overall, 3.01 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.13 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.17 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.07 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.42 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

For ethnicity, twenty-two participants self-reported as White, while eight participants self-reported as non-White. The White participant mean scores indicated 3.19 for overall, 3.09 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.17 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.23 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.05 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.40 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

The non-White participant mean scores indicated 3.03 for overall, 2.90 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.13 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 2.94 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.09 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.05 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

Each site had a total of six participants. Site One participant mean scores were 3.18 overall, 3.02 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.23 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.23 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.20 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.27 for Individualized Consideration (IC). Site Two participant mean scores were 3.28 for overall, 3.20 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.27 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.42 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 2.93 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.52 for Individualized Consideration (IC). Site Three participant mean scores were 2.90 for overall, 2.90 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 2.82 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 2.60 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.17 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.07 for Individualized Consideration (IC).Site Four participant mean scores were 3.10 for overall, 2.85 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.20 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.15 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.08 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.23 for Individualized Consideration (IC). Site Five participant mean scores were 3.25 for overall, 3.22

for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.28 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.37 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 2.92 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.43 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

Of the Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores, the majority of scores are above 3.00; however, scores that fell under the 3.00 baseline were male participant IC scores (2.99), non-White participant IIA scores (2.90) and IM scores (2.94), Site Two IS scores (2.93), Site Three overall scores (2.90), IIA scores (2.90), IIB scores (2.82), and IM scores (2.60), Site Four IIA scores (2.85), and Site Five IS scores (2.92).

All single sample t-tests for Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores can be found in Table 4. A single sample t-test was conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference existed between Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores. Overall participants received statistically significant Self-Reported Transformational Scores (M = 3.14, SD = 0.38), $t(30) = 2.06$, $p = 0.049$.

Table 4

t-test of Transformational Leadership Scores Self-Reported on the MLQ-5x™

One-Sample Test

Test Value = 3

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
TL	2.060	29	0.049	0.143	0.000	0.286
Site1	1.408	5	0.218	0.183	-0.151	0.518
Site2	2.318	5	0.068	0.283	-0.031	0.598
Site3	-0.889	5	0.415	-0.100	-0.389	0.189
Site4	0.453	5	0.669	0.100	-0.467	0.667
Site5	1.481	5	0.199	0.250	-0.184	0.684
Male	0.714	7	0.498	0.113	-0.260	0.485
Female	1.980	21	0.061	0.155	-0.008	0.317
White	2.196	21	0.039	0.186	0.001	0.362
Non-White	0.218	7	0.833	0.025	-0.246	0.296

There was no statistically significant relationship between Site One participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.18, SD = 0.32) and the general participant population, $t(6) = 1.40$, p = 0.218. There was no statistically significant relationship between Site Two participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.28, SD = 0.30) and the general participant population, $t(6) = 2.32$, $p = 0.068$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Site Three participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 2.90, SD = 0.28) and the general participant population, $t(6) = -0.89$, $p = 0.415$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Site Four Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.10, SD = 0.54) and the general participant population, $t(6) = 0.45$, $p = 0.669$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Site Five participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.25, SD = 0.41) and the general participant population, $t(6) = 1.48$, $p = 0.199$.

There was no statistically significant relationship between Male participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.11, SD = 0.45) and the general participant population, $t(8) = .71$, $p = 0.498$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Female participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.15, SD = 0.37) and the general participant population, $t(22) = 1.98$, $p = 0.061$. There was no statistically significant relationship between White participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.19, SD = 0.40) and the general participant population, $t(22) = 2.20$, $p = 0.039$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Non-white participants Self-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.03, SD = 0.32) and the general participant population, $t(8) = .22$, $p = 0.833$.

While overall Self-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance, and white participant Self-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance, Mind Garden™ has indicated that Peer-Reported scores are more reliable and valid, thus Peer-Reported scores will be utilized to reject the null hypothesis of research question one. As a result, Self-Reported Transformational Scores will not be used for the acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis of Research Question One.

Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores. Peer-reported Transformational Leadership Scores were collected overall, by gender, by ethnicity and by site. The mean of overall Transformational Leadership Scores was 3.20, the mean of Idealized Influence (II) scores was 3.28 for IIA and 3.21 for IIB, the mean of Inspirational Motivation (IM) scores was 3.13, the mean of Intellectual Stimulation (IS)scores was 3.11, and the mean of Individualized Consideration scores was 3.31.

Eight male participants and twenty-two female participants peer-reported. The male participant mean scores indicated 3.21 for overall, 3.29 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.27 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.29 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.00 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.25 for Individualized Consideration (IC). The female participant mean scores indicated 3.20 for overall, 3.28 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.19 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.07 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.14 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.34 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

For ethnicity, twenty-two participants peer-reported as white, while eight participants peer-reported as non-white. The white participant mean scores indicated 3.23 for overall, 3.29 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.31 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.13 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.12 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.34 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

The non-White participant mean scores indicated 3.13 for overall, 3.25 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 2.93 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.13 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.06 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.25 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

Each site had a total of six participants. Site One participant mean scores indicated 3.28 for overall, 3.38 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.33 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.34 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.02 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.27 for Individualized Consideration (IC). Site Two participant mean scores indicated 3.20 for overall, 3.21 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.39 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 2.95 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.08 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.38 for Individualized Consideration (IC). Site Three participant mean scores indicated 3.19 for overall, 3.38 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 2.97 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.15 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.35 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.20 for Individualized Consideration (IC).Site Four participant mean scores indicated 2.85 for overall, 3.00 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 2.84 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 2.79 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 2.63 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 2.93 for Individualized Consideration (IC). Site Five participant mean scores indicated 3.50 for overall, 3.43 for Idealized Influence (IIA), 3.48 for Idealized Influence (IIB), 3.39 for Inspirational Motivation (IM), 3.48 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 3.78 for Individualized Consideration (IC).

Of the Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores, the majority of scores are above 3.00; however, scores that fell under the 3.00 baseline were non-white participant IIB scores (2.93), Site Two IM scores (2.95), Site Three IIB scores (2.97) IIA, Site Four overall scores (2.85) IIB scores (2.84) IM scores (2.79) IS scores (2.63) and IC scores (2.93). All Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

Transformational Leadership Scores Peer-Reported on the MLQ-5x™

	M (*SD*) N=30	Male N=8	Female N=22	White N=22	Non-White N=8	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5
Overall	3.20 (.56)	3.21	3.20	3.23	3.13	3.28	3.20	3.19	2.85	3.50
Idealized Influence (IIA)	3.28 (.54)	3.29	3.28	3.29	3.25	3.38	3.21	3.38	3.00	3.43
Idealized Influence (IIB)	3.21 (.68)	3.27	3.19	3.31	2.93	3.33	3.39	2.97	2.84	3.48
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	3.13 (.65)	3.29	3.07	3.13	3.13	3.34	2.95	3.15	2.79	3.39
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3.11 (.72)	3.00	3.14	3.12	3.06	3.02	3.08	3.35	2.63	3.48
Individualized Consideration (IC)	3.31 (.68)	3.25	3.34	3.34	3.25	3.27	3.38	3.20	2.93	3.78

Note. Mind Garden scores Idealized Influence as two categories IIA (Attributive) and IIB (Behavior)

All single sample t-tests for Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores can be found in Table 6. A single sample t-test was conducted to determine if a statistically significant difference existed between Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores. Overall participants received statistically significant Peer-Reported Transformational Scores (M = 3.21, SD = 0.55), $t(30) = 2.85$, $p = .006$.

Table 6

t-test of Transformational Leadership Scores Peer-Reported on the MLQ-5x™

			One-Sample Test			
			Test Value = 3			
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
	t	df				
TL	2.854	29	0.006	0.205	0.061	0.349
Site1	1.936	5	0.079	0.275	-0.037	0.588
Site2	2.125	5	0.057	0.208	-0.008	0.424
Site3	1.153	5	0.273	0.192	-0.174	0.558
Site4	-0.689	5	0.505	-0.150	-0.629	0.329
Site5	4.258	5	0.001	0.500	0.242	0.758
Male	1.778	7	0.096	0.206	-0.041	0.454
Female	2.294	21	0.027	0.205	0.025	0.384
White	3.155	21	0.003	0.232	0.084	0.380
Non-White	0.722	7	0.481	0.131	-0.256	0.519

There was no statistically significant relationship between Site One participants Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.28, SD = 0.49) and the general participant population, $t(6) = 1.94$, $p = 0.079$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Site Two participants Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.21, SD = 0.34) and the general participant population, $t(6) = 2.13$, $p = 0.057$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Site Three participants Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M= 3.19, SD = 0.58) and the general participant population, $t(6) = 1.15$, $p = 0.273$. There was no statistically significant relationship between Site Four participants Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 2.85, SD = 0.75) and the general participant population, $t(6) = - 0.69$, $p = 0.505$. There was no statistically significant relationship between

Site Five participants Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.50, SD = 0.41)

and the general participant population, $t(6) = 4.26$, $p = 0.001$.

