

Summer 2014

Transformational Leadership and a Culture of Efficacy: A Search for Correlation in the Alabama Two-Year College System

Johnny H. McMoy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>



Part of the [Community College Leadership Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McMoy, J. (2014). Transformational leadership and a culture of efficacy: A search for correlation in the Alabama two-year college system (doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University).

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND A CULTURE OF EFFICACY: A SEARCH
FOR CORRELATION IN THE ALABAMA TWO-YEAR COLLEGE SYSTEM

by

JOHN HORACE MCMOY, III

(Under the Direction of Lucinda Chance)

ABSTRACT

This research project explores the predominant leadership characteristics among community college presidents as measured by Bass and Avolio's transformational leadership continuum, the degree of collective teacher efficacy among faculty, and any correlation that exists between them. The populations studied are the presidents and faculty of community colleges in Alabama. Two instruments were employed, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) and Goddard's CE-SCALE (2000, 2002), as a measure of collective teacher efficacy.

The researcher found evidence of mid-range collective efficacy scores among faculty and strong evidence of pervasive transformational leadership characteristics among college presidents. The researcher also found a positive correlation using Spearman coefficients between the degree of transformational leadership characteristics and the degree of collective teacher efficacy among four of the five dimensions of transformational leadership on the leadership continuum. Correlation was most pronounced for Idealized Influence (Behavior), which centers on the fact that transformational leaders communicate their most important values and sense of purpose to followers, a characteristic that promotes a collective and cohesive view of institutional purpose. Although a slightly negative correlation was found for Idealized Influence

(Attributes), modest positive correlations were also found for Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration.

INDEX WORDS: Transformational leadership, institutional culture, culture of efficacy, collective efficacy, MLQ, CE-SCALE

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND A CULTURE OF EFFICACY: A SEARCH
FOR CORRELATION IN THE ALABAMA TWO-YEAR COLLEGE SYSTEM

by

JOHN HORACE MCMOY, III

B.A., Auburn University-Montgomery, 1975

M.A., University of Tennessee, 1978

M.B.A., Vanderbilt University, 1999

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2014

© 2014

JOHN HORACE MCMOY, III

All Rights Reserved

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND A CULTURE OF EFFICACY: A SEARCH
FOR CORRELATION IN THE ALABAMA TWO-YEAR COLLEGE SYSTEM

by

JOHN HORACE MCMOY, III

Major Professor: Lucinda Chance

Committee: Paul Brinson

Georj Lewis

Electronic Version Approved:

Summer 2014

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my three daughters, Meredith, Shelley, and Brooke. May this effort inspire them to persevere in the face of obstacles and competing priorities and to seek always the portal to learning and understanding that education represents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my sincerest appreciation to my dissertation committee, Dr. Lucinda Chance, Dr. Paul Brinson, and Dr. Georj Lewis. My committee offered timely and invaluable advice on matters of inquiry, execution, and methodology. But more than this, they inspired me to keep going through the trying, difficult aspects of this research project as well as through the tempests of my own duties as a College Dean and parent.

I would also like to thank three individuals in particular who likewise inspired me to persevere to the end. Gail Elliott helped me celebrate the small victories along the way, and her unyielding belief and encouragement, particularly through the coursework, comps, and early work on this dissertation, helped me move step by step toward the often distant goal of completion. Dr. Vicki Hawsey Karolewics, a friend and mentor of many years, reinforces daily why education matters and why I love the art and science of changing lives for the better. And finally, I want to acknowledge the encouragement and support of Dr. Laura Meeks, who helped me set the incremental goals that ultimately made completion possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 7

LIST OF TABLES 11

CHAPTER

I Introduction 12

 Background 13

 Transformational Leadership 13

 Institutional Culture 15

 The Alabama Community College System..... 16

 Research Questions 17

 Significance of the Study 17

 Research Methodology 18

 Rationale for Quantitative Study 18

 Role of the Researcher 18

 Survey Participants 19

 Instrumentation 19

 Data Collection and Processing 20

 Delimitations and Assumptions 21

 Delimitations..... 21

 Assumptions..... 21

 Key Terms and Definitions..... 21

 Summary 22

II Review of the Literature..... 24

	Transformational Leadership and the Two-Year College President.....	25
	Culture of Efficacy and Two-Year College Faculty	33
	Chapter Summary	38
III	Methods.....	41
	Research Questions.....	41
	Role of the Researcher	41
	Research Design.....	43
	Populations Studied	43
	The Alabama Community College System.....	43
	Survey Participants	47
	Sample.....	47
	Instrumentation	50
	Validation.....	54
	Data Collection	55
	Response Rates	56
	Data Analysis	57
	Reporting the Data	59
	Chapter Summary	59
IV	Report of Findings	60
	Research Questions.....	60
	Research Design.....	61
	Respondents	62
	Findings.....	63

	10
Chapter Summary	72
V Conclusions and Recommendations.....	74
Analysis of Research Findings.....	76
Discussion of Research Findings	77
Conclusions.....	80
Implications.....	82
Recommendations.....	83
Concluding Thoughts.....	85
REFERENCES	86
APPENDICES	93
A. IRB Approval.....	93
B. CE-Scale.....	94
C. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form.....	95
D. GSU Statement of Informed Consent	96
E. Letter of Endorsement from Chancellor.....	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: ACCS Descriptive Information	44
Table 2: Student Population Profile.....	45
Table 3: Legend for Leadership Results.....	63
Table 4: Percentiles for Individual Scores Based on Self Ratings (United States)	65
Table 5: Presidential MLQ Raw Scores by Factor	66
Table 6: Presidential Scores by Percentile Rank	67
Table 7: Faculty CE Scores by Institutional Identifier	68
Table 8: Pearson and Spearman Coefficients	70

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Transformational leadership and institutional culture have enjoyed tremendous scrutiny and currency at speakers' lecterns, at strategic planning workshops, and in the research literature. This fact is particularly true for transformational leadership. In fact, as far back as 2001, Lowe and Gardner reported in a summative examination of articles in just one journal, *Leadership Quarterly*, that one-third of the articles addressed some aspect of transformational leadership. And while institutional culture has not received as much critical and empirical attention, it remains a significant part of the linguistic lexicon of institutional success and effectiveness. Leadership and culture are particularly important in contemporary higher education because colleges must optimize effectiveness in a milieu that is increasingly characterized by under-prepared students and severe financial constraints.

The researcher is drawn to the two themes of transformational leadership and institutional culture because in a career that has spanned business and higher education in the United States and abroad, this writer has seen firsthand how strongly a culture is influenced by the leader and how much a culture can promote and facilitate effectiveness in its vested stakeholders. Because of the prominence of higher education—particularly in the two-year colleges—in preparing students for further study or immediate entry-level employment in tomorrow's global workforce, it is important to maximize the synergies of all institutional constituencies, a goal that is best realized when the leadership style and institutional culture are synchronized effectively. When these two themes are in positive harmony, it is less difficult to improve student learning outcomes and achieve one's institutional mission.

This study focuses on a hypothesized positive correlation between the transformational leadership traits of presidents in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS), as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), and faculty perceptions of an institutional “culture of efficacy,” as measured by Goddard’s Collective Efficacy Scale (CE-SCALE). No previous study has paired the MLQ with the CE-Scale. The researcher hypothesizes that the highest scores on the MLQ, equated with transformational leadership, will positively correlate with the highest scores on the CE-Scale, associated with the existence of a culture of collective efficacy. The results of the study will thus have implications for college presidents and faculty and staff, as well as other stakeholders and community partners, as the two-year colleges continue to seek ways to engender a learning orientation in an environment of impinging economic constraints.

Background

The background to this study establishes the importance of transformational leadership and summarizes key empirical research that supports both its value in institutional effectiveness and its influence on culture. Secondly, this section addresses institutional culture itself and discusses relevant research that shows that a “culture of efficacy” is conducive to both a college’s success in achieving an institutional mission and the ability of institutions to respond preemptively to the challenges that confront it.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership as a crucible through which one can view positive institutional change began with Burns’ seminal work, *Leadership*, published in 1978. Burns wrote about the linkage between visionary, charismatic leadership and the intrinsic motivation engendered by such leadership in followers. Burns viewed transformational leadership as

transcending and in contrast to what he called transactional leadership, which is centered on structural and bureaucratic theories of leadership and power and exchange theory. Strategic planning, incentives, fiscal control, evaluation and assessment, and control of information are associated with transactional leadership (Kezar and Eckel, 2008). Some theorists (e.g., Birnbaum, 1992) have suggested that transactional leadership is actually better in the higher education milieu due to its ubiquitous authority and power structures, although there is no empirical research to support either position (Kezar & Eckel, 2008).

House (1976) and others theorized that charismatic leadership is inextricably linked to the transformational construct as a dominant paradigm for the leaders and as a validating domain for the followers. Bass and Avolio posited a seven-factor leadership continuum from four factors associated with transformational leadership (most desirable), to one associated with laissez-faire leadership (least desirable) (Bass, 1985, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1992, 1994). Transformational leadership is cited as highly desirable because it focuses on empowering followers to realize their potential and thereby maximize organizational success and effectiveness (Avolio, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1990a). It is a natural fit with education, “where a strong moral purpose and commitment among both school staff and managers...will tend to favour the effectiveness of transformational over more transactional forms of leadership in fostering change” (Mujis et al., 2006, p. 88).

The MLQ instrument was developed by Avolio and Bass to categorize leadership behaviors across the seven dimensions. Four dimensions are associated with transformational leadership: idealized influence/charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Two are associated with transactional leadership: contingent reward and constructive transactions, and management-by-exception (active and passive) and

corrective transactions. The seventh is associated with forms of laissez-faire or “hands-off” leadership. The MLQ was first developed in South Africa through interviews with 70 senior executives. It continues to be refined, but its validity has received strong research support (Antonakis et al., 2003). While there are two forms of the MLQ, this study utilizes only the self-rater form.

Institutional Culture

“Institutional culture,” as a term, remains ambiguous, although educators and business leaders would assert that, broadly speaking, it is the vast integument of “feeling” and perceptions surrounding an organization or firm. For the purposes of this study, the researcher will follow the prescriptions of Mintzberg (1989), Ochi (1981), and others who discuss culture as “organization ideology” (Mintzberg) with prescribed effectiveness attributes shared across the most successful entities. (For example, see Ochi’s Theory Z cultures.) The concept of institutional culture, despite its sometimes difficult and perhaps even ineffable definition, is therefore linked as a construct in this study with intentionality.

To measure or attempt to quantify culture, this study utilizes the twelve-item short form of the Collective Efficacy Scale (CE-CALE) developed by Goddard (2002), which evolved from earlier work by Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk (Goddard & Hoy, 2000; Hoy & Woolfolk, 2000). The CE-Scale is administered to teachers to assess their shared perceptions of the institutional culture of efficacy. Its focus is not on faculty views of administrative leadership, but rather on their collective effect on student learning. The twelve items on the short form are scored from one point to six, the six usually corresponding to “strongly agree.” (Some items are reverse scored.) The individual numbers are converted to a standardized score and are ultimately reported as scores ranging from 200 to 800. A score of 800, for example, is higher than 99% of

the schools in the sample, while a score of 200 is lower than 99% of the institutions in the sample (Goddard, 2002). A copy of the CE-SCALE is included as Appendix B.

It is interesting to observe any correlations that exist in light of more visible reporting of cultural conflict on campuses between administrators and faculty as evidenced by more votes of no-confidence and comments such as this one in *Academe* by two faculty members: “These professional administrators hold no allegiance to faculty values...Their allegiance is...to their own careers, their next positions, and friends and mentors in their mutual admiration club” (Mattson & Bernt, 2008, p. 55). Ayers (2009) echoed this view in his comment that “the community college is a site of ideological struggle...a contradiction between managerialism and professionalism,” where “there are tensions between managerialist strategies and techniques on the one hand, and professional expertise and creativity, on the other” (p. 168).

The Alabama Community College System

The study focuses on the Alabama Community College System (ACCS), comprised of twenty-two comprehensive community colleges and four technical colleges. For this study, all but one community college, a two-year military preparatory school, were invited to participate. The ACCS, which serves more than 300,000 people, provides both foundational general education core courses designed to facilitate transfer to baccalaureate institutions as well as career/technical programs of study that position students for success in the local and regional workforce.

The ACCS is a microcosm of other systems throughout the nation since it is comprised of a wide range of institutional settings and types. It comprises, for example, both rural and urban institutions, colleges that are chiefly career/technical and those that are chiefly college-preparatory, and institutions that have more than 10,000 students and those that have less than

1,500. The ACCS has been in a widely publicized transition in recent years, buffeted like most post-secondary systems by severe fiscal constraints. Additionally, a plethora of scandals has beset the system, challenges that have led many to question the authenticity of its commitment to its professed mission. Yet there have continued to be bright spots as evidenced by an observation from a senior administrator at one of its institutions, a Bellweather finalist, on its recognition from the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the League for Innovation in the Community College, and other entities: “[Our rules] attest to truths from time-honored principles; yet those truths are modified to more accurately reflect how a culture of intentionality developed from deliberate strategic planning, dynamic participation in shared governance, and conscientious fiscal responsibility” (Johnson, 2007, p. 516).

Research Questions

Transformational leadership has often been described as empowering for both leaders and followers in establishing a positive institutional culture in higher education. This study links presidential leadership style and culture in the ACCS. To this end, the following overarching research question guides this study: Is a “culture of efficacy” more or less likely to be found in ACCS institutions where the president exhibits a high degree of transformational leadership? In addition, the following sub-questions contribute to the value of the study:

1. In the context of the leadership continuum, what are the predominant leadership styles found among presidents in the ACCS?
2. What leadership styles correlate with the highest “culture of efficacy” scores?

