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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the leadership behaviors of the public Historically Black College and University (HBCU) presidents through their self-perceptions and the perceptions of their upper-echelon administrators. The study also examined their perceptions and behaviors to determine if they are grounded in leadership theory by analyzing their espoused definition of effective leadership. The HBCUs in this study were formed before 1954.

The data were examined using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The Leadership Profile (Sashkin, 1996) was used to determine how a sample of the upper-echelon administrators and the presidents perceived their leadership. The Leadership Survey developed for this study was used to obtain demographic information on the presidents and to assess the level of agreement with specific statements about this segment of higher education. Personal interviews of the presidents most frequently nominated by their peers as being exceptionally effective were conducted.

The results of this study provide an explanation of the leadership behaviors and characterizations of the leadership styles of the public HBCU presidents as perceived by their upper echelon administrators and themselves. The presidents, as perceived by their administrators, were found to be mostly transformational leaders but with differing leadership strengths. Different combinations of behavior were found and some were perceived to be more effective than others. Institutional situations and contexts as well as personal leadership behaviors had some effect on the way they chose to lead the college.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
or university in their charge. The study also reports that the collective perceptions, of the presidents as a group, about leadership are grounded in leadership theory. The study provides a profile of the leadership of each college or university and their perceptions about effective leadership. The relationships between the leadership and the intervening organizational context and situation is also examined to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the environment in which HBCU presidents function. The perceptions of the presidents and the upper echelon officers about the future of the HBCU and its role in the future of higher education was also examined through levels of agreement with recent opinions about institutional pressures, viability, and mission. The study revealed that the presidents and the upper echelon administrators are confident that there is a niche in higher education for the HBCU and that the missions are continuously being redefined to respond to the needs of the community for broad access to higher education.
CHAPTER I

Introduction

The management and leadership in historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) has been scrutinized in the media and higher education circles for the past several years. Recently the questions raised center around issues of access to higher education as well as institutional management. According to Healy (1996), almost every state with a public black college has a public black college in trouble. He points out that problems include: a) transient leadership, b) decreases in enrollment, c) inadequate funding, d) perceived slights by state officials, e) complaints by African-American students about the recruitment of whites, f) federal investigations into alleged financial aid violations, and g) competition between the public and private black college sectors.

Is the primary problem one of leadership, sponsorship, management, mission, or some other factor? Many friends, alumni, and public policy makers argue about the leadership, the stability, and the future of these institutions in the media. According to Mercer (1992), in some states, a hostile political environment has created a threat to the very existence of some HBCUs, and that makes the job of president even more stressful and difficult.

It was suggested by the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) Committee L on the Historically Black Institutions and the Status of Minorities in the Profession (1995), that there is a profound difference in the way these institutions are viewed by African-Americans, and the manner in which they are perceived by other
groups. In 1990, the U.S. Congressional House Committee on Education and Labor held a series of hearings on issues and matters pertaining to HBCUs that brought this very point into the public arena for discussion. Reports in the media, of interviews with several presidents of HBCUs, include a variety of opinions and concerns about the cause and effect of the institutional problems (Healy, 1996; Mercer, 1992).

Today, there are 94 HBCUs remaining throughout the United States and the District of Columbia. In this study, these institutions were designated as “historical” because they were founded before 1954 to provide a system of higher education for the African-American under a separate, but equal, philosophy of education (Bowles and Decosta, 1989).

Some of the HBCU presidents have pointed to the apparent differences in perception about the position of president between candidates for president, and those selecting the president (Bailey, 1987). Some presidents say that the process of selecting a president fails to produce the desired institution/employee match because of the multiplicity of criteria and people involved in the process. Others identified the lack of shared values between the governing boards and the selected presidents. Others pointed to the interference by these boards in the daily activities of the institution. In some institutions the leaders have changed so frequently that many have termed these college presidencies as revolving doors (Mercer, 1992).

The lose of power, as well as the day-to-day involvement of the governing boards in instructional administration, rather than governance, has a strong impact on the president’s ability to fulfill the charge of the office and provide leadership (Cox, 1992). Rosovsky (1990) says, “governance concerns power: who is in charge; who makes
decisions; who has a voice; and how loud is that voice" (p.261)? In higher education, the power and authority to lead the organization has been vested in the position of the president. Kaufmann (1980) describes the president as the person who occupies the key position in the institution, as the link between internal and external constituencies, and the person who voices the value and purpose for which the institution stands. Inferred from this is that institutional management and vitality are linked to, and are dependent upon, effective leadership.

The range of leadership issues, intertwined with the survival and vitality of these institutions, is a source of considerable concern at a time when leadership as well as accountability are being continually evaluated and heavily scrutinized by students, faculty, and sponsors. Leadership is one of the most widely discussed topics today and one of the most puzzling and elusive. There is general agreement on some basic knowledge about leadership, but no agreed upon definition of leadership. Although often defined through the eye of the researcher, nearly every definition of leadership includes vision. Taylor (1989) says that, “vision creates a focus of what is possible; a dream intended for reality” (p.32). Assessing leadership in an organization involves understanding the relationships between the leaders and the followers. Defining effective leadership involves determining the measures of effectiveness. For this research, the measures of effectiveness are defined in the literature review, and are evaluated in the instrument selected for data collection.

It is important to understand as much as possible about the factors influencing the leadership of these institutions. As Chaffee (1989), Cameron and Whetten (1983) clearly point out, a college or university cannot rise above, or exceed, the level of the president’s
leadership. Much of the problem is studying leadership arises from understanding the concept itself.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is that there is little information available on how HBCUs are led and what contributes to effective leadership of them. Leadership theory and studies of presidential leadership were reviewed in order to identify factors influencing the effectiveness of college and university presidents. The leadership profiles of select HBCU presidents were studied and documented to determine what confluence of factors make some leaders more or less effective by conducting within group comparisons. The behaviors and perceptions that influence the leader’s effectiveness is also documented. The research is framed from a review of the literature on organizational leadership theory in education administration and within the context of position power, authority, governance and the HBCU.

Definitions

Leadership

Duke (1989) says that the concept of leadership serves a variety of purposes. The literature is saturated with general descriptions of what leaders do. According to Rost (1991), “the reality is that, scholars and practitioners do not know, with certainty, what leadership is” (p.6). Rost says that the definitions of leadership in the past have been inadequate and focused on management. Rost concludes that the model of leadership as good management is embedded in the entire society and culture, and embodies a male
model of leadership that is management oriented, technocratic, goal dominated, cost-benefit driven, hierarchical, emotional, short-term, materialistic, quantitative, and rational.

The study of leadership has fostered many paradigms that place the behavior of the leader, as well as what she/he can accomplish, as the central focus. Taylor (1989) stated that there are central ingredients to effective leadership, but they are not tools or techniques. Rather, they are values and beliefs that the leader develops from within. He concluded that leaders create environments in which people can be productive and satisfied, while experiencing personal and professional growth.

Burns (1978) developed a definition of leadership, which stresses the reciprocal relationship between leader and followers in a political context. His definition will be used in this research. This view is consistent with the Weberian explanation of legitimate power and authority. He said that leadership is...

the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition or conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers (Burns, p.425).

There is some agreement among scholars that leadership is related to social influence, and the literature assessing the effects of leadership tends to be similar across a variety of disciplines and approaches to study. Several authors have conceptualized leadership behavior in terms of influence, authority, and power used with others. Pfeffer (1991) found that leaders have role sets that are embedded in social systems, which constrain their actions. He stated that, "leadership is associated with a set of myths reinforcing a social construction of meaning which legitimates leadership role occupants, provides belief in potential mobility for those not in leadership roles, and attributes social
causality to leadership roles, thereby providing a belief in the effectiveness of individual control" (p. 353).

In consideration of the use of power, control, or influence in leadership, the reciprocal relationships between leaders and followers are often overlooked. Control and influence-based notions of leadership too easily become focused on the tangible accomplishments of leaders. By doing this, symbolic purposes and values of leadership are largely overlooked. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) suggested, in fact, that the symbolic dimension of leadership becomes crucial when the constraints on leaders prevent them from achieving major objectives. Leaders must be comfortable with the use of power and realize its limitations. Neustadt (1960) recognized this quality of leadership in his work on presidential power. He noted that the impression the president makes “depends not only on the content of his action but on the events surrounding it, and these events are understood by those who watch him work” (p.81)

Trow and Nybom (1991) have stated that leadership in higher education in large part is the taking of effective action to shape the character and direction of a college or university along four dimensions: symbolic, political, managerial, and academic. Many theorists argue that leadership is impossible in American colleges and universities because the institutions are ungovernable (Cohen and March, 1974; Jago, 1982). Kaufmann (1980) on the other hand believes that effective presidencies are essential to the life of colleges and universities. He also purports that governing boards conveying to the presidents a better understanding of the actual nature and complexity of the position can increase the effectiveness.
Effectiveness

Conceptions about effectiveness have centered around behavior ever since Stogdill (1948) focused on the behavior of leaders when synthesizing the results of more than 25 years of research on leadership. He identified specific sets of personal characteristics that were consistently associated with leadership (Stogdill). Research at the University of Michigan, at Ohio State, and at Harvard in the 1950’s supported the use of behavior as a determinant of effectiveness (Sashkin, 1996). Understanding effectiveness involves understanding the linkages between means and ends and the understanding of task and relationship behavior. Others suggest that effectiveness depends solely on engaging in different combinations of tasks and relationship behavior in different situations (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969; House, 1971). Fiedler (1967) combined a situational hypothesis with some variations of the personal characteristics and proposed this combination as a measure of effectiveness that included perceptions of others about the leader.

In considering the Weberian model of a bureaucracy, it can be seen that a combination of variables affect the leadership of an organization because organizations function as cooperative systems (Barnard, 1968). Rosenbach, Sashkin, and Harburg (1996) later developed the Leader Behavior Questionnaires (LBQ) (The Visionary Leader (TVL) and The Leadership Profile (TLP)) to measure the combinations of behaviors validated as effective in measuring the presence of the combination of behaviors that have been shown to be present in effective leaders. In this study, effectiveness is viewed as a combination of behaviors, missions, and situations as viewed by presidents and their upper echelon administrators.
Purpose and Context

The purpose of this research is to add to the body of information on leadership by examining leaders of HBCUs. To do this it is essential that we understand the underpinnings of these institutions if we are to grasp the assumptions relevant to the leadership and organizational evolution. Scholarly study of leadership in these institutions has been largely undocumented. The existing literature on theory and role models in higher education does not include the perceptions of HBCU presidents and the situations in which the HBCUs function. Few studies have examined in detail the nature of the dynamic internal relationship between African-American leaders and followers or the perceptions of this body of leaders about their position and the situation in which they function. Thompson (1963) explored the impact that personal charisma has in stimulating the followership but only limited work has been devoted to the identification of independent variables related to African-American leader-follower relationships in the larger society.

Membership in the accreditation associations excluded most HBCUs. It was only after 1954 and passage of laws dealing with desegregation in higher education, that many of the HBCUs were allowed to be considered as promoters of scholarly academics by the larger community of higher education scholars. The Southern Association of Colleges (SACS), through its commission on colleges, brought historically black colleges into the accreditation process in 1929 and developed the Black College Association as the watch dog for standards (Roscoe, 1989). Any HBCU that was interested in becoming accredited had to go through a review process established by the Black College Association, who would then recommend acceptance or rejection to the Southern
Association of Colleges. The accreditation process maintained the separate but equal philosophy. Today in the State of Louisiana, there are two systems of higher education -- the Louisiana State System and the Southern University System.

Morris (1979) has summarized the divergent views over the conceptual difference concerning the goals and purposes of black colleges by saying that...

On one side, they are viewed as being just like all other colleges and universities, except for their histories of unique service to blacks under conditions under which black students and faculty have had no other educational choices. On the advocate's side, the historical conditions in which black colleges operate are a product of choice of black Americans and not simply a byproduct of a no-choice situation. Advocates, however, maintain that black institutions are the willful creations of a people seeking an opportunity that has been restricted everywhere. Blacks attend and have attended black institutions under great constraint, but ultimately have made the choice to do so because these institutions offer them what they want and need. Through that free choice, [black colleges] are understood to have developed a special capacity to serve their communities - a capacity which will constitute an essential part of free choice in the education of blacks for a long time to come (p. 180).

A study funded by the National Center for Education Statistics noted that missionary groups, northern-based philanthropists, and the Freedman's Bureau (Turner and Michaels, 1978) established many of the HBCUs. It also reported that more than half were created before 1890 and during the Reconstruction period. The first HBCU was Cheyney University of Pennsylvania, established during the 1830s to protest the practice of limiting or prohibiting the education of African-Americans, most of whom were still enslaved. During the decade between 1865 and 1875, 24 private institutions were formed. Although a few states established public institutions for African-Americans, the major thrust was the second Morrill Land Grant Act of 1890, which ignited more construction of public black colleges. For the most part, these institutions are small,
under-funded, and have a high percentage of socially and economically disadvantaged students (Elam, 1993).

Though these colleges and universities represent only three percent of all American colleges and universities, their enrollment is steadily rising. HBCU enrollment increased from 70,000 in 1954 to 200,000 in 1980. More recently, enrollments increased from 239,755 in 1988 to 257,804 in 1990 (FEDIX MOLIS, 1996). By 1990 they enrolled 17% of the nation’s African-American students while in the same year they accounted for 27% of all African-Americans graduating college that same year. By 1995 the total enrollment in HBCUs had reached 272,571 (Kennard, 1996). HBCUs have made significant contributions to our nation, and they continue to be of vital importance to the development of leadership, and other skills, in the larger community. Almost 40% of the country’s African-American college graduates have attended an HBCU (Carter, 1992; Bailey, 1987).

HBCUs make every effort to ensure that no qualified student is denied the opportunity to attend college. Grants, scholarships, loans and employment are awarded based on need or special achievement. Today over 13% of the students enrolled are white, almost two percent are Hispanic, and a fractional percent are Asian or Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans. Almost four percent are nonresident aliens.