There was no statistically significant relationship between Male participants Peer-

Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.21, SD = 0.46) and the general participant

population, $t(8) = 1.78$, $p = 0.096$. There was no statistically significant relationship between

Female participants Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.20, SD = 0.59)

and the general participant population, $t(22) = 2.29$, $p = 0.027$. There was no statistically

significant relationship between White participants Peer-Reported Transformational Leadership

Scores (M = 3.23, SD = 0.49) and the general participant population, $t(22) = 3.16$, $p = 0.003$.

There was no statistically significant relationship between Non-White participants Peer-Reported

Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.13, SD = 0.73) and the general participant

population, $t(8) = 0.72$, $p = 0.481$.

Overall Peer-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance, Site Five

participant Peer-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance, female participant

Peer-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance, and White participant Peer-

Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance.

Rejection of Null Hypothesis. As 3 was set as the baseline for student MLQ-5x™

scores, the null hypothesis can be rejected for both peer-rated (3.2) scores, as $\mu > 3$, $p = 0.006$.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two states: *Is there a relationship between the frequency of*

transformational leadership qualities fostered through doctoral higher education programs

(taken from Appendix E and Appendix F) and doctoral student scores of transformational

leadership qualities taken from the MLQ-5x™? A null hypothesis indicates that there is no

significant relationship between transformational leadership qualities scores among students within doctoral higher education programs and course offerings/programming intended to foster transformative qualities.

Analysis. After the analysis was conducted for RQ1, mean peer-rated scores were identified, and as these scores indicate stronger validity for the MLQ-5x™ they were utilized for the correlation analysis in RQ2.

Themes surrounding Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration were located through a program evaluation of curriculum courses, cognate courses, and extracurricular programming found on the participant site's website. These themes were calculated using Appendix D, and a correlation analysis was conducted between Appendix D scores and the peer-rated MLQ-5x™ scores. This correlation was conducted both overall, and by individual transformational leadership attribute (Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration). Appendix D results can be found in Table 7.

Table 7

Program Evaluation Rubric Results for Identification of Transformational Leadership

	M (*SD*) N=5	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5
Overall	25.00 (9.06)	19	41	21	21	23
Idealized Influence (II)	5.6 (4.28)	4	13	2	4	5
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	6.00 (2.65)	5	10	5	7	3
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	7.80 (3.35)	8	10	9	2	10

Individualized Consideration (IC)	5.60 (2.51)	2	8	5	8	5

A bivariate correlation was conducted using results from the Program Evaluation from

Appendix D vs. Peer-Reported Transformational scores found through the MLQ-5x™. The first

bivariate correlation was conducted using overall Program Evaluation results versus Overall Site

scores. The Overall Site score was not related to Program Evaluation totals, $t(4) = 0.074$, $p =$

0.946, $r = 0.042$. A second bivariate correlation was conducted using Idealized Influence (II)

scores from the Program Evaluation versus Idealized Influence Attribute (IIA) scores found in

the MLQ-5x™. The Idealized Influence Attribute (IIA) score was not related to the Program

Evaluation totals, $t(4) = -0.398$, $p = 0.717$, $r = -0.224$. A third bivariate correlation was

conducted using Idealized Influence (II) scores from the Program Evaluation versus Idealized

Influence Behavior (IIB) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The Idealized Influence Behavior (IIB)

score was not related to the Program Evaluation totals, $t(4) = 1.021$, $p = 0.382$, $r = 0.508$. A

fourth bivariate correlation was conducted using Inspirational Motivation (IM) scores from the

Program Evaluation versus Inspirational Motivation (IM) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The

Inspirational Motivation score was not related to the Program Evaluation totals, $t(4) = -2.072$, p

$= 0.130$, $r = -0.767$. A fifth bivariate correlation was conducted using Intellectual Stimulation

(IS) scores from the Program Evaluation versus Intellectual Stimulation (IS) scores found in the

MLQ-5x™. The Intellectual Stimulation score was not related to the Program Evaluation totals,

$t(4) = 2.950$, $p = 0.060$, $r = 0.862$. A sixth bivariate correlation was conducted using

Individualized Consideration (IC) scores from the Program Evaluation versus Individualized

Consideration (IC) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The Individualized Consideration score was

not related to the Program Evaluation totals, $t(4) = -0.471$, $p = 0.670$, $r = -0.262$. Results from

the bivariate correlation of Program Evaluation totals versus Peer-Reported Transformational

Scores identified in the MLQ-5x™ can be found in **Error! Reference source not found.**.

Table 8

Correlation of Program Evaluation Rubric Results versus Peer-Reported TL Scores

	df	t	p	r
Overall	3	0.074	0.946	0.042
Idealized Influence (IIA - Attributes)	3	-0.398	0.717	-0.224
Idealized Influence (IIB - Behavior)	3	1.021	0.382	0.508
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	3	-2.072	0.130	-0.767
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3	2.950	0.060	0.862
Individualized Consideration (IC)	3	-0.471	0.670	-0.262

Note. Mind Garden scores Idealized Influence as two categories IIA (Attributive) and IIB (Behavior)

Next, themes surrounding Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual

Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration were located through interviews with program

chairs from participant sites. These themes were calculated using Appendix E, and a correlation

analysis was conducted between Appendix E scores and the peer-rated MLQ-5x™ scores. This

correlation was conducted both overall, and by individual transformational leadership attribute

(Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized

Consideration). Appendix E results can be found in Table 9.

Table 9

Interview Rubric Results for Identification of Transformational Leadership

	M (SD) N=5	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5
Overall	11.20 (2.54)	10	15.5	9.5	9.5	11.5
Idealized Influence (II)	3.5 (0.50)	3	4	3	4	3.5
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	2.20 (0.97)	2.5	3.5	1	1.5	2.5
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3.00 (0.79)	3	4	3.5	2	2.5
Individualized Consideration (IC)	2.50 (1.00)	1.5	4	2	2	3

A bivariate correlation was conducted using results from the Interview from Appendix E vs.

Peer-Reported Transformational scores found through the MLQ-5x™. The first bivariate

correlation was conducted using overall Interview results versus Overall Site scores. The Overall

Site score was not related to Interview totals, $t(4) = 0.457$, $p = 0.679$, $r = 0.255$. A second

bivariate correlation was conducted using Idealized Influence (II) scores from the Interview

versus Idealized Influence Attribute (IIA) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The Idealized

Influence Attribute (IIA) score was not related to the Interview totals, $t(4) = -2.126$, $p = 0.123$, r

$= -0.775$. A third bivariate correlation was conducted using Idealized Influence (II) scores from

the Interview versus Idealized Influence Behavior (IIB) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The

Idealized Influence Behavior (IIB) score was not related to the Interview totals, $t(4) = -0.108$, $p =$

0.921, $r = -0.062$. A fourth bivariate correlation was conducted using Inspirational Motivation

(IM) scores from the Interview versus Inspirational Motivation (IM) scores found in the MLQ-

5x™. The Inspirational Motivation score was not related to the Interview totals, $t(4) = 0.212$, p

= 0.845, $r = 0.122$. A fifth bivariate correlation was conducted using Intellectual Stimulation (IS)

scores from the Interview versus Intellectual Stimulation (IS) scores found in the MLQ-5x™.

The Intellectual Stimulation score was not related to the Interview totals, $t(4) = 0.689$, $p = 0.540$,

$r = 0.370$. A sixth bivariate correlation was conducted using Individualized Consideration (IC)

scores from the Interview versus Individualized Consideration (IC) scores found in the MLQ-

5x™. The Individualized Consideration score was not related to the Interview totals, $t(4) =$

1.012, $p = 0.386$, $r = 0.504$. Results from the bivariate correlation of Interview totals versus

Peer-Reported Transformational Scores identified in the MLQ-5x™ can be found in Table 10.