Significance of the Study

Much has been written about the effectiveness of transformational leadership and the way that a “culture of efficacy” positions a college for positive change, but no empirical studies exist

that link the two using these instruments. This study examines a hypothesized positive correlation between transformational leadership and a culture of efficacy through a study of presidential leadership and faculty perceptions of culture within the ACCS, a project that contributes to the knowledge base in both leadership and culture in higher education. This study offers insights into effective leadership paradigms that can benefit administrators, faculty, governance entities, and other stakeholders.

This study also helps the researcher professionally, as this writer has spent more than seven years in a leadership position in the ACCS, including two as a college dean and observed first-hand some of the challenges faced by the system in recent years. The system, for example, has had seven Chancellors since 2006. This study provides personal perspective on effective presidential leadership styles and their effects on institutional culture.

Research Methodology

Rationale for Quantitative Study

A quantitative approach was chosen in this study to determine whether a correlation exists between presidential leadership style and a “culture of efficacy” at institutions within the ACCS. The quantitative perspective was selected because it reflects the project’s underlying positivist construct and its premise that an objective reality exists that can be expressed through numbers. A central feature of the study is a reliance on numbers and measurements and the relationships discovered in an analysis of their interrelationships (Glatthorn, 2005).

Role of the Researcher

Because this study is entirely quantitative in nature, the role of the researcher was one of data collection and analysis. The researcher emailed surveys to two populations within the

ACCS, the college presidents and full-time faculty. After the data were collected, the researcher conducted cross-tabulations to determine whether correlations exist, and if so, to what degree.

Survey Participants

Survey instruments were emailed to 20 of the 26 institutions comprising the ACCS. One institution, Marion Institute, which prepares students for careers in the military services, was excluded because of its uniqueness or differentiation. The remaining institutions are either technical colleges or community colleges, but all offer Certificates and Associate of Science, Associate of Arts, or Associate in Applied Science degrees. To control for results skewed by newly employed presidents, all presidents surveyed had been in their present positions a minimum of one year. There were no similar limitations for faculty because of the difficulty of determining length of service from institutional rosters. Surveys were emailed only to faculty at institutions whose presidents completed the MLQ.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were applied in this quantitative study. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used as a measure of leadership style and the Collective Efficacy Scale (CE-SCALE) was used as a determinant of institutional culture. The MLQ was completed by college presidents in the ACCS, and the CE-SCALE was completed by ACCS faculty. The instruments were emailed to all eligible two-year college presidents and fulltime faculty at institutions whose presidents completed the MLQ. Institutions were identified by survey participants, which allowed the researcher to conduct cross-tabulations.

The MLQ, originally developed by Bass in 1985, measures leadership style across a continuum, from transformational leadership to transactional to laissez-faire. The MLQ has undergone many modifications and revisions, but the version of the MLQ used in this study is

the form (Form 5X-SHORT) published by Bass and Avolio in 1995. Its psychometric characteristics were assessed by Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam in 2003 in a comprehensive study comprising more than 3,000 raters; they found strong statistical support for the instrument's validity (Northouse, 2007).

Like the MLQ, the CE-SCALE has undergone a number of revisions, beginning with the Gibson and Dembo (1984) teacher efficacy scale. This study employs the 12-item short Collective Efficacy Scale developed by Goddard (2002) from the earlier work of Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk (2000) and Hoy (2000). Strong support exists for the psychometric properties of both the long and short forms (Goddard, 2002).

Data Collection and Processing

A concerted effort was made to collect completed MLQs from all applicable presidents. A personal solicitation was sent through a third-party vendor and repeated to achieve an optimal return rate. There are approximately 2,000 full-time faculty in the ACCS. All fulltime faculty were surveyed from each "MLQ" college to maximize statistical validity. To ensure an optimal survey population size, the researcher followed the recommendations of Gall et al. (2007) to collect, to the degree possible, a minimum of thirty faculty responses from each institution.

Once all data were collected, the CE-SCALE scores were recorded by institution on an Excel spreadsheet and average scores were calculated, resulting in an overall collective "culture of efficacy" number for each college. Each score was compared to the MLQ score for the applicable president. It was hypothesized that a positive correlation would be found between a high score on the CE-SCALE and transformational presidential leadership.

Delimitations and Assumptions

Delimitations

The study has two important delimitations. First, the study is restricted to those access institutions in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) that provide traditional instruction focused on the award of Certificates and AA, AS, and AAS degrees (see definitions). This caveat means that one of the 26 institutions comprising the ACCS will be excluded as a hybrid, Marion Institute, which offers specialized preparation for students seeking careers in the military services. Secondly, the study is restricted to college presidents in the ACCS who have been in their current positions for a minimum of one year. While the years of service will vary widely, all presidents included in the study will have had at least twelve months to influence their respective institutional cultures.

Assumptions

The researcher assumes that the responses of the ACCS presidents and faculty reflect their true perceptions and feelings. This tenet is significant because the accuracy of the participants' responses forms a key philosophical and practical underpinning of the study.

Key Terms and Definitions

Alabama Community College System (ACCS): For the purposes of this study, the ACCS is defined as the twenty-six institutions in the Alabama Community College System, excluding Marion Institute, which prepares students for a military career.

Culture of Efficacy: In this study, a culture of efficacy is defined as the belief of faculty that their efforts will positively impact students and is functionally defined here in accordance with the 12-item short Collective Efficacy Scale (CE-SCALE), an instrument developed by Goddard (2002) from the earlier

work of Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk (2000) and Hoy (2000).

Faculty Member: For the purposes of this study, this term refers to a full-time faculty member who was employed by an ACCS member institution at the time this project was initiated. Length of service or employment is not a relevant factor.

Laissez-Faire Leadership: Laissez-Faire leadership is on the far right of the Bass and Avolio (1995) leadership continuum and represents a leadership style characterized by a passive, “hands-off” approach.

President: In this study, this term refers to a sitting president who holds the position by virtue of appointment by the Alabama Board of Education, meeting all the terms and conditions of its bylaws, and who has served in this position for a minimum of one year at the time this project was initiated.

Transactional Leadership: For the purpose of this study, this style of leadership is one in which leaders advance their own purposes through a values exchange with followers, and is a leadership style in the middle of the Bass and Avolio (1995) leadership continuum.

Transformational Leadership: For the purposes of this study, transformational leadership is on the far left and apex of the Bass and Avolio (1995) leadership continuum, and is characterized by a desire of leaders to have followers achieve self-actualization and reach their fullest potential, an impetus that enables an organization to achieve at high or extraordinary levels.

Summary

Leadership style and institutional culture are subjects that have undergone considerable scrutiny in higher education theory and practice. However, few empirical studies have combined

these areas in an examination of one system. This quantitative study examined a possible correlation between presidential leadership style in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) and the presence of a “culture of efficacy” as viewed by each institution’s faculty. The study made use of existing survey instruments, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X-SHORT) published by Bass and Avolio to assess presidential leadership style, and the Collective Efficacy Scale (12-item short CE-SCALE) developed by Goddard to assess institutional culture. After cross-tabulation, the leadership style of participating presidents was categorized under the aegis of the Bass and Avolio leadership continuum (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) and correlated to the degree to which a “culture of efficacy” exists as viewed by faculty on specific campuses. While the study was focused on one college system, its findings may provide insights on administrative leadership and institutional culture for educational theorists, practitioners, governance entities, and other stakeholders.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Community colleges were specifically cited by President Obama in his 2012 State of the Union Speech, calling upon the nation to value and promote partnerships between community colleges and businesses in an effort to connect the unemployed and underemployed with jobs arising from the nation's ongoing economic recovery. Studies such as the Texas Completes Design Report (2012) and the North Carolina Completion by Design Initiative (North Carolina Cadre Report, 2012) mark the movement from mere access to higher education through the community college portal to completion and success.

In his monograph, *Access, Success, and Completion* (2013), Terry O'Banion, publishing under the aegis of the League for Innovation in the Community College, is one example of advocates who mark the critical importance of both transformational leaders who can galvanize the sometimes disparate elements of community college programs and services around a unifying theme of student success, and the need for faculty who are committed to collectively promoting and valuing student learning above all else. This marks a shift in thinking. O'Banion points out that previous measures of success do not reflect transformative outcomes. "Retention," he asserts, for example, "might be more appropriate as a success measure for prisons rather than higher education institutions, as it reflects merely the ability to hold someone in place" (p. 4).

This research project was grounded in literature that contextualizes both transformational leadership and a culture of efficacy, specifically in Alabama's two-year college system. The project tested the hypothesis that an institution with a transformational leader will demonstrate a positive correlation with a culture of efficacy among its faculty.

Transformational Leadership and the Two-Year College President

Transformational leadership is a process through which leaders and followers experience positive change, change that is concerned with “values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals” (Northouse, 2007, p. 175). Its central focus is on transforming the power of the leader to understand the demands and present and potential needs of followers and to translate that understanding into a leader-follower relationship that results in “mutual stimulation and elevation” (Burns, p. 4). Burns, House, Bass, and Avolio provide the seminal framework for an examination of transformational leadership scholarship.

Although Downton (1973) is credited as the first writer to use the term transformational leadership (Northouse, 2001), its use became widespread with the publication of the acclaimed work, *Leadership*, by James Macgregor Burns in 1978. Burns contrasts transformational leadership with a far more prevalent model, transactional leadership, which focuses on a leader-follower exchange, such as votes in exchange for a no-tax pledge or grades for the compensatory completion of academic work (Northouse, 2001). Emerging almost simultaneously with the work of Burns was that of House (1976), whose theory of charismatic leadership had many similarities with the construct of Burns. House posited that a charismatic leader modeled actions toward followers that exhibited specific characteristics, including “being dominant, having a strong desire to influence others, being self-confident, and having a strong sense of one’s own moral values” (Northouse, p. 178).

House’s charismatic leader also demonstrates specific types of behaviors toward followers. House asserted that the leader is viewed as competent, as conveying high performance expectations for followers, and as confident in the abilities of followers to satisfy those expectations (Northouse, p. 179).

A major synthesis and reformation of the work of Burns and House occurred in the theoretical constructs of Bass et al. in the 1980s and 90s. Bass (1985) gives more attention to the follower than Burns and views House's perspectives on charisma as important but insufficient as a condition for transformational leadership. Bass suggests three things that transformational leaders do to inspire followers to exceed expectations: they raise follower consciousness of the significance and value of goals, they motivate followers to look beyond self-interest toward unit or organizational goals, and they move followers to inculcate higher-order needs (Bass, 1985).

A significant epoch in the development of contemporary transformational leadership models was Bass's construction of a seven-factor leadership continuum, ranging from non-leadership, laissez-faire, to transactional, to optimally, transformational (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Bass posits four factors associated with transformational leadership: charisma or idealized influence, inspiration or inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, domains that are consistent with those of successful school leaders: "professional demeanor and work habits; relationships; intellectual integrity; and moral and ethical dimensions" (Martin, 2009, as cited in Melton et al., 2011, p. 41).

Factor one, charisma or idealized influence, describes leaders who serve as strong role models. Factor two, inspiration or inspirational motivation, describes the ability to communicate high expectations and levels of motivation to followers. Factor three, intellectual stimulation, addresses the ability to motivate followers to be innovative and creative in thinking through organizational issues and challenges. And factor four, individualized consideration, refers to the ability of leaders to listen effectively and empathetically to followers' expressions of need and contribution (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

Bass describes two dimensions or factors of transactional leadership, contingent reward and management by exception. Contingent reward refers to leadership behavior that addresses the exchange paradigm between the leader and follower. In other words, outcomes are negotiated between the leader and follower, and there is an exchange of effort for a particular payoff or reward. Management by exception involves leader criticism of the follower that takes one of two forms: active or passive. In active management by exception, the leader closely monitors the actions and performance of the follower and intervenes to shape behavior to conform to the leader's interpretation of workplace or organizational norms. In the passive form, the leader acts only when problems have surfaced or organizational performance standards have not been met (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Finally, the last factor, non-leadership or laissez-faire, describes virtual leader absence. The leader literally takes a "hands-off" approach toward followers; the behavioral dimension is manifested by little or no interest in follower needs or wants and deferred workplace decisions (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Transformational leadership as a body of research and theory has many strengths and a few significant weaknesses. One strength is its sheer staying power. Vast amounts of scholarship have been devoted to its study since the publication of Burns' seminal work. One study, for example, found that female leaders were as transformational as men, and in some measures, exceeded them (Bas, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996). Secondly, transformational leadership makes sense to practitioners intuitively. Its central tenant of leaders interacting with followers to affect follower empowerment is congruent with popular conceptions of a key leadership role. Thirdly, it makes leadership a shared process between the leader and follower. It is not, therefore, the sole purview of the leader acting independently. Finally, it amplifies various permutations of leader-

exchange theory, moving beyond mere exchange to a transcendental relationship that recognizes the needs and self-actualization of followers (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1985).

The major criticism of transformational leadership is its conceptual ambiguity. Because it addresses such a plethora of areas and dimensions, transformational leadership is hard to define precisely. Tracey and Hinkin (1998), for example, have shown in their research that there is considerable overlap among the four “I’s” of Bass and Avolio (1990): idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Regarding the leadership approach of institutional leaders specifically, it is significant that the leader is expected to influence teaching and learning, but at the same time, rarely participates directly in the process at the classroom level. The leader’s influence on teaching and learning, therefore, is largely in indirect affective ways (Wahlstrom and Louis, 2008), particularly when a leader faces significant and unexpected crises. Leaders at community colleges, therefore, must be good communicators and able to “demonstrate this value in a variety of ways, including coaching staff to be more thoughtful and considerate, showing respect and courtesy for others, and communicating honestly” (Walker & McPhail, 2009, p. 330-1).

