Fall 2008

Presidents at Public Colleges, Universities and Technical Colleges in the State of Georgia: A Leadership Tribute Analysis

Peter Nicholas Mastopoulos

PRESIDENTS AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA: A LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTE ANALYSIS

by

PETER NICHOLAS MASTOPOULOS

(Under the Direction of Linda M. Arthur)

ABSTRACT

This descriptive quantitative study identifies self-described leadership attributes of college or university presidents in the University System of Georgia and technical college presidents in the Technical College System of Georgia. Additionally, this study identifies commonalities in leadership attributes between both groups. Data for this study was collected using the *Leadership Attributes Inventory (LAI)* survey instrument that was disseminated to all 68 presidents at the public institutions of higher education in the State of Georgia.

Forty survey recipients completed and returned the survey, yielding a 59% response rate. In order to analyze the data and draw conclusions, statistical tests of central tendency were employed and their standard deviation calculated. To determine statistical significance at the .05 level, an analysis of variance using institution type and institution size was conducted. Overlap in the top 25% of the 37 tested leadership attributes was identified in seven areas: committed to the common good, ethical, visionary, personal integrity, energetic with stamina, accountable and

dependable/reliable. Only one leadership attribute—coaching—was determined to have a statistically significant difference based upon institutional size rather than type.

INDEX WORDS: College presidents, University presidents, Technical college leadership, Higher education administration, Higher education leadership

PRESIDENTS AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA: A LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTE ANALYSIS

by

PETER NICHOLAS MASTOPOULOS

B.A., Armstrong Atlantic State University, 1992

M.S.A., Central Michigan University, 1998

Ed.S., Georgia Southern University, 2005

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

2008

PRESIDENTS AT PUBLIC COLLEGES, UNIVERSITIES AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA: A LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTE ANALYSIS

by

PETER NICHOLAS MASTOPOULOS

Major Professor:	Linda M. Arthur
Committee:	Paul M. Brinson Nicholas L. Henry

Electronic Version Approved:
December 2008

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife, Shannon, for her indefatigable support throughout this endeavor and for her sustaining desire to see me succeed and to my parents, Evangeline and Nick, for their continuous interest and constant encouragement in all of my educational pursuits. While traveling along the journey to completion of this work, the aforementioned individuals managed to help me readjust my compass bearings when I deviated off course. Thus, I never stayed lost for long and was able to reach my destination with their assistance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am convinced that no work of this breadth and depth can be completed alone. Upon nearing completion of this work, I was reminded of a turtle that was found on a fence post. Everyone who saw the turtle realized that it could not have ascended the fence post alone; someone helped it get there. This is a metaphor that I evoke when thinking about this undertaking from inception to completion.

I wish to acknowledge my dissertation committee chairman, Dr. Linda M. Arthur, whose talent enabled her to make my seemingly insurmountable burdens become bearable. The two additional members of my committee, Dr. Paul "Mac" Brinson and Dr. Nicholas L. Henry (who was ironically the commencement speaker at my high school graduation twenty years ago), who each in his own way, served as a guiding beacon for me during my journey toward completion of this academic undertaking. Without their experience, guidance and honest counsel, this final opus would not have been possible.

Additionally, I would be remiss if I did not credit my past and present supervisors in the Office of External Affairs at Armstrong Atlantic State University, Mr. Robert L. DiBella, Dr. Michael E. Donahue and Ms. Wynn Sullivan, who have supported my educational ventures by enabling me to adjust my work schedule to meet the requirements of the degree program. To my friend and cohort member Dr. Kenneth D. Boyd, Vice President for Economic Development at Savannah Technical College, who preceded me in completion of his degree, I thank him for willingly sharing his experiences and prudent suggestions with me. To my other friends and colleagues who have entertained my challenges and triumphs, I also offer my sincere appreciation to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

According to Kerr and Gade (1986), the role of academic presidents is one of the most visible, but least understood roles in contemporary society. In addition to knowledge, experience, ingenuity and sheer survival skills, presidents rely upon their leadership attributes to keep their institutions running smoothly on the course to greatness. For too long, the role of college presidents has been taken for granted. The data collected herein was the commencement of a close examination of the leadership attributes of college, university and technical college presidents at public institutions in the State of Georgia.

Background of the Study

According to Birge (2000), academic presidents are engaged in a wide variety of civic and social activities in their roles as leaders of higher education institutions. DeHart (2003) reports that public institutions of higher education are critical parts of our public administration. A large percentage of most state budgets is devoted to these institutions for training a labor force for the global economy. Therefore, higher education institutions face not only the typical problems of public agencies in general, but also a heavy burden of other institutional goals, and these goals in part form the agenda of academic presidents. These challenges, along with the complexities presented by DeHart, are confounded by Minor (2001), who concludes that institutional context and presidential leadership share an interactive link with one another.

Apart from the multiple constituencies and the complicated milieu in which academic presidents operate, certain leadership competencies seem characteristic of these leaders. Sharples (2002) addressed the importance of leadership roles, values and skills vis-à-vis the size of their institution, the rate of growth of their institution and the geographic setting of their institution. He found the importance of roles, values and skills were not affected by institutional demographic characteristics.

A 2001 quantitative study by Turner describes the perceptions of selected university presidents in Oklahoma to determine how they addressed tasks related to their presidencies. The major conclusion revealed that the selected presidents generally exhibited the concept of self-directed learning and found that human relations is the most critical element of the job. Also in 2001, Vittletoe studied the leadership practices, behaviors and experiences that prepared them for their presidencies and determined that culture is critical to the understanding of leadership.

In a 1999 study by Wen, a profile of community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles was conducted to determine the relationship between perceived leadership style and characteristics of the selected presidents. According to the Leadership Effective Adaptability Description (LEAD) Inventory, which categorizes leadership styles into for categories: telling, selling, participating and delegating, these presidents were self-described as selling or participating leaders and were found to be only moderately adaptable in their style. In Georgia, certain leadership attributes are characteristic of technical college presidents: having a vision, networking, delegating, ethical decision-making and commitment to the common good (Cannon, 2003).

In the mid 1990s, the status of colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia were formally realigned to coincide with national trends. As a result, some community colleges became colleges and some colleges became universities (University System of Georgia Board of Regents Meeting Minutes, July 9, 1996). Approximately five years later, in 2000, the technical institutes in the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education (now the Technical College System of Georgia) were formally upgraded to technical colleges to recognize the academic preparation encompassed by their programs (State Board of Technical and Adult Education Meeting Minutes, July 6, 2000). With the change in status of the technical institutes, former institute directors were elevated to presidents.

Statement of the Problem

Academic presidential leadership in public colleges and universities and technical colleges is complex because of the multiple constituencies that presidents serve and the multiple roles that they must fulfill. Research indicates that the desired leadership characteristics of college and university presidents are similar regardless of the institution they serve. Research has also shown the desired characteristics of technical college presidents in Georgia, and they are in tandem with the characteristics of college and university presidents. However, little is known about the similarity of attributes between college or university presidents and technical college presidents following the status changes that occurred in the last ten years.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to identify the self-described leadership attributes of college, university presidents and technical college presidents at public

colleges, universities and technical colleges in Georgia to determine similarities and differences more than a decade after status realignments.

Research Questions

The overarching question that was addressed is this: how similar are the attributes of public college or university presidents when juxtaposed with public technical college presidents in Georgia? The following sub questions guided the research:

1. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of presidents of public colleges or universities in the State of Georgia?
2. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia?
3. To what extent do the self-described leadership attributes of public college or university presidents and public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia overlap?

Therefore, this study attempted to determine the similarities and differences in the self-described leadership attributes of public college or university presidents and technical college presidents in Georgia.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study provide useful data for presidential candidates as well as presidential search and screening committees in the State of Georgia and possibly elsewhere. Data gathered from the study might also be useful as a foundation for additional future research in educational leadership. The findings herein should also be useful as guidelines for performance assessments. A course in presidential leadership in higher education might take advantage of this data for curriculum development. The

results of this study will also fill a void (in the field of educational leadership) regarding the leadership attributes of college, university presidents and technical college presidents in the State of Georgia, and elsewhere.

Research Design

This research study was a self-reporting descriptive study utilizing a survey as the instrument for the collection of data. This methodology ensured a standardized and quantitative collection of data from members of the population. Thus, the data was compiled quantitatively.

Participants

The presidents of the 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia and the presidents of the 33 technical colleges in the Technical College System of Georgia provided the responses to the research questions. In a case where there was an interim or acting president of one or more of the institutions, that person was considered the president for the purposes of this study.

Instrumentation

The *Leadership Attributes Inventory (LAI)* from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education with two demographic questions served as the instrument for collecting data. The *LAI* gave the respondents the opportunity to describe the 37 leadership attributes in a six point Likert scale with the following categories: very underdescriptive, underdescriptive, somewhat underdescriptive, somewhat descriptive, descriptive and very descriptive. The demographic questions provided respondents with the opportunity to provide the type and size of the institution with which they are affiliated.

Data Analysis

To statistically analyze the data collected for this study, the raw data was entered into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 15.0, a statistical software program. Descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, means, modes, percentages, t-test and one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) were calculated. Demographic data were also categorized and described. Frequency scores were used to determine how often attributes were chosen. T-tests were used to determine the equality of means of the two different groups of presidents for comparison. The ANOVA was used to determine equality of attributes between various subgroups of presidents. All statistical tests were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Data Collection

The address list of presidents in the University System of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia were obtained from their respective website: www.usg.edu and www.tcsg.edu. An email announcing and describing the project was sent to all presidents. Three days later, a packet containing a letter of transmittal, survey instrumentation, a postage paid acknowledgment card addressed to this researcher and a postage paid envelope addressed to this researcher was sent via United States Postal Service to each president. The letter of transmittal that accompanied the survey is a critical element in the absence of personal contact. Each letter was personalized with the name of the president. The acknowledgement card was designed so that is could be returned separately from the survey instrument by the respondents, so that this researcher could acknowledge participants without compromising the anonymity of the survey. A

follow-up letter was sent via email to all participants one week after the initial packet was mailed to serve as a reminder to complete the survey.