Table 10

Correlation of Interview Rubric Results versus Peer-Reported TL Scores

	df	t	p	r
Overall	3	0.457	0.679	0.255
Idealized Influence (IIA - Attributes)	3	-2.126	0.123	-0.775
Idealized Influence (IIB - Behavior)	3	-0.108	0.921	-0.062
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	3	0.212	0.845	0.122
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3	0.689	0.540	0.370
Individualized Consideration (IC)	3	1.012	0.386	0.504

Note. Mind Garden scores Idealized Influence as two categories IIA (Attributive) and IIB (Behavior)

Finally, the matrix from Appendix F was calculated, which indicates the frequency of

each transformational leadership attribute within the participant site. Frequency was conducted

for the program evaluation of required course descriptions, cognate course descriptions, and

interviews. A final correlation was conducted between frequency scores in Appendix F and the peer-rated MLQ-5x™ scores. This correlation was conducted both overall, and by individual transformational leadership attribute (Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration). The frequency scores from Appendix F can be found in Table 11.

Table 11

Compilation Rubric Results for Identification of Transformational Leadership

	M (*SD*) N=5	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5
Overall	36.20 (11.53)	29.00	56.50	30.50	30.50	34.50
Idealized Influence (II)	9.10 (4.62)	7.00	17.00	5.00	8.00	8.50
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	8.20 (3.19)	7.50	13.50	6.00	8.50	5.50
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	10.80 (3.95)	11.00	14.00	12.50	4.00	12.50
Individualized Consideration (IC)	8.10 (3.21)	3.50	12.00	7.00	10.00	8.00

A bivariate correlation was conducted using results from the Interview from Appendix F vs. Peer-Reported Transformational scores found through the MLQ-5x™. The first bivariate correlation was conducted using overall Compilation rubric (Program Evaluation and Interview) versus Overall Site scores. The Overall Site score was not related to Compilation rubric totals, $t(4) = 0.156$, $p = 0.886$, $r = 0.090$. A second bivariate correlation was conducted using Idealized Influence (II) scores from the Compilation rubric versus Idealized Influence Attribute (IIA) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The Idealized Influence Attribute (IIA) score was not related to

the Compilation rubric totals, $t(4) = -0.528$, $p = 0.634$, $r = -0.292$. A third bivariate correlation

was conducted using Idealized Influence (II) scores from the Compilation rubric versus Idealized

Influence Behavior (IIB) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The Idealized Influence Behavior (IIB)

score was not related to the Compilation rubric totals, $t(4) = -0.907$, $p = 0.431$, $r = 0.464$. A

fourth bivariate correlation was conducted using Inspirational Motivation (IM) scores from the

Compilation rubric versus Inspirational Motivation (IM) scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The

Inspirational Motivation score was not related to the Compilation rubric totals, $t(4) = -1.294$, $p =$

0.286, $r = -0.598$. A fifth bivariate correlation was conducted using Intellectual Stimulation (IS)

scores from the Compilation rubric versus Intellectual Stimulation (IS) scores found in the MLQ-

5x™. The Intellectual Stimulation score was not related to the Compilation rubric totals, $t(4) =$

2.353, $p = 0.100$, $r = 0.805$. A sixth bivariate correlation was conducted using Individualized

Consideration (IC) scores from the Compilation rubric versus Individualized Consideration (IC)

scores found in the MLQ-5x™. The Individualized Consideration score was not related to the

Compilation rubric totals, $t(4) = -0.083$, $p = 0.939$, $r = -0.048$. Results from the bivariate

correlation of Compilation rubric totals versus Peer-Reported Transformational Scores identified

in the MLQ-5x™ can be found in Table 12.

Table 12

Correlation of Compilation Rubric Results versus Peer-Reported TL Scores

	df	t	p	r
Overall	3	0.156	0.886	0.090
Idealized Influence (IIA - Attributes)	3	0-.528	0.634	-0.292
Idealized Influence (IIB - Behavior)	3	-0.907	0.431	0.464
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	3	-1.294	0.286	-0.598
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3	2.353	0.100	0.805
Individualized Consideration (IC)	3	-0.083	0.939	-0.048

Note. Mind Garden scores Idealized Influence as two categories IIA (Attributive) and IIB (Behavior)

All analysis was conducted through SPSS version 25. For the bivariate correlation, Pearson *r* should be identified between -1.00 and +1.00. The closer the Pearson *r* score is to -1.00 or +1.00, the more significance the relationship is. An alpha level of 0.05 was selected to indicate significance. A null hypothesis would state there is no statistically significant relationship between intended transformational leadership qualities and student MLQ-5x™ scores. If the significance level for each test falls below the alpha level of 0.05 then the null hypothesis can be rejected. If all three bivariate correlations indicate there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership fostering activities and student MLQ-5x™ scores, then the null hypothesis can be rejected, and it can be stated that there is a relationship between program/course offerings and student transformational leadership scores.

Acceptance of Null Hypothesis. As it was stated that all three sets of bivariate correlations must indicate a significant relationship between transformational leadership

fostering activities (Appendix D, Appendix E, Appendix F) and student MLQ-5x™ scores , and no significant relationship was found in any of the correlation designs, than the null hypothesis must be accepted. The null hypothesis states there is no statistically significant relationship between intended transformational leadership qualities and student MLQ-5x™ scores

Research Question Three

Research Question Three states: *How are transformational leadership skill fostered through doctoral higher education leadership programs?* No null hypothesis is given.

Analysis. Results from both the semi-structured interviews with program chairs/directors, as well as the program evaluation of course offerings, program offerings, and extracurricular activities that help foster transformational leadership qualities among doctoral student populations was taken during the analysis of RQ2. Results were categorized by participant site, and found in Appendix D, Appendix E, and Appendix F. Results from Research Question Three have been organized and are displayed in Table 13.

Table 13

Results of Transformational Leadership Fostering Activities by Participant Site

Attribute	Site One	Site Two	Site Three	Site Four	Site Five
Idealized Influence	Internships Progress Reports	Guest Lectures Summer Institute	Weekly Ten Hours of Mentored Research Guest Lectures	Guest Lectures Partnership with Engineering Education and Student Affairs	Self-Defined as Supportive and Inclusive Guest Lectures at department, college, and university level
Inspirational Motivation	Goal Seeking Ethical Considerations	Goal Seeking Ethical Considerations	Goal Seeking Mock Career Interviews	Career Goals Ethical Considerations	Group Dynamics Personal Barriers
Intellectual Stimulation	Critical Discourse Models Practicum	Major Learning Theories Research Colloquium	Organizational Models Research Colloquium	Critical Race Theory Field Trips to Partnering Organizations	Social Justice Class Organizational Operations and Theories
Individualized Consideration	Super Advising Session Writing Center	Cohort Driven Peer Mentorship	Semi-Cohort Model Peer Mentorship	Cohort Driven Peer Mentorship	Cohort for Research Seminar Back Channel of Peer Mentorship

Site One. Site One results indicated highest support for Intellectual Stimulation and lowest support for Individualized Consideration. For Idealized Influence, both required and optional course syllabi indicated no structured leadership talks, partnership building, or leadership support. However, the program website for Site One did provide four instances of Idealized Influence support, including internship or practicum opportunities, research apprenticeship opportunities with an assigned faculty mentor, indication that chairs serve as mentors, and proposed frequency of mentor support from assigned chairs. Interview results stated that mentorship was not a formal requirement for students, but support is provided through student progress reports every semester. These progress reports provided constructive criticism related to coursework and long-term goals. Additionally, no formalized partnerships are available outside of the program; however, guest speakers are encouraged to assist faculty in their own courses.

Inspirational Motivation of Site One was found in three instances of required course syllabi, which listed the investigation of higher education issues related to appropriate goals, the exploration of research methods toward qualitative/quantitative goals and reviewing ethical issues within assessment procedures. Optional course syllabi listed one instance of Inspirational Motivation through investigating higher education methodology analysis procedures and ethics. The program website for Site One provided two Inspirational Motivation indicators focused on program chair assistance and principal investigator assistance for outlining ethical considerations of research. Interview results stated that goals of students are considered in the application process, and admittance does factor whether the program can assist students in achieving their goals. Goals are also set for each student through the abovementioned progress reports. While

discussions of ethical considerations of emotional intelligence are not formalized, the topic of imposter syndrome is commonplace.

Intellectual Stimulation of Site One was found in five instances of required course syllabi, which listed the focus of critical discourse analysis to improve classroom interaction, critical reads of multilevel methodologies, investigating contemporary concepts of organization and administration, and considering the needs of government, industry, and health-related organizations. No Intellectual Stimulation indicators were found in Site One. The program website for Site One also provided three indicators of Intellectual Stimulation, including a student and alumni body currently working in various higher education organizations, a practicum near national organizations, and providing support in organizational change and leadership. Interview results stated that there is a course offered on critical contemporary theory, and that program workshops offer discussions on organizational issues/barriers. Additionally, students are offered conference money for either first-time attendance or for presentation of research, and that these conferences provide critical/creative approach models.