Significance

These colleges and universities purport to promote the widest possible sensitivity to the complex factors involved and the institutional commitment required to create successful higher education programs for students buffeted by the racism and neglect of the economic, educational and social institutions of America (Cheek, 1991; Carter, 1992).
In 1980, U.S. President Carter issued an executive order declaring the importance of HBCUs and the need to strengthen and extend their capacity (Minority Higher Education Reports, 1980). This order was made in part because of the changes taking place in the funding and support of higher education in this country.

Historically black colleges and universities offer different learning experiences and different environments for educational development than is available at institutions founded to serve white ethnic and religious minorities. African-American students on HBCU campuses display more positive psychological adjustments, more significant academic gains, and greater cultural awareness than African-American students attending predominantly white campuses (Allen, 1992). The research by Allen also stated that, in general, the fit between African-American students and higher education seems more favorable on historically black campuses than on predominantly white campuses.

According to the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) (1992), historically and predominantly black institutions are a vital national resource and the backbone of African-American leadership. The data say..."that these institutions have produced upwards of 70% of all the African-American graduates of colleges since the inception of this nation; and in the future are expected to graduate over 300,000 college graduates every ten years" (p.2). The NAFEO record shows that more than 50% of the nation's African-American business executives and elected officials are graduates of black colleges, as are 75% of African-Americans with Ph.D. degrees, 75% of African-American military officers, 80% of African-American federal judges, and 85% of African-American physicians.
Yet, few leadership studies include the perceptions of HBCU leaders. Scholarly attention to the college presidents has been constrained by a focus and interest on the character of presidencies in more prominent institutions. The primary purpose of HBCUs was to provide higher education for African-American students although their charters were, in most cases, not exclusionary. Today HBCUs include faculty and students of all races although they still serve a unique function in educating African-American students. This function is not merely historic or traditional, but ongoing and oriented toward the future.

The on-going litigation to determine the implementation of the Fordice decision by the U. S. Supreme Court should be has also caused many, including U. S. President Bill Clinton and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), to question the future of HBCUs. Both have reaffirmed their support for these institutions. In 1975, the Black Mississippi Council of Higher Education filed a class action suit against the state of Mississippi to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This action emanated from a history of disparities in the state’s funding of its institutions of higher education. The United States Supreme Court in the United States v. Fordice (1992) held that...

States which have operated officially sanctioned segregated higher education systems must do more than utilize race-neutral access policies and permit students freedom of choice to meet their affirmative duty to disestablish their dual system under the equal protection Clause (112s. Ct. 2738).

Under the Court’s decision, practices that could be traced to the old system of segregation had to be eradicated or justified. The decision was not what the council expected. Although the court provided support under - Title VI, the Black Mississippi
Council did not receive the relief of requiring the state to invest equally in all institutions or to upgrade the condition of the HBCUs. The fate of the HBCUs through possible closings, reallocation of funds, mergers, and potential loss of identity may reshape and diminish a significant segment of higher education in this country (Committee L, 1995).

This research is significant because it will document the perceptions of and about the current leadership in HBCUs for the inclusion and understanding of leadership and followership in higher education as well as contribute to an understanding of the HBCUs' function in American higher education.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature for the history and theories relevant to leadership both overall and in educational organizations to identify variables that influence leadership effectiveness. Attention then shifts to a review of studies on the college presidency of four-year institutions in general. Variables that influence leadership effectiveness and contribute to understanding leader behavior and the response of followers in theory development will be examined. This is followed by studies on HBCU presidents and African-American presidents of predominately black institutions. Information on the HBCUs was provided in Chapter I as historical background and context for the analysis that follows. The resulting research on this topic examined and documented the leadership perceptions and profiles of HBCU presidents and the perceptions of others about their leadership.

Theoretical Framework—Overall Leadership

The literature on leadership includes several important reviews and compilations for research study. The studies are organized in different ways and cut across several essential variables. Most research has focused on the actions of leadership such as managing, motivating, compromising, planning, organizing, and other behaviors that
have a high probability of leading to desirable organizational outcomes. Presidents all
differ in their strategies, tactics, personalities, codes of personal conduct, and in the
results they leave behind them. These findings about leadership have resulted from
different emphases and periods of study over the years. However, the overall strategies
used to study leadership theory can be divided into five main research approaches, trait
theory, behavioral (style) theory, situation theory, contingency theory, and transactional
theory.

In the study of higher education, these theories are cast into broader categories
focusing on the strategies, outcomes, and actions associated with leadership as opposed to
the personal traits or characteristics of those in leadership positions. It is important to
note that the theories of leadership developed in higher education have a foundation in
the leadership theory, which is largely based in the industrial paradigm. Bensimon,
Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) explain that recent theoretical research has attempted to
integrate findings in higher education literature with more general theories of leadership.
In their examination of works on leadership in higher education, Bensimon, Neumann,
and Birnbaum grouped the literature into five categories: trait theory, power and
influence theories (both transactional/social exchange and transformational/social power),
behavioral theory, including managerial roles, contingency theory, and cultural and
symbolic theory. Later this conceptualization was used to develop strategies for analysis
and categorization of approaches to study based on frames.

Initially, theory development and testing for leadership focused on the individuals
and their particular traits and sought to define leadership in all-encompassing terms.
These studies on leadership centered on certain physical characteristics, personality traits,
and intellectual abilities. Trait theories tend to explain leadership in terms of personality and character. Bird (1940) compiled a list of 79 traits from 20 psychologically oriented studies done by Smith and Kruger (1933) for educators. Stogdill (1974) also divided the early literature into several categories: great-man theories, trait theories, environmental theories, personal-situational theories, humanistic theories, exchange theories, perceptual and cognitive theories, behavioral theories, and transformation theories.

Other theorists preceding Stogdill pointed out that the range of traits shown in a leader were largely determined by the situation. Stogdill expanded this conceptualization to include an analysis of leadership that focused on the leader as well as the situation. Equally important to this research, Gerth and Mills (1953) went even further and included the motives of the leader—the images that the selected publics hold of them, the type of institution and atmosphere in which he or she leads—and the position itself in the study of leadership. The view of others in assessing leadership effectiveness emerged as an important method in the decade that followed, and has become a part of most research to assess organizational leadership.

Many have found through research that the reviewing of traits alone has not proven reliable for the selection of leaders or an evaluation of their effectiveness. Stogdill's work in 1948 all but closed the door on this approach as a reliable research construct. Style theory emerged, and is similar to trait, but focuses on the way leaders manifest their leadership through themselves. It stresses their power of influence. The influence process is related directly to power, and each leadership style is related to some form of power. In the two decades that followed, studies of supervisors behavior and relationships on railroad work crews at the University of Michigan, on factory
supervisors at Ohio State, and on college undergraduates at Harvard, all pointed to two
general qualities to describe leadership style: consideration of employees and their
Unfortunately, research that followed failed to confirm that effective leaders actually
engage in this type of task/relationship behavior, leading one group of scholars to call it
the 'high-high leadership myth' (Larson, Hunt & Osborn, 1976). Leadership style does
not exist in isolation. Bass (1981) subsequently found that leader style interacts with the
situation and the followers that make up the complete picture.

Tuckman and Johnson (1965), after reviewing over 60 studies, suggested that the
role of leaders arose from the social context in which they were placed. The role is said
to change with the situation. Situation theory focuses on both the characteristics of the
task and the social context in which the leader is functioning. Personal-situational
theories address the interactive effects of individual and situational factors and provide a
way to assess the common element; yet, it also informs us that there is no prescribed
formula of behavior that produces leadership. It is in this area that Stogdill (1948) had
the greatest impact on theoretical research that followed.

The situation within which leadership takes place can be divided into three
aspects: interpersonal, organizational, and societal. Leadership occurs within a given
organization. In turn, leadership is shaped by the characteristics of that organization.
Hare, Borgatta, and Bales (1955) say that the type of leadership exercised is contingent
upon the formality of the organization.

Later research (Halpin, 1966, Fiedler, 1967) moved away from broad-based
theory and toward discussion of particular organizational aspects of leadership. Fiedler's
contingency theory of leadership recognizes the importance of the situation or context in which leadership occurs. He advances the belief that the characteristics of both the leader and the situation interact to determine leader effectiveness. The essence of the theory is that effective leadership is dependent upon the fit between the motivation of the leader and the favorableness of the situation in which the leader exists and performs. He argues that relationship-motivated leaders will be more effective than task-motivated leaders in situations of moderate favorableness. The reverse holds in highly unfavorable situations. Under these situations Fiedler expects a task motivated leader to be more effective than a relationship-motivated leader. Situational theory advances leadership as a role.

Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) investigated the extent to which behaviors selected by first-line supervisors were constrained by the expectations of others. In their study, they illustrated that leader behaviors are responses to the demands of the social context. They also concluded that the effect of leadership might vary depending upon the level in the organizational hierarchy. This approach to study has limited application in higher education because of its focus on the superior subordinate relationship. In higher education the faculty governance and shared governance approach to leadership is not congruent with this paradigm.

More recently, the attributes discussed in the literature on leadership center around contingency theory. Contingency theory focuses on a blend of style and the situation. Research on the context of a particular style based on gender and ethos in leadership (Rodgers-Rose, 1980) has increased in recent years. Both concepts embrace leadership as relational, mutually cooperative, enterprises between leaders and followers where the goal is not simply the empowerment of the self, but the empowerment of others.
for the benefit of all. Rodgers-Rose says that the leader creates with the followers..."a vision for the organization which incorporates their most basic needs of security and safety, as well as fostering self-actualization and social responsibility" (p.5). It is concluded by some (Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1991) that this theory also has limited application in higher education because of faculty governance issues. However, when viewed in a broader organizational context and from an institutional perspective, there may be implications for a multi-campus system perspective.

In summary, the literature indicates that the overall challenges of leadership and the experiences of leaders as documented over time has shown us that leadership is not primarily a function of interpersonal skills, style, or situations. Leadership is a catalyst for action, a dynamic process. The transactional approach involves a leader-follower exchange. This theory is a merger of several research perspectives and research findings. Transaction theory is rooted within the broader theory of social exchange (Homans, 1958, 1961). Social exchange theory stresses the interdependence of both participants. Selznick, (1957) has said that the task of the leader is to insert values into an organization to the point of organizational acceptance. It then requires a willingness to use the powers in the position to provide the organizational purpose. Trow (1975) has said that leadership in higher education is the taking of effective action to shape the character and direction of a college or university through symbolic, political, managerial, and academic dimensions.

**Transformational and Transactional Leadership**

A large body of leadership research has been devoted to studying the effect of
democratic and autocratic approaches, task and relations orientation, and structure for subordinates and the consideration of them in promoting change. Burns conceived it as transformational and transactional leadership approaches. Transformational leadership emerged as the higher order approach calling for change in attitude, beliefs, values and needs. It meant changing what the followers see and changing the context. Transactional leadership was shown to be task-oriented and resulted in only marginal improvements. Bass (1985), in a study of 70 senior executives, found that the most important component in the larger concept of transformational leadership was charisma. He found transformation factors more highly correlated with perceived unit effectiveness than were the transactional factors. In the conceptualization, the transactional leader accepts and maintains the culture of the organization as it exists, taking on its belief system, language, and social structure.

Transformational leadership involves a one-way focus on the relationship between the leader and followers with the leader being the initiator of the relationship. Burns (1978) says a transformational leader...

looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents (p. 4).

Social influence theories of leadership differentiate between transactional and transformational leadership (Bensimon, 1993). Transformational leaders change organizational culture by introducing new beliefs and goals and by changing the way group members define their roles.

In this method of leadership, the leader is expected to create elements of the organization's culture by means of his or her own behavior and interactions with
organization members. This is the essence of what some have called charismatic leadership. Charismatic leadership involves the creation of shared values, beliefs, and norms through strongly affective reactions to the leader’s behavior (Bennis, 1984). Through intensive clinical interviews with 90 reputedly charismatic leaders, Bennis and Nanus (1985) identified a set of specific behavior strategies used by these individuals. Sashkin (1985) turned these into specific behaviors and developed instruments, the TVL and the TLP, to measure them. Both are behavior questionnaires. The five specific leadership behaviors that Sashkin derived from Bennis’ studies are focusing attention on specific issues of concern, taking risks, communicating skillfully, demonstrating consistency and trustworthiness, and expressing active concern for people including one’s self (Sashkin and Fulmer, 1985).

The concept of transforming or transformational leadership also embraces thoughts about possessing a dream or having a futures orientation (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1986). Basically, Gardner (1986) says, “researchers use the terms transforming, transformational, and innovative interchangeably to refer to leadership that goes beyond merely managing the system to helping the system achieve its next stage of evolution” (p.23). Burns (1978) stresses the reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers. In his research, Burns examined behavior and exchange relationships between leaders and subordinates and the characteristics of leaders of successful organizations. He contrasted transactional and transformational leadership and differentiated between them by the way leaders engage relations with others based on the hierarchy of human needs. Transformational leaders motivate followers to do more through raising their level of consciousness, increasing their need, and getting them to transcend their own self
interest for the sake of the organization. They are less likely to accept the status quo and are more likely to search for new ways and approaches. The leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation.

The transactional leaders, on the other hand, are task oriented and are focused on margins and degrees of change. They are more focused on existing conditions and take few risks. They are perceived often as controlling. While aware of each other’s power, leaders and followers pursue their own purposes and goals while forming temporary relationships. This conceptualization by Burns generally provides an umbrella for all of the literature when consideration is given to the imperatives of values, ethics, and personalities. Burns (1978) further states that “transformational leadership is moral if it deals with true needs and is based on informed choice” (p.127). “Transformational leadership, as originally conceptualized, typically emerges in national or social mass movements with which individuals identify and for which they are willing to make basic sacrifices” (Bensimon, 1993, p.6). Bensimon used this in her construction of frames for higher education. This construction also appears to have direct application to the circumstances and missions of HBCUs and followers.