Limitations

With only 68 public colleges, universities and technical colleges in the State of Georgia, the population was relatively small; therefore, receipt of a higher than usual percentage of completed surveys was critical to the extrapolation of the data. A response rate of 51% or 35 completed surveys was considered acceptable, but also effected a limitation.

Delimitations

Only presidents of public colleges or universities and technical colleges in the State of Georgia were included in this study.

Summary

"Just when a body thought he had the Ol' Miss mastered, why that old river, she'd just shift and the pilot, he'd have to start learnin (sic) it all over again." This description of the Mississippi River by Mark Twain is a metaphor for academic leadership. Leaders in academe are faced with challenges to which there are seldom readily available solutions. To quote Bennis (1989), "To an extent leadership is like beauty: It is hard to define, but you know it when you see it" (p.1).

The men and women who hold academic presidencies are on the periphery of many groups, but at the center of a social process (Kerr & Gade, 1986). By better understanding their attributes, the blending and dichotomy of leadership attributes between college and university presidents and technical college presidents in the State of Georgia became evident.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

According to Bogue (2006), "American higher education is an enterprise of complex heritage, mission and governance culture—an enterprise expected to serve as both a cultural curator and a cultural critic. Contemporary issues such as the call for accountability and the pressure of the marketplace ideology present colleges and universities with a possible breakpoint change moment in both mission and leaderships as established policy and philosophic principles are challenged and leadership vision and values are called to question" (p. 309).

Stodgill (1948) explained that early leadership studies focused on leadership traits and the differentiation between leaders and non-leaders. Etzioni (1961) addressed leadership in its historic context as centering on power whereas Hersey and Blanchard (1982) looked at differences between effective and less effective leaders. Others suggested that leadership behaviors are driven by individual worldviews or by mediation abilities. From the wealth of literature in the field, one might conclude that leadership is structurally based or one might subscribe to the emerging view that cultural or transformational leadership must be the central focus of academic administrators or that truly effective leaders are visionaries. Sergiovanni (1992) suggested that the practice of followership provides the basis for leadership and that leaders play a pivotal role in a stewardship or servanthood role. English (1994) insisted that we look outside of the confines of behaviorism and structuralism to moral leadership. From these various

explanations of leadership, it is realized that leadership is an elusive subject in which questions come easier than answers.

Academic Leadership and the Forces Placed Upon It

Gillett-Karam (2001) juxtaposes the roles of faculty member and president, but shows how a president can employ leadership attributes learned as a faculty member:

> One cannot live in one's mind; the world of theory is set aside for the world of practicality and everydayness. One does not quote Plutarch or Plato when asking for money or seeking a solution to outsourcing grounds or cafeteria management. Yet, other lessons learned from the professor are critical. Management of any system is based on knowledge of task and people, on knowledge of goals of leadership and the outcomes desired…Being a professor meant to seek deeper meaning in all things, a maxim that aids me when Solomon would be the only person who could ever solve some problems that come to the president's office. (p. 168)

Presidents of higher education institutions typically have only a short time to accomplish their goals; thus, they do not have time to research the needs of the institution for several years before taking action. With the time that a president has in the presidency, he/she must accomplish good for all constituencies—students, faculty, staff, alumni and community. It is at the juncture for the accomplishment of good that the roles of the ethical professor and the ethical president intersect.

Contrary to traditional thought, Strathe and Wilson (2006) describe academic leadership as the middle of a pathway, rather than the end—a place to which one goes to

and comes from. Significant changes in the last several decades have made academic administrative roles in colleges and universities less attractive than they previously were.

> Economic changes have meant declining state support for higher education, with resultant increasing tuition and attendance costs. From the public have come greater demands for accountability of higher education institutions given these rising costs. Employers complain that graduates cannot communicate, do not work well in teams, are not current with the appropriate technology in their fields and lack leadership skills for the effective management of others. (p. 6)

Not only is academic leadership subject to changing external forces, but faculty changes have also led to leadership challenges.

Current college and university faculty is aging, and it is projected that one third or more will retire within the next decade. Traditionally, faculty members decrease their level of engagement in administrative endeavors as they approach retirement. As a result, academic administrators must now handle many of the administrative tasks once shared by faculty members working on committees and temporary assignments.

Students, too, have changed and the leadership response to that change has had to evolve. Strathe and Wilson (2006) assert that today's students are technologically savvy—often more so than the faculty. Students want instructional delivery systems that better meet their learning styles and personal needs. Today's students are often nontraditional in terms of age, hold full-time jobs, and have familial responsibilities. Today's students are frequently transfer students, bringing heterogeneous academic backgrounds to their respective degree programs. Additionally, today's students are quicker to challenge and even engage in litigation in academic matters than they were in

the past. This set of circumstances has forced academic administrators to manage more than degree programs; academic administrators must also attend to conflicts between faculty and students.

In his 1990 book *Powershift*, Alvin Toffler argued that in a highly turbulent economic and social environment, there would be a generalized erosion of power and authority. At present, in all types of organizations, power is shifting at all levels of management. For example, knowledge workers (those whose work involves white collar rather than blue collar work) believe they have the right to work autonomously because, according to Von Glinlow (1988), knowledge workers identify more with their profession than they do with their organization. In their book *Powerful Leadership* (2002), Stephan and Pace maintain that the traditional, rigid, authoritarian, drill sergeant style of management will not foster a good working climate for knowledge workers, and power and authority will continue to erode.

Ascension to the Academic Presidency

Strathe and Wilson (2006) recognize that faculty members have historically served as the source of academic leadership.

> Often beginning at the level of department chair or head, faculty members frequently did not choose to enter academic administration; rather it was their turn the first among equals notion. Assuming department responsibilities often meant some release time, and additional administrative stipend, and in some cases a guaranteed full or partial appointment for the summer. Experienced chairs or heads who were viewed, most often by others, as successful or effective leaders were often then encouraged to seek assistant or associate dean positions, where

> they gained additional administrative experience by working with multiple disciplines, managing larger budgets, and representing the unit outside of the institution. If successful, these persons then either sought or were sought for deanship positions. It is at this level that they gain significant experience in personnel management of staff and faculty, budget development and resource allocation, facilities management, and academic policy development and implementation. The deanship clearly is a position from which to bring about change. Successful deans move to central office academic affairs administrative positions. (p. 6-7)

From this point, the next step is often a presidency, where faculty peers are no longer peers. The impact of decisions made at this level is often much greater and more widespread than a president realizes. Personal values and ethics are often tested. Perspectives are broadened, and the issues examined are larger and subject to more scrutiny than ever before. Strathe and Wilson (2006) conclude that successful presidents have a high level of integrity, work well with others and enjoy collaborative and cooperative endeavors. Successful presidents are able to assess the strengths and weaknesses of others and to build cohesive teams based upon individual differences.

Common Threads in Higher Education Presidential Leadership

According to Harvard University's Summer Institute for new university presidents in Trombley (2007), an academic president is a symbol, a politician, a fundraiser, a financial officer, a problem-solver and a human resource manager. In addition to these roles that require various leadership styles, Trombley asserts that presidents are also targets:

> Perhaps being considered a target is an inevitable aspect of the symbolism of the college presidency, which carries with it implications of power and control. Presidents are viewed by their various constituencies as responsible for everything, good and ill. (p. 14)

Despite being a target, presidents of higher education institutions are staying in office at a single institution longer than ever before—an average of 8.5 years according to a 2006 study from the American Council on Education published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. However, Trombley (2007) identifies a new style of presidential leadership that encompasses collaborative and decisive leadership. This new leadership style required for a successful interaction with constituencies, especially boards of directors, is "integral leadership" that is collaborative, yet decisive (p. 16). Strathe and Wilson (2006) state that while academic administrators have some independent tasks, those responsibilities reflect a shared mission or vision for the unit. There is limited individual work time because much of the work being done is collaborative, consensual and cooperative rather than independent. Effective academic leadership is proactive, not reactive and is forward focused.

Garcia (2007) addresses equality in decision making (or impartial and fair decision making) as a leadership attribute of an academic presidency. After having served as president of Berkley College from 2001 to 2007, she became president of California State University, Dominguez Hills. She describes the responsibility of being a college president as "daunting and awesome" and associates individual values and principles as essential to the presidency (p. 26). In a personal reflection on presidential leadership, Garcia analogizes the struggle for democracy and equality in higher education

as a journey. These facets of leadership are exercised only through proper feeding of the mind, body and spirit. She relates a scenario that a colleague shared with her:

> One of the saddest comments I have heard came from a presidential colleague who told me that she admired how I try to keep connected with friends. She told me that, because of her position, she never made true friends. For her, it was the position and family and nothing else. (p. 27)

The isolation, whether real or perceived, can affect leadership because the isolation can inhibit constructive dialog especially in difficult situations.

According to an article written for *Black Issues in Higher* Education (2001), Hampton University in Hampton, Virginia, regularly hosts an executive leadership summit for aspiring college presidents and educational administrators. The summit brings together former Hampton University administrators who are now presidents at other institutions and those who desire to hold such positions for two days of teambuilding and sharing of knowledge, skills and abilities. Participants are able to hear firsthand about the challenges faced by college presidents and are exposed to a variety of strategies that current leaders have found successful.