Community college presidents today face all of the old constraints of limited resources, increasing enrollment, rising expectations, and increased accountability. But now they must exercise effective leadership additionally in a new and unique world of media immediacy. In their qualitative study of community college presidents who faced “wounding” experiences, such as a vote of no confidence, Maslin-Ostrowski et al. (2011) point out that a common element in the presidents’ narratives was the cold fact of life that they would eventually and inevitably be “misinterpreted, misunderstood, and misrepresented” (p. 36-37). Today, the breath of rumor “can escalate into campaigns for good or ill within minutes via the Internet, blogs, electronic news,

and Twitter,” an environment whose expanse lies far beyond the bricks and mortar of a campus (Maslin-Ostrowski, Floyd, and Hrabak, 2011, p. 30).

The four “I’s” of transformational leadership are thus evidenced when community college presidents face crisis situations. Murray and Kishur (2008), for example, performed a case-study qualitative analysis of the decision-making processes of community college presidents facing potentially catastrophic challenges across four constructs: financial, personnel, political, and public relations. When confronted unexpectedly with an issue like proration, successful presidents mastered idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and, perhaps most importantly demonstrated in this study, individual consideration. Most community college presidents examined in the study “expanded their normal circle of advisors by seeking advice from attorneys, other presidents, civic and community leaders, and other individuals who may have been able to provide some insight into resolving the challenge” (p. 492). And certainly, listening is key to transformational leadership, as VanBolkom and Eastham (2011) assert, both inside and outside the organization. Leaders who attentively listen to those inside the institution have better insight into the paradigm for transformational modifications and course corrections than those who do not, “provided that the organizational climate encourages people to tell the truth and provide useful feedback and information,” while transformational leaders who listen to feedback from outside the organization are better able to “incorporate recent research findings, stakeholder opinions, new ideas and ‘best practices’ into their professional and organization development processes” (p.26).

The four “I’s” of transformational leadership parallel the multi-year work of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) in developing a list of critical competencies for existing and aspiring college presidents. This project culminated in a

framework comprising six competency domains: organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (American Association of Community Colleges, 2005). Factor two, for example, inspiration or inspirational motivation, which describes the the ability to communicate high expectations and levels of motivation to followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994), is echoed in the communication competency as defined by the AACC: “An effective community college leader uses clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community, to promote the success of all students, and to sustain the community college mission” (AACC, p. 5).

Transformational leadership requires acute self-awareness and an ability to engage in meaningful self-reflection as a precursor to improving organizational culture through the empowerment of followers. These characteristics were the focus of Stoeckel and Davies’ qualitative study (2007) of the reflective leadership of selected community college presidents. As one college president stated:

I really do feel like community college work is mission work. [Being congruent is not just about my personal self-knowledge,] it is about helping people realize their full potential. [It is about building a reflective college culture that] affords people who are interested in it [the chance] to pay attention to their own mind, body, [and] health connection (Stoeckel and Davies, p. 908).

This thought was echoed by a president who participated in another study of the efficacy of the leadership competencies developed by the AACC:

When I first became president, I thought the position was about directing people to do their job. I have come to understand that the most important job of the president is to

manage the culture and provide an atmosphere where people can reach their full personal and professional potential. It is about creating the conditions for excellence and mentoring people, not directing them (quoted in McNair, Duree, & Ebbers, 2011, p. 13).

The critical importance to community college presidents of managing through transformational leadership and its constituent dimensions is cited by Tschechtelin (2011) as one of the three response paradigms to the external and internal threats to the achievement of the community college mission. And in influencing culture as a transformational leader, the community college president, particularly in rural settings, is in turn influenced by the culture exerted by the external community and the particular belief systems engendered there (Leist, 2007).

The research of Hassan, Dellow, and Jackson (2010) also informs the study of transformational leadership. The authors took leadership competencies identified by the American Association of Community Colleges and asked community college presidents in New York and Florida to rate them in importance and rate the value of various categories of preparatory activities and behaviors. While the competencies themselves are consistent with Bass's four I's of transformational leadership, the study revealed great variation in the frequency of behaviors and activities to cultivate the specific competencies. While community college advocacy, for example, received the highest mean score in importance (along with two other measures), it received the lowest score in frequency of behaviors and activities to enhance it. Low self-ratings in advocacy may negatively reflect the president's performance in areas such as Bass's factor three, intellectual stimulation (Bass & Avolio, 1994), the ability of leaders to be innovative and creative in thinking through organizational issues and challenges unique to the community college. In their study of community college presidents, Walker and McPhail (2009) noted that some participants actually expressed regret that members of the campus community

perceived them as separate from the process of teaching and learning, and that winning this battle of perception was an ongoing struggle for a transformational leader. As one college president in their study noted, “You have to be constantly reinforcing in a variety of ways these symbolic gestures of recognition, appreciation, and validation” (p. 335).

Looking at the transformative effectiveness of community college presidents through the crucible of one important paradigm, globalism, was the subject of Frost’s study (2009) of rural community colleges in Illinois. He notes the paradoxical fact that the presidents themselves cite the fiscal, administrative, and political difficulty of staying current and being responsive to the global needs of the workplace—sometimes severely constraining college resources—but almost all still asserting that they would not choose to slow the reach of globalism regardless of the cost. Frost argues that community college presidents may never “catch up.” He quotes one college leader in his study: “Will workers continue to believe that short-term training will work for them after they’ve been ‘downsized’ three or four times?” (p. 1022). Frost posits that it would perhaps be better for community college presidents to lead their faculties and other stakeholders in more classic, more adaptive skills such as critical thinking and team building. The individualized consideration of transformational leadership may prove particularly difficult on campuses where “loyalty to the work group are stronger than loyalty to the institution” (Alfred, 2008, p. 85). Not surprisingly, as shown by Ayers (2009), in the murky ambiguities of contemporary community college leadership, leaders find it easy to adopt directive managerialism as a conceptual framework where the “repression of values is...the antithesis of transformational leadership” (p. 179).

Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) researched correlation between transformational leadership, using the MLQ, and work engagement, a dimension related to

cultural efficacy among employees. Work engagement was defined as a motivational paradigm delineated by “high levels of energy and mental resilience,” by the display of “enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge at work,” and by “full concentration, happiness, and engrossment in one’s work” (p. 316), representing “vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005). The researchers found a positive correlation between transformational leadership and work engagement that was statistically significant (Babcock-Roberson & Strickland, 2010).

Culture of Efficacy and Two-Year College Faculty

There are many ways to define or identify institutional culture. A common perspective is that it “is an attempt to get at the feel, sense, atmosphere, character, or image of an organization” (Hoy and Miskel, 2008, p. 177). And it is clear from the research that culture transcends the personality dynamics of individuals (Mintzberg, 1989; Ouchi, 1981). Organizations are said to have strong cultures when basic assumptions emerge as articulate and consistent patterns (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). Once established, a culture shapes the perceptions of actors as either affirming or threatening (McGrath & Tobia, 2008).

What teachers and administrators think of their ability to effect change has a defining effect on school culture. The concept of collective teacher efficacy is centrally a belief that student learning can be directly affected by faculty actions. “Schools with strong cultures of efficacy, trust, and academic optimism,” Hoy and Miskel assert, “provide higher levels of student achievement” (p. 187). And while being adept in effective instructional pedagogies is critically important, student learning can also be impacted by the level of teacher job satisfaction, their feelings of collegiality and trust, their beliefs in their collective professionalism, and their

collaboration with one another (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008), particularly for at-risk students (McGrath & Tobia, 2008).

However, determining an organization's culture is a challenge. While some researchers assert that quantitative methods are inadequate to gauge, determine, or assess an organization's culture (Schein, 2004), there is increasing evidence of the value and use of quantitative methods to detect an organization's shared values, values that largely define its institutional culture (Maslowski, 2006). Current scholarship on the culture of schools is thin, with most of it centered on businesses and only through extrapolation extended to schools. There is little research on the analysis of culture directly in schools (Hoy and Miskel, 2008), and almost none that examines institutional culture specifically in community colleges. Thus, almost all of the research literature focuses on K-12 settings, although leading theorists affirm its relevance in two-year college contexts (W. Hoy, personal communication, January 31, 2012).

Even on those rare occasions when community college research examines the cultural contributions and value of student-teacher engagement, the emphasis is on the student. An exception is the quantitative work of Barnett (2011), whose results confirmed her hypothesis that active faculty validation of students, defined as "recognized, respected, and seen as valued" (p. 194), was positively correlated with both a greater sense of academic engagement and greater rates of persistence. Barnett's work thus addresses a central tenant of collective efficacy, the belief that student learning can be directly affected by faculty actions (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). The efficacy of Barnett's conclusions were strengthened by the fact that her findings reflected strong positive correlation for faculty validation after controlling for other factors, including age, sex, ethnicity/race, mother's educational attainment level, course load, and grade-point average (Barnett, 2011). Cohen (2011) notes the presence of a seismic shift in the culture of community

colleges in general “as two options have become unacceptable: allowing sizable percentages of matriculants to fail and/or drop out, and reducing academic standards so that those who do get through have not been sufficiently prepared for either subsequent studies or the workplace” (p. 93).

A strong culture is not always conducive to maximizing effectiveness; sometimes a culture can reduce effectiveness (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). This is why trust is so important in schools. Trust is a central tenant of collective efficacy, and has three referent dimensions: trust in the leader, trust in the students and parents, and trust in each other (Hoy and Miskel, 2008), which are not constructed in the same way (Geist and Hoy, 2003, 2004). Serva, Fuller, & Mayer (2005), in a study of trust in work teams, found that “perceived ability of colleagues was a strong predictor of trust and that trust was a significant predictor for risk-taking behaviors” (p. 642). Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) found that while principles of shared governance and leader-teacher trust matter, teacher-to-teacher relationships are even more significant as an underpinning for the way in which teachers work to enhance instruction.

It is also true that a faculty’s perceptions regarding collective efficacy are empowered by successes (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). It is a given that all organizations will experience difficulties; however, organizations with a strong integument of collective efficacy can adapt and prevail when faced with trials and challenges (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). Positive collective efficacy can arise from active teacher participation in leadership. Research suggests that enhanced teacher influence in schools is positively correlated with school improvement (Mayrowetz, Murphy, Louis, & Smylie, 2007).

Collective efficacy does not originate only from direct experience. Another source of a strong sense of collective efficacy is the stories teachers hear about the successes of their

colleagues within their own school as well as those outside it (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). In many ways, exchanging stories and thoughts within their own workgroup has come to represent a significant boundary for teachers. The work group, as Alfred (2008) asserts, has almost supplanted the institution itself, “as their touchstone and perceptions of work are formed through the lens of the work group, not through personnel in other parts of the institution” (p. 85).

Another way of increasing collective efficacy is through verbal persuasion—through faculty workshops, dialog at formal and informal meetings, and other positive interactions. The degree to which verbal persuasion is strengthening is a function of the amount of cohesion (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). Verbal persuasion occurs across many roles and forms of interaction, as, for example, “mentor, mentee, coach, specialist, advisor, facilitator, and so on” (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008, p. 463). Green and Ciez-Volz (2010) include “caring and empathetic,” “creative,” “flexible,” “cooperative and collegial,” and “encouraging and motivational” in their inventory of characteristics of the most effective community college instructors (p. 85). Sprounse, Ebbers, and King (2008) noted that community college faculty hegemony developed across three dimensions: “faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development” (p. 987), and their influencers, “culture of learning, leadership, ownership of goals, and structure and sustainability” (p. 996).

A strong component of a culture of collective efficacy is thus what teachers think of each other. Their perceptions lead “to inferences about the faculty’s teaching skills, methods, training, and expertise” (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 189). And it is hard to separate these perceptions from those about the students as well (Hoy and Miskel, 2008). Townsend and Twombly (2007) note, in fact, that the foundational ideology of the community college faculty member is devotion to learning and student success. The use of a specific instrument to measure the collective efficacy

of a school, the CE-Scale, developed by Goddard, Hoy, et al. is discussed in detail in Chapter Three.

Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) looked specifically at how indirect leadership, in this study in the person of a principal, was experienced and translated into instructional process, examining elements of both principal-teacher and teacher-teacher interrelationships. The authors, studying 4,165 teachers in 39 districts in 138 schools, found that principal leadership's effects on instruction were relatively weak in two of the three types of instruction studied (standard contemporary practice and flexible grouping practice). Only in "focused instruction," an instructional typology seen negatively in much current debate, did the authors see much effect. However, in examining the degree to which a collective sense of responsibility, which the researchers asserted was a manifestation of collective efficacy, positively impacted student learning, the authors found a significant correlation between a collective sense of efficacy and school outcomes, although not to the degree the researchers had anticipated. Lester (2009) looked at indirect leadership in her qualitative study on bullying among and between community college faculty and concluded that formal and informal power structures can have both empowering positive or corrosive negative effects on cultural efficacy, particularly among academic and vocational faculty and in the absence of stable formal leadership infrastructure.