Horton (1985), in his description of qualities of a successful chief executive officer, states that, “leadership is based on trust and effective management is fueled by it” (p.141). Its chief sets the moral tone of an organization and the values brought to the position of leadership. In his study of organizational dynamics, Bass (1985) states that there must be congruence between the values of the leader and those being led. He sees the leader as a social architect who builds a culture that represents the unique properties of the organization. Weber’s (1921) treatment of leadership, while it emphasized
charisma and authority, defined leadership as a functional relationship between leaders and followers (Coser, 1971).

**Influence, Power, and Authority in Leadership**

The literature describes many types of power associated with leadership. However, this study is concerned with power as it relates to authority and influence. This is primarily because power and influence theories have been a major factor in understanding the effectiveness of the leaders of academic organizations. It was Burns’ work that reacquainted scholars with the critical distinction first raised by Weber (1947) regarding the economic and non-economic sources of authority. “The transformational approach incorporates the idea that leadership involves what Weber called non-economic sources of authority and the transactional approach is based on economic or quasi-economic transactions between a leader and followers” (Sashkin, 1995, p.4).

Authority is the core concept of an organizational structure and the means of legitimate power. “Authority means the probability that a specific command will be obeyed” (Weber, 1921, p.196). He also said that there were three modes of authority: traditional, charismatic, and legal-rational or bureaucratic and each is associated with a different type of administration.

Power is thought to be the ability to influence a mental and physical change in behavior, opinions, attitudes, goals, needs, and values. Yukl (1994) says that to influence is to have an effect on the attitudes, perceptions and behavior of others and comes from three sources—position, personal, and political. Virtually everyone wants to be outside of the sphere of responsibility but well inside the sphere of influence.
Power based on authority is derived from the leader’s established position within an organization’s structure and is granted by the institution as part of the position. Bok (1982) maintains that in this environment of shared authority, presidents have limited though significant powers. Fischer (1984) clearly confirms and demonstrates in his study of effective leadership that the college president must be aware that there are different types of power that must be used to get things done. He concludes that the most important organizing definition of leadership is the exercise of power.

Etzioni (1969) also says that power is the central concept in understanding and researching leadership because authority is “value laden” and more difficult to measure. It is difficult to determine when it is legitimate and when it is not. He contends that measuring power is less of a problem because it lends itself to empirical measurement. He has proposed that there are three ways of looking at higher education organizations from a sociological perspective. They are from a bureaucratic model, a collegial model as a community of scholars, and a conflict or political model. He points to the relationship between those in control and those under control as the central variables for characterizing differences among organizations.

Kaufmann (1977) states that, “although a president does not control an institution, he shares in the capacity to mold and shape it; and while these are limitations on authority, there are no limitations on initiatives” (p.165). Many years ago Harper (1904), in thoughts about national leadership proposed that, “the president, if he has the power of veto, may stand in the way of progress, but he can not secure forward movement except with the cooperation of those with whom he is associated” (p.8). This statement is still applicable today and is well suited for academic organizations because it points to the
influence process as a major component of a leader’s power. Cohen and March (1974) stress the ambiguities of presidential roles and the organization of an enterprise having few clear goals and many complex and contradictory missions.

Authority appears in many forms and combinations in higher educational systems. The system as a whole locates authority at the top in political forms that follow from the support and control of patrons, and bureaucratic forms that follow from the location of overall administration in central agencies (Etzioni, 1969). At the level of the individual university or college, authority is often possessed by institutional trustees and to some degree by campus presidents, chancellors, or rectors and their immediate administrative staff. In this research, the primary focus is on presidential effectiveness and power as expressed and manifested through the institution, the position, and the relationships of the president.

According to Trow (1991), the near absolute authority of the American college president has been lost in most of our universities with the rise of the research university and the emergence of a genuine academic profession in the last decade of the nineteenth century. A great deal of autonomy has been delegated to the faculty and its senates and their autonomy is an important constraint on the power of the president. Ashby (1964) stated that the art of using authority is to secure consent. Carbone (1981) says that delegation is the key to understanding why some presidents are effective, aggressive leaders while others are not.

Trow and Nybom (1991) state that “the governing board is the usual one legal or traditional seat of authority in institutions of higher education. Some of the authority and the power that accompanies it are normally delegated to the president and by him or her
to the faculty" (p.83). In the years that followed further reviews by Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) concluded that exchange theory provides a better understanding of leadership because power and influence theories tend to provide a one-way view.

In summary, we have found that leadership research and theory has centered on the leader-follower relationship, in the context of the small group rather than on organizational leadership. The study of leadership has focused on the role of the leader at middle or lower levels of the organizational hierarchy. For many years it was thought that the secret of leadership was some special characteristic of the "born leader", some intangible trait that gave such leaders a key to success. Stogdill (1948) challenged this idea in the late 1940s when he conducted a major integrative review and synthesis of research on leadership. He found that in more than 100 research studies none showed any clear evidence of substantial difference in characteristics/traits between leaders and non-leaders. The focus then turned to research on behavioral factors such as capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status. Research to determine effectiveness centered around these five basic themes until a focus on a specific personal trait called charisma emerged. The focus in this area was short lived and was later combined with several other perspectives that proved more useful. Continued research by Bales (1958), House (1971), and Larson, Hunt and Osborn (1976), revealed that consideration of task focused and relationship centered behavior were important constructs in analyzing leader effectiveness. Later research lent support to these as viable factors, but the evidence was not convincing and considered incomplete. In the meantime, Tuckman (1956) and some others (Hare, 1957; Bass, 1981) found that style interacted with the situation and the follower to form a more complete picture. The
situation and the structure emerged as critical factors in the examination of leadership.

Research by Fiedler (1967), Halpin (1966), and Hersey and Blanchard (1969) resulted in the contingency approach for assessing organizational leadership and the motivation and skill of the employee. The idea of blending style and the situation provided some measure of stability to the research on leadership until a breakthrough finally occurred in the late 1970s, when Burns (1978) introduced transformational and transactional leadership by focusing on the distinction between managers and leaders. Burns' work really served to reacquaint scholars with the critical distinction that was first raised by Weber's (1947) discussions of the difference between economic and non-economic sources of authority. Rost (1991) said that all of the previous discussions of leadership really dealt with management or supervision, not leadership, and the two are quite distinct. Burns observed that management and supervision are based on the exchange of certain activities and duties for certain rewards which are transactional in nature; while leadership is more complex and powerful and is based on influence, consideration, stimulation, and motivation. Bass (1985) conducted major research around transformational leadership and showed that transformational and transactional leadership are separate and independent dimensions (Sashkin, 1995).

The research has revealed that effective leaders, possessing a need for power and influence, must be motivated to make an impact and have a strong need to make a difference. More tenuous in terms of a research base, but consistent with the observations of the scholars, is the view that effective leaders express their need for power and influence in ways that benefit the organization. Weber (1947) and Fiedler (1967) also showed us that a leader's formal authority is important because it determines
the sorts of extrinsic motivators the leader can bring to bear in a situation. It also defines
the limits of intrinsic motivation through the delegation of authority to others.

The work by Burns (1978) has led to the development of several new approaches
to the study of leadership. Identification of effective leadership behavior provokes
considerable disagreement particularly because there is so little consensus on what
behaviors are effective. The examination of the literature in this area points out how
volatile the evidence is when trying to secure consistent measures of effectiveness. It
clearly points out that all specifications are at best tentative and open to change as more
studies are conducted and the range of leaders are studied in different organizations. The
emphasis here has been to look for organizationally relevant leadership behaviors as it is
the organizational focus that is the most relevant and important to a contribution in this
area.

*The College Presidency - Governance and Organization*

After reviewing the literature on the characteristics of effective college presidents,
I found that most of the studies centered on the roles and functions of the presidents and
their relationships with the governing boards. Fischer (1991) examined the relationship
between the governing board and college presidents in higher education. He found that
the policies and practices of most governing boards are antithetical to effective
presidential leadership. The research reviewed indicates that presidential position
effectiveness appears to be heavily influenced by the governing structure.

Cohen and March (1974) called the governance of higher education organized
anarchy. They studied 40 institutions in the early 1970s when the academic presidency
was at its peak by asking the presidents how they personally would determine if they
were successful in their position. They found very little consensus among the responses given by the presidents.

Cohen and March contest the heroic conception of the president as a person who leads the institution; rather they conclude that the organization has deemed this position a reactive one rather than active. They proposed that the governing structure has yielded a symbolic position with only modest control over events and campus business (Kerr and Gade, 1986, p.150).

This conception would put the role and behavior of the president in the group of administrator and manager rather than leader. Their study of presidents indicates that the presidency is a symbolic position. It further supports the recent perceptions echoed in the media by several former presidents concerning the over involvement of governing boards in the day-to-day activities of the institution (Mercer, 1992). Cohen and March’s theory of organized anarchy as a way of viewing governance and organization also is supported in the conceptions of leadership by Rost (1991) and Yukl (1994) which center around management or transactional behaviors.

In another empirical study of presidential leadership in 32 academic institutions Bensimon (1989) used the frames adapted by Birnbaum (1988) from the work of Bowman and Deal (1984) to analyze the roles, behavior and governance patterns of college presidents. The purpose of this study was to determine how these presidents defined good leadership. The four frames used were the bureaucratic frame, the collegial frame, the political frame, and the symbolic frame. These frames focused on different aspects of organizational behavior and were developed out of an industrial paradigm of leadership that had been adapted and used to explain the actions and responses of leaders in the academic enterprise. Argyris and Schon (1974) said that the process of making these interpretations results in what is being called espoused theories because they
represent what presidents say good leadership should be as well as the way they see themselves or the way they would like others to see them.

In this study by Bensimon, an analysis was also made of leadership as it related to institution type and the length of the tenure of the president. The results of this study showed that there are differences in leadership behavior and style based on tenure in office and role perceptions. The findings also showed that the presidents are likely to have a single or paired frame orientation toward leadership and that leaders of community colleges are more likely (than leaders of other institutions of higher education) to have a single frame orientation. Universities were more paired or multi-frame oriented. The same pattern was found to exist in new and seasoned presidents responding in the interviews. This study points to the relative importance of institutional type, presidential tenure, and governing structure as important variables in understanding effective leadership in higher education. Clearly inferred is how different situations and circumstances affect leader behavior. Much of leadership is contingent upon the factors influencing the perspective of the leader.

Kerr (1984) conducted a study to answer some basic questions about leadership by a president, and provided a collection of advice to institutions, presidents, and governing boards about the presidency. It involved over 850 interviews, including 28 at historically black institutions. The report identifies and discusses past and current developments that are believed to have made the college and university presidency less attractive now to able people than it was formerly. It is especially concerned with the growing constraints on the presidency. The report reaches the conclusion that the American presidency is in trouble and that many of the problems that the presidents face
arise out of the very strength and centrality of the role, a role that has no real counterpart outside the United States.

Kerr's interviews were conducted with current and past presidents, board members, and persons who refused presidencies and with executive search consultants. The sample included analysis by geographic region, type of institution, and category of institution as determined by academic program. A significant finding of the interviews was that an effective presidency starts, but does not end, with an effective board. In fact, they found that the following combination was desirable: an effective board and effective chair of the board, an effective presidency, and an effective president. In analyzing multi-campus relationships, they found the leadership to be bifurcated with the greatest difference being where decisions are highly centralized at the system level. This results from the system heads trying to hold on to too much detailed authority or taking too long to make decisions.

Based on the findings, Kerr (1984) concluded that the share of the president in governance is thought to be too small by both the president and the institution. He in fact says that the central role of the presidency, to ensure the overall and long term welfare of the institution, has diminished. The research above supports the perception of many that the governing structure and institutional organization are critical to understanding and evaluating the leadership of institutions of higher education. Kerr (1984), Fischer (1991) and Bensimon (1989) all point to the relative importance of institutional type, and governing structure in understanding effective leadership in higher education. They also point out how the situations and circumstances surrounding governance and organization affect leadership.
Fischer, Tack and Wheeler (1988) also concluded that we have allowed the selection and governance processes to become too democratized to the point that it is difficult to determine who is in charge. They say that leadership in higher education has been reduced to involvement and that the decision making process is constrained by the need to manage by consensus and the will of the majority. Presidents are required to jockey for power according to interest group support instead of doing what is best for the institution. Efforts by governing boards to respond to constituent demand have often interfered with the presidential selection process.

Chaffee (1989) examined four studies of leadership and noted that they all reach different conclusions; yet, they are consistent with the experiences of practitioners. Situational variables and the circumstances of the institution explain the differences. She points out the usefulness of function and culture in the study of organizations.

Cohen’s and March’s (1974) use of an organized anarchy model of college administration points to the relative impotence of college presidents. From their viewpoint individuals who reside in the presidency carry out functionary tasks prescribed by the role of the office; the anarchic nature of the institution circumscribes presidential power so that it is almost negligible. Because American institutions of higher education have unclear goals, a misunderstood technology, and fluid participation, Cohen and March portray the college president as an individual who drives a car out of control on an icy freeway. In contrast, an earlier view of college leadership describes the college president as the person in whose shadow the institution exists. A college president is capable of affecting change in the institution by the ability to develop creative ideas, to articulate to constituencies those plans, and to implement an agenda by the effective use
of presidential power and prerogative. If this is true then the impact of frequent presidential turnover on the fabric of the institutions can be major.

In the study of HBCU presidents of four year institutions, this is significant because the population consists of a variety of the governing configurations, including private and public institutions, land grant and religious sponsored institutions, multi-campus institutions, and membership in state wide systems.

The President's Role and Behavior

Benezet, Katz, and Magnusen (1981), in their study of 25 presidents concluded, "today's president inherits a structure that mandates a managerial role" (p.42). They say that efficient management is what most trustees want and what most presidents can provide. Their central finding is that presidential power seems to be dissipating and that the presidency was downgraded from one of leadership to manager and gatekeeper.