Within the last ten years, nine senior administrators from Hampton University have become presidents at other institutions, carrying with them the professional talents learned under the tutelage of Hampton University President Dr. William R. Harvey. Harvey's executive leadership model emphasizes vision, work ethic, academic excellence, innovation, courage, management fairness, fiscal conservatism, team building and results.

Leadership Preparation

According to Siegrist (1999), if leadership is vital to academic institutions, leadership preparation programs are a very serious business, and graduate programs must move beyond the training of efficient managers to the preparation of visionary, moral and transformational leaders. While leadership is at least as old as man, the term, according to English (1994) did not appear in the literature on school administration until well after the turn of the 20th century. Educational administration began as an offshoot of scientific management, and its early adherents were fervently entrenched in the doctrine of efficiency. Following the researchers who focused on efficiency were the behaviorists and organizational sociologists, neither of whom was able to proactively address the problems that would face 21st century administrators.

By the late 20th century, the understanding of educational leadership changed dramatically in recognition that what leaders do is largely determined by the nature of those being led and the culture of the organizations in which the leaders work. Additionally, those organizations are influenced by and, in turn, influence the greater culture of which they are part.

According to Strathe and Wilson (2006), preparation for academic administration has been primarily on-the-job training. While colleges might provide some training for new chairs and heads, it often focuses on managing budgets, completing forms, scheduling classes and making instructional assignments. Unit-level administrators gain much of their administrative experience by trial and error along with mentoring when available. Mentoring has long been recognized as valuable to the development of successful administrators. Most often, administrative mentorships are informal and the

administrator typically serves as the role model for the mentee. In other cases, internal institutional administrative preparation programs are developed to provide a more structured and formal mentoring process.

Bolch (2001) details the role of executive coaching as a catalyst to the leadership development process. While the process of leadership development often spans many years, executive coaching has become one of the fastest growing trends in the last ten years because of the value in compressing the amount of time required for the exacting of productive leadership strategies and skills. Although it was more common in the past for coaches to work with executives who were in trouble or likely to derail, coaching is now more commonly growth-oriented, helping executives develop skills and competencies that will help them succeed and advance. Bolch has identified nine common skills areas on which executive coaches often focus: communication, interpersonal skills, teamwork, initiative, creativity, adaptability, judgment, leadership and maturity.

Situational Attributes

Fujita (1990) conducted interviews with 142 college trustees, administrators, and faculty leaders to investigate attitudes about their presidents' effectiveness and criteria on which academic presidents should be evaluated. This group of presidential constituencies identified the following leadership dimensions upon which presidents are often assessed:

1. Willingness to be influenced by others
2. Competence
3. Respect for the culture of the college
4. Encouraging the free flow of information
5. Association with outcomes

6. Involvement

7. Commitment to the institution

8. Leadership primarily through position

9. Appearance, image and impact

10. Comparison with the predecessor

This study concluded that the way in which campus leaders assessed their presidents was directly related to the way the campus leaders were perceived to approach power and leadership and shared in the common understandings of the community. These campus leaders, involved in presidential assessments, took symbolic, cognitive, social and cybernetic (human control mechanisms that are mechanical or electronic) systems theory into account.

Schön (1987) states that in the varied topography of professional practice, there is high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the hard ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the application of research-based theory and techniques. In the swampy lowlands, messy, confusing problems defy technical solutions. Ramaley (2000) states that as president she spent most of her time in the swampy lowlands. In her experience, when she ascended to the cooler, breezier heights, she found the problems were easier to solve, but less important.

Ramaley (2000) reflects on a time in the 1990s when she was preparing a keynote address on the subject of president-practitioner for the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE). As she was preparing her presentation, she received a job announcement from her alma mater, Swathmore College, which at the time was seeking a president. The college sought a person with the following characteristics:

- Strong academic credentials
- Leadership skills
- Strong interest in fostering a culturally and racially diverse community
- High energy tempered with patience, persistence, a sense of humor, and a tolerance for diversity of opinion
- Ability to be visible and accessible and to welcome interaction with other people

After reading the description she realized that one critical element was missing: a president today must be a "learner among learners, willing to embrace the novel and unexpected and able to be an agent for change" (p. 76). To do this, Ramaley asserts that presidents must "model what it means to have a truly educated mind and then use that mind in public" (p.76). Presidents must constantly study the environment and test various hypotheses in the living laboratory in which they preside. She further asserts that presidents should apply the same expectations they would have of any well-educated person whose capacity to think through problems in the swampy lowlands will depend on both the attitudes and knowledge and the skill and experience to employ a rigorous scholarly approach.

In works spanning 25 years, futurists Toffler and Toffler (1995) carefully documented the transition to a symbolic society where information is the ultimate currency, and the concept of intellectual property is recognized.

Leadership and Personality

Lawrence (2006) details the difference between leadership attributes and a cult of personality and asserts that a personality cult is not an attribute of successful presidents. He recounts an interview with Charles Vest, a former president of The Massachusetts

Institute of Technology who described the cult of personality associated with a university president as the death knell of a good university. Institutional vision has to come from within and be collective, and a group of first-rate individuals cannot be led by ego. Presidents, according to Vest, who rely on ego in lieu of leadership attributes, will have short-term presidencies.

Lawrence (2006) reveals, through his interviews with university presidents, that there are major themes that emerge including insights on family life, the encouragement and emergence of leadership abilities early in life, the necessity of teamwork, building diversity in higher education, access, intelligence, humility, integrity and active listening as desirable traits. He strongly contends that command and control leadership have never been the key to success in the academy. Instead, presidents should seek to tap the strengths of their leadership teams.

Research by Collins (2001) addressing the elements that transform "good" organizations into "great" ones supports that of Lawrence. Collins concludes that every great organization was led by a "level 5" leader during pivotal transition years. Level 5 leadership describes an executive who builds enduring greatness through a paradoxical blend of personal humility and professional will (p. 38).

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) conducted a comparative study of college presidents' images of their leadership roles. These authors assert that differing beliefs about the organizational world and the leadership roles lead to differences in how presidents carry out their presidential job. Some presidents deem it critically necessary to create clearly defined bureaucratic structures while others may deem exerting charisma, creating coalitions a top priority. "A college president, as the key formal leader of a

college, has a unique opportunity to bring her or his personal understanding and interpretive schemes to bear on how others understand and feel about their realities" (p.679). Some presidents view leadership as a complex enactment of a deeper reality that is personally constructed through beliefs about the nature of reality rather than purely an external, physical or behavioral phenomenon.

In their 1990 study, Neumann and Bensimon described the presidency as a subjective reality that is the minds of the presidents who experience it rather than as a given, objective reality. They divide presidents into four types:

1. Type A: Externally directed initiator who connects with the institution
2. Type B: Internally directed initiator who connects with the institution
3. Type C: Externally directed reactionary who is distant from the institution
4. Type D: Internally directed reactionary who is distant from the institution

Type A presidents are usually concerned with making major contributions to the state, country and humanity in general. Type B presidents are student centered and believe that what happens in the daily life of the students is paramount. Type C presidents are primarily concerned with short-term, resource-related interactions between the college and the external environment. Type D presidents focus on inanimate organizational features like budget processes, program reviews and organizational structure rather than the human and social side of the organization. Type A and B presidents are usually associated with financial stability and high faculty morale more so than type C and D presidents.

Summary

No one seems to succinctly summarize the leadership of a college president better than Bogue, (2006) when he states:

> American colleges and universities are not above the need for and contributions of constructive criticism, nor are they above the need for continuing introspection and change. American higher education, however, is an enterprise of complex heritage, mission and governance culture. It is an enterprise serving as a guarantor of personal, civic, cultural and economic health in our society. It is an enterprise of multiple and legitimate stakeholders, and it is an enterprise moving to a future of contending issues related to its purpose and performance. Collegiate leaders are the premier trustees of collegiate purpose and performance and have a special leadership calling, as our colleges and universities are expected to educate leaders for every sector of our national life. The metaphors of Servant/Exemplar, Steward/Trustee, Artist/Designer resonate nicely with that complexity of heritage, mission and governance culture. These metaphors also carry theories of role and value disposition designed to enhance leadership effectiveness. A special duty and a special pleasure await the touch of loving leaders in American colleges and universities. (p. 325)

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Academic presidential leadership in public colleges and universities is complex because of the multiple constituencies that presidents serve and the multiple roles that they must fulfill. Research has indicated that the desired leadership characteristics of college and university presidents are similar no matter the institution they serve. Research has also shown the desired characteristics of technical college presidents in Georgia, and they are in tandem with the characteristics of college and university presidents. However, little is known about the attribute similarity of college or university presidents and technical college presidents following the status changes that occurred in the last ten years.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to identify the self-described leadership attributes of college or university presidents and technical college presidents at public colleges, universities and technical colleges in Georgia to determine similarities and differences a decade after status realignments.

The overarching question to be addressed is this: how similar are the attributes of public college or university presidents when juxtaposed with public technical college presidents in Georgia? The following sub questions guided the research

Research Questions

1. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of presidents of public colleges, universities in the State of Georgia?

2. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia?
3. To what extent do the self-described leadership attributes of public college and university presidents and public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia overlap?

Population

The population for this project, the 35 college and university presidents in the University System of Georgia and the 33 presidents of the technical colleges in the Technical College System of Georgia, was the group of interest to this researcher.