Individualized Consideration of Site One was found in no required or optional course syllabi. The program website for Site One did provide two indicators of Individualized Consideration, including support through a writing center, and support from faculty and alumni in securing an internship or practicum. Interview results stated that there is no cohort model, and most support comes from progress reports. Students are typically full-time in their careers, with families and commutes, thus there is very limited peer-support. Aside from the progress reports students receive every semester, three faculty members are assigned for a "super advising" session when students reach 18 credits, 36 credits, and at the end of the program.

Site Two. Site Two results indicated highest support for Idealized Influence and lowest support for Individualized Consideration. For Idealized Influence, required course syllabi indicated one instance, where guest lectures are included in a government organization and administration course. Optional course syllabi indicated six instances of Idealized Influence, including mentorship in an internship course, guest speakers in a professional helping skills course, guest speakers in campus internationalization course, guest speakers in a college and university presidency course, corporate partnership development in an institutional advancement course, and partnership development in a global and intercultural perspectives in higher education course. The program website for Site Two provided six instances of Idealized Influence, stressing courses taught by guest speakers, mentorships, guest speakers at a summer institute, and international partnerships. Interview results found that the department is a community of mentors, and mentorship is an integral role of all faculty members, students, and alumni. Students are offered brown bags frequently to provide students with topics outside of their traditional coursework. Guest speakers are formally brought in twice a year but are a common occurrence within individual courses. The program is also described as partnership-driven, which is fostered through partnering with international institutions, through a leadership series, and a summer institute. The model is self-described as a very strong support model.

Inspirational Motivation of Site Two was found in five instances of required course syllabi regarding the discussion of institutional goals and ethical considerations. Optional course syllabi listed two instances of Inspirational Motivation through the identification of career goals, and ethical consideration. The program website for Site Two provided three instances of Inspirational Motivation indicators focusing on career goal consideration within the application process and discussing the diversity of student body-goals. Interview results stated that goals are

weighed in the application process, and that goals are an informal discussion with advisers, mentors, or fellow students. Leadership is also taught with high ethical consideration, and integrity is expected for any doctoral student who joins the journal's editorial board. Students are also taught to be interdependent.

Intellectual Stimulation of Site Two was found in three instances of required course syllabi, which mention critical examination and critical reading. Optional course syllabi listed seven instances of Intellectual Stimulation, including analyzing empirical research critically, critically discussing major learning theories, critical discussion of education motivation, critical discussion of metacognition and self-regulated learning, critical indigenous research, and critical policy analysis. The program website for Site Two provided no instances of Intellectual Stimulation. Interview results stated that there are policy field trips, monthly workshops, and journal editing positions. Students are provided an organizational administration course and have the chance to participate in a research colloquium. There is also an understanding that critical thinking comes from the knowledge of what tools are available to the student/future leader.

Individualized Consideration of Site Two was found in one instance of required syllabi through the investigation of organizational structure. Optional course syllabi listed two instances of Individualized Consideration through investigating higher education structures and the exploration of support skills. The program website for Site Two provided five indicators of Individualized Consideration including dissertation support, graduate assistantship support, building strong supportive relationships at the summer institute, being a part of a cohort model, and the general diversity within the cohort model. Interview results stated that peer mentorship is encouraged through a peer advising setup, and that there are numerous opportunities in both

formal and informal settings to help facilitate this. The program is also described as a strong

cohort model, with the philosophy that strong support equals strong results, and that support is

given through scaffolding.

      Site Three. Site Three results indicated highest support for Intellectual Stimulation and

lowest support for Idealized Influence. For Idealized Influence, both required course syllabi and

optional course syllabi indicated no instances of Idealized Influence. The program website for

Site Three provided two instances of Idealized Influence through ten hours of mentored research

on a weekly basis and support through graduate assistantships or research apprenticeships.

Interview results stated that there are ten hours of mentored research per week, and that guest

speakers happen twice a month.

      Inspirational Motivation of Site Three was found in two instances of required course

syllabi through the discussion of ethical inquiry about educational problems and the ethical

evaluation about problems of practice in evaluation. Optional course syllabi did not provide any

instances of Inspirational Motivation. The program website for Site Three provided three

instances of Inspirational Motivation indicators focusing on the expectations of students to

contribute to a rich academic community, choosing a degree that supports an individual's career

goals, and asking for a statement of purpose in the application process. Interview results stated

that goals are considered in the onboarding process, that expectations are set ahead of time for

students, and that career preparation happens through informal interviews between students and

prospective job sites.

      Intellectual Stimulation of Site Three was found in one instance of required course

syllabi, which provides organization and governance models of decision making. Optional

course syllabi listed three instances of Intellectual Stimulation, including coursework that

reviews community college organizational structure, organizational arrangement of college and university management functions, and theories of student affairs programming. The program website for Site Three indicated five instances of Intellectual Stimulation, including discussions of educational theory and practice, thinking critically about institutional priorities, having definitive knowledge of educational theory and practice, being able to apply research in a critical approach, and offering a minor in organization and governance. Interview results show there is an entire course on organization and governance, that ten hours of structured research are required weekly, and that informal research workshops occur twice a month. It was also stated in the interview that a research colloquium is provided for students to share their research findings.

Individualized Consideration of Site Three was found in three instances of required course syllabi, including structured feedback of academic writing, structured opportunity in survey work, and maximizing constituent support by identifying contemporary issues. Optional course syllabi listed no indicators of Individualized Consideration. The program website for Site Three provided two indicators of Individualized Consideration including supporting the doctoral student through the institution's mission and providing support through graduate assistantships. Interview results stated there is informal peer-mentorship that occurs within the program, and the students will oftentimes lead the cohort/peer-mentorship. There is also a semi-cohort model that is student driven, and there is support through a research seminar for the dissertation process.

Site Four. Site Four results indicated highest support for Individualized Consideration and lowest support for Intellectual Stimulation. For Idealized Influence, both required course syllabi and optional course syllabi indicated no instances of Idealized Influence. The program website for Site Four provided four instances of Idealized Influence by outlining the faculty role

as a mentor and stating that active partnerships are encouraged with educational organizations.

Interview results stated there is mentorship through the editorial board process, and that guest

speakers do come to individual courses at the university level, but not so much on the program

level. It was also stated that there are strong partnerships with student affairs and with the

engineering education doctoral program.

Inspirational Motivation of Site Four was found in one instance of required course syllabi

through the focus of variations of institutional goals. Optional course syllabi provided one

instance of Inspirational Motivation by focusing on ethical principles in student affairs related

material. The program website for Site Four provided five instances of Inspirational Motivation

indicators focusing on career goals, professional goals during a student comprehensive exam,

membership in professional associations, expected ethical conduct as a researcher, and general

expectations from a faculty adviser. Interview results show that goals are identified in the

application process, and that pairing of students occurs from advisers to match students to

colleagues that share their same goals. It was also found that there is a graduate student's

assembly to assist students with barriers, through this is not required, and that imposter syndrome

is discussed in coursework, though no discussions are formalized.

Intellectual Stimulation of Site Four was found in one instance of required course syllabi

through the discussion of institutional structures. Optional course syllabi listed one instance of

an Intellectual Stimulation indicator through the discussion of educational organizational theory.

The program website listed no indicators of Intellectual Stimulation. Interview results stated

there is a focus on organizational complexity and change through coursework. Results also show

that coursework includes critical race theory, and that the program is working toward a culture of

research teams. There was also discussion of infrequent field trips to other institutions.

Individualized Consideration of Site Four was found in no instances of required course syllabi. Optional course syllabi listed two instances of Individualized Consideration through coursework discussing institutional structures, and supervised work experience. The program website listed six indicators of Individualized Consideration through the discussion cohort models, supporting student progress, and structured in-class activities. Interview results stated that peer mentorship is informal and happens more often in the apprenticeship setting. It was also stated that there is a strong cohort model, that advising is seen as strategic, and there are offerings of classes on the future professoriate.

Site Five. Site Five results indicated highest support for Intellectual Stimulation and lowest support for Inspirational Motivation. For Idealized Influence, no instances were found in required course syllabi. Optional course syllabi indicated that organizational theory supports leadership. The program website for Site Five provided four instances of Idealized Influence by stating that it seeks to mentor scholar practitioners, support and sustain inclusive environments, provide research and teaching support, and providing a supportive community. Interview results stated that there is no formal mentorship, but that students meet with advisers at the beginning of each semester to discuss coursework. Although there is no formal mentorship, informal mentorship opportunities occur through a back channel of communication. It was also stated that there are frequent guest speaking engagements through the school of education, the larger campus, and within coursework, happening every semester. Guest speakers are often alumni, but guest speakers from diverse backgrounds in higher education are also invited to speak with students.