Kerr and Gade (1987) examined the changing context of the role of the college president based on institution type and the internal and external forces affecting that role. They found that the only truthful generalization about colleges and universities in America is that no truthful generalizations can be made. They did say that many unnecessary burdens are placed upon presidents in the conduct of their duties.

Considerable research on the characteristics and background of persons attaining leadership positions in major organizations and some elite educational institutions has been conducted. Several comprehensive studies have also been completed. The most recent ones are discussed below. Former presidents have produced much of what has been written about the presidency. Their work is considered by many to be more informational and anecdotal than scholarly (Carbone, 1981).
Carbone (1981) examined the experiences and present situations of ex-presidents. He began his examination with the observation that much of what has been written on the presidency has little application to the present because of the many changes that have occurred in higher education. He states that the presidency is influenced by the changes in the type of research required, its service to society, enrollment, rising expectations, international considerations, adult education, and a host of other factors. In this study, he had a 49% response rate which netted 1409 respondents. He found the following: 1) prior academic experience is more important to obtaining the presidency than credentials; 2) that 25% of the participants served less than four years; 3) that rapid turnover in this position was considered detrimental to institutional welfare; and 4) that the job of the president differs based on size, type, tradition, and control of the institution. Carbone also concluded that the role of institutional autonomy, legislative action, bureaucratic regulation, and super board policy is nowhere more clearly revealed than in the decreasing ability of presidents to exert clear decisive leadership.

Tierney (1988) states that the kinds of individuals chosen as college presidents over the last century have been remarkably consistent, yet the role of the office has changed over time. In studies of the presidential career path, as summarized by Cohen and March (1974), and Fischer, Tack and Wheeler (1989), it was found that the individuals who become president are likely to have experiences in the institution from the ground level up and presumably have the vision and experience for a composite view of the institution. This implies that the presidential “career ladder” progresses from faculty member to department chair to academic dean to provost to president. Socolow (1978) states further that “senior positions in academic administration have long been the
almost exclusive province of those who served a substantial time in academe” (p. 42). In
1983, when Moore conducted her investigation, over 80% of college presidents had been
a faculty member at one time, although they may not have had previous experience as a
dean or department chair.

Tierney states that the “average” college president is a white male in his forties
who has had prior experience in academe, most likely as a faculty member. Patterns of
appointment in religious, gender, and race-based schools tend to hire members of their
own faith, gender, and race (Jencks and Reisman, 1977). Kerr and Gade (1988) were
more explicit. They concluded that presidents do not look alike; they do not talk alike;
and they do not have the same personalities or characters. They do not cherish the same
goals in life or for higher education. Moreover, they are not interchangeable. The
challenge in the study of presidencies is to see the similarities and the dissimilarities at
the same time.

In an earlier study Kerr and Gade (1986) examined what kind of people, and from
what kinds of backgrounds, become college presidents. They also looked at how they
served on the job and where they went after leaving. For an analysis they used the data
collected for the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. It included 800
interviews. They found that presidents have considerably less power than they once did
and that presidential succession is anomalous. Yet, nearly all presidents affect their
institutions in some significant manner and occasionally in major ways. They say that...

Some institutions will have survived because of their presidents while a
few will have failed for the same reason. Some will have improved
marginally while others will have declined marginally due to their efforts.
Occasionally an institution will have moved clearly ahead, and rarely,
some segment of higher education will have been clearly advantaged
because of some president’s contributions” (Kerr and Gade, 1986, p.4).
Kerr and Gade (1986) also reported that many presidents said that the fit or match between the institution and its president was dependent upon the congruence between the characteristics of the institution’s governance pattern and the style of the particular president. They also revealed that dependence on one source of money centralized authority.

According to Cohen and March (1974) the tenure of American college presidents decreased abruptly during the 1960’s. Kerr’s (1970) analysis of the years in office of the 58 presidents of universities belonging to the Association of American Universities (AAU), found that the mean number of years that sitting presidents had been in office was 10.9 in 1899, 9.5 in 1939, 7.4 in 1959, and 5.9 in 1969. The median dropped from 7 years in 1929 to 2 years in 1969. There are no HBCU members of AAU but there are eleven institutions that belong to multi-campus systems campuses, of which a HBCU is a system member.

An analysis of the length of the terms held by some of the existing presidents of HBCUs indicates that terms of sitting presidents range from 27 years to a few months (Mercer, 1992). What does it mean then when these presidents say they are troubled, calling the presidency a revolving door and say that the average tenure is changing? Cohen and March’s research suggests that it is a matter of misunderstood expectations. They assert that presidents currently in office can expect to remain in office fewer years than presidents did before 1952; and that presidents currently in office are leaving office earlier than they had expected.

The changing character of the institutions and the rapid changes in society are thought to impact on presidential tenure and organizational leadership. According to
Cohen and March (1974). “During most of the twentieth century the median college president has served about 10 years” (p.161). Sontz (1991) also reports that there have been few American college presidents that have lasted more than a decade. Nevertheless, the concern of some HBCU presidents with frequent turnover and institutional vitality is real. Cheek (1991) says that within the past decade, nearly 90% of the historically black colleges and universities have undergone a leadership change.

Cohen and March’s findings of over 22 years ago about presidential power are still true today. In fact, later reviews by Sontz (1991), Carbone (1981), and Kaufmann (1980) studying presidents’ relationships with their governing boards over time highlights the significance of Cohen and March’s (1974) conclusion.

The tenure expectations of an American college president, as a whole are now about what they have been through most of the twentieth century. Tenure was higher during the 1930-1945 period than earlier or subsequently. There have been long-run changes within schools that have shown considerable growth. In general, however, there has not been any dramatic change in recent years in any of the four basic assertions. That is, we do not believe there is evidence of any major recent shifts in the expected tenure of new presidents, or the expected additional or full tenure of current presidents, or that departing presidents are leaving office much earlier than would have been expected. There have been some recent changes, but these appear to us to have been more conspicuously changes in the reasons why presidents leave office and in the interpretations made of their departures than in the amount of time presidents should be expected to serve (p.61).

Cohen and March (1974) have also pointed out the haphazard nature of the presidential selection process when compared with the business world. They state that at times institutions seek a fiscal manager, and at other times the president needs the proper academic credentials, or a high enough profile to project the college’s image to politicians or foundations for financial support. Other times search committees seek “insiders” over someone who has no feel for the institution. Search processes vary from
institution to institution and although there is no concrete criteria for selection, a composite picture of a college president does emerge from the literature. It is clear from the literature that there is no way to determine at the outset who will be an effective leader and who will not.

Birnbaum (1989) collected data on the changes in colleges and universities resulting from leadership changes over a ten-year period (1970-1980). Using the functioning inventory as a measure, he found that it did not change when leadership changed. In this study, he started with the hypothesis that if leaders make a difference institutions should change as leaders changed.

Leadership Effectiveness

In an earlier study, Birnbaum (1986) also reviewed the cognitive processes used by college presidents to make decisions. He showed that the conditions in which they led, and the biases that resulted, might cause them to over estimate their own effectiveness. He concluded that leadership is in part a social attribution used by both leaders and followers to explain their actions.

In the early 1980s, Bennis and Nanus (1985) conducted interviews with over 90 CEOs in public and private organizations that had been deemed by others to be exceptional leaders. They identified several behavioral patterns considered to be characteristic of these outstanding leaders in management terms. They are:

a) management of attention - defined as the ability to focus people’s attention in dramatic ways by use of metaphors and exciting presentation;

b) management of communication - defined as the ability to communicate clearly on a one-to-one basis;
c) management of trust - defined as the ability to inspire trust in one’s self on the part of followers - by exhibiting consistency in action;

d) management of respect - defined as constant and consistent behavior showing caring and concern for followers as individuals; and

e) management of risk—defined as the ability to concentrate one’s efforts on achieving success, with others, rather than focusing on avoiding failure.

Kouzes and Posner (1987) asked managers to write detailed memoirs of their greatest, most positive leadership experience and then analyzed them to identify specific characteristics of each case. Using factor analysis to examine the results, they sorted the answers into ten clear behaviors. These findings resulted in the design of a questionnaire to measure transformational leadership titled: the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). The LPI has five scales designed to measure the ten specific behaviors including inspiring a shared vision, empowering others to act, celebrating others’ achievements, and searching for opportunities to improve the organization.

Bensimon (1993) drew on the models of transactional and transformational leadership for variables affecting leadership in academic organizations in interpreting the initial actions of four presidents in institutions experiencing financial hardship and low morale. She focused on the creation and communication of vision as defined by Boal and Bryson (1988) to be “a mental image of the future of the organization that was cognitively, emotionally, behaviorally, and consequentially real to participants” (p.8). In Bensimon’s study, the actions and consequences of these four new presidents were examined over a period of five years. All four presidents were selected from outside of the institution, the institutions were small and none had a strong tradition of faculty
Bensimon concluded that leadership in academic organizations must combine transactional and transformational approaches to be successful. It is also revealed that vision is a concept that is essential and figures prominently in perspectives of effective leadership and must be brought to fruition through collective endeavors. This study suggests that new presidents should consider their role from both the transactional and transformational perspective.

In a study of the effective college president by Fischer, Tack, and Wheeler (1988), it was concluded that the effective college president might have more in common with his or her corporate counterpart. Four hundred eighty-five individuals considered knowledgeable about higher education were asked to identify the five most effective college presidents in the nation. These experts ended up with 412 effective presidents who were surveyed. The results proved statistically significant in differentiating between effective and representative presidents. They determined that the effective presidents, when compared to representative presidents, were found to be less collegial and more distant; more inclined to rely on respect than affiliation; more inclined to take risks; more committed to an ideal or vision than the institution; believe more strongly in the concept of merit pay; more thoughtful than spontaneous; work longer hours; and are more supportive of organizational flexibility than rigidity. They also found that not all presidents seen as effective held Ph.D. degrees, and many had more experience in administration and other fields outside higher education than representative presidents did. Others were appointed at a younger age than most representative presidents were. Interestingly, although a number of the effective presidents graduated from ivy league or
their sister institutions, their parents were more likely not to have graduated from high
school and their spouses were less likely to be professional volunteers for the institution.
These presidents had published more and tended to be members of the American Council
on Education and to have graduated from Michigan, Yale, Harvard, or Vanderbilt. In
general, this study concluded that the effective college president was not the collegial
prototype. They in fact were strong, action-oriented visionaries who acted out of a kind
of educated intuition.

Kaufmann (1980) conducted a research study on the effectiveness of the college
and university presidents. The sample size was 32. In this study, he explored the
relationship between the presidents and the governing boards, the problems of leadership
in multi-campus systems, and the challenges of increasing centralized administration. He
stated that the president’s performance could not be separated from a governing board’s
performance. The study also describes the presidency as a temporary role of leadership
rather than a professional career. Kaufmann found that much of the discretion (authority
and autonomy) of the president had eroded because of uniform procedures, formulas, and
policies. In the assessment of the performance of presidents, his research revealed that
the system presidency is the least satisfying and least stable of all presidencies. The
performance and the role at this level often are shaped by the actions of predecessors in
their involvement with the board and the campus presidents. He concludes that a proper
balance between autonomy and control are necessary conditions for effective
performance in a system presidency.

Kaufmann (1980) stated that the type of institution, its history, traditions, and
ethos would also determine many role expectations. Kofter and Heskett (1992)
concluded that leadership effectiveness is based on a leader’s influence over culture and their ability to change organizational culture. This resulted from conducting a series of qualitative studies in over 200 organizations.

To summarize, in this section several influencing factors were presented in the literature as affecting leadership approaches and understanding leadership behavior in organizations. The literature reveals that much of the leadership in higher education is dependent on the match between the institution and its president. The governance pattern and structure, the funding sources, and the organization all impact on the type of leadership in institutions of higher education as well as the role and behavior of the presidents. The effectiveness between the institution and its president was dependent upon the congruence between the characteristics of the institution’s governance pattern and the style of the particular president. They also revealed that dependence on one source of money centralized authority.

The behaviors identified are different from those previously measured by Bass (1978) in theory development because they are more behaviorally defined. Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggest that leaders act in ways they have described in order to construct organizational systems or, as Schein (1990) says, organizational culture. Kouzes and Posner (1987) take a step beyond Bass toward a much clearer behavioral explanation of transformation leadership because they are more specifically and behaviorally focused. Bensimon (1993) applies the concepts specifically to higher education organizations and confirms that in higher education a combination of actions, transformational and transactional, are required for effectiveness with each having a profound effect on the organization, the role, and the style of the president.
The style, role and type of leader chosen and the length of the term are variables that cut across three main areas, personality, behavior, and situation. The literature points out that there is a large degree of convergence in the work of various research scholars and practitioners on the study of leadership. The more recent focus on organizational concepts of leadership adds an important element for theory development and grounding of existing theory as well as for the development of leadership training. This study of the HBCUs is both interesting and important. It will add to this understanding by assessing the combination of factors that impact on organizational leadership effectiveness through analysis of presidential behavior, institutional health, as well as other factors identified above.

*African-American College Presidents and Leadership in Higher Education*

Running a university is certainly no easy task. The skills, patience, insight, and sheer stamina required are incredible. When we add the enormously complicated question of race, it adds a completely new dimension for study. This area of the literature review focuses on race as an element in the leadership in HBCUs primarily because it was a factor in the creation of the institutions, their mission, as well as the fact that the majority of the leaders of HBCUs at inception were not of African heritage as they are today. Embree (1944) stated that it was considered unwise when these institutions were formed and as late as the 1920s to have an African-American president. Seventeen of all HBCUs are land grant colleges and 89 (82%) of all HBCUs were established between 1834 and 1923. Of this group and during this period 80 (90%) were at the level of four-year and above. Thirty-six of the 89 institutions established during this period were also public (Elam, 1993).
According to Embree (1944), noticeable African-American leadership in America began to emerge in the ante-bellum period in 1890 and came to maturity in 1930. Embree concluded that three characteristics marked the African-American leader: he did not derive his power from a democratic source; he was a self-styled exemplar; and his position was tenuous and vulnerable. He also said that, "caste is the principle determinant of any discussion of historical African-American leadership" (p. 96). The campuses struggled with the dilemma of non-black leadership of HBCUs through the 1920s. The majority of the teachers were also not of African descent. African-American groups were viewed as monolith and outside of the main political arena.