Participants

The target audience for the survey was the 35 college and university presidents in the University System of Georgia and the 33 presidents of the technical colleges in the Technical College System of Georgia. In cases where an acting or interim president was serving in the role of the president, that person was considered a president for the purposes of this study.

Instrumentation

When properly conducted, descriptive survey research provides valuable data, and a survey is a useful tool in determining the attributes of a population. Surveys are either administered to a sample population or as a census to the entire population (Gay, 1996). The *Leadership Attributes Inventory (LAI)* developed by Moss and Johansen (1991) served as the data collection instrument. According to Moss, Lambrecht and Jensrud (1994), this instrument yields a diagnostic assessment of thirty-seven attributes that predispose desirable leadership performance. This instrument created under the auspices

of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education contains two parts: a Rating-by-Self and a Rating-by-Others component. However, for the purposes of this study, only the Rating-by-Self component was used because comparison between self-described leadership attributes rather than externally described attributes was the focus of this study.

Reliability of a survey instrument measures consistency. However, the consistency of an instrument can be assessed in several ways: re-test reliability, internal consistency and interrater reliability. The *LAI* contains reliable evidence of all three. Three studies with re-test reliability were conducted with an average correlation coefficient of .97. An internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha rated at .97 and .98 in two separate studies. Interrater reliability for this instrument ranges from .75 to .84.

Validity of a survey instrument is the extent to which the instrument measures what it portends to measure. In four studies conducted during the design of the instrument, all respondents indicated that the identified attributes are relevant to leadership thus denoting a high level of face and content validity. Additionally, the 37 leadership attributes have been shown empirically to be highly related to the conceptualization of leadership.

The survey instrument was distributed in two colors: gold for colleges or universities and brown for technical colleges. The original instrument was modified with the addition of two demographic questions that will allow the respondent to identify whether he/she is reporting from a technical college or a college or university and whether the student body of the institution is more than 5,000 or less than 5,000. These pieces of data were essential to the analysis of the total data collected.

Data Collection

Data was collected using a two-page survey instrument with six response categories for indicating whether the leadership attribute is very descriptive to very undescriptive. An email was sent to all 68 participants one week in advance of the survey to announce the project and to ask for assistance. Then, the survey, itself, was mailed along with a cover letter and a postage-paid, self-addressed return envelope. Participants were asked to respond within a 10-day period. When seven days had elapsed since the mailing of the survey, an email was sent as a reminder to respond and a formal note of appreciation for participation.

Response Rate

While a 100% return rate would have been the optimum response to this survey administration, that occurrence was not anticipated. Fowler (1993) explained that there are groups of a survey population who will not respond. These groups are those who, for some reason do not receive the survey; those asked to provide data, but refuse; those who are unable to reply because of illness or other incapacity and those whose position has changed.

While there is no agreed upon standard found in the research literature for a minimum response rate, Gall, Borg and Gall's (1996) research found that the relevance of the survey to the respondents affects both the accuracy and rate of response. In this case the survey was relevant to the respondents, thus increasing accuracy and rate of response. Other impediments to a 100 percent response rate indicated above was mitigated by the following procedures:

1. An email with advance notice of the survey was mailed to all participants.

2. The survey, itself, was mailed to all participants.
3. A follow-up letter with a message of appreciation and a reminder was mailed to non-responding members of the survey population.

For the purpose of this study, this researcher aimed to obtain at least a 51% response rate or 35 completed surveys. To this end, a 59% response rate or 40 completed surveys was realized, thus exceeding the target response rate.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data generated for this study, the data was entered into SPSS Version 15.0. SPSS is a statistical software program for the social sciences. Descriptive statistics, including, frequency distributions, means, percentages, one-way analysis of variances was employed. Frequency scores were used to determine how often attributes are chosen, and the means were calculated to determine the average score of the data. Each attribute was analyzed individually, and all statistics were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Data Reporting

The data from this study is reported through tables and narrative description. Frequency counts of responses to individual survey questions helped to explain any responses that are statistically significant.

Summary

The purpose of this descriptive research study was to determine if the self-described leadership attributes of public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia are the same or different from the self-described leadership attributes of public college and university presidents in the State of Georgia. This study was undertaken through use of

the *LAI* published by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Data was requested from 68 presidents—the entire survey population.

CHAPTER 4

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the data analyzed from 40 *Leadership Attribute Inventory (LAI)* survey instruments received from the respondents of this study. The 40 completed surveys received from the respondents out of the 68 (35 from colleges or universities and 33 from technical colleges) that were disseminated created a yield of 59%. With a target yield of at least 51%, the yield of 59% exceeded the target.

Sixty-eight survey packages were mailed via the United States Postal Service to presidents at colleges or universities in the University System of Georgia and presidents at technical colleges in the Technical College System of Georgia. Of the 40 completed surveys that were returned, 19 were from technical college presidents and 21 were from college or university presidents comprising 47.5% and 52.5% of the total respondents, respectively.

In order to adequately present the data collected for this study, this chapter is divided into five sections that include the following topics: restatement of the research questions, demographics of respondents, findings, analysis of the findings, specific responses to research questions and a conclusion.

Research Questions

The overarching question that was addressed is this: how similar are the attributes of public college or university presidents when juxtaposed with public technical college presidents in Georgia? The following sub questions guided the research:

1. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of presidents of public colleges or universities in the State of Georgia?

2. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia?

3. To what extent do the self-described leadership attributes of public college and university presidents and public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia overlap?

Respondents

The population for this study consisted of 68 college, university or technical college presidents in the State of Georgia—35 from the University System of Georgia and 33 from the Technical College System of Georgia. Only two demographic questions were posed in the survey: type of institution where employed and size of institution where employed. Of the 68 surveys that were disseminated, 40 completed surveys were returned—19 from technical college presidents and 21 from college or university presidents. Thus, there is nearly a mix of half technical college presidents and half college or university presidents. Table 1 shows the number and percentage of respondents from each institutional grouping.

Table 1

Type of Institution Where Respondents are Employed

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Technical College	19	47.5
College or University	21	52.5

Type	Frequency	Percentage
TOTAL	40	100.0

The second demographic question posed in the survey related to the size of the institution where the respondent is employed. Two choices were available as responses: student body at my institution is under 5,000 or student body at my institution is over 5,000. Of the 40 survey respondents, 20 are from institutions with less than 5,000 students and 14 are from institutions with more than 5,000 students. Six survey respondents either overlooked the question or opted not to answer it. Table 2 shows the valid percentage (non-responses discounted) distribution by institutional size.

Table 2

Size of Student Body at Institution Where Respondents are Employed

Type	Frequency	Valid Percentage
Fewer than 5,000	20	50.8
More than 5,000	14	41.2
No Response	6	
TOTAL	40	100.0

When both the type of institution and size of institution are correlated, of the 19 respondents from technical colleges, 11 are from institutions of fewer than 5,000 students, and 5 are from institutions of more than 5,000. Three technical college presidents did not respond to the question about institutional size. Of the 21 college or

university presidents who responded, 9 are from institutions with fewer than 5,000 students, and 9 are from institutions of more than 5,000. Three college or university presidents did not respond to this question. Table 3 shows the frequency distribution of responses by type and size of institution.

Table 3

Respondent Distribution by Type and Size of Institution

Type	Frequency	Valid Percentage
Technical College		
Fewer than 5,000	11	68.8
More than 5,000	5	31.3
No Response	3	
Total	19	100.0
College or University		
Fewer than 5,000	9	50.0
More than 5,000	9	50.0
No Response	3	
Total	21	100.0

Findings

Table 4 shows the number of responses from all survey participants to each survey question, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard

deviation. The mean scores range from a high 5.85 to a low 4.58, and seven responses less than "somewhat descriptive" (4) were chosen.

Table 4

Descriptive *LAI* Statistics for all Respondents

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Committed to the Common Good	39	5	6	5.85	.366
Accountable	40	5	6	5.70	.464
Ethical	40	4	6	5.70	.516
Visionary	40	4	6	5.70	.516
Energetic with Stamina	40	4	6	5.60	.672
Personal Integrity	40	4	6	5.58	.549
Dependable, Reliable	40	5	6	5.55	.504
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	40	4	6	5.53	.640
Willing to Accept Responsibility	40	4	6	5.53	.784
Achievement-Oriented	40	4	6	5.50	.555
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	38	4	6	5.47	.603
Adaptable	40	4	6	5.45	.714
Initiating	40	4	6	5.35	.700
Planning	40	3	6	5.35	.700
Persistent	40	4	6	5.35	.662
Motivating Others	40	4	6	5.35	.580
Decision-Making	40	4	6	5.33	.694

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Sensitivity, Respect	40	4	6	5.30	.687
Problem-Solving	40	4	6	5.30	.687
Team Building	40	4	6	5.28	.751
Networking	40	4	6	5.28	.679
Confident	40	4	6	5.23	.698
Time Management	40	3	6	5.23	.862
Appropriate Leadership Styles	40	4	6	5.20	.687
Intelligent with Practical Judgment	40	3	6	5.18	.781
Insightful	40	4	6	5.13	.723
Coaching	40	4	6	5.10	.810
Information Management	40	4	6	5.10	.810
Even Disposition	40	3	6	5.10	.810
Courageous, Risk-Taker	40	4	6	5.08	.730
Communication	40	4	6	5.08	.616
Delegating	40	3	6	5.05	.815
Conflict Management	40	4	6	5.00	.716
Organizing	40	4	6	4.98	.660
Tolerant of Ambiguity/Complexity	40	2	6	4.93	.829
Stress Management	40	3	6	4.88	.822
Tolerant of Frustration	40	2	6	4.58	.984

The following attributes were identified as being in the top 25% for all respondents: committed to the common good, accountable, ethical, visionary, energetic with stamina, personal integrity, dependable/reliable, enthusiastic/optimistic and willing to accept responsibility.