Inspirational Motivation of Site Five was not found in either required or optional course syllabi. The program website for Site Five provided three instances of Inspirational Motivation

through motivating and leading people so that institutional and personal goals are met, that graduates will conceptualize and implement different institutional goals, and that faculty generate high scholarly expectations. Interview results stated that there is no discussion of goal setting, but discussions of group dynamics happen in early stages of coursework. The discussion of imposter syndrome also occurs at this stage as well, and that discussions of personal barriers, specifically in the dissertation stage, are included.

Intellectual Stimulation of Site Five was found in one instance of required course syllabi through the application of planning for educational organizations. Optional course syllabi listed five instances of Intellectual Stimulation indicators through critical analysis of historical development in higher education, investigating organizational operations, applying and synthesizing within organizations, investigating organizational theory, and supporting organizational decision-making. The program website listed four instances of Intellectual Stimulation indicators through the program's creation of problem solvers, creating space for innovation, leading transformative innovation, and enhancing organizations through leadership. Interview results stated that higher education concentration courses discuss organizational theory, and that there is a social justice class where students approach leader perspectives. There is also a student development and learning class where students discuss organizational barriers, and that leadership discussions don't focus solely on executive level leadership, but on mid-level leadership as well.

Individualized Consideration of Site Five was found in no instances of required course syllabi. Optional course syllabi listed three instances of Individualized Consideration through offering a cohort program for research seminar, and attention given to organizational structure. The program website listed two indicators of Individualized Consideration by stating that the

program is supportive to inclusive environments, and that the program is welcoming and supportive. Interview results stated that peer support happens through back channels, and that students have informal support if they join the editorial staff of the program's journal. It was also stated that the Ed.D. option has a cohort model, while the Ph.D. option is more of a *de facto* cohort model. Support is also provided for students who publish pre-dissertation, but publishing is not required or encouraged.

Overview of Common and Unique Fostering Activities

Common transformational leadership fostering activities were found among the five participant sites. These results have been organized and are displayed in Table 14.

Table 14

Most Common Transformational Leadership Fostering Activities

Attribute	Most Common Practices
Idealized Influence	Guest Speakers
Inspirational Motivation	Identification of Career Goals in Application Process
Intellectual Stimulation	Organizational Coursework and Discussions of Ethical Considerations
Individualized Consideration	Cohort Models

The most common activity for Idealized Influence was found in the offering of guest speakers. The practice of offering guest speakers provides a real-world outlook on many of the complex tasks that educational leaders face daily, thus offering current doctoral students a glimpse of what to expect in their future careers. The most common activity for Inspirational Motivation came through the identification of career goals, whether in the application process, or throughout the doctoral student's time in the program. Goal setting provides students with the proper scaffolding to not only reach their academic or career aspirations, but to provide a frame of reference for where they should be throughout benchmarks of their respective program. The most common activity for Intellectual Stimulation was found in organizational coursework and discussions of ethical considerations, which both relate to future relationships with constituent groups. While organizational coursework provides students with an understanding of how higher education institutions function, coursework focusing on ethical considerations will assist students in making decisions that are fair for future constituents. The most common activity for Individualized Consideration was the cohort model. While some of the participant sites had formal cohort models, others had informal models that were led by current students. The idea of any cohort model, whether formal or informal, helps build up a student's sense of being part of a team, thus aiding them in not only retention, but building a strong network of trusted colleagues for future goal setting.

Of all the unique fostering activities explored, the most advantageous may come from Site One's facilitation of letters, or progress reports, every semester. This method of feedback appears to provide the most structure than any other program investigated, as it not only provided feedback for individual coursework, but also feedback on where a student was with their research, and with their career goals. Another unique fostering activity that was significant came

from Site Three's ten required hours of mentor-led research per week. Site Three was

comprised; however, or mainly full-time students who were undertaking graduate assistantships.

While research is implied in a doctoral program, a mandated requirement of ten hours may prove

to be difficult for any program offering part-time programs to working professionals. A final

unique fostering activity was found in Site Four's partnership with the Engineering Education

doctoral program. This partnership was significant because it provides students the opportunity

to interact with colleagues outside of the traditional higher education path and presents a

multitude of possibilities for collaboration.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to identify whether transformational leadership skills are above average within students enrolled in doctoral programs in higher education, and whether their respective programs are assisting in the development of these transformational leadership skills. This chapter includes a discussion of key findings as related to the literature on transformational leadership, and what implications may be valuable to researchers, graduate program chairs, deans of education schools and colleges, and prospective higher education doctoral students. Also included is a discussion of how these implications can be useful for theory and practice. The chapter concludes with a discussion of limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Summary and Overview of Dissertation

This study included a non-experimental, mixed-methods research design that incorporated student survey results, program chair interviews, and a program evaluation of course descriptions and program websites. The study attempted to answer three research questions:

1. Do above average transformational leadership qualities exist in doctoral higher education students? If so, to what extent?

2. Is there a relationship between the frequency of transformational leadership qualities fostered through doctoral higher education programs (taken from Appendix E and Appendix F) and doctoral student scores of transformational leadership qualities taken from the MLQ-5x™?

3. How are transformational leadership skill fostered through doctoral higher education leadership programs?

Data were collected in three parts. First, chairs from of five universities in the Commonwealth of Virginia that offer doctoral higher education programs were interviewed. These program chairs were also asked to provide six currently enrolled doctoral higher students, leading to a grand total of thirty students. These thirty doctoral higher education students were then asked to complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x™) created by Mind Garden, Inc. and then have two fellow students from their current program peer-rate their responses. Mind Garden, Inc. then provided total scores of Transformational Leadership, with a breakdown of sub scores regarding Idealized Influence (Attribute), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Finally, the researcher worked with a research team to identify how these 4 I's of transformational leadership appeared within the program chair interview transcripts, as well as how they appeared through required and optional course descriptions, and the program websites for the corresponding participant site.

Discussion of Research Findings

Research Question 1 - Do above average transformational leadership qualities exist in doctoral higher education students? If so, to what extent? A null hypothesis indicated that transformational leadership qualities are not above average in doctoral higher education students. The null hypothesis was rejected, as 3 was set as the baseline for student MLQ-5x™ scores, with overall peer-rated scores (3.2), as $\mu > 3$, $p = 0.006$.

While self-reported scores were not part of the correlation design for Research Question Two, nor were they used as a basis of rejecting the null hypothesis (peer-reported scores show

stronger validity/reliability), it was noted that the only set of scores that provided significance among the self-reported came from white participants. White participant self-reported Transformational Leadership Scores (M = 3.19, SD = 0.40) were statistically significant in comparison to the general participant population, $t(22) = 2.20$, $p = 0.039$.

Of the peer-reported scores, Overall Peer-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance (M = 3.20, SD = 0.56, $t(30) = 2.85$, $p = 0.006$). This signifies that doctoral higher education students who participated in the study were above average regarding their transformational leadership scores. It was also noted that Individualized Consideration was scored highest (M=3.31, SD = 0.68), and Intellectual Stimulation was scored lowest (M = 3.11, SD = 0.72). Regarding Individualized Consideration, this may suggest that currently studied doctoral higher education students are strong in relation to active listening and supporting others. While Intellectual Stimulation was scored lowest, it was still above average, as $\mu > 3$.

Regarding the peer-reported sub scores, Site Five participant Peer-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance (M = 3.50, SD = 0.41, $t(6) = 4.26$, $p = 0.001$), female participant Peer-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance (M = 3.20, SD = 0.59, $t(22) = 2.29$, $p = 0.027$), and White participant Peer-Reported Transformational Scores did indicate significance (M = 3.23, SD = 0.49, $t(22) = 3.16$, $p = 0.003$). Site Five also peer-reported highest of all participant sites (M =3.50), this indicates that peer-raters found students to have the most transformational leadership attributes. Peer-reported female participant scores were also significant with mean scores (M = 3.20) consistent with overall peer-reported scores (M = 3.20). Finally, peer-reported white participants scores were also significant (M = 3.23), which coupled with self-reported white participant scores (M = 3.19), could lead to a

possible discussion about how white doctoral higher education students are self-reporting and being peer-reported in comparison to students of color.

Research Question 2 - Is there a relationship between the frequency of transformational leadership qualities fostered through doctoral higher education programs (taken from Appendix D, Appendix E and Appendix F) and doctoral student scores of transformational leadership qualities taken from the MLQ-5x™? A null hypothesis indicated that there was no significant relationship between transformational leadership qualities scores among students within doctoral higher education programs and course offerings/programming intended to foster transformative qualities.