Cheek (1991) also pointed out that "in the years following W.W.I., several black colleges witnessed uprising of faculty, students, and alumni protesting their school's failure to promote African-American leaders" (p. 103). Today the majority of the presidents of HBCUs and the faculty and staff are of African descent as are the students, although demographic profiles are showing a change in enrollment patterns. There are four HBCUs with over 50% white student enrollment and another six with over 25% white student enrollment. Many state supported institutions have also become part of a multi-campus system of institutions.

A study by Bradley, Carey, and Whitaker (1989) of African-American, female college presidents produced several findings and conclusions relevant to this research. The one new finding, which contributes to the perceptions of the role of the president, was that they deemed it essential to promote social justice for people. They concluded that in the end these actions would assist in creating a society in which individuals could overcome barriers in achievement. They also concluded that the presidents must have an
understanding of human dynamics and human behavior and that a leader must be able to
listen, assess, analyze and decide. This same group of female African-American college
presidents stated that the principles that provide the foundation for their leadership
include integrity, honesty, fairness and respect.

The presidents agreed that it is difficult to become president, and it is equally
difficult to hold on to the position. There was also a consensus that African-American
women have to be "overqualified" and need to have already demonstrated abilities that
go far beyond what is required for the job. Sometimes, they reported, race and gender
hindered their ability to achieve certain desired goals. However, they also agreed that a
positive side of being African-American and female is that because of the widely held
belief that African-American women are less valued, they are likewise less threatening in
a participatory style of leadership; thus making it easier to convince people that they are
indeed sharing power and to mobilize them to action. Gardner (1987) stated, "Leadership
is a performing art" (p.16).

stated that the major stereotyping that occurs with African-Americans is that some
governing boards view them as being suited to lead urban, predominantly black
institutions but not suburban, predominantly white ones. A review of the search
committee reports included in this study revealed that many feel that the president should
reflect the community. Having a president function as a role model for the college and
the community was thought to be critical. One president in the Vaughan study analyzed
it this way:

It is my belief that we still live in a society where standards of
performance are applied differently to various ethnic groups and
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individuals within those groups. Performance within a multi-ethnic society has requirements that differ from group to group. An African-American president is 'expected' to champion affirmative action causes, as an example. To generalize, there is a set of beliefs and behaviors that are expected of an African-American president that may or may not be expected of others. Such expectations require a special awareness and ability to provide presidential leadership in a very balanced and sensitive manner (p.21).

This president is asserting that leadership qualities are not, and should not, be limited or constricted by race or gender. He purports “fit” should be the more important consideration in the selection of a president.

Kerr and Gade (1986) found that African-American presidents of HBCUs have to be much more concerned about issues of quality, and academic and fiscal respectability than presidents of predominately white institutions in the study. It was also more difficult for the HBCU presidents than for other presidents in the study to penetrate certain power and social circles. In addition to regular responsibilities, there were many outside activities that drew on their time simply because of race. Because there are so few African-American presidents, it has become incumbent on the few to fill a disproportionate number of local and national roles. The fact of their blackness, Kerr and Gade (1986) recalls, requires exceptional performance on all fronts and says they are all judged by stricter standards than other presidents.

Tucker (1980) states that African-American leaders must possess skills to cope with not only the daily administrative responsibilities but also the special demands placed upon them by virtue of their blackness. Tucker elaborates that some of the turnover and failure to succeed in positions of leadership emanates from the fact that many college presidents have been placed in positions but were refused and denied the power to ensure effectiveness. He also offers another reason, stating that many presidents lack the
prestige and image to be effective before assuming the role of presidency because many have been functioning as administrators of minority affairs.

There are longstanding debates and confusion over the functions of African-American leaders, the goals of African-American organizations, and the extent to which African-American people participate as followers. As a result, these polemic African-American leaders, followers, and organizations, (while needed and supported by African-American populations), often tend to be viewed as unnecessary or subversive by white populations (Hinds, 1979; Kemer, 1968; and Theohavis, 1978).

Few studies have examined in detail the nature of the dynamic relationship between African-American leaders and followers. Thompson (1963) explored the impact that personal charisma has in stimulating followership but only limited work has been devoted to the identification of independent variables related to leaders and their relationships.

College presidents come from very diverse backgrounds, and each has varying degrees of experience related to their ethnicity. By their own admission, African-American college presidents concurred that their upbringing had a significant impact on their leadership style. African-American women seem to place their emphasis on having a heightened sense of the individual and stressing the importance of social justice for all. Wolters (1975) also states that, “African-American women in leadership, like all women, are still considered both “status and role incongruent” (p.25).

Overall, research on leadership suggests a variety of factors and characteristics important and related to leadership development and research. But, Thompson’s (1963) assessment of African-American leadership development identified two major factors
that stood out from previous scholarly work: the leader’s recognition of unmet social needs and the persistence of inequity in the distribution of opportunities. Thompson pointed out several main factors influencing African-American leaders that directly influence their ability to perform their jobs as others in similarities. The factors include the continued presence of political inequities. The absence of adequate economic opportunity, and the continued violence against African-American people and a failure of society to respond to it (Kerner, 1968; Conyers, 1981).

McPhail (1989) discussed the results of his research on multiple roles of the contemporary African-American college president in a paper presented at the National Conference of the American Association on Higher Education. He stated that, like their white counterparts, presidents of the nation’s HBCUs have seen their roles evolve, as they have become promoters competing aggressively for students and philanthropic dollars for their colleges and universities. The nine key areas in which presidential leadership has been most critical are reviewed in his study of LeMoyne-Owen College. McPhail (1989) notes the importance of a blend of presidential skill and a strategic plan in sustaining the drive toward excellence and equity in institutional renewal. These areas are centered in good management. They include board development, administration, fund development, community outreach, faculty and staff competence, positioning the college, curriculum renewal, enrollment management, and outcomes assessment.

The issue for presidents in HBCUs is frequently couched in very traditional terms, the "we-they" relationship often present between faculty and administration. The same holds true for gender differences. In the previously discussed study by Bradley, Carey, and Whitaker (1989), the presidents agreed that being African-American and female
reinforced the importance of these principles in their everyday actions and behaviors. In a recent response to the editor of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (1996) several HBCU presidents highlighted the dynamics and volatile nature of the relationships and perceptual differences that exist around the leadership of HBCUs. These presidents objected to the stereotyping of their leadership abilities and the lack of recognition of the differences among the institutions and them as leaders.

The section above points out how scarce scholarly research is on the HBCU and its leaders as a group in the study of leadership and leadership in higher education. Most of the material about African-American leadership centers on social movements. Educational leadership research has not been inclusive of this group. Much of the information available is anecdotal, not generalizable to HBCU leaders, but has provided information on the presence of variables that may affect leadership in HBCUs. There are factbooks about the institutions, but little on the behavior of the leaders.

**Conceptual Framework**

Theory on leadership has progressed from studies of the great person, which was pervasive for the first half of the twentieth century to becoming centered on behavior for the 30 years that followed. Trait studies investigated personality traits and intelligence of leaders and attempted to relate them to specific skills. Behavioral studies explored the activity patterns and content of a leader's action in order to identify behavior patterns (Razik and Swanson, 1995). Consideration of the situation followed and, more recently, the vision or focus on long range planning and accountability for results has become the major focus of research on leadership.

By the 1970s, all three approaches, the trait, the behavioral, and the situational
seemed to have some relationship to effectiveness, but none surfaced as the driving factor (Sashkin, 1996). In the decade that followed, research on organizational culture, behavior, and personality traits came to influence views of leadership effectiveness. Burns (1978) argued that there are two basic types of leadership: transactional and transformational. He focused on outcomes, values, and beliefs and categorized them into two measurable approaches for evaluating and assessing leadership termed transactional and transformational. The continued study of leadership has not moved away from this conceptualization but has progressed to include additional indicators for assessing effective leadership.

The focus on vision and long range accountability for results from an organizational perspective resulted in Sashkin and Fulmer's (1988) development of the visionary leadership theory. Many other scholars (House, 1988; Schein, 1992; Rost, 1991; and Yukl, 1994) no longer explain leadership in terms of the individual or the group, but they too look at leadership as it relates to a combination of actions including the individual, the demands of the situation, and the organization. Inquiries that are more recent are turning toward a focus on leadership as a relationship connected to organizational culture.

One thing that is clear in the existing literature is that leadership is imperfectly understood and that there is no defined path to becoming a leader. Fiedler (1967), Bensimon (1989), and Rost (1991), agree that most of the theories of leadership are incomplete. Stogdill (1974) said that a complete theory of leadership should explain a) the emergence of a leader in an unstructured group and the processes that maintain leadership; b) the relation of leader's personality characteristics and behaviors to group
processes; and, c) the situation in which leaders’ personality and behaviors are most effective. Razik and Swanson (1995) define leadership, as influencing other’s actions in order to achieve desirable ends (p. vi). Effective leaders are said to design cultures that help others work together effectively by sharing the value of the vision and the cooperation (Schein, 1990). Each approach to the study of leadership highlights different components of leadership as well as points to their interrelatedness.

A review of the leadership literature in higher education and of HBCUs specifically has shown us that presidents differ in their strategies, tactics, personalities, codes of personal conduct, and in what results they leave behind. The literature and recent articles (Healy, 1996; Bradley, Carey and Whitaker, 1989) have revealed that an additional and distinct form of social responsibility exists for African-American presidents from other groups studied by scholars of leadership theory. The situation is important for explaining perceptions of leadership and the styles that emerge. The mission, the political climate, size, and other variates shown in Figure 1 are important indicators for situational and organizational contexts in the leadership of institutions of higher education. For this study in particular, situation is an important consideration because HBCUs were founded in large part out of social and political needs. Figure 1 brings the major views reviewed together and provides a model for the study of leadership in organizations. Razik and Swanson (1995) iterate the thoughts of many research scholars today when they state that “no one theory has embraced all the necessary variables to satisfactorily define the complexity of the leadership role or to predict best case leadership scenarios” (p. 59).

The collection of theories on organizational leadership (Bennis, 1984; Bensimon,
1993: Burns, 1978) indicates that there is the common agreement on actions taken by leaders that makes it possible to categorize them as having a particular style. Certain combinations of behaviors, personal characteristics, situations and organizational factors are believed to be predictors of, or more frequently associated with, effective leadership. The conceptual framework combines the major theories on behavior, personal characteristics, and situational and organizational context into an approach to assess leadership styles and effectiveness. The variables and variates in the figure have foundations in the literature and are discussed in the sections below, as well as within the methodology. The discussion below is divided according to the three major variables forming the theoretical categories for leadership research.

**Personal Characteristics**

In the literature, the criteria most frequently cited by the presidents themselves were vision, creativity, empowerment, and charisma. Many characterized their style of leadership as being persuasive, collegial, and participatory. This highlights the influence of personal characteristics on leader behavior. Leaders must be comfortable with the use of power and realize its limitations. A segment of the research community (Fischer, 1984; Bok, 1982; Etzioni, 1969) focused on power and influence relationships as part of the behavioral approach to theory development. Effective leaders use power to empower others who then use power and influence to enact the leader's vision of the organization.
Figure 1. Conceptual Framework for the Study of Leadership
The work by Stogdill (1948), House (1977, 1988), McClelland (1975) and Jaques (1976, 1986) revealed at least three specific personal characteristics that differentiate effective organizational leaders from others. They are called: a) influence (impact belief) - the belief that one can control or affect one’s environment; b) time (cognitive time spans of vision) - leaders think and function in a timely fashion; and c) power need - power and influence are needed to get things done.

The point made in the literature by the majority of the African-American presidents was that some of the same skills and strengths that helped them to survive historically have been passed on, embraced by, and continue as survival strategies, particularly for African-American women presidents. Horton (1985) concluded that, leaders do not come from a particular frame of reference but they reflect our cultural heritage and the many dimensions of life in and out of organizations” (p.145).

Situation and Organizational Context

Effective leaders, according to both Schein (1985) and Sashkin (1988), are long-range culture builders. Parson’s (1960) points out that all organizations must effectively carry out four critical functions if they are to survive over time. This is referred to in the literature as the organizational context. The four functions are adapting, attaining goals, coordinating or integrating the efforts of organizational members and groups, and maintaining the organization’s culture. The organization’s culture is the pattern of values and beliefs, which supports effective operation of the other four functions. Leaders create an environment in which people can be productive and satisfied while experiencing personal and professional growth.
Research has also revealed that occasionally the behavior required for effective leadership is contrary to the leader's needs and values. The governing structure of the organization may not be conducive to providing effective leadership. The values may differ somewhat depending on the situation (type of organization and its goals) (Sashkin, 1987). Schein (1985) suggests that possibly the only really important function of a leader is creating and inculcating certain specific values and beliefs into the organization that support effective operation.

The governing structure and organization, the size of the institution, the level, and the type of institutional control are important variates in understanding and determining effective leadership as well as for development of a theory about leadership. Kerr (1984) stated that few presidents can be better than their boards, pointing to the relative importance of the governing structure and institutional control as factors influencing leader behavior and effectiveness.

There is little dispute that strong effective leadership at the presidential level is essential to ensure the continued growth and survival of higher education today. In fact, the literature on HBCUs reveals that much of an institution’s ability to advance and make lasting contributions depends on the leadership of presidents who are committed to advancing the institution’s mission and to addressing a diverse range of social needs. Schein (1990), Bensimon (1989), and Chaffee (1989) all point to the political climate, organizational structure, goals, and impact of governance as influential in the study of leadership behaviors. The situation, in which the HBCU presidents perform, flows out of the institution’s history of traditions.