Table 5 shows the number of responses from Technical College System of Georgia Presidents to each survey question, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard deviation. The mean scores range from a high 5.84 to a low 4.42, and two leadership attributes were found to be "undescriptive" (2). The table displays the responses from highest mean score to lowest.

Table 5

Descriptive *LAI* Statistics for Technical College System of Georgia Presidents

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Accountable	19	5	6	5.84	.375
Committed to the Common Good	19	5	6	5.79	.419
Visionary	19	4	6	5.68	.582
Ethical	19	5	6	5.68	.478
Energetic with Stamina	19	4	6	5.63	.684
Dependable, Reliable	19	5	6	5.58	.507
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	18	4	6	5.56	.616
Personal Integrity	19	4	6	5.53	.612
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	19	4	6	5.53	.697
Decision-Making	19	4	6	5.47	.612

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Willing to Accept Responsibility	19	4	6	5.47	.841
Sensitivity, Respect	19	4	6	5.42	.607
Initiating	19	4	6	5.42	.607
Problem-Solving	19	4	6	5.42	.607
Achievement-Oriented	19	4	6	5.42	.607
Appropriate Leadership Styles	19	5	6	5.37	.496
Time-Management	19	4	6	5.37	.831
Persistent	19	4	6	5.37	.684
Adaptable	19	4	6	5.37	.684
Coaching	19	4	6	5.32	.749
Networking	19	4	6	5.32	.671
Motivating Others	19	4	6	5.32	.582
Confident	19	4	6	5.21	.713
Information Management	19	4	6	5.21	.631
Team Building	19	4	6	5.21	.787
Planning	19	3	6	5.21	.787
Intelligent with Practical Judgment	19	4	6	5.21	.787
Insightful	19	4	6	5.21	.713
Delegating	19	4	6	5.16	.688
Conflict Management	19	4	6	5.11	.658
Organizing	19	4	6	5.11	.567
Communication	19	4	6	5.05	.405

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Stress Management	19	4	6	5.00	.745
Even Disposition	19	3	6	4.95	.848
Courageous, Risk-Taker	19	4	6	4.84	.688
Tolerant of Ambiguity/Complexity	19	2	6	4.79	.918
Tolerant of Frustration	19	2	5	4.42	.769

The following attributes were identified as being in the top 25% for technical college presidents: accountable, committed to the common good, visionary, ethical, energetic with stamina, dependable/reliable, ideological beliefs are appropriate to the group, personal integrity and enthusiastic/optimistic.

Table 6 shows the number of responses by University System of Georgia Presidents to each survey question, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard deviation. The mean scores range from a high 5.90 to a low 4.71, and only three responses less than "somewhat descriptive" (4) were chosen. The table displays the responses from highest mean score to lowest.

Table 6

Descriptive *LAI* Statistics for University System of Georgia Presidents

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Committed to the Common Good	20	5	6	5.90	.308
Ethical	21	4	6	5.71	.561
Visionary	21	5	6	5.71	.463

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Personal Integrity	21	5	6	5.62	.498
Achievement-Oriented	21	5	6	5.57	.507
Energetic with Stamina	21	4	6	5.57	.676
Willing to Accept Responsibility	21	4	6	5.57	.746
Accountable	21	5	6	5.57	.507
Dependable, Reliable	21	5	6	5.52	.512
Adaptable	21	4	6	5.52	.750
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	21	4	6	5.52	.602
Planning	21	4	6	5.48	.602
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	20	4	6	5.40	.598
Motivating Others	21	4	6	5.38	.590
Persistent	21	4	6	5.33	.658
Team Building	21	4	6	5.33	.730
Courageous, Risk-Taker	21	4	6	5.29	.717
Initiating	21	4	6	5.29	.784
Confident	21	4	6	5.24	.700
Networking	21	4	6	5.24	.700
Even Disposition	21	4	6	5.24	.768
Problem-Solving	21	4	6	5.19	.750
Sensitivity, Respect	21	4	6	5.19	.750
Decision-Making	21	4	6	5.19	.750
Intelligent with Practical Judgment	21	3	6	5.14	.793

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Time Management	21	3	6	5.10	.889
Communication	21	4	6	5.10	.768
Tolerant of Ambiguity/Complexity	21	4	6	5.05	.740
Appropriate Leadership Styles	21	4	6	5.05	.805
Insightful	21	4	6	5.05	.740
Information Management	21	4	6	5.00	.894
Delegating	21	3	6	4.95	.921
Conflict Management	21	4	6	4.90	.768
Coaching	21	4	6	4.90	.831
Organizing	21	4	6	4.86	.727
Stress Management	21	3	6	4.76	.889
Tolerant of Frustration	21	3	6	4.71	1.146

The following attributes were identified as being in the top 25% for college or university presidents: committed to the common good, ethical, visionary, personal integrity, achievement-oriented, energetic with stamina, willing to accept responsibility, accountable and dependable/reliable.

Table 7 shows the number of responses by Technical College System of Georgia Presidents at institutions with a student body under 5,000, to each survey question, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard deviation. The mean scores range from a high 5.91 to a low 4.64, and only one response less than “somewhat

descriptive" (4) was chosen. The table displays the responses from highest mean score to lowest.

Table 7

Descriptive *LAI* Statistics for Technical College Presidents at Institutions with fewer than 5,000 students

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Committed to the Common Good	11	5	6	5.91	.302
Accountable	11	5	6	5.82	.405
Ethical	11	5	6	5.73	.467
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	11	5	6	5.73	.467
Coaching	11	4	6	5.64	.674
Sensitivity, Respect	11	5	6	5.64	.505
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	11	5	6	5.64	.505
Decision-Making	11	5	6	5.55	.522
Motivating Others	11	5	6	5.55	.522
Personal Integrity	11	5	6	5.55	.522
Visionary	11	4	6	5.55	.688
Adaptable	11	4	6	5.55	.688
Team Building	11	4	6	5.45	.688
Problem-Solving	11	5	6	5.45	.522
Initiating	11	4	6	5.45	.688
Dependable, Reliable	11	5	6	5.45	.522

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Energetic with Stamina	11	4	6	5.45	.820
Conflict Management	11	5	6	5.36	.505
Appropriate Leadership Styles	11	5	6	5.36	.505
Time Management	11	4	6	5.36	.809
Networking	11	4	6	5.36	.674
Willing to Accept Responsibility	11	4	6	5.36	.924
Confident	11	4	6	5.36	.809
Even Disposition	11	4	6	5.27	.647
Persistent	11	4	6	5.27	.647
Achievement-Oriented	11	4	6	5.27	.647
Information Management	11	4	6	5.18	.603
Delegating	11	4	6	5.18	.751
Planning	11	4	6	5.18	.603
Intelligent with Practical Judgment	11	4	6	5.18	.751
Insightful	11	4	6	5.09	.701
Communication	11	4	6	5.00	.447
Organizing	11	4	6	5.00	.632
Stress Management	11	4	6	4.91	.701
Courageous, Risk-Taker	11	4	6	4.82	.603
Tolerant of Frustration	11	4	5	4.64	.505
Tolerant of Ambiguity/Complexity	11	2	6	4.64	1.027

The following attributes were identified as being in the top 25% for technical college presidents at institutions with fewer than 5,000 students: committed to the common accountable, ethical, enthusiastic/optimistic, coaching, sensitivity/respect, ideological beliefs are appropriate to the group, decision-making and motivating others.

Table 8 shows the number of responses by Technical College System of Georgia Presidents at institutions with a student body over 5,000, to each survey question, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard deviation. The mean scores range from a high 6.00 to a low 4.40, and no response less than "somewhat descriptive" (4) was chosen. The table displays the responses from highest mean score to lowest.

Table 8

Descriptive LAI Statistics for Technical College Presidents at Institutions with more than 5,000 students

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Committed to the Common Good	5	6	6	6.00	.000
Dependable, Reliable	5	6	6	6.00	.000
Accountable	5	6	6	6.00	.000
Energetic with Stamina	5	6	6	6.00	.000
Ethical	5	5	6	5.80	.447
Willing to Accept Responsibility	5	5	6	5.80	.447
Visionary	5	5	6	5.80	.447
Time Management	5	4	6	5.60	.894

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Planning	5	5	6	5.60	.548
Personal Integrity	5	4	6	5.60	.894
Persistent	5	5	6	5.60	.548
Achievement-Oriented	5	5	6	5.60	.548
Information Management	5	5	6	5.40	.548
Problem-Solving	5	5	6	5.40	.548
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	5	4	6	5.40	.894
Appropriate Leadership Styles	5	5	6	5.40	.548
Insightful	5	5	6	5.40	.548
Decision-Making	5	4	6	5.20	.837
Organizing	5	5	6	5.20	.447
Delegating	5	5	6	5.20	.447
Networking	5	4	6	5.20	.837
Sensitivity, Respect	5	4	6	5.20	.837
Communication	5	5	6	5.20	.447
Intelligent with Practical Judgment	5	4	6	5.20	.837
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	5	4	6	5.20	.837
Initiating	5	5	6	5.20	.447
Adaptable	5	4	6	5.20	.837
Stress Management	5	4	6	5.00	1.000
Team Building	5	4	6	5.00	.707
Motivating Others	5	4	6	5.00	.707

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Confident	5	4	6	5.00	.707
Conflict Management	5	4	5	4.80	.447
Coaching	5	4	5	4.80	.447
Even Disposition	5	4	6	4.80	.837
Tolerant of Ambiguity/Complexity	5	4	6	4.80	.837
Courageous, Risk-Taker	5	4	6	4.60	.894
Tolerant of Frustration	5	4	5	4.40	.548

The following attributes were identified as being in the top 25% for technical college presidents at institutions with more than 5,000 students: committed to the common good, dependable/reliable, accountable, energetic with stamina, ethical, willing to accept responsibility, visionary, time management and planning. Additionally, all respondents in this group gave the same rating to the top four attributes as shown by a standard deviation of .000.