In their analysis of community college culture as a resource for enhancing student learning, McGrath and Tobia (2008) note that faculty have a unique portal for enhancing collective efficacy for each other as well as for the students they serve because the faculty and student experience in the classroom is the fulcrum for the community college mission. The authors cite the value of faculty collaboration (verbal persuasion) through such activities as "reflective inquiry" group seminars, which provide a medium at some community colleges for

collaboratively sharing the efficacy of “assignments, exams, and student responses for the purpose of collectively discussing their intended effects on student learning” (p. 49). These factors and others feed a particular distinctive culture of efficacy for faculty that is distinct from the other subcultures that collectively define the ambiguous and amorphous term “institutional culture” (Locke & Guglielmino, 2006).

The collective efficacy that arises from teacher-to-teacher and teacher-to-student relationships is an important consideration for a host of reasons, not the least of which is economic. Over \$3 million dollars are typically spent on the career of each teacher (Flannigan, Jones, and Moore, 2004, cited in Green and Ciez-Vols, 2010). “How,” ask Flannigan et al., “will community college hiring practices ensure that new faculty members are able to appreciate the culture of the past while at the same time embrace the vision of the future?” (Green and Ciez-Vols, p. 82).

Chapter Summary

Examining the relationship between presidential leadership and collective efficacy among faculty is important because of, among other reasons, the sheer weight of numbers.

Approximately six million students are enrolled in community colleges and these students are taught by almost 400,000 full- and part-time faculty (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). It would be worthwhile for researchers to examine in further empirical research the effect of the trend toward increasing reliance on part-time faculty, now almost two-thirds, as it is largely only the full-time faculty who participate in designated professional development days on campuses, interact frequently with one another in multiple venues, and participate in other campus events and processes, such as serving on campus committees and attending assemblies (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). For the present, forty-three percent of the nation’s college students are enrolled

in community colleges, with an even higher percentage of enrollment for minorities and low-income populations (Tschechtelin, 2011).

Community college faculty have little control over matters other than actual teaching and curriculum (Townsend and Twombly, 2007). However, more and more theorists and practitioners are coming to the realization that “there is a need for more leadership from more people to get needed work done” (Leithwood & Marshall, 2007, cited in Wahlstrom, p. 48). It is therefore endemic in the educational landscape of the future that “community colleges, as increasingly open systems, are actors in their own destiny” (Frost, 2009, p. 1010).

Transformational leadership as a theoretical construct encompasses the framework of Bass and Avolio (1994) and their precursors in establishing a leadership continuum. To transcend the commonalities of transactional exchanges between the leader and followers and achieve transformative organizational change, these researchers cite the presence of idealized influence, inspiration or inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass and Avolio, 1994). This work provides a conceptual framework for contemporary qualitative and quantitative studies of transformational leadership as it specifically applies to leaders in the community college setting.

Similarly, the work of Hoy and Miskel (2008), and Goddard et al. (2006), provides a conceptual framework for much contemporary scholarship on the importance and facilitating value of a culture of efficacy among faculty. Contemporary quantitative and qualitative studies show the difficulty of maintaining a culture of collective efficacy in an environment characterized by increasing internal and external pressures and constraints.

Transformational leadership and a culture of efficacy are particularly timely subjects against the panoply of the Alabama Community College System and its recent history of scandal

and reformation. Recent articles about the system demonstrate both the landscape that led to its enormous challenges as well as its renewal and recommitment to its mission.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a description of the methodology employed to first measure for transformational leadership among college presidents in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS), secondly, to measure the degree to which their faculty reflect a culture of collective efficacy, and thirdly, to measure the degree of correlation between them. The foundation for this research project was established in the previous chapter when the researcher viewed these three goals through the lens of transformational leadership, a culture of collective efficacy for faculty, and the Alabama Community College System (ACCS). Details of the methodology employed are detailed below.

Research Questions

As stated in Chapter One, the overarching research question that guided this project was the following: Is a “culture of efficacy” more or less likely to be found in ACCS institutions where the president exhibits a high degree of transformational leadership? In addition, the following two sub-questions contribute to the value of the study:

1. In the context of the leadership continuum, what are the predominant leadership styles found among presidents in the ACCS?
2. What leadership styles correlate with the highest “culture of efficacy” scores?

Role of the Researcher

The researcher is a dean at a 6,000-student community college in Alabama, and manages Information Technology, Management Information Systems, Planning and Assessment, Institutional Research, and Library Services. In addition, the researcher is responsible for

campus-wide institutional effectiveness and accreditation. When this dissertation project began, the researcher was employed as a Chief Planning Officer at a state college in Georgia.

Because this study is entirely quantitative in nature, the role of the researcher was one of data collection and analysis. The researcher emailed surveys to two populations within the ACCS, the college presidents and full-time faculty. After the data were collected, the researcher conducted cross-tabulations to determine whether correlations existed, and if so, to what degree.

Before beginning this quantitative research project, the researcher clarified his predispositions pertaining to the project to be undertaken, including worldview, experiences, assumptions, and any other issue that might serve as a barrier to a completely objective analysis of the data (Creswell, 2009). To this end, the researcher determined that he is a proponent of transformational leadership among presidents, having served and consulted at a variety of two-year colleges in five states, and having seen firsthand the positive effects on culture of strong, visionary presidential leadership. In addition, the researcher is predisposed to expect that institutions whose presidents exhibit transformational leadership will also demonstrate a culture of collective efficacy.

To combat these biases, the data collection was completely objective with no process intervention by the researcher other than a consistent, generic introduction to the instruments employed (Appendix A and B). The introduction guaranteed complete confidentiality and respondents were informed that no identifying information would be included in the report of the findings. In other words, not only were the responding institutions not to be identified by name, but they would also not be identifiable by the descriptions used. The MLQ was sent electronically to the ACCS presidents directly from a third-party vendor, which also tabulated the raw data results. Similarly, the CE-SCALE was emailed to fulltime faculty with only a

generic introduction, again promising complete confidentiality and assuring respondents that only aggregated responses would be published.

Research Design

This quantitative project design comprised the collection, tabulation, and analysis from two existing survey instruments and a search for correlation among the results. A quantitative approach was chosen because it reflects the project's underlying positivist construct that an objective reality exists that can be expressed through numbers. A central feature of the study was a reliance on numbers and measurement and the connections discovered in an analysis of their interrelationships (Glatthorn, 2005).

Populations Studied

The populations chosen for this study were the presidents and faculties in the ACCS. These populations were chosen because the ACCS is a microcosm for diverse institutional types and ethnicities. Within the two-year college context, the ACCS includes institutions ranging in size from 409 (Marion) to 12,083 (Calhoun), that are rural, suburban, and urban, and include both terminal career/technical certificates and college preparatory programs of study. No institution in the ACCS offers terminal degrees beyond the associate.

The Alabama Community College System

Much descriptive and demographic information on the Alabama Community College System is found on the system's official website in the 2009-2010 Chancellor's annual report (www.accs.cc/pdfs/AnnualReports/Report2010a.pdf). The system comprises twenty-two community colleges, including a two-year military preparatory institution, four technical colleges, and two specific workforce training programs. (The military college is excluded from this study. See additional exclusions in Chapter 3.)

Frieda Hill, Chancellor until 2011, stated in her introductory letter to her 2010 annual report that, in a recent conference of the American Association of Community Colleges, “six national associations representing 1,200 community colleges pledged to increase graduation rates for our students to 50 percent, double the current 25 percent rate nationwide” (Hill, 2010). While an important overarching goal of the Alabama Community College System, it will be a challenge to achieve it in light of the fact that many students enroll needing developmental courses before attempting the academic rigor of a regular college curriculum.

The ACCS is administered by nine trustees. Eight are elected from defined districts throughout the state. The state governor, currently the Honorable Robert Bentley, serves as president. A vice president is elected each year by the members. Demographic and descriptive statistics for the ACCS are given in the table below for the 2009-2010 academic year (ACCS, 2010):

Table 1

ACCS Descriptive Information

146,205	Total Enrollment in Academic and Career/Technical Programs
91,367	Associate Degree Enrollment
54,838	Career/Technical Enrollment
25,153	Total Enrollment in Adult Education
102,203	People Served in ACCS Workforce Development

A profile of the student population (ACCS, 2010) is provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Student Population Profile

94.70%	Alabama Residents
26.47	Median Age
40.01%	Male
59.99%	Female
33.00%	Minority
55.00%	Attend Full-Time
63.90%	Qualify for Financial Aid

The educational needs of the state are great. Alabama's per capita income is \$22,984, well below the national average of \$27,334. Its educational attainment rates are also low in comparison with the rest of the nation, with 17.9% of adults over the age of 25 having *less* than a high school education. Many students, particularly in North Alabama, have access to a hybrid institution, Athens State College, which offers only junior- and senior-level courses, one of only five such institutions in the nation. During the 2009-2010 academic year, for example, 79% of its students came from community colleges and represented 56 of the state's 67 counties (ACCS, 2010).

The Alabama Community College System has been the center of major scandals in recent years, an occurrence that has brought both its leadership and culture under public scrutiny. A decade of malfeasance was highlighted by the termination of the Chancellor of the Alabama College System in 2008. He was eventually arrested and pled guilty to fifteen felony charges,

including obstruction of justice, money laundering, bribery, and conspiracy. The Chancellor himself was involved in six separate scandals according to federal prosecutors. Additional personnel at a number of Alabama's community college system were touched by these events and others. At Bishop State Community College in Mobile, for example, thirteen employees were arrested for fraudulent handling of financial aid. The ensuing investigations of scandals throughout the state revealed a widespread core of corruption. At one point, it was reported that 28 of the 146 members of the state legislature were on payrolls at various community colleges, most doing little or no work for their compensation (Kelley, 2009). For a complete chronology of these events, see Kelley, 2009.

However, the aftereffects of these occurrences were positive. More than 39 new statutes or revisions to existing ones were enacted after 2006 as a direct result of the scandals and related investigations (Kelly, 2009). Another result of these events was a greater display of transparency. Detailed records of community college expenditures are now mandated to be publicly accessible on the websites of each institution. In other words, an interested citizen can find records of payments to all third party vendors or other entities as well as the classification (on the state salary scale) and salary of each ACCS employee.

A second reason for the selection of the presidents and faculties in the ACCS as the survey populations is the renewed national interest in the community college as a portal to learning, critical thinking, and adaptable workplace skills to enhance economic development, improve global competitiveness, and create a citizenry that has a strong foundation for lifelong learning and service.

Survey Participants

The institutions selected for this study were those comprising the Alabama Community College System, with one exception, Marion Institute. This college has a differentiated mission in that it prepares students specifically for careers in the military services. The remaining institutions are designated either technical colleges or community colleges, but all offer Certificates and Associate of Science, Associate of Arts, or Associate in Applied Science degrees. To control for results skewed by new presidents, all presidents surveyed were in their positions for a minimum of one year. There was no similar limitation for faculty because of the difficulty of determining length of service from institutional faculty rosters. Surveys were emailed only to faculty at institutions whose presidents completed the MLQ.

Sample

To determine the degree to which ACCS presidents exhibit characteristics of transformational leadership, the researcher surveyed all presidents of the constituent colleges of the Alabama Community College System unless they were excluded by the experimental parameters employed (i.e., an institution excluded because of differentiated mission, Marion Institute, or a president excluded because he or she had less than one year term of service or lacked permanent status). Thus, the final survey population included was from the following twenty institutions. Institutions ultimately included are not identified by name in Chapter 4, but are randomly displayed as a number without any information that facilitates identification, a condition of participation, as mentioned previously, agreed to with the presidents and the Chancellor:

Alabama Southern Community College

Bevill State Community College

Bishop State Community College
Calhoun Community College
Central Alabama Community College
Drake State Technical College
Enterprise State Community College
Faulkner State Community College
Jefferson State Community College
Lawson State Community College
Lurleen B. Wallace Community College
Northeast Alabama Community College
Northwest-Shoals Community College
Reid State Technical College
Shelton State Community College
Snead State Community College
Trenholm State Technical College
Wallace Community College Dothan
Wallace State Community College Hanceville
Wallace State Community College Selma

The listing of college presidents is publicly accessible on the ACCS website. Because of the transparency that has evolved after the scandals of the last six years, the website of each constituent institution includes a listing of all employees and their employment classification, among other information, including monthly compensation, a fact that facilitated targeting fulltime faculty employed by an ACCS institution.

For the presidents who responded, all full-time faculty at their institutions were emailed the CE-SCALE instrument by the researcher. The respective institutional websites were used to identify the applicable faculty populations. In the column marked “Job Classification,” faculty have an identifiable classification in accordance with State Board Policy. While the website listings do not directly differentiate full- and part-time faculty, the salaries make this distinction apparent. The potential faculty survey populations, had all presidents responded, were as follows (IPEDS FY, 2010):

Alabama Southern Community College	56
Bevill State Community College	119
Bishop State Community College	91
Calhoun Community College	145
Central Alabama Community College	56
Drake State Technical College	26
Enterprise State Community College	69
Faulkner State Community College	72
Jefferson State Community College	138
Lawson State Community College	95
Lurleen B. Wallace Community College	52
Northeast Alabama Community College	55
Northwest-Shoals Community College	89
Reid State Technical College	26
Shelton State Community College	89
Snead State Community College	37

Trenholm State Technical College	76
Wallace Community College Dothan	127
Wallace State Community College Hanceville	127
Wallace State Community College Selma	54
TOTAL	1,599

Instrumentation

The instruments employed in this project have been thoroughly vetted through more than ten years of empirical research. The instrument used to measure transformational leadership was the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). And the instrument used to determine the presence of a culture of collective efficacy among faculty was the CE-SCALE developed by Goddard (2000, 2002).