It is important to understand, as the research conducted by Kerr and Gade (1986)
revealed, that most college and university presidents would like to be more effective as leader, and most are also convinced that they could be—if they were less restrained and more supported in their role. The type of control and level of the institution are also critical variates in strategies for leadership and approaches to providing leadership. Kerr and Gade (1986) also emphasized the fit or match between the institution and the president: pointing out the interrelatedness of the situation and organizational context and personal characteristics. The continued focus on the position of the HBCUs in higher education across the nation by the media, the federal government, and some state governments raises many questions about the political climate and points to its relative importance for the assessment of leadership of these institutions.

**Leader Behavior**

The study of leadership from the behavioral perspective has been done using observation, diaries, surveys, and the analysis of critical incidents. Behavioral theorists have studied leadership by examining the managerial roles and patterns of activity in an effort to determine what leaders actually do. The Ohio State Leadership Studies were influential in identifying two important aspects of leadership behavior theory: initiating structure (task oriented) and consideration (relationship oriented) (Stogdill and Coons. 1957). Behavioral theories have emphasized the influence of personal internal variables such as respect, trust, caring for others, warmth, and support for others upon the circumstances in which leadership is exercised (Bensimon. Neumann. and Birnbaum. 1989). "The behavioral approach to leadership analysis proved that leadership behaviors may be quantifiable and observable" (Razik and Swanson. 1995. p.42).
Sashkin (1996) and Bennis (1985) identified behavioral competencies shared by the leaders they studied. Bennis called these competencies management of attention, management of communication, management of trust, management of respect, and management of risk. Sashkin used them to develop the first version of his Leaders Behavior Questionnaire (Sashkin, 1987). Consistency in the findings (Kouzes and Posner, 1987, 1988; Bennis, 1984; Sashkin and Fulmer, 1985, 1988) yielded support for researchers of behavior to classify creative combinations of behaviors into styles.

Burns (1978) originally believed that a leader was either transactional or transformational. They were, in his view, opposite ends of a single dimension. Research by Bass (1985), however, showed that the two leadership approaches are different but not exclusive of one another. That is, a leader can be either transactional or transformational, but one might also be both or neither. It is clear from the research that leadership behaviors are a function of both the personal characteristics of the leader and the situation. Sashkin (1996) reports that Kurt Lewin provided a classic formula when he said, "behavior is a function of the person and the situation or B=f (P, S)." This formulation is used in the research study.

Cohen and March (1974) concluded that the major characteristic of the presidency of an American university or college is ambiguity about what the president is supposed to be. This lack of understanding has led many presidents to leave office sooner than expected and affects their behavior. Length of service is an intervening variate that affects leader behavior.
Style and Effectiveness

As depicted in the model, Fiedler (1967), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Bass (1985), Kouzes and Posner (1987), and Sashkin (1990) have identified many behaviors and categories of behavior associated with certain styles and effective leadership. By combining personal characteristics and the situation and organizational context to explain and predict leader behavior, the resulting style can be labeled. Effectiveness has been shown to depend on engaging in different combinations of behavior in different situations by leaders with certain personal characteristics (Heresy & Blanchard, 1969; House, 1971; Sashkin, 1995). Today considerable attention is given to the contrast between transactional and transformational leadership as an effectiveness measure. Transactional or managerial leadership deals with how things are done and is equally important to understanding how transformational leader's function. Developing supportive follower relations, providing clear task direction, and coaching compliment a fair reward policy and the need to get things done right. As stated earlier, the style of an effective leader is thought to be transformational and emanates from leader behavior as influenced by a combination of personal characteristics, and the situation and organizational context. “Effective executive leadership - leadership that truly transforms organizations - depends on synergism among personal, situational, and behavioral factors” (Sashkin, 1996, p.1).

Cohen and March (1974) further suggest that a president must live with the fact that a wide assortment of factors outside of their control can overwhelm the impact of any action taken. This is also clearly presented in the perceptions provided through the research by Kerr and Gade (1986) and Bradley, Cary and Whitaker (1989) in the discussions on political climate and external influences. Most presidents agree that the
real test of leadership is whether the institution has been strengthened, particularly academically, and this takes time to accomplish. Not all of what a leader does is leadership that makes role-based conceptions of leadership too restrictive. A truly effective leader will typically demonstrate a high degree of both transactional and transformational leadership (Rosenbach, Sashkin and Harburg, 1996). Duke (1989) concluded that leaders act, but observers judge whether or not the actions constitute leadership based on a variety of factors. Yukl (1994) observes that the essence of leadership is influence over followers. This study addresses the leadership in public HBCUs and the impact of the president’s behaviors, personal characteristics, and the situation and organization on effective leadership in HBCUs as institutions of higher education.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study was designed to answer to the following questions and hypotheses.

Question One:

Is there only one or are there multiple characterizations of leadership behaviors of four-year HBCU presidents?

Null Hypothesis: There will be no difference in the characterization of the leader behaviors and styles among presidents of HBCUs as perceived by the upper echelon administrators of each university.

Question Two:

Do differences in governing structure, land grant status, enrollment, leader's age and age of the institution affect the leadership behaviors among the presidents?
**Null Hypothesis:** There will be no relationship between the leadership style of four year HBCU presidents and selected factors (i.e., governing structure, land grant status, enrollment, and age of the institution).

**Question Three:**

Do presidents of HBCUs perceive their institutions’ futures to be linked to their leadership, and how are these perceptions affected by differences in enrollment, age of the institution, leader age, and leader tenure in office?

**Null Hypothesis:** There will be no relationship between the way HBCU presidents perceive the importance of their leadership to the institution’s future and the enrollment, age of the institution, leader age, and leader tenure in office.

**Question Four**

How does the way in which presidents of HBCUs define leadership effectiveness compare with definitions found in leadership theory?

**Null Hypothesis:** There will be no difference in the definitions of leadership effectiveness between that espoused by the presidents and the definitions found in leadership theory.

**Question Five**

Do differences in governing structure, land grant status, enrollment, and age of the institution affect leader perceptions of effectiveness among the presidents?

**Null Hypothesis:** There will be no variances in the leaders perceptions of effectiveness based on factors such as governing structure, land grant status, enrollment, and age of the institution?
**Question Six:**

How do the leadership behaviors of the most effective leaders as nominated by their peers compare with those not nominated: and what are their similarities, if any, in the situations and governing structure?

**Null Hypothesis:** There will be no difference in the behaviors and characteristics of the most effective leaders as nominated by their peers by situation and governing structure and those not nominated.
CHAPTER III

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research design for this study, defines the population and the resulting study sample, explains the human rights protection for participants, and describes the instruments and the methods of measurement for the variables tested. This chapter also includes a discussion concerning data collection procedures, as well as analytical methods.

Research Design

A survey research methodology was used to collect the data for the investigation into HBCU leader behavior and characteristics, and to obtain the espoused definitions of leadership by the presidents and upper-echelon administrators/administration. This survey was conducted using two forms. Personal interviews were also conducted with presidents most frequently nominated by their peers as being most effective.

Population and Sample

The institutions were identified from the 1996 Minority Online Information System (MOLIS) on the World Wide Web and confirmed by a 1997 membership roster of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education Conference Program. Presently, there are 36 colleges and universities in the prescribed population.
throughout the U.S. and its territories. The entire population of 36 public four-year historical black colleges and universities formed before 1954 was contacted for this study. Only 34 of the 36 institutions in the population had presidents seated. Each president and three of their upper echelon administrators were contacted for participation. The presidents and upper echelon administrators were identified from personnel rosters from each institutions' Internet web site. Telephone numbers, addresses, and other important information were downloaded into a database for use with mailing labels and development of a contact list. A study sample of 136 was pursued, 34 presidents and 102 upper echelon administrators. One hundred and thirty-six surveys were mailed. The survey returns produced a study sample of 31. The sample included presidents who headed colleges in 16 different states. All presidents who received at least one nomination as being an effective president were interviewed. Seven unstructured interviews were conducted using the Leadership Survey as a guide.

Human Rights Protection

Before the initiation of this research, approval was obtained from the Human Subjects Review Board at the State University of New York at Buffalo. The presidents and upper echelon administrators were mailed a cover letter and both surveys. The cover letter (Appendix A) explained the importance of the research and the need for their participation. The letter assured each respondent that their responses would only be reported in the aggregate and that individual responses would remain confidential. Each survey was coded and code numbers only for analysis of the data identified respondents. Since grouped responses were used in the data analysis, there was no identification of any individual responses in the reporting of quantitative results.
In order to obtain personal interviews, based on the frequency of nominations for being more effective, each president nominated was advised of such nomination, and contacted for an interview. In reporting the interview results, individual responses are used anonymously to capture the essence of the group consensus about effective leadership.

**Instrumentation**

There were two instruments used in this study. One instrument, the Leadership Survey (LS) questionnaire, was developed specifically for use with this study, and was designed to obtain population-specific data and perceptions of this sample about factors influencing their leadership and their conception of effective leadership. The questionnaire was pre-tested for reliability and ambiguity. It was also necessary to estimate the time needed for completion, to uncover any misunderstandings, ambiguity, and hostilities or personal problems that may have been generated by the ordering or tone of the questions. This instrument was also used as the interview guide for clarification of the open-ended questions with the leaders identified by their peers as most effective.

The other instrument, The Leadership Profile (TLP), first developed by Sashkin in 1974 to assess leadership effectiveness by examining a variety of variables and combinations, has been used for several years and has been modified as new discoveries have been made in the study of leadership effectiveness. This instrument has developed over the past decade in response to a paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1970) with respect to leadership theory. The TLP is designed to assess the perceptions of the leader (self) and the perceptions of others (observer) about the leadership in order to develop a
comprehensive description of leadership qualities. The TLP provides a measure of both transactional and transformational leadership and has been shown valid in measuring both. These two styles do not have an either/or relationship. Together they produce the combination of behaviors seen in most effective leaders. The questionnaire has been validated and tested for reliability with different groups of managers, chief executive officers of corporations, and leaders of public and private educational institutions (Sashkin, 1996).

**Measurement and Variables**

Both instruments were used to gather perceptions of the presidents and their upper echelon administrators in order to develop a complete evaluation and profile of each leader. The leaders provided a self-perception as well as an evaluation of their peers by selecting the most effective leader in their population according to their own definition of effective leadership. The LS, included in Appendix B, consists of three parts. Part I had seven questions; each respondent was asked to indicate their level of agreement on a five point scale with statements about variates of each major variable found in the literature. Questions one, five, six and seven focus on situational and organizational context. In question five, each respondent had an opportunity to provide other variates that may affect leader effectiveness, that might have been unique to these institutions, or that did not surface in the literature. Questions two, three, and four provide data on leader behavior.

Part II of the LS had a single two-part question. This particular question provided the presidents with the opportunity to espouse a theory of effective leadership of these institutions. Each respondent was asked to identify the most effective public HBCU
president, state the criteria used, and define effective leadership in their own terms. In Part III, of the LS data were collected on personal characteristics including age, race, gender, educational background, and length of term in office. Two of the questions on the LS assess whether the leaders perceive that the institution can and will survive over time.

Data on some of the situation and organization variates including size/enrollment, institutional age, control, level, and governing structure were collected from existing documents. These data were categorized using nominal, ordinal, and interval scales. The primary sources included the Minority On-line Information System, Peterson’s Guidebook On-line, and HBCU Home pages on the World Wide Web. Content analysis of personal interviews and existing profiles of the institutions were also used to obtain data on some of the situation and organization variates, including size, enrollment, control, degree level, and organization and governing structure.

The TLP, included in Appendix C, consisted of 50 items forming ten scales comprised of five items each. In this forced choice approach, items were ordered so that respondents read and made a choice about an item without knowing that the item was part of a specific scale. Two of the questions on the scale were negatively stated to assess reliability of the responses. Table 1 below lists the leadership scales, variables and variates measured by the TLP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Variates</th>
<th>Leadership Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured, instill same in others</td>
<td>Scale 7 Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of power and influence</td>
<td>Scale 8 Follower-Centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Scale 9 Visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops shared values and beliefs</td>
<td>Scale 10 Principled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, Skills, and Resources</td>
<td>Scale 1 Capable Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets goals and expectations Behavior</td>
<td>Scale 2 Reward Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal, Vivid, Listener</td>
<td>Scale 3 Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Integrity, reliable, trustworthy</td>
<td>Scale 4 Credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for others, influence</td>
<td>Scale 5 Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, energy, risk taker</td>
<td>Scale 6 Creative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is considerable discourse on the contrast between transactional and transformational leadership. By design, this instrument includes two scales devoted to the assessment of transactional behaviors as part of the combination of behaviors used to assess style or effective leadership. The capable management scale and the reward equity scales are used to assess transactional leadership. The capable management scale measures how well the leader accomplishes the day to day basic administrative tasks. The reward equity scale measures the degree to which leaders make clear and explicit their goals and performance expectations as well as how well they deliver on the rewards promised.
The transformational leadership behavior assessment consists of four scales to measure effectiveness or determine leadership style: 1) communications leadership, 2) credible leadership, 3) caring leadership and 4) creative leadership. The communications leadership scale measures the ability to manage and direct the attention of others through clear and focused interpersonal communications; it assesses the way in which a leader gets complicated ideas across and whether they are able to focus others on key ideas.

The credible leadership scale deals with a leader’s perceived integrity. The five questions used for this measurement focus on reliability and trustworthiness and how it is established. This scale is closely aligned with the scale of caring leadership.

The caring leadership scale focuses on the concern for others and the degree of that concern. It assesses the consistency with which a leader demonstrates respect and concern for others. It questions the extent of the respect for other people’s feelings, as well as the value and respect they show for differences.

The creative leadership scale assessed the entrepreneurial actions of a leader by questioning the extent to which they took risks, accepted challenges, created opportunities, and spent time and energy worrying about failure.

The leadership characteristics were assessed using four scales also. They include 1) visionary leadership, 2) follower-centered leadership, 3) confident leadership, and 4) principled-centered leadership. The visionary leadership scale measured a leader’s ability to define and express clearly a future for the organization. The questions in the assessment related back to the leader’s ability to deal with ambiguity and complexity as well as the knowledge required to achieve the vision. The scale also assessed the involvement of followers in the planning and implementation process.
The follower-centered leadership scale focused on the positive use of power and influence to see if group and organizational goals were achieved. This scale measures the degree to which the leader sees followers as empowered partners.