Table 9 shows the number of responses by University System of Georgia President at institutions with a student body under 5,000, to each survey question, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard deviation. The mean scores range from a high 5.78 to a low 4.78, and only one response less than “somewhat descriptive” (4) was chosen. The table displays the responses from highest mean score to lowest.

Table 9

Descriptive *LAI* Statistics for University System Presidents at Institutions with Fewer than 5,000 students

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Accountable	9	5	6	5.78	.441
Ethical	9	5	6	5.78	.441
Committed to the Common Good	9	5	6	5.78	.441
Personal Integrity	9	5	6	5.67	.500
Willing to Accept Responsibility	9	4	6	5.67	.707
Achievement-Oriented	9	5	6	5.67	.500
Adaptable	9	4	6	5.67	.707
Dependable, Reliable	9	5	6	5.56	.527
Visionary	9	5	6	5.56	.527
Planning	9	4	6	5.44	.726
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	9	4	6	5.44	.726
Initiating	9	4	6	5.44	.726
Time Management	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Courageous, Risk-Taker	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Confident	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Appropriate Leadership Styles	9	4	6	5.33	.866
Networking	9	4	6	5.33	.707

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intelligent with Practical Judgment	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Even Disposition	9	4	6	5.33	.866
Tolerant of Ambiguity/Complexity	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Energetic with Stamina	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Motivating Others	9	4	6	5.22	.667
Communication	9	4	6	5.22	.667
Persistent	9	4	6	5.22	.667
Tolerant of Frustration	9	3	6	5.11	1.054
Problem-Solving	9	4	6	5.11	.928
Decision-Making	9	4	6	5.11	.782
Team Building	9	4	6	5.11	.982
Delegating	9	4	6	5.11	.928
Sensitivity, Respect	9	4	6	5.11	.782
Insightful	9	4	6	5.11	.601
Information Management	9	4	6	5.00	.866
Stress Management	9	4	6	5.00	.707
Coaching	9	4	6	5.00	1.000
Organizing	9	4	6	5.00	.707
Conflict Management	9	4	6	4.78	.833

The following attributes were identified as being in the top 25% for college or university presidents at institutions with fewer than 5,000 students: accountable, ethical, committed

to the common good, personal integrity, willing to accept responsibility, achievement-oriented, adaptable/open to change, dependable/reliable and visionary.

Table 10 shows the number of responses by University System of Georgia Presidents at institutions with a student body over 5,000, to each survey question, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard deviation. The mean scores range from a high 6.00 to a low 4.44, and only four responses less than "somewhat descriptive" (4) were chosen. The table displays the responses from highest mean score to lowest.

Table 10

Descriptive *LAI* Statistics for University System Presidents at Institutions with more than 5,000 students

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Committed to the Common Good	8	6	6	6.00	.000
Visionary	9	5	6	5.78	.441
Energetic with Stamina	9	4	6	5.67	.707
Team Building	9	5	6	5.56	.527
Planning	9	5	6	5.56	.527
Motivating Others	9	5	6	5.56	.527
Ethical	9	4	6	5.56	.726
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	9	5	6	5.56	.527
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	8	5	6	5.50	.535
Personal Integrity	9	5	6	5.44	.527

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Dependable, Reliable	9	5	6	5.44	.527
Persistent	9	4	6	5.44	.726
Accountable	9	5	6	5.44	.527
Achievement-Oriented	9	5	6	5.44	.527
Adaptable	9	4	6	5.44	.882
Sensitivity, Respect	9	4	6	5.33	.707
Willing to Accept Responsibility	9	4	6	5.33	.866
Problem-Solving	9	4	6	5.22	.667
Networking	9	4	6	5.22	.667
Even Disposition	9	4	6	5.22	.667
Initiating	9	4	6	5.22	.833
Decision-Making	9	4	6	5.11	.782
Conflict Management	9	4	6	5.11	.782
Communication	9	4	6	5.11	.928
Courageous, Risk-Taker	9	4	6	5.11	.782
Confident	9	4	6	5.11	.782
Appropriate Leadership Styles	9	4	6	5.00	.707
Time Management	9	3	6	5.00	1.000
Insightful	9	4	6	5.00	.866
Information Management	9	4	6	4.89	.782
Organizing	9	4	6	4.89	.782
Delegating	9	4	6	4.89	.782

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intelligent with Practical Judgment	9	3	6	4.89	.928
Tolerant of Ambiguity/Complexity	9	4	6	4.89	.782
Coaching	9	4	6	4.67	.707
Stress Management	9	3	6	4.56	1.014
Tolerant of Frustration	9	3	6	4.44	1.130

The following attributes were identified as being in the top 25% for college or university presidents at institutions with more than 5,000 students: committed to the common good, visionary, energetic with stamina, team building, planning, motivating others, ethical, enthusiastic/optimistic and ideological beliefs are appropriate to the group.

Data Analysis

Based upon an analysis of variance, only one leadership attribute proves to have a significant difference among the presidents based upon the size rather than the type of university (Table 11). Otherwise, there is no statistical difference between leadership attributes of college or university presidents and technical college presidents with or without regard to institutional size.

Table 11

ANOVA Calculation for the Leadership Attribute Coaching

Item	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Coaching					
Between Groups	5.390	3	1.797	3.107	.041

Item	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Within Groups	17.345	30	.578		
Total	22.735				

Additionally, based upon the frequency distribution of response, it can be determined that presidents at institutions smaller than 5,000 self-describe the leadership attribute of coaching as a significantly more descriptive attribute than presidents at institutions of more than 5,000 (Table 12).

Table 12

Frequency Distribution of Responses to the Leadership Attribute Coaching

I work at a:	Size		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Technical College		Somewhat Descriptive	1	33.3	33.3	33.3
		Descriptive	1	33.3	33.3	66.7
		Very Descriptive	1	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	3	100.0	100.0	
	< 5000	Somewhat Descriptive	1	9.1	9.1	9.1
		Descriptive	2	18.2	18.2	27.3
		Very Descriptive	8	72.7	72.7	100.0
		Total	11	100.0	100.0	
	>5000	Somewhat Descriptive	1	20.0	20.0	20.0
		Descriptive	4	80.0	80.0	100.0
		Total	5	100.0	100.0	
College or University		Descriptive	2	66.7	66.7	66.7
		Very Descriptive	1	33.3	33.3	100.0
		Total	3	100.0	100.0	
	<5000	Somewhat Descriptive	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Descriptive	1	11.1	11.1	55.6
		Very Descriptive	4	44.4	44.4	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	

I work at a:	Size		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
	>5000	Somewhat Descriptive	4	44.4	44.4	44.4
		Descriptive	4	44.4	44.4	88.9
		Very Descriptive	1	11.1	11.1	100.0
		Total	9	100.0	100.0	

None of the technical college presidents and institutions with more than 5,000 students identified coaching as being "very descriptive," and only one college or university president identified coaching as such.

Response to Research Questions

This researcher sought to answer the overarching question of how similar are the attributes of public college or university presidents when juxtaposed with public technical college presidents in Georgia. Each of the sub questions below is addressed to comprise a response to the overarching question.

1. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of presidents of public colleges or universities in the State of Georgia?
2. What are the major self-described leadership attributes of public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia?
3. To what extent do the self-described leadership attributes of public college and university presidents and public technical college presidents in the State of Georgia overlap?

The responses to the top ten self-described leadership attributes of college or university presidents ranged from *somewhat descriptive* (4) to *very descriptive* (6). From the highest mean score in the top ten of 5.90 to the lowest mean score 5.52, there is only a .38 difference. The number of responses, minimum numerical response, maximum numerical response, mean and standard deviation are shown in table 13:

Table 13

Top Ten Self-Described Leadership Attributes of University System of Georgia Presidents

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Committed to the Common Good	20	5	6	5.90	.308
Ethical	21	4	6	5.71	.561
Visionary	21	5	6	5.71	.463
Personal Integrity	21	5	6	5.62	.498
Achievement-Oriented	21	5	6	5.57	.507
Energetic with Stamina	21	4	6	5.57	.676
Willing to Accept Responsibility	21	4	6	5.57	.746
Accountable	21	5	6	5.57	.507
Dependable, Reliable	21	5	6	5.52	.512
Adaptable	21	4	6	5.52	.750

The responses to the top ten self-described leadership attributes of technical college presidents ranged from *somewhat descriptive* (4) to *very descriptive* (6). From the highest mean score in the top ten of 5.84 to the lowest mean score 5.47 there is only a .37 difference. The number of responses, minimum numerical response, maximum numerical response, mean and standard deviation are shown in table 14:

Table 14

Top Ten Self-Described Leadership Attributes of Technical College System of Georgia Presidents

Attribute	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Accountable	19	5	6	5.84	.375
Committed to the Common Good	19	5	6	5.79	.419
Visionary	19	4	6	5.68	.582
Ethical	19	5	6	5.68	.478
Energetic with Stamina	19	4	6	5.63	.684
Dependable, Reliable	19	5	6	5.58	.507
Ideological Beliefs are Appropriate	18	4	6	5.56	.616
Personal Integrity	19	4	6	5.53	.612
Enthusiastic, Optimistic	19	4	6	5.53	.697
Decision-Making	19	4	6	4.57	.612

In each of the tests of central tendency conducted to determine mean responses between groups of presidents, the standard deviation, in all cases, is low indicating the strength of the mean score.