The MLQ, originally developed by Bass in 1985, measures leadership style across a continuum, from transformational leadership to transactional to laissez-faire. The MLQ has undergone many modifications and revisions, but the version of the MLQ used for this study is the form (Form 5X-SHORT) published by Bass and Avolio in 1995. As of June 2011, the Form 5X-SHORT is the only iteration still in print (2011 editorial note, MLQ manual, 2004). The form has undergone validation by extensive confirmatory and discriminatory factor analysis (Bass and Avolio, 2004).

The current form of the MLQ has been widely vetted in empirical and theoretical research. As Bass and Avolio assert in the MLQ manual and sample set (2004):

The MLQ and MLQ Report have evolved over the last 25 years based on numerous investigations of leaders in public and private organizations, from CEOs of major corporations to non-supervisory project leaders. The major leadership constructs—

transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant leadership—form a new paradigm for understanding both the lower and higher order effects of leadership style. This paradigm builds on earlier leadership paradigms—such as those of autocratic versus democratic leadership, directive versus participative leadership, and task-versus relationship oriented leadership—which have dominated selection, training, development, and research in this field for the past half century (p. 3).

The MLQ consists of a series of ratings of how often observed leader behaviors occur, and utilizes a five-point Likert scale for responses:

0 = Not at all

1 = Once in a while

2 = Sometimes

3 = Fairly often

4 = Frequently, if not always

The MLQ is delivered by mail or electronically by a commercial vendor, Mind Garden, Inc., with clear, concise instructions that allow administration without assistance or proctoring. The questionnaire takes approximately fifteen minutes for completion and requires no more than a ninth-grade reading ability (Bass and Avolio, 2004). Sample questions from the MLQ Manual follow:

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts.
2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.
3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious.

Like the MLQ, the CE-SCALE has undergone a number of revisions. The instrument's development can be traced back to the Gibson and Dembo (1984) teacher efficacy scale and the

work of Bandura (1993, 1997). Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2000) acknowledge their reliance on Bandura (1997), who posited that developing a high degree of collective efficacy is difficult in the sense that teachers face a number of challenges in the areas of public accountability, responsibility for the achievement of student learning outcomes, and little control over their workplace milieu, but that once achieved, there is no reason to believe it cannot be sustained. Goddard et al. further noted agreement with Bandura (1997) that there is a reciprocal causality inherent in collective teacher efficacy. “To the extent collective teacher efficacy is positively associated with student achievement,” they assert, “there is strong reason to lead schools in a direction that will systematically develop teacher efficacy; such efforts may indeed be rewarded with continuous growth in not only collective teacher efficacy but also in student achievement” (Hoy, et al., 2000, p. 483).

The CE-SCALE has been modified several times. This study employed the 12-item short Collective Efficacy Scale developed by Goddard (2002) from the earlier work of Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk (2000) and Hoy (2000). The CE-SCALE utilizes a six-choice (strongly agree to strongly disagree) response scale identical to that employed by Gibson and Dembo. The following questions are taken from the CE-SCALE (Hoy, 2012) as an example of the instrument’s individual items:

1. Teachers in the school are able to get through to the most difficult students.
2. Teachers here are confident they will be able to motivate their students.
3. If a child doesn’t want to learn teachers here give up.

Strong empirical support exists for the psychometric properties of both the long and short forms (Goddard, 2002). To validate the instrument, Goddard et al. (2000) conducted two extensive field tests, both in elementary school environments, although the researchers point out

that this context has expansive validity in other settings. “Although our hypothesis was supported by data drawn from a population of urban elementary schools,” they point out, “social cognitive theory does not predict that the impact of collective teacher efficacy would be limited to the urban schools we sampled” (Goddard et al., 2000, p. 502). Hoy also notes that there is no reason why, under the same application of theory, that the results would not apply to community college faculty as well (Hoy, personal correspondence, 2012).

In the first study cited, involving 70 schools in five states, the researchers studied the relationships between collective teacher efficacy and trust in fellow teachers, conflict, individual efficacy, and perceptions of powerlessness, and found, as predicted, strong support for the reliability and validity of the measure of collective efficacy. Nevertheless, minor adjustments in the instrument were made as a result of the pilot study (Goddard et al., 2000).

A second validation study with the revised instrument was conducted within elementary schools in an urban school district in the Midwest. Again the results demonstrated strong reliability and validity. As they predicted, their measure of collective teacher efficacy showed positive correlation to “(a) aggregated teacher efficacy as assessed by Bandura’s (2000) measure, (b) aggregated personal teacher efficacy assessed using Hoy and Woolfolk’s (1993) adaptation of a set of Gibson and Dembo (1984) items, (c) and faculty trust in colleagues” and showed, in addition, strong internal reliability ($\alpha = .96$) (Goddard et al., 2000, pp. 495-6).

In summary, the CE-SCALE was demonstrated to be valid and reliable in two independent experimental constructs. In both, evaluation of teaching competence and teaching task, the major investigative themes of the instrument, were highly interrelated and together constituted a single, discernible indicator of collective efficacy (Goddard et al., 2000).

This research project utilized the short form of the CE-SCALE, which has been found to have experimental validity equal to that of the long form. All of the questions on the short form appear on the long. Goddard (2002) utilized the same data set cited earlier in the study of elementary schools in a large urban district in the Midwest (Goddard et al., 2000). However, Goddard (2002) noted that the two major divisions of the instrument, the measurement of Task Analysis (TA) and Group Competence (GC), were not equally addressed. Goddard noted the absence of anything in the conceptual model that allowed for one dimension being unequal to the other in the overall framework. Thus, the responses of teachers to the 21 items were aggregated at the level of the participating schools and examined through the lens of principal axis factor analysis. Goddard selected twelve items, and a second principle axis factor analysis was undertaken, followed by measurement using Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency (Goddard, 2002). Goddard summarizes his findings:

Scores from the 12-item scale and the 21-item scale were highly correlated ($r = .983$), suggesting that little change resulted from the omission of almost 43% of the items (from 21 to 12 items). The significance of this finding is that the correlation was not low. Indeed, a low correlation would have suggested that the 12-item short form was measuring something different than the original scale (p. 107).

The short form thus retains the psychometric validity of the longer version and is more parsimonious (Goddard, 2002). All questions on the short form are critical to an accurate measure of collective efficacy.

Validation

As stated previously, the MLQ has a commercial distributor, and tests of its reliability and validity are reported in an accompanying manual, the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Manual and Sample Set, Third Edition (2004). Its psychometric characteristics have been assessed by many researchers, notably among them Antokakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramamiam, who conducted in 2003 a comprehensive study comprising more than 3,000 raters, finding strong support for the instrument's validity (Northouse, 2007). The use of the MLQ in empirical and theoretical research is global in scope. Its latest version, the Form 5X-SHORT, has been used in approximately 300 thesis and dissertation research projects around the world between 1995 and 2004 alone. This iteration of the form has "been translated into Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Norwegian, Swedish, Hebrew, Turkish, Arabic, Chinese, Thai, and Korean for use in various assessment and training research projects" (Bass and Avolio, 2004, p. 33).

The CE-SCALE is distributed by the Ohio State University Department of Education. It is publicly accessible at the www.waynehoy.com/collective_effficacy website address, and includes scoring instructions developed by Goddard and Hoy. "Collective efficacy," Hoy points out in the instructions, "is the shared perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty as a whole will have positive effects on students" and the CE-SCALE instrument "measures the collective efficacy of a school" (www.waynehoy.com/collective_effficacy, p. 1).

Data Collection

A link to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) survey instrument was emailed by Mind Garden, Inc., the commercial vendor for the administration and tabulation of the MLQ results, to the presidents of 20 of the 26 institutions comprising the ACCS. Completed MLQs were mailed back to Mind Garden, Inc. for tabulation. As instructed by the researcher, the vendor made two follow-ups, approximately fourteen and twenty-one days after the initial email. The initial email was sent immediately upon approval by the researcher's committee, the IRB, and the ACCS Chancellor.

Because of the nature of the construct, the presidents were identified by the MLQ vendor when the results were delivered to the researcher. This identification was necessary to enable the researcher to examine any correlations that would be demonstrated between the MLQ score of a president and the corresponding CE-SCALE score of his or her respective faculty.

The CE-SCALE was sent by the researcher to all fulltime faculty at institutions whose presidents completed a MLQ approximately two weeks following the date of the last follow-up email to presidents. Data from the CE-SCALE was received, tabulated, and analyzed by the researcher. A follow-up was sent to faculty approximately two weeks from the date of first release.

The personal solicitation was sent initially and repeated to achieve an optimal return rate. There are approximately 1,400 faculty in the ACCS and all full-time faculty were surveyed from each “MLQ” college in an effort to obtain maximum statistical validity. In addition, to augment the return rates, the researcher recruited an employee or work study to collect completed surveys on these campuses. The researcher was not involved in the in-person solicitation of faculty.

Response Rates

The researcher originally anticipated that at least fifty percent of the eligible presidents would complete the MLQ, particularly in light of the fact that the results could inform administrative decision-making, that the expense of the exercise was borne entirely by the researcher, and that the project carried the endorsement of the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor. Queries for non-responders were repeated at least once. However, it was understood from the outset that the participation of the presidents was voluntary and that the response rate would determine the number of institutions included in the research construct. In other words, any

institution whose president did not complete the MLQ represented a de facto exclusion of that institution and meant that faculty there would not be contacted.

A similar methodology was used for collecting surveys from faculty. The completed CE-SCALES were sent or delivered directly to the researcher. A goal was to obtain a minimum response rate of forty percent. The actual response rates are given below:

Institution 1	40%	
Institution 2	37%	
Institution 3	34%	
Institution 4	69%	
Institution 5	14%	(Not used because of low response rate)
Institution 6	4%	(Not used because of low response rate)
Institution 7	N/A	(President withdrew faculty participation)

Data Analysis

Results from both the MLQ and the CE-SCALE were each scored as composite numbers for each respondent. The composite numbers were determined by the researcher for the CE-SCALE and by the vendor for the MLQ. The measure of transformational leadership through the MLQ is reported as a number between 0 and 4.0 for each of the nine points on Bass and Avolio's leadership continuum:

Idealized Influence (Attributed)

Idealized Influence (Behavior)

Inspirational Motivation

Intellectual Stimulation

Individualized Consideration

Contingent Reward

Management-by-Exception (Active)

Management-by-Exception (Passive)

Laissez-Faire

The numbers on the MLQ correspond to points on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 4.0, frequently, if not always, to 0.0, not at all. Some items are reverse scored.

For the CE-SCALE, the twelve items are each scored from one point, “Strongly Disagree,” to six, “Strongly Agree.” As on the MLQ, some items on the CE-SCALE are reverse scored. The individual numbers for faculty are converted to an institutional standardized score and reported as scores between 200 and 800. A score of 800, for example, demonstrates a very strong culture of efficacy, while a score of 200 demonstrates a very weak one.

Once the data were collected, Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the degree of correlation between the MLQ scores for presidents and the CE-SCALE scores for applicable faculty. The degree to which presidents exhibited characteristics of transformational leadership were measured against national norms based on statistical data developed by Mind Garden, Inc. from approximately 4,000 instruments collected within the United States.

Several statistical limitations should be noted. First, the small sample size available for the MLQ was an obstacle. Secondly, other impinging variables or factors closely related to the study, such as college size, location, and other traits, were not collected due to privacy issues. Thus, the association assessment between MLQ and CE-SCALE was not adjusted for covariates or potential confounders. Fourthly, the study relied on self-reporting and thereby incurs inherent bias.

Reporting the Data

To enlist the participation of the ACCS presidents, complete anonymity was assured. To this end, the MLQ scores of the presidents are not identifiable by institution or by any other identifier, such as institutional size or type. To identify an institution as urban, for example, would have limited the schema to four institutions, too few to avoid speculation or discomfort on the part of some participants.

Findings are reported in tables. To answer the first research question regarding the predominant leadership styles of presidents, a table shows the percentile rankings of presidents for each of the five dimensions of transformational leadership.

To answer the second research question regarding which presidential leadership scores correlate with the highest CE-SCALE scores among faculty, additional tables show the MLQ score for a particular president for each dimension of transformational leadership and the corresponding CE-SCALE score showing coefficients for any correlations found. The researcher discusses the implications of the correlations in Chapter 5.

Chapter Summary

The objective of the study was to examine, in the context of the leadership continuum, the predominant leadership styles found among presidents in the Alabama Community College System and to examine what leadership styles correlate with the highest culture of efficacy scores among faculty. This study was based on a quantitative research design, utilizing two instruments, the MLQ and CE-SCALE, that have not only been thoroughly vetted over years of empirical and theoretical analysis, but are highly visible and prominent in the field of educational research.

CHAPTER 4

REPORT OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to report on the data collected in accordance with the methodology described in the previous chapter. The research project addresses transformational leadership among presidents in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS), the perception of collective efficacy among ACCS faculty, and the presence of a correlation between the two.

To measure transformational leadership among the presidents, the researcher, through the services of a commercial vendor, Mind Garden, Inc., administered the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), an instrument whose psychometric properties have been well established among many diverse populations. The research parameters for the participation of the presidents were clearly defined in Chapter 3. Presidents, for example, were excluded who were employed less than one year at the time of project initiation as were presidents who were classified as interim or acting. The participation of all presidents meeting the research parameters was solicited by the researcher.

To measure Collective Efficacy among faculty, all fulltime faculty were solicited for participation for any ACCS institution whose president completed the MLQ. The measure for Collective Efficacy was Goddard's CE-SCALE, an instrument whose psychometric properties were also vetted through extensive empirical research.