After three correlations were conducted, no significant relationship was found in any of the correlation designs, and the null hypothesis was accepted. The first correlation between Appendix D (Program Evaluation Results) vs. MLQ-5x™ scores yielded no significance, $t(4) = 0.074$, $p = 0.946$, $r = 0.042$. The second correlation between Appendix E (Interview Results) vs. MLQ-5x™ scores yielded no significance, $t(4) = 0.457$, $p = 0.679$, $r = 0.255$. The third correlation between Appendix F (Compilation Results) vs. MLQ-5x™ scores yielded no significance, $t(4) = 0.156$, $p = 0.886$, $r = 0.090$.

While all three correlations yielded no significance, this does not indicate that doctoral higher education programs are not instilling transformational leadership qualities, but that there was no correlation between student scores and what was measured through Appendix D, Appendix E, and Appendix F. A justification for these correlations yielding no significance may also be due to the small sample size of the research.

Research Question 3 - How are transformational leadership skills fostered through doctoral higher education leadership programs? Data collected from Appendix D (Program

Evaluation) and Appendix E (Interview) results indicated that doctoral higher education programs are in fact providing multiple activities to instill transformational leadership qualities within students. Not only were common activities identified through research question three, there were unique activities among the five participant sites.

It was found that whether through providing guest speakers, identifying career goals, setting goals, discussions of ethical considerations, or arranging students into cohorts, the Commonwealth of Virginia does offer doctoral higher education programs that are designed with transformational leadership in mind. Additionally, some of the doctoral higher education programs studied are providing more student-focused activities such as progress reports every semester, mentor-led research, or partnerships with other doctoral departments. These unique offerings may assist doctoral higher education students in their own future leadership responsibilities by providing a model that is both creative and critical in its approach.

Implications for Theory and Practice

This study indicated that doctoral higher education students within the Commonwealth of Virginia do possess transformational leadership qualities that are above average. While Bass (1985) theorized that transformational leadership instills trust, appreciation, and allegiance, the doctoral higher education student participants from this study can theoretically inspire future followers through a leadership model that has been indicated through research as reliably effective. As Bastedo, Samuels, and Kleinman (2014) found a correlation between charisma (Idealized Influence) within college presidents and applications received, if these doctoral higher education students undertake presidencies, they may be able to assist in enrollment declines. Additionally, while this research has been primarily focused on executive positions such as the presidency, mid-level and entry level positions may find benefit from a transformational leader

in that they instill trust and possess charisma. Basham (2012) found that transformational leaders are better equipped to assist tenured faculty and staff, these doctoral higher education students will perhaps be able to find commonplace leveraging methods that avoid turnover. As Harrison (2000) found that transformational presidents provide shared vision, trust and empowerment, these doctoral higher education students may be able to lead followers into becoming agents of change.

However, while Basham (2012) found that transformational leadership is only one tool in a tool box, the doctoral higher education students from this study may need to further their other leadership qualities to be well equipped for future obstacles, but they may find comfort in knowing the strength of this particular tool. To reiterate Northouse (2016), "Transformational leadership involves an exceptional form of influence that moves followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them. It is a process that often incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership" (p. 161). While undertaking a transformational leadership style, the doctoral higher education students from this study can potentially lead future higher education institutions with an acumen that goes above and beyond what is expected of their respective governing board. Furthermore, this potential leader may also assist higher education institutions with low morale, low enrollment, or low fundraising efforts. Based on the research of this study, it is the recommendation of the researcher that doctoral higher education programs offer student progress reports on a semester basis and create partnerships with organizations outside of the program. Progress reports for doctoral higher education students can provide guidance for the student regarding their research, professional goals, networking, and job seeking. With these progress reports occurring on a semester basis, it would not only provide more data to the doctoral higher education program about the growth of a student throughout the program, it

would provide the student with a more personalized manner of feedback than final course grades. Doctoral higher education programs that create partnerships with organizations outside of the program can lead to more resources or funding opportunities, more knowledge of trends and practices in the various fields, and potentially more impact for the program. These partnerships may also provide students with the opportunity to provide their own expertise for the challenges facing partnering organizations. In summation, the doctoral higher education students that possess above average transformational leadership will be well versed for the complexities that surround the American college of university campus, and these recommendations may provide scaffolding for their future tasks.

Limitations

Throughout the performance of this research, some limitations surfaced. While the MLQ-5x™ measured thirty current doctoral higher education students in the Commonwealth of Virginia, this only provided a fraction of all currently enrolled students within Virginia and did not measure students across other states. Additionally, students enrolled in these programs were primarily White and/or female, and more male participants, or participants of color could in fact provide a better glimpse as to how transformational leadership qualities are among these participants. Participants were also only peer-evaluated by two currently enrolled doctoral higher education students, and a larger sample size could affect peer-reported scores.

Another limitation came from the survey being conducted only once for participants. While this does provide a current reading of transformational leadership qualities among current doctoral higher education students, a pre-test/post-test may have provided a model of growth for the researcher. To provide a pre-test/post-test survey of students would have taken more time for the researcher and would have required students to participate earlier in their program. However,

all student participants that were surveyed had completed at least their first year in the program and may have already had transformational leadership qualities instilled through their respective programs. If doctoral higher education students were contacted before they start coursework (after being accepted into the program), and then again near the completion of coursework, this may have provided a growth model for transformational leadership.

Another limitation can be found in the enrollment status of student participants. While some programs offer full time enrollment, others offer part time enrollment. Because doctoral higher education student participants had varying enrollment statuses, this may have led to individual participant sites scoring higher on the MLQ-5x™. If all doctoral higher education programs functioned in a strictly full time or strictly part time model, this may have altered doctoral higher education student scores.

A final limitation came through the program evaluations. While some programs required a strong timeline for course offerings, other programs had more freedom in required/optional coursework, and thus could not provide a uniform plan of study across all participant sites. If all doctoral higher education programs provided an identical plan of study, this may have led to stronger correlation results. Also, some participant sites websites were more structured and current, while others had not been updated recently, or were not as organized. This led the researcher and research team toward difficult decisions regarding how transformational leadership qualities appeared throughout doctoral higher education programs. For example, Site Four was currently in a redesign, and thus course catalog numbers did not necessarily match up with the listed program of study, and thus course names were used rather than course numbers to make these matches.

Recommendations for Future Research

While this research did measure transformational leadership qualities among doctoral higher education students within the Commonwealth of Virginia, there is room for significant future research. As there is a leadership shortage on the horizon for higher education institutions, it would be advantageous to measure doctoral higher education students across other states, or even other countries. As stated earlier, there are there are approximately 57 doctoral-level higher education programs in the United States, and this study only investigated five ("Graduate Program Directory", 2018). It would be beneficial to measure more higher education doctoral students across various demographics outside of ethnicity and gender to see how socio-economic status, career ambition, full time versus part time enrollment, or even regions differ from one another. As this study shows, doctoral higher education programs are also offering numerous activities that impart transformational leadership; however, these activities could be further measured or monitored to identify intended/actualized outcomes. In addition, the transformational leadership instilling activities were self-reported by program chairs and program websites, and ethnographic or even observational data could provide strong findings about how these doctoral higher education programs function.

Further research could also focus on other leadership qualities outside of transformational leadership. Measuring doctoral higher education students leadership scores among trait-based approaches, behavior-based approaches, skills-based approaches, situational-based approaches, path-goal approaches, leader-member-exchange approaches, servant approaches, authentic approaches, and/or adaptive approaches, could provide an indication of what leadership style is the strongest among these populations. Research into how these populations are situated in other leadership styles may provide program chairs a better understanding of what offerings may cultivate these other styles.

Finally, further research could also focus on how students within master's higher education programs are situated regarding transformational leadership. This research may also assist with the limitation of a pre-test/post-test. Student participants in this study were not asked about their graduate education prior to the doctoral higher education program, and it would be interesting to see how many students came from a master's in higher education program. It also would be interesting to see how many students came directly from the master's program versus those master's holders returning after years in the workforce. As many master-level higher education students enter entry-level or mid-level higher education careers, it would provide a stronger argument for how transformational leadership is embodied within higher education employees.