Summary

This chapter presented the findings and an analysis of the data related to the overarching research question and the sub questions. The data collected was processed using SPSS Version 15.0 to conduct statistical calculations. "Committed to the Common

Good" was the attribute found to have the highest overall mean score among all respondents. Among college or university presidents, this attribute has a mean score of 5.90, and among technical college presidents, this attribute has a mean score of 5.79. Of the top 25% of leadership attributes in terms of mean scores, overlap was found in seven of ten. The only leadership attribute—coaching—was statistically significant at the .05 level when institutional size rather than institutional type was taken into consideration. At colleges or universities and technical colleges with fewer than 5,000 students, coaching is considered much more descriptive of presidents than at institutions with more than 5,000 students.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This quantitative research study was undertaken to determine the major leadership attributes of presidents at the 33 public technical colleges and the 35 public colleges or universities in the State of Georgia. The leadership attributes were self-identified by each president. Further examination was conducted to determine if institutional size has any statistically significant difference at the .05 level. Leadership attributes discussed in this study were identified on the *Leadership Attributes Inventory (LAI)*, the survey instrument that was disseminated to the survey population. Of the 68 surveys that were distributed, 40 were completed, returned, and used for the purpose of this study.

Analysis of Research Findings

This researcher found no statistically significant differences in leadership attributes exhibited by college or university presidents and technical college presidents. In fact, seven of the top 10 self-described leadership attributes overlap. The only leadership attribute—coaching—was statistically significant at the .05 level when institutional size rather than institutional type was taken into consideration. At colleges or universities and technical colleges with fewer than 5,000 students, coaching is considered much more descriptive of presidents than at institutions with more than 5,000 students.

Discussion of Research Findings

The findings of this research coincide with those of Bogue (2006), who concluded that higher education in America is an amalgamation of complex heritage, mission and governance. This is confirmed through the diversity of leadership attributes displayed by college or university presidents and technical college presidents at public institutions in Georgia. The 37 leadership attributes addressed in the *LAI* run the gamut from internally focused (e.g., ideological beliefs) to externally focused (e.g., delegating).

The overlap of leadership attributes between college or university presidents and technical college presidents along with the high mean scores of the responses indicates agreement with the thesis purported by Hersey and Blanchard (1982) that leadership behaviors, in part, determine effective versus less effective leaders. None of the leadership attributes addressed in the *LAI* were deemed undescriptive. Additionally, English (1994) suggested looking outside of the confines of behaviorism to moral leadership. His thesis is aligned with responses to the ethical leadership attribute of the *LAI*. Item number 20 on the *LAI* states, "Ethical—I act consistently with the principles of fairness and right or good that can stand the test of close public scrutiny." The mean response to this from all presidents was 5.70 with a standard deviation of .516, and was ranked third in terms of mean score in the list of responses.

Neumann and Bensimon (1990) asserted that differing beliefs about leadership roles among presidents lead to differences in how the presidency is carried out. The *LAI* responses seem to support this statement with a 5.74 total mean score for *LAI* Item Number 34, "Ideological beliefs are appropriate to the group."

Toffler and Toffler (1995) argued that a transition to a symbolic society where information is the ultimate currency and intellectual property is recognized seems to be related to highly rated leadership attributes: visionary and adaptable. By virtue of the responses, presidents show a vision for and adaptability to the future.

Conclusions

From the leadership attributes data collected and analyzed for this study, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Leadership attributes displayed by college or university and technical college presidents at public institutions across the State of Georgia are consistent.
2. Only one leadership attribute displayed by presidents at public colleges or universities and technical colleges in the State of Georgia is significantly different when institutional size is taken into account. Presidents at institutions with fewer than 5,000 students rate themselves significantly higher on coaching than do their counterparts at larger institutions.
3. Thirty-six of the 37 leadership attributes identified in the *Leadership Attributes Inventory (LAI)* transverse colleges, universities and technical colleges without regard to institutional size.
4. While some *LAI* leadership attributes are more descriptive of presidents than others, the difference between the highest rated and the lowest rated is inconsequential.

Implications

Through a review of the relevant literature combined with conclusions gleaned from the completed surveys, the following implications of this study are presented:

1. The University System of Georgia and its colleges and universities should be interested in this study because the evidence presented provides insight into the leadership attributes with which presidents self-identify.
2. The Technical College System of Georgia and its technical colleges should be interested in this study because the evidence presented provides insight into the leadership attributes with which presidents self-identify.
3. With such an obvious overlap of leadership attributes among college or university and technical college presidents at public institutions in the State of Georgia, there should be some interest in the formation of a presidential leadership development consortium for presidents of both systems.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based upon the conclusions and implications drawn from the data gathered herein, this researcher proffers the following recommendations for future research:

1. Additional studies comparing and contrasting the self-described leadership attributes of the presidents in the University System of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia with the results of the observer version of the *LAI* administered to the faculty and staff who directly report to the presidents.
2. A similar study to compare and contrast the self-described leadership attributes of presidents and public institutions in the State of Georgia with self described leadership attributes in neighboring states could provide a multi-state or regional analysis of higher education presidential leadership attributes.

3. A similar study that further divides the size of the student body of the institution into size categories could provide some additional insight into the leadership attributes based upon institutional size.
4. A similar study that includes private colleges and universities would enable a researcher to make further distinctions in leadership attributes of academic presidents to derive more broad-based conclusions.

Recommendations for Implementation

Based upon the conclusions and implications drawn from the data gathered herein, this researcher proffers the following recommendations for applying the research to practice:

1. Presidential search firms seeking candidates for presidencies in the University System of Georgia or the Technical College System of Georgia should imbed the major leadership attributes identified by this study into all search processes.
2. Curricula developed for programs in higher education presidential leadership development should include detailed explanations and an examination of the major leadership attributes that are recognized in the *Leadership Attributes Inventory (LAI).*
3. The University System of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia might collaborate on a presidential leadership development seminar based upon the major leadership attributes defined by this study to better prepare new presidents for their roles in the State of Georgia.

Dissemination

To gain the most benefit from and exposure to this study, this researcher will attempt to publish articles in journals and other periodicals related to leadership attributes of presidents at public institutions of higher education in the State of Georgia. Additionally, this researcher will be prepared to provide lectures on the results of this study and will apply for inclusion in the *Armstrong Atlantic State University Experts Guide for the Media* as a resource for leadership research. The experts guide is designed to help the media identify qualified experts at Armstrong Atlantic State University.

REFERENCES

Bennis, W. G. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, PA: Addison Wesley.

Birge, J. F. (2000). Academic presidents as public leaders. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (03), 931A. (UMI No. 3008059)

Bogue, E. G. (2006). A breakpoint moment: Leadership visions and values for trustees of collegiate mission. *Innovative Higher Education*, 5(30). 309-326.

Bolch, M. (2001). Proactive coaching. *Training & Development*, 38(5), 58-65.

College presidents share advice with aspiring leaders. (2001, December 20). *Black Issues in Higher Education*, p. 17.

Cannon, D. G. (2003). Desired leadership attributes of Georgia technical college presidents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (02). (UMI No. 0805033)

Collins, J. C. (2001). Good to great. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

DeHart, A. (2003). Institutional leadership in higher education: An inquiry into perspectives and roles of college and university presidents in public institutions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65 (02), 692A. (UMI No. 3121872)

English, F. W. (1994). *Theory in educational administration*. New York: Harper Collins College Publisher.

Etzioni, A. (1961). *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Fowler, F. J., Jr. (1993). *Survey research methods* (2cd ed.). Newberry Park, CA: SAGE.

Fujita, E. (1990). The evaluation of college presidents: Dimensions used by campus leaders. Portland, OR: Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Meeting Paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED326114).

Gall, M. D., Borg, W.R. & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Garcia, M. (2007). Democracy, diversity and presidential leadership. *Liberal Education*, (Summer) 22-27.

Gay. L. R. (1996). *Educational research* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gillett-Karam, R. (2001). Introduction: Community college leadership: Perspectives of women as presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 167-170.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management and organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kerr, C. & Gade, M. L. (1986). *The many lives of academic presidents*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities.

Lawrence, F. L. (2006). *Leadership in higher education: Views from the presidency*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Minor, J. T. (2001). Making sense of success: Leadership attributes and practices of successful university presidents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (07), 2360A. (UMI No. 3020847)

Neumann, A. & Bensimon, E. M. (1990). Constructing the presidency: College presidents' images of their leadership roles, a comparative study. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 61 (6), 678-701.

Ramaley, J. A. (Summer 2000). Change as a scholarly act: Higher education research transfer to practice. *New Directions in Higher Education*, no vol. number (110).

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sharples, R. H. (2002). The importance of leadership competencies: Perceptions of North Carolina community college. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63 (04), 1238A. (UMI No. 3048933)

Siegrist, G. (1999). Educational leadership must move beyond management training to visionary and moral transformational leaders. *Education*, 120, 297-303.

State Board of Technical and Adult Education Meting Minutes. (2000, July 6) Retrieved on June 1, 2007, from http://www.dtae.org/board/July00minutes.html.