Research Questions

The overarching research question that guides this project is the following: Is a "culture of efficacy" more or less likely to be found in ACCS institutions where the president exhibits a

high degree of transformational leadership? Two sub-questions will contribute to the value of the study:

1. What are the predominant leadership styles found among presidents in the ACCS?
2. What leadership styles correlate with the highest “culture of efficacy” scores among faculty?

Research Design

As stated in Chapter 3, the method of solicitation employed to administer the MLQ to ACCS presidents was direct solicitation, which took the form of a direct email inquiry from the researcher that included a personal entreaty, the IRB Informed Consent agreement, and instructions on how to log on to the Mind Garden, Inc., website where the MLQ instrument was housed. Although the project received endorsement from the Chancellor of the ACCS, participation was completely voluntary. The solicitation was repeated four times. To encourage participation, the researcher committed to a premise of complete confidentiality, an assurance that no information would be published that allowed identification. This level of confidentiality meant that no demographic or other information, such as Carnegie classification or location, would be used for identification purposes. Participants received assurances that institutions would be identified in random order only as Institution 1, Institution 2, etc. While seven presidents completed the MLQ, the data from only four were ultimately usable for the culture of efficacy correlation part of the research construct.

The methodology utilized in the research construct specified the delivery of the CE-SCALE by email to all fulltime faculty at colleges whose presidents completed the MLQ. Of the seven presidents completing the MLQ, one chose to opt out of participation prior to the solicitation of his or her faculty. All faculty were solicited twice by email, the solicitation

consisting of a personal entreaty and explanation of the project, the instrument and instructions for completion, and the IRB Informed Consent agreement. Because of low response rates, the researcher employed agents, e.g., an employee or federal work study at each target institution, to collect faculty surveys. The researcher was not directly involved in the personal collection of surveys at any institution. Collection efforts were successful for only four of the six institutions.

Respondents

The presidents who completed the MLQ met all of the research parameters. They were officially named presidents through the search protocols specified by the State Board of Education, the governance entity, and were employed in their current positions a minimum of one year at the commencement of this project. The researcher's confidentiality agreement prohibits the release of any identifying information regarding presidential respondents. Although the small number of respondents precludes assertion of statistically significant findings, the researcher points out that the respondents were representative of the system as a whole; they comprise a diverse, albeit small, sample in terms of both gender/ethnicity and institutional size, incorporating both small and mid-sized institutions. Based upon the representative nature of the respondents, the researcher draws suggestive findings and plausible conclusions.

All faculty members at participating institutions were solicited, so no random sampling techniques were utilized. All faculty were classified fulltime and none were excluded from solicitation. Demographic information on faculty respondents was not collected. Even had demographic information been obtainable, publication of this information might allow institutional identification and would therefore violate both the terms of the confidentiality agreement with the presidents as well as the terms of the researcher's participation agreement with the Chancellor of the Alabama Community College System.

Findings

In reporting the results of the MLQ to any subject, the results do not indicate that a respondent is or is not a transformational leader, but rather the degree to which he or she exhibits transformational leadership characteristics along Bass and Avolio's leadership continuum when measured against national norms. Although the MLQ is used internationally, the national norms used in this project are taken from populations only in the United States. In Bass and Avolio's leadership continuum, five areas are associated with transformational leadership, three with transactional leadership, and one with laissez faire leadership. In Table 3, the dimensions on the leadership continuum are linked with their abbreviation:

Table 3

Legend for Leadership Results

Abbreviation	Leadership Dimension
II (A)	Idealized Attributes
II (B)	Idealized Behaviors
IM	Inspirational Motivation
IS	Intellectual Stimulation
IC	Individual Consideration
CR	Contingent Reward
MBEA	Management-by-Exception: Active
MBEP	Management-by-Exception: Passive
LF	Laissez-Faire

Mind Garden, Inc. publishes a table of national norms based on the administration of the self-rating form of the MLQ to leaders across a broad spectrum of fields and disciplines within the United States. Scores on each dimension range from 0 to 4.0. The nationally normed percentiles for corresponding individual scores (N = 3,755) are provided in Table 4 with the abbreviations in Column One identified as in Table 3:

Table 4

Percentiles for Individual Scores Based on Self Ratings (United States)

Percentile	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MBA	MBP	LF
5	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.25	2.00	0.25	0.25	.00
10	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.25	0.50	0.25	.00
20	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.50	1.00	0.50	0.25
30	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.75	3.00	2.75	1.00	0.75	0.25
40	2.75	3.00	3.00	2.75	3.00	3.00	1.25	0.85	0.50
50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.25	3.00	1.50	1.00	0.50
60	3.00	3.25	3.25	3.00	3.25	3.25	1.75	1.25	0.75
70	3.25	3.25	3.50	3.25	3.50	3.50	2.00	1.25	0.75
80	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	2.25	1.50	1.00
90	3.50	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	2.75	2.00	1.25
95	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.75	3.00	2.25	1.50

Legend IIA=Idealized Attributes	Legend IIB=Idealized Behaviors
Legend IM=Inspirational Motivation	Legend IS=Intellectual Stimulation
Legend IC=Individual Consideration	Legend CR= Contingent Reward
Legend MBEA = Management-by-Exception: Active	Legend MBEP = Management-by-Exception: Passive

Mind Garden, Inc. tabulated the results of the seven participating presidents. The results are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

Presidential MLQ Raw Scores by Factor

Identifier	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MBA	MBP	LF
P1	3.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	1.8	1.0	1.0
P2	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.0	0.8	1.5	0.3
P3	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.5	3.0	0.3	0.8	0.8
P4	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.3	0.5	0.0	0.0
P5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	1.3	0.3	0.0
P6	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	1.3	1.0	0.3
P7	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	2.3	1.0	0.3	0.5

Legend IIA=Idealized Attributes	Legend IIB=Idealized Behaviors
Legend IM=Inspirational Motivation	Legend IS=Intellectual Stimulation
Legend IC=Individual Consideration	Legend CR= Contingent Reward
Legend MBEA = Management-by-Exception: Active	Legend MBEP = Management-by-Exception: Passive

The responses of the presidents are best understood, however, when converted to percentile rank as measured against the national norms for the United States published by Mind Garden, Inc. The presidential scores by percentile rank are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Presidential Scores by Percentile Rank

Identifier	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MBA	MBP	LF
P1	70	95	95	95	95	95	60	50	80
P2	95	90	50	70	70	50	10	80	30
P3	90	90	90	70	80	40	5	40	70
P4	70	95	95	80	90	60	10	0	10
P5	95	95	95	80	95	95	40	10	10
P6	95	95	95	95	95	95	40	50	30
P7	70	90	90	80	90	10	30	10	50

Legend IIA=Idealized Attributes	Legend IIB=Idealized Behaviors
Legend IM=Inspirational Motivation	Legend IS=Intellectual Stimulation
Legend IC=Individual Consideration	Legend CR= Contingent Reward
Legend MBEA = Management-by-Exception: Active	Legend MBEP = Management-by-Exception: Passive

When measured against national norms, all seven presidents ranked high on the five dimensions of transformational leadership. With each of the seven presidents reviewed across the five dimensions, the cumulative number of factors scored is 35. Of the 35 scores among the presidents, only one score, “Inspirational Motivation” for P2, was lower than the 70th percentile. In other words, 34 of 35, or 97%, of the scores when measured against national norms were high on measures of transformational leadership. In fact, 24 scores, or 69%, were at the 90th percentile or higher.

The CE-SCALE scores for the four institutions are provided in Table 7. For the CE-SCALE, the twelve items on the survey instrument are each scored from one, “Strongly Disagree,” to six, “Strongly Agree.” As on the MLQ, some items on the CE-SCALE are reverse scored. The individual numbers for faculty are converted to an institutional standardized score and reported as scores between 200 and 800. A score of 800, for example, demonstrates a very strong culture of efficacy, while a score of 200 demonstrates a very weak one. The scores for the ACCS institutions were all in the mid-range against empirical norms, meaning that all four institutions were neither high nor low in the degree of collective efficacy reported.

Table 7

Faculty CE Scores by Institutional Identifier

Institution	Aggregate CE Score
1	404.295
2	409.042
3	394.731
4	414.017

As noted earlier, three institutions were excluded from this part of the experimental construct, one because the president withdrew permission for faculty solicitation and two because of low response rates.

To quantify correlation between the presidents’ transformational leadership scores and faculty CE-SCALE scores, the researcher calculated correlation coefficients. The researcher

prefers Spearman's rank correlation over Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient because the usage of the former is free from any requirement that the underlying populations be normally distributed. However, the Pearson calculations are included as a point of comparison.

Pearson's coefficient measures the direction and strength of the linear relationship between two quantitative variables and is reported as a number between -1 and 1. A correlation value of zero means that no linear relationship is present between the variables. A positive or negative value demonstrates a positive or negative relationship, which is strongest the closer the values are to -1 or 1 (Rumsey, pp. 58-59). The Spearman coefficient does not require that the relationship between the two variables be linear. Spearman's utility comes from its examination based on rank order rather than actual values (Rumsey, pp. 325-327).

The Pearson column reports Pearson's product-moment sample correlation coefficient computed using the Excel function "CORREL." The Spearman column reports Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, which is the Pearson coefficient for correlation of the ranks where ties among ranks are broken by assigning the average (mean) in lieu of the associated ranks. Table 8 displays the Pearson and Spearman coefficients for each of the five factors of transformational leadership: Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration.

In terms of sample statistics, the Pearson coefficients indicate modest positive correlations for three of the five pairs of scores. The Spearman coefficients indicate modest positive correlation for four of the five pairs of scores, most notably for Idealized Influence (Behavior).

Table 8

Pearson and Spearman Coefficients

Number	Factor	Pearson Coefficient	Spearman Coefficient
IIA	Idealized Influence (Attributed)	-0.0682812	-0.2108185
IIB	Idealized Influence (Behavior)	0.51084002	0.4472136
IM	Inspirational Motivation	-0.1161251	0.21081851
IS	Intellectual Stimulation	0.10324155	0.21081851
IC	Individual Consideration	0.32059721	0.21081851

As stated previously, the Spearman coefficient is most useful in interpreting these results as it is not based on any underlying assumption that the survey populations are normally distributed. It is clear from Table 8 that the strongest correlation exists for Idealized Influence (Behavioral). Idealized Influence is related to the idealized manner in which followers view the leader, and because of this idealized view, the leader exerts considerable influence. Followers “want to identify with the leaders and their mission...[and] develop strong feelings about such leaders, in whom they invest much trust and confidence” (Bass and Avolio, p. 26). The Behavioral aspect of Idealized Influence centers on the fact that transformational leaders “talk about [the leader’s] most important values and beliefs, specify the importance of having a strong

sense of purpose, consider the oral and ethical consequences of decisions, and emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission” (Bass and Avolio, p. 94).

Only one Spearman coefficient was negative, that for Idealized Influence (Attributed). The Attributed aspect of Idealized Influence focuses on the fact that transformational leaders “instill pride in others for being associated with [the leader], go beyond self-interest for the good of the group, act in ways that build others’ respect for [the leader], and display a sense of power and confidence” (Bass and Avolio, p. 94).

As was true for Idealized Influence (Behavior), the Spearman coefficients for the remaining three factors were also positive, although not to the same degree. The first of these, Inspirational Motivation, addresses the fact that inspiration can be found among followers without the presence of their identification of the leader. Instead, the “inspirational leaders articulate, in simple ways, shared goals and mutual understanding of what is right and important” (Bass and Avolio, p. 27). Here, the Inspirational Motivation dimension centers on the tendency of transformational leaders to “talk optimistically about the future, talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished, articulate a compelling vision of the future, and express confidence that goals will be achieved” (Bass and Avolio, p. 94).

The second, Intellectual Stimulation, is focused on the fact that transformational leaders are catalysts for the intellectual stimulation of followers’ values and ideas. Through transformational leadership, followers “are encouraged to question their own beliefs, assumptions, and values, and, when appropriate, those of the leader, which may be outdated or inappropriate for solving current problems” and on their own “learn to tackle and solve problems...by being creative and innovative” (Bass and Avolio, p. 27). Intellectual Stimulation focuses on the fact that transformational leaders characteristically “re-examine critical

assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, seek differing perspectives when solving problems, get others to look at problems from many different angles, and suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments” (Bass and Avolio, p. 95).

The third, Individualized Consideration, has as its central tenet an “understanding and sharing in each others’ concerns and developmental needs and treating each individual uniquely” (Bass and Avolio, p. 28). This dimension of transformational leadership addresses the propensity of the leader to “spend time teaching and coaching, treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group, consider each individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others, and help others to develop their strengths” (Bass and Avolio, p. 95).

Chapter Summary

The first research question of this project addressed the identification of the dominant leadership style of the community college presidents. The respondents exhibited strong evidence for transformational leadership when measured against national norms. Of the 35 possible measurements (seven presidents with five scores each for the five leadership dimensions measured by the MLQ), 34, or 97%, were on the 70th percentile or higher. Most scores, 24, or 69%, were, in fact, at the 90th percentile or higher.

The collective teacher efficacy scores ranged from 394 to 414, all mid-range when measured against national norms. This finding means that the institutions were neither high nor low in the degree of collective efficacy reported.