Conclusion

The results of this study indicated that doctoral higher education students in the Commonwealth of Virginia possess above average transformational leadership qualities. This study also indicated that the higher education doctoral programs are currently instilling activities that foster transformational leadership in myriad ways. While there may be no direct correlation between transformational leadership qualities among students, and the frequency in which programs are offering transformational leadership fostering activities, the fact is that transformational leadership is a strong part of the currently studied higher education doctoral program, and that students possess a leadership style that will better serve the higher education institutions in which they seek employment. While the future of higher education remains one of the most discussed topics for the United States, those exiting long careers across colleges and universities may be comforted by the promise that these future campus leaders may provide. By employing leaders that are transformational, colleges and universities across the United States

may be better equipped for the changing climate on the horizon, and thus assist countless

students in fulfilling their own potential and achieving their dreams.

REFERENCES

Allen, A. A. (2017). *Strategic planning experiences within higher education as influenced by transformational leadership behaviors* (Order No. 10267814). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1916520690).

American Association of Community Colleges. (2013). *Competencies for community college leaders*. (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(3), 261-295.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Manual and sampler set. (3rd ed.)* Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Basham, L. M. (2012). Transformational leadership characteristics necessary for today's leaders in higher education. *Journal of International Education Research, 8*(4), 343.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bastedo, M., Samuels, N., & Kleinman, E. (2014). Do charismatic presidents influence college applications and alumni donations? Organizational identity and performance in US higher education. *Higher Education, 68*(3), 397-415.

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member Checking: A Tool to Enhance Trustworthiness or Merely a Nod to Validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*(13), 1802–1811. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870

Bourgeois, S. (2016). The presidency in higher education. *Journal of Business and Management, 22*(2), 11-21,143.

Bowen, W. G. (2011). *Lessons learned: Reflections of a university president*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowers, A. J. (2017). Quantitative research methods training in education leadership and administration preparation programs as disciplined inquiry for building school improvement capacity. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 12*(1), 72-96.

Brown, L., Martinez, M., & Daniel, D. (2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Review, 30*(1), 45-73.

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

Cohen, A. M., & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cook, B. J. (2012). *The American college president study: Key findings and takeaways*. Retrieved from American Council on Education website: http://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/The-American-College-President-Study.aspx

Cooney, M. A. (2016). *The demographics and utilization of transformational leadership practices by potential community college presidents* (Order No. 10306872). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1865857607).

Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Eckel, P. D., & Kezar, A. (2011). Presidents leading: The dynamics and complexities of campus leadership. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd ed.) (pp. 279-315). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ewell, P. T., & Ikenberry, S. O. (2015). Leadership in making assessment matter. In G. D. Kuh, S. O. Ikenberry, N. A. Jankowski, T. R. Cain, P. T. Ewell, P. Hutchings, & J. Kinzie (Eds.), *Using evidence of student learning to improve higher education* (pp. 117-146). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Finney, J. E., & Kelly, P. J. (2010). Affordability and making sense of information about how students, families, and states pay for higher education. In C. D. Lovell, T. E. Larson, D. R. Dean, & D. L Longanecker (Eds.), *Public policy and higher education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 394-402). New York, NY: Pearson.

Fisher, J. L. & Koch, J. V. (1996). *Presidential leadership: Making a difference*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

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

Friedman, H.H., & Kass-Shraibman, F. (2017). What it takes to be a superior college president. *Learning Organization, 24*(5), 286-297.

Gearin, Christopher A. (2017). New higher education president integration: Change and resistance viewed through social power bases and a change model lens. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 39*(5), 559-574.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

"Graduate Program Directory". (2018, October 23). Retrieved from

      http://apps.naspa.org/gradprograms/srchres.cfm

Grant, A.M., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D.A. (2011). Reversing the extraverted leadership

      advantage: The role of employee proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(3),

      528-550.

Greasley, P.E., & Bocârnea, M.C. (2014). The relationship between personality type and the

      leadership characteristic of empowerment. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,*

      124, 11-19.

Hackmann, D. G., Malin, J. R., & McCarthy, M. M. (2017). Characteristics of tenure-line faculty

      in leadership preparation programs: An analysis of academic preparation and

      administrative experience. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 12*(2), 143-

      165.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and

      transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *33*, 329-351.

Harrison, D. (2000). *Transformational Leadership and Community College*

      Effectiveness, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Helm, P. R. (2009). The president, the alumni, and fund-raising. In L. V. Weill (Ed.), *Out in*

      front: The college president as the face of the institution. Lanham, MD: Rowman &

      Littlefield Education.

Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description

      questionnaire. In R. M. Stodgill and A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description*

      and measurement. (pp. 6-38). Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research.

Hoch, J.E. (2013). Shared leadership and innovation: The role of vertical leadership and employee integrity. *Journal of Business and Psychology. 28*(2), 159-174.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *Social psychology of* organizations, 2nd ed. New York, NY: John Wiley.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lederman, D. (2018, February 12) The disappearing president. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/02/12/without-explanation-university-replaces-its-president-and-obliterates-most-mentions

Martin, J., & Samels, M. (2004). *Presidential transition in higher education: Managing leadership change*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Martin, S.L., Liao, H., & Campbell, E.M. (2013). Directive versus empowering leadership: A field experiment comparing impacts on task proficiency and proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(5), 1372-1395.

Maruping, L.M., Venkatesh, V., Thatcher, S.M.B., & Patel, P.C. (2015). Folding under pressure or rising to the occasion? Perceived time pressure and the moderating role of team temporal leadership. *Academy of Management Journal. 58*(5), 1313-1333.

"Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™". (2018, February 25). Retrieved from http://www.mindgarden.com/16-multifactor-leadership-questionnaire

Nelson, S. J. (2009). *Leaders in the crossroads: Success and failure in the college presidency*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Nugent, S. G. (2009). The president and the press. In L. V. Weill (Ed.), *Out in front: The college president as the face of the institution*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Pettit, L. K. (2010). *If you live by the sword: Politics in the making and unmaking of a university president*. New York, NY: iUniverse.

Pierce, S. R. (2012). *On being presidential: A guide for college and university leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Robey, P. V., & Bauer, S. C. (2013). Change in university-based programs of educational leadership: How responsive have programs been. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 8*(3), 261-279.

Smith, A. A. (2017, November 21). N.C. 2-year system president says he was forced out. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2017/11/21/nc-2-year-system-president-says-he-was-forced-out

Sprinthall, R. C. (2012). *Basic statistical analysis* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tekniepe, R. J. (2014). Linking the occupational pressures of college presidents to presidential turnover. *Community College Review, 42*(2), 143-159. doi:10.1177/0091552113516671

Thomas, G. A. (2013). *The community college president and the new norm: Perceptions of preparedness to take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding* (Order No. 3610716).

Trachtenberg, S. J., Kauvar, G. B., & Bogue, E. G. (2013). *Presidencies derailed: Why university leaders fail and how to prevent it*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX A

ONLINE SURVEY PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Study Title: Transformational leadership qualities among students within doctoral higher education programs.

Responsible Project Investigator: Dr. Dennis Gregory, Associate Professor, Darden College of Education & Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

Investigator: Josh Howell, Doctoral Candidate, Darden College of Education & Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

Purpose of Research: The purpose of this research is to identify the levels of transformational leadership qualities among doctoral students in higher education leadership programs.

Procedures: If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™. Students participating will complete the survey for their own transformational leadership qualities, and those of their peers. This questionnaire will take you approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Risks and Benefits: There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study. The benefits of this study include a greater understanding and the potential improvement of entrepreneurship programming at ODU.

Privacy and Confidentiality: Ensuring your anonymity is a primary concern of the study team, and your records will be kept private to the extent allowed by the law. The data will be accessible only to the researchers associated with this study and the Human Subjects Committee. The results of this study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but the identities of all research participants will remain confidential. Care will be taken to disguise markers of your identity such as your title, department, or any other biographical data.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal: Participation in this study is voluntary, and you have the right to choose not to participate in the study without consequence. Should you decide to participate now, you can later withdraw from participation in the study at any time.

Costs and Compensation: All participants who complete the questionnaire will be receive a $20 Amazon gift card.

Contact information for questions and concerns: Please contact Dr. Dennis Gregory at (757) 683-3702 or via email at dgregory@odu.edu, Josh Howell at (757) 679-2007 or via email at jhowell@odu.edu, or Dr. Laura Chezan, Chair of the Human Subjects Committee at (757) 683-7055 or via email at lchezan@odu.edu if you have any questions about this study. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you should contact the Office of Research at Old Dominion University at (757) 683-3460.

By selecting "I agree" below you are indicating that you have read and understood this consent form, and agree to participate in this research study, and are at minimum 18 years old. Please print a copy of this page for your records.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Study Title: Transformational leadership qualities among students within doctoral higher education programs.