The confident leadership scale assessed the degree of self-assurance of a leader and the level to which they believe they control their own fate. This scale also measured the extent to which the leader is able to instill the same self-confidence in followers. The principle-centered leadership scale measured whether a leader helps develop and support shared values and beliefs with the organization. It assessed their management of change, whether they can create consensus or develop effective teamwork.

**Assumptions**

The research study assumed that:

1) The upper echelon administrators interact and are involved with the president on a variety of university concerns, and are in a position to evaluate the outcomes of decisions and presidential behaviors;

2) The presidents have been given authority by their governing boards to manage and lead the college or university in their charge;

3) The upper echelon administrator’s perceptions of the leadership qualities and behaviors of the presidents are measurable.

**Limitations**

1) The selection of only the public HBCUs formed prior to 1954 as the sample for study may have biased the findings, and does not allow generalizations to be made to other historically black or predominantly black colleges and universities.
2) By administering the TLP and LS instruments through the mail, the meaning of the questions may have been interpreted differently. Although, the instrument has high validity and reliability as tested through a variety of research samples, the possibility of misinterpretation always exists.

3) The non-participation of one institution's upper echelon administrators, as well as the vacancy of two university presidents, are other sources of limitation. Only 31 presidents of 34 institutions were included in the study.

4) All of the interviews took place at meetings arranged at national conferences. More information may have been gained by making site visits to each campus.

5) The sample of respondents did not include the perceptions of people in authority over the presidents. The added perception of this level of perception would enrich the data and provide another dimension to the leader/follower relations.

Validity

Large sets of national data have been gathered and factor analyzed by Sashkin, Rosenbach, and Sashkin (1997). The results provided support for the basic structure of the TLP, adding construct validity for both self and observer ratings. The analysis reported in detail in the latest TLP and LBQ Manual (Sashkin 1996), gives strong support to the scale construction of the TLP. All of the personal characteristic scales appear as clear and independent factors. In summary, factor analysis on large sets of TLP data provide moderate to strong support for the construct validity of the instrument. Overall, recent validity research using the TLP is consistent with the results of this study.

A pilot test of the TLP and the LS was used with a small group consisting of three presidents and two upper echelon administrators from non-participating institutions prior
to administering the survey to validate the LS and obtain an overall assessment of the questionnaire. The validation panel was used to establish face and content validity for presidents and upper echelon officers, as well as to establish time to completion.

The members of the panel were sent a copy of the Leadership Survey, a brief questionnaire titled “Instructions for the Validation Panel” (see Appendix D), as well as a letter of instruction. All five of the panel members responded to the questionnaire. All but one responded that the questionnaire would be useful in obtaining information regarding the particulars about leadership in HBCUs, but suggested that the personal interview would be a necessary follow-up to clarify the open-ended question regarding leadership effectiveness. The one respondent who did not agree based his concern around the ability of the sample to identify the “most effective” leader due to the respondent’s lack of information about the situations in other institutions.

Based on the feedback from the validation panel, interviews were conducted with all presidents who were nominated as effective instead of only interviewing those most frequently nominated. Interviews with presidents not receiving a large number of nominations, however, were used to help analyze and interpret the results. The various minor suggestions were incorporated into the formal instrument before it was mailed out and incorporated into the interviews.

The LS results supported the validity of the TLP responses by the level of agreement when certain statements were presented on both instruments. For example, Scale 9 on the TLP had a reliability coefficient of .866 in this study and on the five-point scale of the LS the presidents’ mean was 4.407, (sd, .888); the upper echelon administrators’ mean was 4.200, (sd, .784). The national tests reported an alpha of .568.
Reliability

The TLP has never been used to measure the behaviors of leaders of HBCUs but it has been used to measure the leadership behavior of managers at various organizational levels in a diverse set of organizations and at Franciscan Colleges (Sashkin & Burke, 1990). This 1996 edition is the fourth major revision of Sashkin’s Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ). Minor improvements in item wording have been made in successive printings since the first printing of the 1984 Second edition. These changes have been made mostly on the basis of scale reliability analyses using Combach’s alpha, a measure of the strength of the relationships among the items that make up a particular scale.

For this study, the scale reliabilities were calculated using the SPSS covariance matrix. The matrix included the five questions that make up each scale. Reliability tests were conducted on each group of respondents as well as overall. The results of the overall tests are reported in Table 2 along with national test results. The table indicates that the scale reliabilities are comparable to the reliability test used on the national sample and in some cases more reliable. The tests conducted at the national level were assessed using the alpha. This indicates construct validity of the instrument as well as supports it reliability in measuring leadership characterization. In this study, the self-data, not shown, had lower internal scale reliabilities, particularly for the five behavior scales. This finding is also consistent with findings in the national data. The results of the national reliability tests for the TLP presented in Table 2 show the consistency and reliability of the instrument across a variety of administrations.

The alphas for the scales range from .795 to .947 with the exception of Scale 8.
Scale 8 had the lowest overall alpha at .373. This is the follower-centered scale; it measures for power and influence. This scale has a low alpha due in part to the fact that it has two separate components: the need for power per se, and the extent to which that need is directed in a pro-or anti social manner. Scale 8 assesses both personal power needs and social power. This low alpha is consistent with national data that has been documented at .366. The overall reliabilities reported on each scale show that the results of the test in this study were consistent with the national test results and in fact were slightly better than the national data across all scales. The reliability results on the visionary leadership, Scale 9, were substantially higher. The national tests reported an alpha of .568 and this study reported an alpha of .866.

The alpha for Scale 9 in this study was .866; however, nationally it was marginal at .568. Nevertheless, over the history of the use of this instrument and in this study it has been shown to be one of the strongest, both in terms of internal consistency and correlation validity. Similarly, Scale 10, principle-centered leadership, assesses the extent to which a leader manages change, achieves goals, develops effective teamwork and creates a values and beliefs consensus. Its alpha was .795 for this study. Scale 7, confident leadership had an alpha of .837. Scales 7, 8, 9 and 10 form the transformational characteristics category of the TLP.

In this study for the two groups of scales 1-2, 3-6, we find alphas above .90 for all scales except scale 3, communication leadership. The alphas for the transformational leadership behavior scales (3-6) are all above .92, expect for the communications scale (3). Grouping the scales in terms of the three categories of the TLP yields strong reliability results. It is noted that various reliability tests and results nationally have led
Table 2. Reliability Coefficients for the Ten Scales of the Leadership Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Scale</th>
<th>HBCUs (n=31)</th>
<th>National Tests* (n=149)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Capable Management</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reward Equity</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Communication</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Credible</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Caring</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Creative</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Confident</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Follower-Centered</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Visionary</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Principled-Centered</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


to continuous item revision by Sashkin (1996) to strengthen the inter-item correlation in each scale.

Data Collection and Analysis

All 34 presidents and at least three upper echelon administrators of each HBCU were contacted. The first contact with each HBCU was with the president. Each upper echelon officer was contacted directly and surveyed independently of the president. The names of the president and the upper echelon administrators were verified with university staff prior to mailing out the survey instruments directly to them. Each respondent was asked to return the surveys directly in the self-addressed envelopes provided to them. The president was not used at any time as a conduit of material or information. The TLP was presented with the LS.

Follow-ups were made in three steps. The steps of the survey follow-up included
sending reminder letters directly to the non-respondents requesting return of the survey along with an additional copy of the survey, e-mail contacts, and face to face administration of the survey. In the follow-up letter, the responsiveness of fellow presidents was emphasized. An appeal was made for the last chance to have input into this targeted research on presidents of HBCUs.

The telephone and personal interview was also used as a means to follow-up on questionnaire responses. The sample of presidents for personal interviews was selected from the returns based on the frequency of the nomination by their peers only. Personal interviews were conducted with the group of seven presidents. Each interview explained in depth the responses to Parts I and II of the Leadership Survey. The personal interviews were not used to collect new data, but to assist in interpretation of the data and for the development of an espoused definition of effective leadership in HBCUs by the presidents of HBCUs. The LS was used as the interview guide. No electronic recording devices were used. A more in-depth analysis of the questions and responses provided on the LS was sought, and the definitions of effective leadership were clarified. The personal interviews also served as a reliability check for the responses obtained from both the LS and TLP instruments.

**Data Analysis**

Descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used to analyze the data relationships. Some multiple regression techniques were also employed. This approach took into account specific variates assumed to be in operation based on the result of past research and current theory. The focus had to do with the order of priority and relative
value or importance of the variables and variates being tested on the leadership style and effectiveness of the presidents. A correlation matrix was developed for all of the variates in the conceptual model. Simple correlations measured the gross magnitude of the effect of each variate on the other variates.

Quantitative data were entered into a computer using numeric codes. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was the software used. Only the questions in Part II of the LS were examined using qualitative techniques for content to develop an espoused theory of leadership, as well as to identify the most effective leader among them. The TLP survey response forms were also forwarded to the authors of the instrument for scoring and conversion of the results to standard scores. Both raw and standard scores are used to report the results. The raw scores have been used in mechanical analyses of the returns but standard scores have been used for comparison and discussion of the leadership assessment in light of national test results.

Correlations were used to determine the levels of agreement in perceptions among the presidents. The Chi-square and t-tests of statistical significance were used on the two groups of leaders based on the total scaled score of the group associated with effective leadership and those in the group that was nominated by their peers as most effective. The data obtained from the LS were analyzed for simple relationships and associations among variables.

To respond to research question one concerning characterization of presidential leadership behaviors, the surveys were sorted by institution, by upper echelon administrator, and by president. Each questionnaire was scored and frequencies and the group means were calculated for each question by institution. The responses were then
sorted by scale and the leadership scale scores were used to determine the style of leadership of the president in each institution as perceived by their upper echelon administrator and as self perceived. Reliability tests were performed on each of the ten scales and correlation matrixes were prepared using only the scores of the upper echelon administrators to the five questions on each scale. The upper echelon group scale scores were then used to characterize the leadership style of each institution. The three overall TLP scores were then plotted on a small triangle and the triangles compared to the profiles developed for characterization of the overall leadership style as determined through the perceptions of the upper echelon administrators. The standard scores were also graphed to present a picture of the range of leadership scores.

For question two concerning variances in style based on institutional situations and organizational contexts, the upper echelon administrators scores were combined for each institution and means were calculated for each of the ten scales and the three overall TLP scores; then a correlation matrix was generated. The scale scores and the overall TLP scores were used to test for relationships and differences using chi-square and t test statistics. The institutions were classified as multi-campus using a yes or no designation, the institutional ages were calculated for 1997, the enrollment, the leaders' ages as given were grouped into categories, and the educational levels were divided into categories for analysis. The leaders' term in office was calculated by combining responses to two questions and converting the responses to years.

The ten scale scores and the three overall scores as determined by the TLP and the responses to the questions on Part I of the LS were used to answer question three concerning the presidents' agreement with the importance of their leadership to the future
of the institution. The group mean for each statement was computed and cross-tabs were run by institutional characteristic. The Pearson chi-square value was calculated as well as the Phi and Cramer's V statistics at the .05 level of significance.

A content analysis of the responses provided by the presidents, using a key word search, was used to answer question four concerning the presidents espoused definition of effective leadership. The response to question five, concerning the espoused definitions, built upon the responses to question four. The responses were sorted by institution and leader demographics and then reviewed for differences.

Question six concerning the most effective leader was answered by tabulating the frequency of nominations across all institutions for each president as nominated by their peers and as nominated by the upper echelon administrators. The presidents identified as most effective through the nomination process were pulled out as a group and compared to the group of leaders not nominated. Regression analysis was done on all combinations of variables. The raw scale scores and the overall TLP and LS scores for the most effective group were separated out and the cross-tabs, correlation, chi-square, and t-test were conducted. The standard scores were graphed and compared to national results and the results of the peer nominations were compared to the results obtained from the TLP scores. The study results follow in Chapter IV and are presented so that no institution or respondent can be identified.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter reports the results of the study which examined the espoused definition of leadership by HBCU presidents, demographic and background data of HBCU presidents, the leadership behaviors, personal characteristics, and educational background of the leaders as self-perceived and as perceived by their upper echelon administrators. The findings are presented in direct response to the six research questions. A discussion of the findings occurs immediately following all responses. Each research question is addressed independently. Descriptive, correlation, and ethnographic methods were used to analyze the data.

Institutional Characteristics and Demographics

Public Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Presidents and upper echelon administrators from all 34 public HBCUs formed before 1954 were invited to participate in the study. A total of 121 individuals returned the surveys, an overall response rate of 88.97%. Of the 34 presidents contacted, 30 (88%) participated, and 91 (89%) of the upper echelon administrators contacted participated. The responses of the upper echelon administrators covered 31 (91%) of the institutions in the sample. Seven of the presidents elected not to complete the self-perception leadership profile instrument (TLP) but did complete the Leadership Survey (LS) which contained statements with a greater focus on their institution, their definition
Because the leadership effectiveness for each institution in this study was determined by the perceptions of the upper echelon administrators, and the self-perceptions of the presidents had no bearing on the outcome of the characterizations, these institutions where the presidents did not complete the TLP were not eliminated from the study sample but the president’s self perception scores were treated as missing data. The inclusion of the responses of these presidents enriched the data and informed the understanding of the leadership of HBCUs according to the presidents’ perceptions.

Table 3 lists all of the institutions invited to participate in the study and reports whether or not they participated. It also lists selected institutional characteristics. Thirteen of the institutions in the study sample were formed as land grant colleges; the enrollment ranges from 1,357 to 10,163 students, and the age of the institution ranges from 47 to 160 years old. The mean age of the colleges and universities in the sample was 109.17 years (standard deviation, 22.33) and the mean enrollment was 4360 students, (standard deviation, 2613). All of the colleges and universities in the sample are part of statewide systems of higher education but only eight are in a multi-campus system of governance.