In regard to the second question, whether the presence of a positive correlation existed between high transformational leadership and high collective efficacy among faculty, the calculation of Spearman coefficients indicated positive correlations among four of the five dimensions of transformational leadership. The correlation relative to the other four scores was

particularly pronounced for Idealized Influence (Behavior), which centers on the fact that transformational leaders “talk about [the leader’s] most important values and beliefs, specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose, consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions, and emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission” (Bass and Avolio, p. 94). Although a slightly negative correlation was found for Idealized Influence (Attributes), modest positive correlations were also found for Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The principal intent of this quantitative study was to investigate the correlations, if any, that existed between transformational leadership and an institutional collective culture of efficacy. The populations studied comprised the presidents of the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) and full-time faculty. Secondary areas of investigation were the dominant leadership styles of the ACCS presidents and what leadership styles correlated to the highest “culture of efficacy” scores.

For the purposes of this study, transformational leadership was defined as leadership characterized by a desire of leaders to have followers achieve self-actualization and reach their fullest potential, an impetus that enables an organization to achieve at high or extraordinary levels. In this study, the researcher followed the seminal leadership construct of Avolio and Bass (1994), where leadership is viewed on a nine-point continuum from transformational to laissez-faire. Five dimensions of transformational leadership appear on the left of the continuum with laissez-faire on the far right.

In defining a culture of efficacy, the researcher followed the prescriptions of Mintzberg (1989), Ochi (1981), and others who define culture as “organizational ideology” (Mintzberg). In examining the degree to which an institution exhibits strong or weak collective efficacy, this study relies on the work of Goddard (2002), which further elucidated the earlier foundational work of Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk (Goddard & Hoy, 2000; Hoy & Woolfolk, 2000).

In undertaking this project, two instruments were used: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) of Bass and Avolio, and the Collective Efficacy Scale (CE-SCALE) developed by Goddard. The psychometric validity of these instruments has been well established

in the literature. The MLQ, for example, has been extensively used to identify leadership styles and “has been used in over thirty countries and in numerous languages, business and industrial firms, hospitals, religious institutions, military organizations, government agencies, colleges, primary schools, and secondary schools” (Bass and Avolio, Manual, p. 12). The researcher made no changes or modifications to either instrument. Indeed, use of the MLQ is licensed and proprietary and only available through a commercial vender. No other research project exists probing links between transformational leadership and cultural collective efficacy using these two instruments.

As stated in Chapter 4, the researcher first solicited voluntary participation in completing the MLQ from ACCS presidents who met the terms and conditions of the research design. (It is important to note that the entire project received endorsement from the Chancellor of the Alabama Community College System.) For institutions whose presidents responded by completing the MLQ, the researcher then solicited participation in completing the CE-SCALE from all fulltime faculty at the respective institutions. Seven presidents completed the MLQ. Faculty surveys were successfully collected from four of the seven institutions.

Thus, this study links transformational leadership among ACCS presidents and the presence of a culture of efficacy among ACCS faculty. To this end, the following research question guided this project: Is a “culture of efficacy” more or less likely to be found in ACCS institutions whose president exhibits a high degree of transformational leadership? In addition, the following sub-questions contributed to the value of the study:

1. In the context of the leadership continuum, what are the predominant leadership styles found among presidents in the ACCS?
2. What leadership styles correlate with the highest “culture of efficacy” scores?

The study found that, overall, a small positive correlation existed between transformational leadership and the presence of a culture of collective efficacy among faculty. In other words, when the presidential MLQ and faculty CE-SCALE scores were examined in rank order, a positive correlation existed between them, thus indicating that the higher an institution's president scores in transformational leadership tendencies, the more likely one will find a higher culture of efficacy relative to other institutions. All seven presidents participating in the study exhibited strong transformational leadership proclivities relative to national norms.

Analysis of Research Findings

As stated in Chapter 4, there were several major findings in this study. First, all seven presidents completing the MLQ exhibited transformational leadership characteristics along Bass and Avolio's leadership continuum when measured against national norms. In Bass and Avolio's leadership continuum, five areas are associated with transformational leaders, three with transactional leadership, and one with laissez-faire leadership. In reporting the scores, Mind Garden, Inc., the commercial vendor for the MLQ instrument, does not say that a subject is or is not a transformational leader, only that he or she exhibits transformational leadership characteristics. Because all seven presidents did indeed exhibit transformational leadership characteristics, it can be inferred from the sample population that transformational leadership characteristics are the prevailing ones among presidents in the ACCS.

The central research question, however, was whether a "culture of efficacy" was more or less likely to be found in ACCS institutions whose presidents exhibit a high degree of transformational leadership characteristics. When the presidents were placed in rank order for each of the five dimensions of transformational leadership and Spearman coefficients of correlation calculated for each dimension against the ranking for the measurement for collective

efficacy among faculty, positive correlation was found for four of the five dimensions, idealized influence (attributed) the exception. Reliance on the Spearman coefficient was based on the fact that it does not assume that the survey populations are normally distributed. There is evidence, therefore, that the higher a president scores in the dimensions of transformational leadership, the higher the institution's faculty score in collective efficacy.

Discussion of Research Findings

The population studied, the ACCS, is an appropriate one because it is a microcosm of other systems throughout the nation since it is comprised of a wide range of institutional settings and types. It is a timely population to examine in light of renewed national interest in the community college as a portal to learning, critical thinking, and adaptive workplace skills to enhance economic development, improve global competitiveness, and create a citizenry that has a strong foundation for lifelong learning and service. The relevance of the renewed interest in community college completion and success is reflected in much recent scholarship and regional and national dialog, a reality reflected, for example, in the work of O'Banion (2013) and the *Texas Completes Design Report* (2012) and the *North Carolina Completion by Design Initiative* (2012).

The finding of this research study that all presidents in the ACCS exhibit transformational leadership characteristics when measured against national norms is positive when viewed through the crucible of the transformational leadership literature cited in Chapter 4. The central focus of transformational leadership on translating the leader-follower relationship into one that results in "mutual stimulation and elevation" (Burns, p. 4) is critical in the ACCS, where twenty-six presidents serve more than 145,000 degree-seeking students.

Bass points out that having a transformational leader does three things to inspire followers to exceed expectations: they raise follower consciousness of the significance and value of goals, they motivate followers to look beyond self-interest toward unit or organizational goals, and they move followers to inculcate higher-order needs (Bass, 1985). Against the Bass and Avolio transformational leadership continuum (Bass and Avolio, 1994), the community college presidents exhibited characteristics of each of the four “I’s”: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

This finding that all participating presidents exhibited characteristics of transformational leadership has critical leadership implications for the ACCS. Idealized influence is related to the idealized manner in which followers view the leader, and because of this view, the leader exerts considerable influence. Followers “want to identify with the leaders and their mission...[and] develop strong feelings about such leaders, in whom they invest much trust and confidence” (Bass & Avolio, p. 26). Inspirational Motivation addresses the fact that inspiration can be found among followers without the presence of the leader. Instead, the “inspirational leaders articulate, in simple ways, shared goals and mutual understanding of what is right and important” (Bass and Avolio, p. 27). Intellectual stimulation is focused on the fact that transformational leaders are catalysts for the intellectual stimulation of followers’ values and ideas. And Individualized Consideration has as its central tenet an “understanding and sharing in each others’ concerns and developmental needs and treating each individual uniquely” (Bass & Avolio, p. 28).

Exhibiting these transformational leadership characteristics in an important finding too because these characteristics reflect an underpinning of good communication in both direct and indirect ways. This fact underscores Walker and McPhail’s (2009) finding that successful leaders must be good communicators, particularly in an environment in which presidents can easily be

misunderstood (Maslin-Ostrowski, Floyd, and Hrabak, 2011), particularly in global contexts (Frost, 2009), or when presidents find themselves in crisis situations across any of four major constructs: financial, personnel, political, and public relations (Murray and Kishur, 2008). This finding is particularly meaningful when it is easy for community college leaders to adopt directive managerialism as a default leadership style (Ayers, 2009). Transformational leaders display “high levels of energy and mental resilience” and “full concentration, happiness, and absorption” into one’s work (Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005, p. 316).

It is equally evident in the research literature that possessing a high degree of collective teacher efficacy among community college faculty is highly desirable. Thus, the finding that among the participating colleges, the collective efficacy scores as measured by Goddard’s CE-SCALE were all in the average range adds significance to the evidence that the scores can be positively impacted by transformational leadership.

The finding that the participating colleges had average collective efficacy scores can be viewed through the lens of its importance. The fundamental concept of collective teacher efficacy is a belief that student learning can be directly affected by faculty actions (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Faculty actions that positively impact student learning transcend instructional pedagogy and include such dimensions as teacher job satisfaction, their feelings of collegiality and trust, their beliefs in their collective professionalism, and their collaboration with one another (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). This is particularly true for at-risk students (McGrath & Tobia, 2008).

A high degree of collective faculty efficacy having a positive impact on student learning was confirmed by Barnett (2011), where she found evidence that active faculty validation of students was positively correlated with both a greater sense of academic engagement and greater

rates of persistence. This observation is significant against the backdrop of the contemporary shift toward completion and job readiness (Cohen, 2011) and innovation as demonstrated by Serva, Fuller & Mayer (2005), who found that the “perceived ability of colleagues was a strong predictor of trust and that trust was a significant predictor for risk-taking behaviors” (p. 628). This conclusion was confirmed by Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) when they found that while principles of shared governance and leader-teacher trust matter, teacher-to-teacher relationships are even more significant as an underpinning for the way in which teachers work to enhance instruction. Enhanced teacher influence is also positively correlated with school improvement (Mayrowetz, Murphy, Louis, & Smylie, 2007) through faculty hegemony developed across multiple dimensions (Sprouse, Ebbers, & King, 2008, and Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008).

Conclusions

Three obvious conclusions can be reached as a result of this research. First, possessing transformational leadership characteristics is a positive attribute for community college presidents, particularly in light of the prominence of community colleges as a portal for economic opportunity (O’Banion, 2013), the influence of presidents on teaching and learning in both direct and indirect affective ways (Wahlstrom and Louis, 2008), and the necessity of strong communication skills (Walker & McPhail, 2009). The ability of a transformational leader to listen to stakeholders beyond campus borders also enables the president to incorporate research, stakeholder perspectives, and innovation into institutional effectiveness frameworks (VanBolkom & Eastham, 2011).

Second, a high degree of collective teacher efficacy is also positive because of its positive effects on student learning through high levels of teacher job satisfaction, feelings of collegiality and trust, through teachers’ belief in their collective professionalism, and their ongoing

collaboration with one another (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008), particularly for at-risk students (McGrath & Tobia, 2008).

Finally, having both transformational leadership and a high degree of collective teacher efficacy is optimal in all of the correlations tested except one, Idealized Influence, Attributed. With this exception, positive correlations were found in all dimensions. The positive correlation was highest, again, for Idealized Influence (Behavior), which centers on the fact that transformational leaders “talk about [the leader’s] most important values and beliefs, specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose, consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions, and emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission” (Bass and Avolio, p. 94).

To summarize these conclusions, this project began with empirical uncertainty. The prevailing leadership style of the ACCS presidents was an open question, particularly in light of pervasive executive scandals over the last eight years. It was explicit and implicit in the literature that transformational leadership characteristics were critically needed in light of both institutional and global challenges. It was no coincidence that the community colleges were prominently mentioned as an engine for personal and professional growth in a presidential state of the union speech.

It is therefore a positive finding that all seven presidents completing the MLQ tested high in transformational leadership traits when measured against national norms. And while the collective efficacy scores of community college faculty in the study were mid-range against national norms, it is significant that the scores were closely correlated with the rank order of the MLQs.

Implications

As stated in Chapter One, many educational constituencies can benefit from this study of transformational leadership characteristics as exhibited by ACCS presidents, measures of collective teacher efficacy, and the presence of positive correlations between them. One such constituency is college presidents. This research demonstrates that even in the presence of average collective teacher efficacy, a transformational leader exerts positive influence on institutional performance and culture in both direct and indirect ways. This research also demonstrates the importance of promoting faculty efficacy as it enhances student learning, a core performance indicator for all higher education institutions.

Thus, because transformational leadership characteristics among executives are highly valued as contributors to organizational success, one implication of the study is the desirability of implementing professional development and other activities that will “move the needle” on the leadership continuum. If a college system values the important role of transformational leadership, it should approach this goal with intentionality. Transformational leadership should be an agenda item at president’s meetings and specific catalytic dialog should be initiated throughout the system, including, but not exclusively, by the Chancellor.

In approaching collective efficacy with intentionality, a symbiotic relationship exists between the leaders and faculty. While faculty can promote efficacy among one another, the leader can implement and promote policies that contribute to an overarching institutional culture that is conducive to learning, growth, and becoming.

Faculty can also benefit from the study because of the value of a high degree of collective teacher efficacy, even in the absence of transformational executive leadership. And similarly, because of the value of a highly developed sense of collective teacher efficacy and its inherent

positive effect on student learning and mutual support among colleagues, collective faculty efficacy too can be promoted with intentionality. Here too professional development plays an important role. Faculty can engage in mutual support and collaboration and empowering dialog on both pedagogical and curricular issues.

A third group that can benefit from the study are institutional stakeholders, such as community leaders, business and industry, legislators, and public and private benefactors. Providing executives with incentives and resources, particularly funding for faculty professional development, facilitates the development and implementation of specific strategies that enhance both transformational leadership and collective faculty efficacy.

To summarize, the researcher believes that while specific response rates from the target populations was somewhat disappointing, the subjects of transformational leadership among presidents and collective teacher efficacy among faculty remain highly relevant in an educational environment marked by scarcity and fierce competition. It is important to support these domains with strong programs of professional development and validation from the highest levels of governance.