Responsible Project Investigator: Dr. Dennis Gregory, Associate Professor, Darden College of Education & Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

Investigator: Josh Howell, Doctoral Candidate, Darden College of Education & Professional Studies, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

Purpose of Research: The purpose of this research is to identify the levels of transformational leadership qualities among doctoral students in higher education leadership programs.

Procedures: If your institution agrees to take part in this study, you will be contacted for a semi-structured interview. The interview protocol will be available to review up to one week prior to the scheduled interview time. In addition, you will be given the transcript of the interview to member check prior to data analysis.

Risks and Benefits: There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study. The benefits of this study include a greater understanding and the potential improvement of entrepreneurship programming at ODU.

Privacy and Confidentiality: Ensuring your anonymity is a primary concern of the study team, and your records will be kept private to the extent allowed by the law. The data will be accessible only to the researchers associated with this study and the Human Subjects Committee. The results of this study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but the identities of all research participants will remain confidential. Care will be taken to disguise markers of your identity such as your title, department, or any other biographical data.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal: Participation in this study is voluntary, and you have the right to choose not to participate in the study without consequence. Should you decide to participate now, you can later withdraw from participation in the study at any time.

Costs and Compensation: None

Contact information for questions and concerns: Please contact Dr. Dennis Gregory at (757) 683-3702 or via email at dgregory@odu.edu, Josh Howell at (757) 679-2007 or via email at jhowell@odu.edu, or Dr. Laura Chezan, Chair of the Human Subjects Committee at (757) 683-7055 or via email at lchezan@odu.edu if you have any questions about this study. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you should contact the Office of Research at Old Dominion University at (757) 683-3460. By selecting "I agree"

below you are indicating that you have read and understood this consent form, and agree to participate in this research study, and are at minimum 18 years old. Please print a copy of this page for your records.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Name: _____

College/University: _____

Role: _____

1. Within your doctoral program of higher education, roughly how many students apply to the program annually?

2. Roughly how many applicants are accepted into the program annually?

3. What qualities or credentials does your application committee typically seek within applicants?

4. What percentage of new students are currently working full-time in an academic field?

5. What percentage of new students receive a graduate assistantship?

6. Could you describe the onboarding experience for new students within the program?

7. Does your program offer peer-mentorships for new students? If so, how is it facilitated?

8. How often do students within the program meet with their academic advisor?

9. Does your program offer a cohort model? If so, how is it facilitated?

10. What types of activities are typically scheduled to build cohort collegiality?

11. Do students within the program receive guidance in overcoming imposter syndrome? If so, how?

12. How often do students receive research workshops?

13. How often are students offered the opportunity to attend guest speaker engagements?

14. Typically, around what areas of academia are guest speakers sought?

15. Would you describe your program as training more for research or for practitioner preparation?

16. Does your program offer seminars for planning the dissertation? If so, how early?

17. Roughly how many of your course offerings focus on leadership development? Which course specifically?

18. In regard to policy, do students within the program attend field trips to state legislatures? If so, what are the learning objectives of these trips?

19. In regard to finance, do students analyze current budget models from their college/university? If so, what items are emphasized?

20. In regard to fundraising, do students meet with major gift officers from their college/university? If so, what topics are highlighted?

21. In regard to research, are students encouraged to serve on editorial boards, or publish pre-dissertation? If so, what training do they receive prior?

22. Would you consider your program an environment that fosters transformational leadership? If so, why?

APPENDIX D

PROGRAM EVALUATION RUBRIC FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

College/University: _____

Transformational Leadership Attribute	Frequency in Required Course Descriptions	Frequency in Optional Course Descriptions	Frequency in Program Website
Idealized Influence *(Keywords: mentorship, leadership talks, building partnerships, leadership support)*			
Inspirational Motivation *(Keywords: goal-setting, goal acquisition, understanding emotional intelligence, ethical considerations, requiring/achieving high expectations)*			
Intellectual Stimulation *(Keywords: critical thinking, creative thinking, organizational issues, organizational barriers, innovation)*			
Individualized Consideration *(Keywords: cohort(s), one-on-one support, peer mentorship, organizational structure/charts/models)*			
Total Frequency:			

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW RUBRIC FOR IDENTIFYING TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

College/University: _____

Interviewee: _____

Research Team Member: _____

Transformational Leadership Attribute	0 – Not at all	1 – Briefly	2 - Sometimes	3 - Fairly Often	4 - Frequently
Did the Interviewee Provide Indicators of Idealized Influence? *(Keywords: mentorship, leadership talks, building partnerships, leadership support)*					
Did the Interviewee Provide Indicators of Inspirational Motivation? *(Keywords: goal-setting, goal acquisition, understanding emotional intelligence, ethical considerations, requiring/achieving high expectations)*					

Did the Interviewee Provide Indicators of Intellectual Stimulation? *(Keywords: critical thinking, creative thinking, organizational issues, organizational barriers, innovation)*					
Did the Interviewee Provide Indicators of Individualized Consideration? *(Keywords: cohort(s), one-on-one support, peer mentorship, organizational structure/charts/models)*					
Total Score:					

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX F

COMPILATION RUBRIC FOR IDENTIFYING TRANSFORMATIONAL

LEADERSHIP

College/University: _____

Rater: _____

Transformational Leadership Attribute	Idealized Influence	Inspirational Motivation	Intellectual Stimulation	Individual Consideration
TL frequency in material found on the program's website				
TL frequency in material found in required course descriptions				
TL frequency in material found in cognate course descriptions				
TL frequency in interview responses from program chairs/directors				
Total:				

APPENDIX G

PARTICIPATION LETTER

Dear X:

My name is Josh Howell, and I am a current Ph.D. student in Higher Education Leadership at Old Dominion University. I am currently undertaking my dissertation research, focusing primarily on the transformational leadership qualities of Ph.D. students in Higher Education Leadership and Community College Leadership programs in the United States.

I am writing to request your program's participation in my study. If you agree, three areas of data will be retrieved from your institution. First, Ph.D. students within your program would be identified to request participation for the completion of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x™) produced by Mind Garden, Inc. The measurement will be provided by me, and students will be provided with their transformational leadership scores upon completion of the survey.

Second, if your program does agree to participate, a program evaluation will be conducted of your program's curriculum. This will be an effort to identify what programming elements assist in the fostering of transformational leadership qualities in students, in an effort to compare your program to other programs selected for the study. The goal is to identify "common themes" of programming and curriculum that assist in fostering transformational leadership qualities. These data will be retrieved through your department's website and catalog.

Finally, an interview protocol will be delivered to you, the chair of the program. The interview protocol is provided to identify any additional transformational leadership motivators that may be outside of the traditional programming and curriculum design. This interview protocol will be available to you electronically, with ample time to review and answer.

With your permission, I invite your program to participate in this study. In order to protect your institution's information, all institution names will be coded to protect privacy. Student scores from the MLQ-5x™ will be protected in a password encrypted dropbox upon completion of the survey, only accessible by myself, the researcher. Finally, a copy of the study will be provided to your department for your own use.

If you agree to participate, please respond to this email at your earliest convenience. I thank you for your time and consideration in this matter, and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Josh Howell
Ph.D. Student in Higher Education Leadership, Old Dominion University
jhowell@odu.edu
757-679-2007

VITA

Joshua Lee Howell
Department of Educational Foundations & Leadership | Higher Education Program
120 Education Building Norfolk, VA 23529

Summary of Work Experience

English Instructor, Department of Arts & Sciences; College of the Albemarle, Elizabeth City, NC, July 2018 - present
Assistant Professor, Department of English; Tidewater Community College, Norfolk, VA, July 2015 to July 2018
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; Tidewater Community College, Norfolk, VA August 2008 to July 2015
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA January 2010 to July 2015
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; Virginia Wesleyan College, Norfolk, VA August 2014 to July 2015
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; Christopher Newport University, Newport News, VA August 2010 to May 2014
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; Hampton University, Hampton, VA January 2014 to May 2014
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; Bryant & Stratton, Hampton, VA April 2014 to August 2014
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; ITT-Technical Institute, Norfolk, VA September 2009 to July 2010
Adjunct Instructor, Department of English; Medical Careers Institute, Virginia Beach, VA October 2005 to February 2009

Education

- M.A. English Literature, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, 2008.
- B.A. English and Theatre, Longwood University, Farmville, VA 2005.

Selected Honors and Awards

Hope House Foundation Board Member of the Year Award	2019
College of the Albemarle Catalyst Award	2019
Tidewater Community College Institutional Responsibility Reward	2018
Tidewater Community College Norfolk Advisor of the Year	2017
Tidewater Community College Exemplary Community Impact Award	2017
Virginia Master Teacher Fellow	2017
Old Dominion University Shining Star Faculty Award	2012 and 2014