Stephan, E. G. & Pace, R. W. (2002). *Powerful leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

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

Strathe, M. I. & Wilson, V. W. (2006). Academic leadership: The pathway to and from. *New Directions in Higher Education*, no volume (134).

Toffler, A. (1991). *Powershift*. New York: Bantam Books.

Toffler, A & Toffler, H. (1995). *Creating a new civilization: The politics of the third wave*. Atlanta: Turner Publishing.

Trombley, L. S. (July/August, 2007). The care and feeding of presidents. *Change*, 39 (4), 14-17.

Turner, M. D. (2001). Learning for leadership in Oklahoma higher education: A study of selected university presidents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (08), 2700A. (UMI No. 3021658)

University System of Georgia Board of Regents Meeting Minutes. (1996, July 9). Retrieved June 1, 2007, from http://www.usg.edu/regents/minutes/1996/jul96.phtml.

Vittetoe, S. O. (2001). The outstanding community college president: A case study of four presidents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (11), 3653A. (UMI No. 3034233)

Von Glinlow, M. A. (1988). *The new professional*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Wen, H. D. (1999). A profile of community college president's leadership styles. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (05), 1434A. (UMI No. 9930358)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) APPROVAL LETTER

Georgia Southern University
Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Phone: 912-478-0843
Fax: 912-478-0719 IRB@GeorgiaSouthern.edu
Veazey Hall 2021
P.O. Box 8005
Statesboro, GA 30460

To: Peter N. Mastopoulos
2011 Cokesbury Drive,
Savannah, GA 31406-2221

cc: Charles E. Patterson
Associate Vice President for Research

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

Date: September 3, 2008

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

After a review of your proposed research project numbered: **H09023**, and titled **"University and Technical College Presidents At Public Institutions In The State of Georgia: A Leadership Analysis"**, it appears that your research involves activities that do not require approval by the Institutional Review Board according to federal guidelines.

According to the Code of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46, your research protocol is determined to be exempt under the following exemption category(s):

☐ Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (I) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (II) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that your research is exempt from IRB approval. **You may proceed with the proposed research.**

Sincerely,

Eleanor Haynes

Eleanor Haynes
Compliance Officer

APPENDIX B

LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTES INVENTORY SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Leadership Attributes Inventory

Please circle the number of the response that best describes you.

Demographic Questions: (circle the response that describes you)

I work at a: **Technical College – 1** **College or University –2**

The student body of my institution is: **Less than 5,000 – 1** **More than 5,000 – 2**

	Very Undescriptive	Undescriptive	Somewhat Undescriptive	Somewhat Descriptive	Descriptive	Very Descriptive
1. ***Energetic with stamina*** – I approach tasks with great energy and work long hours when necessary.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. ***Insightful*** – I reflect on the relationship among events and grasp the meaning of complex issues quickly.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. ***Adaptable, open to change*** – I encourage and accept suggestions and constructive criticism from co-workers and I am willing to consider modifying plans.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. ***Visionary*** – I look to the future and create new ways in which the organization can prosper.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. ***Tolerant of ambiguity and complexity*** – I comfortably handle vague and difficult situations where there is no simple answer or no prescribed method of proceeding.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. ***Achievement-oriented*** – I show commitment to achieving goals and I strive to keep improving performance.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. ***Accountable*** – I hold myself answerable for work and willingly admit mistakes.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. ***Initiating*** – I frequently introduce new ideas.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. ***Confident, accepting of self*** – I appear secure about my abilities and recognize personal shortcomings.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. ***Willing to accept responsibility*** – I willingly assume higher level duties and functions within the organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. ***Persistent*** – I continue to act on beliefs despite unexpected difficulties.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. ***Enthusiastic, optimistic*** – I think positively, approaching new tasks with excitement, and I deal with challenges as opportunities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. ***Tolerant of frustration*** – I act calmly and patiently even when things don't go as planned.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. ***Dependable, reliable*** – I can be counted on to follow through to get the job done.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. ***Courageous, risk-taker*** – I willingly try out new ideas in spite of possible loss or failure.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. ***Even disposition*** – I display a sense of humor and a stable temperament even in stressful situations.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. ***Committed to the common good*** – I work to benefit the entire organization, not just self.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. ***Personal integrity*** – I speak frankly and honestly and practice espoused values.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. ***Intelligent with practical judgment*** – I learn quickly, and I know how and when to apply my knowledge.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Very Undescriptive	Undescriptive	Somewhat Undescriptive	Somewhat Descriptive	Descriptive	Very Descriptive
20. ***Ethical*** – I act consistently with principles of fairness and right or good conduct that can stand the test of close public scrutiny.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. ***Communication (listening, oral, written)*** – I listen closely to people at work, and I organize and clearly present information both orally and in writing.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. ***Sensitivity, respect*** – I show genuine concern for the feelings of others and regard for them as individuals.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. ***Motivating others*** – I create an environment in which people want to do their best.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. ***Networking*** – I develop cooperative relationships within and outside of the organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. ***Planning*** – I am in collaboration with others, develop tactics and strategies for achieving organizational objectives.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. ***Delegating*** – I appropriately and effectively assign responsibility and authority.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. ***Organizing*** – I establish effective and efficient procedures for getting work done in an orderly manner.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. ***Team building*** – I facilitate the development of cohesiveness and cooperation among the people at work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. ***Coaching*** – I help people develop knowledge and skills for their work assignments.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. ***Conflict management*** – I bring conflict into the open and use it to arrive at constructive solutions.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. ***Time management*** – I schedule my own work activities so that deadlines are met and work goals are accomplished in a timely manner.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. ***Stress Management*** – I effectively deal with the tension of high pressure work situations.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. ***Appropriate use of leadership styles*** – I use a variety of approaches to influence and lead others.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. ***Ideological beliefs are appropriate to the group*** – I model and demonstrate belief in the basic values of the organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. ***Decision-making*** – I make timely decisions that are in the best interest of the organization by analyzing all available information, distilling key points, and drawing relevant conclusions.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. ***Problem-solving*** – I effectively identify, analyze, and resolve difficulties and uncertainties at work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. ***Information management*** – I identify, collect, organize, and analyze the essential information needed by the organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX C

PRELIMINARY EMAIL SENT TO SURVEY POPULATION

Dear Presidents in the University System of Georgia and Presidents in the Technical College System of Georgia:

I am currently in the research phase of my dissertation at Georgia Southern University. My research is an examination of leadership attributes of presidents in the University System of Georgia and presidents in the Technical College System of Georgia.

My study will be entitled, *University and Technical College Presidents at Public Institutions in the State of Georgia: A Leadership Analysis*.

Within the next few days, I will be mailing (via US Mail) a brief survey to you, and I respectfully ask that you complete it and return it to me. Due to the small survey population, every response is critical to my study. All return mailing supplies will be provided.

All data will be collected and compiled with full anonymity.

Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. If you decide not to complete the survey for any reason, that decision will signify your decision not to participate in the study.

I will be more than willing to share a summary of the research outcomes with you.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at pete.mastopoulos@armstrong.edu or 912.344.2951

I greatly appreciate your consideration of my request for assistance with this research.

Sincerely,

Peter Mastopoulos
Doctoral Student
Education Administration
Georgia Southern University

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

2011 Cokesbury Drive
Savannah, GA 31406-2221
September 7, 2008

President «First_Name» «Last_Name»
«University»
«Address1»
«Address2»
«City», «State» «Zip»

Dear President «Last_Name»:

I am currently in the research phase of my dissertation at Georgia Southern University. My research is an examination of leadership attributes of presidents in the University System of Georgia and presidents in the Technical College System of Georgia.

My study will be entitled *Presidents in the University System of Georgia and Presidents in the Technical College System of Georgia: A Leadership Analysis.*

I have enclosed a brief survey to you, and I respectfully ask that you complete it and return it to me by **Friday, September 19**. Due to the small survey population, every response is critical to my study. All return mailing supplies are provided.

I have also enclosed a self-addressed, stamped postcard that you can mail separately to let me know that you completed a survey, so that I may thank you and avoid sending you follow-up requests for assistance.

All data will be collected and compiled with full anonymity.

Participation in the survey is completely voluntary. If you decide not to complete the survey for any reason, that decision will signify your decision not to participate in the study.

I will be more than willing to share a summary of the research outcomes with you.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at pete.mastopoulos@armstrong.edu or 912.344.2951

I greatly appreciate your consideration of my request for assistance with this research.

Sincerely,

Peter Mastopoulos
Doctoral Student
Education Administration
Georgia Southern University

APPENDIX E

ACKNOWLEDGMENT POSTCARD SENT WITH LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Dear Pete:

This card acknowledges that the President of [name of institution] returned a completed survey for the study on presidential leadership at public colleges, universities and technical colleges in the State of Georgia.

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP EMAIL SENT TO NON-RESPONDING POPULATION MEMBERS

Dear Presidents in the University System of Georgia and Presidents in the Technical College System of Georgia:

Sometime last week you should have received a letter, survey and postcard from me with my request for your assistance with my dissertation research on leadership attributes of presidents in the University System of Georgia and presidents in the Technical College System of Georgia.

I have been pleased with the overall response, but due to the small size of the survey population, each and every survey is critical to my research.

I would be grateful if you complete the survey and return it to me by Tuesday, September 23. If you would like a summary of the research outcomes, please make a note on the postcard, and I will send a summary to you when the research is complete.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at pete.mastopoulos@armstrong.edu or 912.344.2951.

I greatly appreciate your consideration of my request for assistance with this research.

Sincerely,

Peter Mastopoulos
Doctoral Student
Education Administration
Georgia Southern University