In developing professional development programs, one need not overlook the extensive offerings of the commercial vendor for the MLQ, Mind Garden, Inc. This vendor offers multiple programs linked to the specific results of the MLQ or linked to an area a leader wishes to target as part of a larger context of strategic planning. Mind Garden also offers instruments that measure team performance and institutional culture.

Recommendations

There are several areas for further study. One possible area for further study would be to examine the relationships between the degree of transformational leadership characteristics

found among presidents against the crucible of Carnegie classifications: urban versus rural, large institutional size versus medium and small, male versus female, etc. While the researcher's confidentiality agreement in this research project with the Chancellor and the participating presidents precluded this type of analysis, typographical inquiry would inform empirical research in this field. Each subcategory of institution could be assessed against a measure of collective teacher efficacy among faculty.

Examination of the presence of transformational leadership characteristics could be broadened beyond just presidents. Deans, for example, can wield considerable influence on institutional culture. An area of future inquiry could encompass another layer of executive leadership. These scores, too, could be assessed against collective teacher efficacy.

A third area for further study would be to examine transformational leadership characteristics using an instrument other than the MLQ self-rater form. Mind Garden, Inc., for example, offers commercially the "MLQ 360 Leader's Report," which provides comprehensive analysis that encompasses the perceptions of superiors, peers, and subordinates and gives context that is not as susceptible to the inherent bias in self-rating. As mentioned previously, Mind Garden also offers instruments that measure team performance and institutional culture.

A fourth area for further study would be examining links between transformational leadership characteristics among executives and collective efficacy among faculty against the plethora of vacant positions. At the time of this writing, for example, seven presidential positions in Alabama are open and unfilled and several more existing presidents are close to retirement. It is also an open area of inquiry to view faculty turnover against institutional collective teacher efficacy.

A fifth area for further study would be examining transformational leadership characteristics and collective teacher efficacy against standard institutional performance standards. Research could be conducted, for example, examining graduation and retention rates against scores on the MLQ, CE-SCALE, or other instruments.

Concluding Thoughts

In the researcher's fifteen years in community college leadership, he has come to value a positive, empowering institutional culture above all else, a thought expressed by Bill Aulet (2014): "I came to see in my time at IBM that culture isn't just one aspect of the game—it *is* the game" (p. 25). To this end, the research confirms and strengthens this belief.

Transformational leadership is critical among the cadre of community college presidents as they are asked to do more and more with fewer financial resources. In this environment it is critical that leaders inspire and empower followers to realize their potential both as members of the community in the broadest sense and as practitioners.

Equally important is doing all possible to promote a high degree of collective faculty efficacy as an intentional goal for all faculty, but for faculty leaders in particular. Collective efficacy has a positive effect on learning, and student learning can be measured in both direct and indirect ways. But the researcher believes that there are other organizational benefits that, while more difficult to draw causal inferences from, accrue over the long term, manifested in faculty retention, job satisfaction, innovative practices, risk-taking, and higher degrees of both faculty and student engagement.

REFERENCES

- Alfred, R. L. (2008). Governance in strategic context. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 141, 79-89.
- Alabama Community College System (2010). *Chancellor's annual report*. Retrieved from ACCS website: www.accs.cc/pdfs/AnnualReports/Report2010a.pdf.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). Six competencies for community college leaders. Retrieved from AACC website: www.aacc.nche.edu/newsevents/Events/leadershipsuite/Pages/six_competencies.aspx
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261-295.
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sample set*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Ayers, D. F. (2009). Institutional contradiction in the community college. *Community College Review* 37 (2), 165-184.
- Babcock-Roberson, M. E. & Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144 (3), 313-326.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freenan.
- Barnett, E. A. (2011). Validation experiences and persistence among community college students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34 (2), 193-230.

- Bass, M. V. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, M. V. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231-272.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Short form 6S*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies.
- Bass, M. & Avolio, B. eds. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and Transactional leadership of men and women. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 45, 5-34.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cohen, A. (2011). Further views from professors, state directors, and analysts. *New Directions for community colleges*, 156, 87-100.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Frost, R. A. (2009). Globalization contextualized: An organization-environment

- case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33, 1009-1024.
- Geist, J. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2004). Cultivating a culture of trust: Enabling school structure, professionalism, and academic press. *Leading and Managing*, 10, 1-18.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76 (4), 559-569.
- Glatthorn, A., & Joyner, R. (2005). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Goddard, R. D. (2002). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the measurement of collective efficacy: The development of a short form. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 62 (1), 97-110.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, H. K., and Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 479-508.
- Green, D. W., & Ciez-Volz, K. C. (2010). Now hiring: The faculty of the future. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 152, 81-92.
- Hassan, A. M., Dellow, D. A., & Jackson, R. J. (2010). The AACC leadership competencies: Parallel views from the top. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 34, 180-198.
- House, R. J. (1976). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration theory, research, and practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K. (2012). Collective efficacy scale (CE-SCALE). Retrieved from http://www.waynehoy.com/collective_efficacy.
- Johnson, M. (2007). Wallace State's new rules of business: Affirming the truths of intentional transformation. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 511-516.
- Kelley, D. (2009). *Unethical leadership in higher education and the precarious Journey to recovery: A case study of the Alabama Community College System* (doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama).
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: Examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11 (4), 379-405.
- Leist, J. (2007). External culture: Its impact on rural community college presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 305-325.
- Lester, J. (2009). Not your child's playground: Workplace bullying among community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33, 446-464.
- Locke, M. G., & Guglielmino, L. (2006). The influence of subcultures on planned change in a community college. *Community College Review*, 34 (2), 108-127.
- Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2001). Ten years of the *Leadership Quarterly*: Contributions and challenges for the future. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4),

459-514.

Maslin-Ostrowski, P., Floyd, D. L., & Hrabak, M. R. (2011). Daunting realities of Leading complicated by the new media: Wounding and community college presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35, 29-42.

Maslowski, R. (2006). A review of inventories for diagnosing school climates. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44, 6-35.

Mattson, K., & Bernt, J. The two cultures of academe. *Academe*, 94 (4), 54-57.

Mayrowetz, D., Murphy, J., Louis, K.S., & Smylie, M. (2007). Distributed Leadership as work redesign: Retrofitting the job characteristics model. *International journal of leadership and policy*, 6(1), 69-103.

McNair, D. E., Duree, C. A., & Ebbers, L. (2011). If I knew then what I know now: Using the leadership competencies developed by the American Association of Community Colleges to prepare community college presidents. *Community College Review*, 39 (1), 3-25.

McGrath, D. & Tobia, S. (2008). Organizational culture as a hidden resource. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 144, 41-53.

Melton, T. D., Mallory, B., Tysinger, D., & Green, J. (2011). A validation study of the School Leader Dispositions Inventory: *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* 8 (2), 38-50.

Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management*. New York: Free Press.

Mujis, D., Harris, A, Lumby, J., Morrison, M., & Sood, K. (2006). Leadership and Leadership development in highly effective further education leaders. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30 (1), 87-106.

- Murray, J. P., & Kishur, J. M. (2008). Crisis management in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32, 480-495.
- Northouse, P. (2001). Leadership theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- O'Banion, T. (2013). Access, success, and completion: A primer for community college faculty, administrators, staff, and trustees. Chandler, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory Z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Salanova, M. Agut, S., & Peiro, M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1217-1227.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.
- Serva, M. A., Fuller, M.A. & Mayer, R.C. (2005). The reciprocal nature of trust: A longitudinal study of interacting teams. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 26(6), 625-648.
- Sprouse, M., Ebbers, L. H., & King, A. R. (2008). Hiring and developing quality community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32, 985- 998.
- Stoeckel, P. & Davies, T. (2007). Reflective leadership by selected community college presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31, 895-912.
- Tschechtelin, J. D. (2011). Increased enrollment + student success – funding = ?. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 156, 49-59.

- Townsend, B. & Twombly, S. (2007). *Community college faculty: Overlooked and undervalued*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective Managerial practices? *Group & Organizational Management*, 23 (3), 220-236.
- VanBolkom, W. D., & Eastham, S. (2011). Education and development: Twelve Considerations for transformative practice. *International Education* 40 (2), 22-39.
- Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44 (4), 458-495.
- Walker, M. W. & McPhail, C. J. (2009). Spirituality matters: Spirituality and the community college leader. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33, 321-345.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs		
Institutional Review Board (IRB)		
Phone: 912-478-0843		Veazey Hall 2021
Fax: 912-478-0719	IRB@GeorgiaSouthern.edu	P.O. Box 8005 Statesboro, GA 30460

To: Johnny McMoy
Dr. Lucinda Chance

CC: Charles E. Patterson
Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College

From: Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
Administrative Support Office for Research Oversight Committees
(IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Initial Approval Date: 12/10/12

Expiration Date: 05/31/13


Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

After a review of your proposed research project numbered H13107 and titled "Transformational Leadership and a Culture of Efficacy: A Search for Correlation in the Alabama Two-Year College System." it appears that (1) the research subjects are at minimal risk, (2) appropriate safeguards are planned, and (3) the research activities involve only procedures which are allowable. You are authorized to enroll up to a maximum of 1,200 subjects.

Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that the Institutional Review Board has approved your proposed research.

If at the end of this approval period there have been no changes to the research protocol; you may request an extension of the approval period. Total project approval on this application may not exceed 36 months. If additional time is required, a new application may be submitted for continuing work. In the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, **whether or not it is believed to be related to the study**, within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator **prior** to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, you are required to complete a *Research Study Termination* form to notify the IRB Coordinator, so your file may be closed.

Sincerely,



Eleanor Haynes
Compliance Officer

APPENDIX B

CE-SCALE

CE-Scale Short Form

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your school from **strongly disagree** to **strongly agree**. Your answers are confidential.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Teachers in the school are able to get through to the most difficult students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers here are confident they will be able to motivate their students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. If a child doesn't want to learn teachers here give up.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teachers here don't have the skills needed to produce meaningful student learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers in this school believe that every child can learn.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. These students come to school ready to learn.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Home life provides so many advantages that students here are bound to learn.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Students here just aren't motivated to learn.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Teachers in this school do not have the skills to deal with student disciplinary problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The opportunities in this community help ensure that these students will learn.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Learning is more difficult at this school because students are worried about their safety.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Drug and alcohol abuse in the community make learning difficult for students here.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(Copyright© Goddard & Hoy, 2003)

APPENDIX C

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Leader Form**

My Name: _____ Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.**

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4
1.				0 1 2 3 4
2.				0 1 2 3 4
3.				0 1 2 3 4
4.				0 1 2 3 4
5.				0 1 2 3 4

Note that as part of the proprietary rights of Mind Garden, Inc., only five sample items of this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

APPENDIX D

GSU STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT



 COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP STATEMENT OF
INFORMED CONSENT**

Dear Research Participant:

My name is Johnny McMoy, and I am a doctoral candidate at Georgia Southern University. This project is being conducted to investigate the possible correlation between transformational leadership among college presidents in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) and the presence of a strong culture of collective efficacy for college faculty.

The purpose of this research is to answer the following research question: Is a “culture of efficacy” more or less likely to be found in ACCS institutions where the president exhibits a high degree of transformational leadership?

Participation in this research will include completion of the Bass and Avolio (1994) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) for college presidents and Goddard’s CE-SCALE instrument for college faculty. The psychometric properties of both instruments have been long established and both are used without modification by the researcher. Each instrument should take no more than fifteen minutes to complete.

Risk is no greater than risk associated with daily life experiences. The responses of participants are strictly confidential and will be reported as aggregate data without any attributable reference to a particular participant or institution. The data (survey responses) will be maintained in a secure location for a minimum of seven years. Because no previous research exists that examines transformational leadership and collective efficacy using these specific instruments, participants will be contributing to empirical research that can inform administrative policy and organizational constructs.

Participants have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact me or my faculty advisor, Dr. Lucinda Chance, whose contact information is located at the end of this document. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-478-0843.

Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary and can be withdrawn by participants at any time.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number **H13107**.

Title of Project: Transformational Leadership and a Culture of Efficacy: A Search for Correlation in the Alabama Two-Year System

Principal Investigator: Johnny McMoy, 143 Birmingham St. SW, Cullman, AL 35055; 478-230-9945; mcmoyj@att.net
 Faculty Advisor: Dr. Lucinda Chance, College of Education, PO Box 8131, Statesboro, GA 30460; 912-681-5307; lchance@georgiasouthern.edu.

By returning the survey, the participant agrees to the informed consent.

APPENDIX E

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM CHANCELLOR



Mark A. Heinrich, Ph.D.
Chancellor

Department of Postsecondary Education
Post Office Box 302130
Montgomery, AL 36130-2130
t 334.293.4500
f 334.293.4504
www.accs.cc

January 11, 2013

Mr. Johnny McMoy
143 Birmingham St. SW
Cullman, AL 35055

Dear Mr. McMoy:

I am in receipt of your request regarding the research phase of your dissertation entitled *Transformational Leadership and a Culture of Efficacy: A Search for Correlation in the Alabama Two-Year College System*. Your request to invite presidents in the Alabama Community College System to participate in a survey, is approved. I believe this is a worthwhile endeavor and wish you much success.

I look forward to reviewing your findings when you are finished. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Heinrich, Ph.D.
Chancellor

tj

cc: Presidents

education works.

Governor Robert Bentley President
Randy McKinney District 1
Betty Peters District 2
Stephanie Bell District 3
Yvette M. Richardson District 4
Ella B. Bell District 5
Charles E. Elliott District 6
Gary Warren District 7
Mary Scott Hunter District 8