**Characteristics of the Presidents and Upper Echelon Administrators**

The leaders assessed in the study ranged in age from 47 – 67 years old. The mean age was 56.3 years; the standard deviation was 6.62 years. All but one of the presidents were African-American. There was one Caucasian president in the sample and three females. The survey data indicated that the presidents held the office of president for an average of 7.12 years, (standard deviation 6.13) with eight having held the position of
Table 3. Public Four Year HBCUs formed before 1954 by Institutional Name, Land Grant Status, Enrollment, and Age (P=36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Land Grant</th>
<th>1995 Enrollment</th>
<th>1997 Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama A&amp;M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.594</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama State</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.576</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany State</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluefield State</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie State</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.946</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central State</strong> 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3225</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyney</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppin State</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.175</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City State</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.694</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.034</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A &amp; M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10.133</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.609</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris-Stowe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.152</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.487</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, MO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.512</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley State</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.766</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Agriculture &amp; Technical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8.050</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.343</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk State</strong> 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.652</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah State</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina State</strong> 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.693</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Univ. &amp; A&amp;M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9.904</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee State</strong> 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8.464</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.163</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Maryland Eastern Shore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U of District of Columbia</strong> 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10.599</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.007</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Virginia State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.956</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston Salem State</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 No president at the time of study
2 No responses, refusals, or insufficient responses
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Table 4. Study Group Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable / Group</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Upper Echelon Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 46 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-56 yrs.</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-63 yrs.</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 63 yrs.</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

president for over 13 years. Ninety three percent (93%) had doctorate degrees; and of this group, 90% obtained their highest degree from a predominately white institution.

Seventy percent (70%) of all of the presidents/chancellors in the study attended an HBCU for part of their education and training. Two served as American Council of Education (ACE) Fellows. Over 70% (73.8) of the upper echelon administrators have earned doctoral degrees. 5.8% of them from a HBCU. Of the upper echelon administrators responding, 74.7% were male and 74.7% were HBCU graduates. Of the HBCU graduates, 67.3% earned bachelors degree and 26.9% earned a master’s degree from a HBCU. Over 80% (80.3) of all upper echelon administrators received their highest degree from a predominately white institution. The respondents have held their present position for a mean of 7.89 years with a standard deviation of .92 years. Six upper echelon administrators have served as ACE Fellows. The average age is 51.78 years with a standard deviation of 8.16 years. However, 24.20% of the upper echelon
administrators are over 56 years of age with ages ranging from 57 to 75 years of age. African-Americans make up 84.5% of all upper echelon administrators responding.

Results

Research Question One: Characterization of Presidential Behaviors

Is there only one or are there multiple characterizations of leadership behaviors of four-year HBCU presidents? The null hypothesis was that there would be no difference in the characterization of the leadership behaviors and styles among presidents of HBCUs as perceived by the upper echelon administrators of each university.

Table 5 provides a summary of the study sample raw scores for the observer perceptions. The raw scores are listed by individual scale and are combined for all upper echelon administrators of each university to provide a group mean for each HBCU in the sample. There are 25 possible points on each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Measured Behaviors and Leadership Scales</th>
<th>Upper Echelon Administrators (Observer)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Capable management</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Reward Equity</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Communication</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Credible</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Caring</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Creative</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Confident</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Follower-centered</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Visionary</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Principle-centered</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a group, the upper echelon administrators scored the presidents similarly across all leadership scales in that the scores are close in range. For the ten leadership scales the raw scores range between 16.94 (standard deviation 3.19) and 19.88 (standard deviation 2.67). The combined mean for the transactional scales is (18.97) slightly higher than combined means for the transformational behavior (18.34) and transformational characteristics (18.82) scales.

On the individual leadership measures, the observers rated the presidents highest on communication leadership. The top four raw scale scores according to the upper echelon administrators were communication leadership (19.88, standard deviation 2.67), visionary leadership (19.58, standard deviation 4.17), principle-centered leadership (19.23, standard deviation 4.08), and capable management (19.21, standard deviation 3.42). The lowest of the ten was credible leadership (16.94, standard deviation 3.19), creative leadership (17.76, standard deviation 2.77), confident leadership (18.07, standard deviation 3.88), and follower-centered leadership (18.38, standard deviation 3.85).

Figure 2 graphically depicts the observer responses by institution for each of the three overall scales using standard scores. By standardizing the raw scores (mean of 50 and standard deviation 10), we see how the observer ratings compare with administrations of the TLP in other organizations; and they permit an additional assessment in light of broader instrument administration. The standard scores for each institution by scale are presented in Appendix G. These distributions of scores reveal that most of the leaders (20, 64.5%) received higher scores on the transformational characteristics leadership scales. The transformational characteristic scores (black) include measures of self-confidence, power and influence, vision, and shared values.
Figure 2. Leadership Profile Scale Scores by Upper Echelon Administrators by Institution
Seven (22.5%) were rated highest on transactional leadership (checkered), which measured the presence of managerial behavior. The remaining four (13%) universities received the highest scores on transformational behavior (white) which provide measures of communications, integrity, respect and concern for others, and creativity.

In total, the chart reveals that over 77% of the universities were given higher ratings by their upper echelon administrators on the scales measuring transformational leadership and lower overall scores on managerial leadership as assessed through the transactional measures. There are variances in the leadership characterizations as perceived by the upper echelon administrators of each HBCU. While the overall scores vary, throughout the assessment of leadership in each university some patterns have emerged.

Fifteen of the universities’ scores are below the 50 point mark on all scales and 16 are above. Overall, the distribution of leader behaviors across the sample is similar to others who have been evaluated with the TLP. The scores for the group of 31 universities fall into a normal range. The overall standard scores range from a high of 71.9 to a low of 13.49. The high and the low are on the transactional leadership measures. The average observer group score for transactional leadership is 49.56; for transformational leadership behavior, 48.71; and for transformational leadership characteristics, 51.28.

Figure 3 depicts the overall profile of the sample using the diagnostic triangle developed by Rosenbach, Sashkin, and Harburg (1996), the instrument authors. The triangle provides a composite picture of the strengths and leadership development needs of the leaders using the average observer group scores.
The diagnostic triangle approach was developed to assist the leaders in analyzing their behavior. According to Rosenbach, Sashkin, and Harburg (1996) people with this profile, average in all three areas of leadership, are in an excellent position for growth and development. The triangle indicates that as a group the presidents of HBCUs have sound managerial capabilities and may already look toward transformational leadership. This profile also informs us that as a group these presidents may feel a degree of frustration in building the organization and in their efforts to manage organizational
changes and achieve their goals. Some have a high level of satisfaction and productivity while others are undeveloped as managers and exhibit few leadership qualities. Overall, this normal distribution reflects an average profile.

When the combined observer score for each university in the sample is plotted on the triangles by university. Figure 4, a variety of behavior characterizations are evident. The result reveals that their perceptions vary across six of the nine categories of leadership characterizations. Nine of the universities have average (aspiring) leaders, eight have undeveloped managers, seven have self-actualizing leaders, two have inspirational idealists, one has a visionary thinker, and four exhibit so few leadership qualities that they could not be classified. Although placed in a style group, many of the leaders exhibit characteristics that cut across more than one style or fall mid-range between two. The characterizations are not absolute but are indicative of the current behavior that may be modified as individual leader and/or university needs arise. A full description of the standards by which the characterizations are made is provided in Appendix F.

The seven self-actualizing leaders are considered to be effective leaders and are believed to have followers who report a high level of satisfaction as well as productivity. These leaders are thought to be culture builders with sound managerial ability and are in tune with the needs, values, and goals of the organization. The nine aspiring or average leaders are seen as effective managers but because of a lack of clarity with goals and paths to realizing them, they are not considered as effective transformation leaders even though there is evidence of transformational characteristics. For this, group transformational behaviors remain an area for growth.
Self-Actualizing
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For the eight presidents characterized as underdeveloped managers, there is a need to focus on personal development in management and leadership. There really is no imbalance to overcome but a need for development in all areas of management and leadership. The visionary thinker is said to have great ideas but lacks the management skills to bring the vision to reality. The lack of follower and organizational involvement creates much of this problem. The president that is characterized this way has low standard scores on all other individual leadership scale measures, the lowest being on the credible and creative leadership scales. The two inspirational idealists have visions and the skills to communicate them to others but are diagnosed as lacking an understanding of how organizations function. Thus, they are unable to manage their visions to effect a change in organizational culture although they are able to excite followers who may become committed to them and their ideas.

There is a difference in the characterization of the leadership behaviors and styles among the presidents as perceived by the upper echelon administrators of each university. The null hypothesis was rejected.

**Question 2: Leader Behavior Variances by Situation and Organizational Context**

Do differences in the governing structure, land grant status, enrollment, leaders' age, and age of the institution affect the leadership behaviors among the presidents? The null hypothesis was that there would be no significant relationship or difference in the leadership behaviors of four-year HBCU presidents and these factors. To test this, a correlation matrix, Appendix G, was generated and the relationships and differences were analyzed using 2-tail t-tests for significance. Tables 6 and 7 show categorical variates.
Table 6: Results of the t-Tests for Equality of Means for Land Grant Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLP Leadership Scale</th>
<th>Land Grant Yes (n=13)</th>
<th>Land Grant – No (n=18)</th>
<th>t-value 2-Tail</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>(Standard Deviation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable management</td>
<td>19.01 (4.04)</td>
<td>19.36 (3.00)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Equity</td>
<td>18.03 (3.90)</td>
<td>19.25 (2.97)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>19.42 (3.33)</td>
<td>20.21 (2.11)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible</td>
<td>16.16 (3.12)</td>
<td>17.50 (3.22)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>17.99 (3.71)</td>
<td>19.31 (2.33)</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>16.88 (2.55)</td>
<td>18.40 (2.82)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>17.59 (3.34)</td>
<td>18.42 (3.60)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower-centered</td>
<td>17.94 (4.33)</td>
<td>18.71 (3.57)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>19.27 (4.71)</td>
<td>19.80 (3.86)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle-centered</td>
<td>18.57 (4.20)</td>
<td>19.71 (4.04)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Results of the t-Tests for Equality of Means for Governing Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLP Leadership Scale</th>
<th>Independent Campus</th>
<th>Multi-campus System</th>
<th>t-value 2-Tail</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>(Standard Deviation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capable management</td>
<td>19.72 (3.14)</td>
<td>17.76 (3.98)</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Equity</td>
<td>19.16 (3.182)</td>
<td>17.51 (3.87)</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>20.21 (2.10)</td>
<td>18.92 (3.89)</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible</td>
<td>17.05 (2.87)</td>
<td>16.61 (4.20)</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>19.30 (2.24)</td>
<td>17.20 (4.38)</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>17.91 (2.61)</td>
<td>17.34 (3.34)</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>18.55 (3.62)</td>
<td>16.69 (4.51)</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower-centered</td>
<td>19.09 (3.59)</td>
<td>16.39 (4.12)</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>20.30 (3.44)</td>
<td>17.51 (5.53)</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle-centered</td>
<td>19.78 (3.68)</td>
<td>17.67 (5.00)</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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No significant differences were found between the behaviors of presidents and the governing structure or land grant status of the universities. The follower-centered scale had the lowest significance at .09, t-value was -1.76. The second lowest was capable management with a 2 tail significance of .17, t-value -1.42. For land grant status, the lowest 2 tail significance was .17 for creative leadership. The second lowest was on credible leadership (.26, 2 tail significance, t-value 1.16).

However, there is a difference at the .05 level of significance for age of the institution when the ten individual scale scores are correlated with the continuous variates, institution age, leader age, and enrollment. Table 8 shows that many of the correlations are negative. In fact, all scales correlated negatively with leader age and institution age, indicating negative relationships. But for enrollment, all scales correlated positively except caring (r = -.006). The significant difference is found between communication leadership and institution age (r = -.368). This test statistic indicates that the older the institution the lower the communications leadership scale score, therefore the less likely the president is to communicate effectively with others throughout the organization. The communications leadership scale is one of four scales measuring transformation behaviors and it focused on the ability to manage and direct the attention of others through clear and focused communications. It measured how the leaders got complicated ideas across and whether they were able to focus others on key ideas.

Although not meeting the specified level of significance, institution age and principled leadership had a probability of .051 (r = -.354). This scale measured leader performance in developing and supporting shared values and beliefs. It is likely that the older the institution the less likely the president is to engage followers in culture building.
Table 8: Correlation Coefficients for Institution Age, Enrollment, and Leader’s Age by the Ten Leadership Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLP Leadership Scale</th>
<th>Institution Age Pearson Correlation r (Probability p)</th>
<th>Enrollment Pearson Correlation r (Probability p)</th>
<th>Leader’s Age Pearson Correlation r (Probability p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capable management</td>
<td>-.164 (.378)</td>
<td>.010 (.958)</td>
<td>-.237 (.300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Equity</td>
<td>-.240 (.193)</td>
<td>.061 (.746)</td>
<td>-.238 (.299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-.368 * (.042)</td>
<td>.188 (.310)</td>
<td>-.188 (.414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible</td>
<td>-.298 (.104)</td>
<td>.220 (.234)</td>
<td>-.260 (.256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>-.269 (.144)</td>
<td>-.006 (.975)</td>
<td>-.193 (.401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>.112 (.550)</td>
<td>.102 (.586)</td>
<td>-.212 (.356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>-.228 (.217)</td>
<td>.072 (.700)</td>
<td>-.237 (.301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower-centered</td>
<td>-.215 (.246)</td>
<td>.096 (.607)</td>
<td>-.204 (.375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>-.313 (.087)</td>
<td>.115 (.537)</td>
<td>-.121 (.601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle-centered</td>
<td>-.354 (.051)</td>
<td>.103 (.581)</td>
<td>-.161 (.485)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p<.05

The visionary leadership scale also approached significance with a probability statistic of .087 (r = -.312) and may be predictable by the institution age. This leadership scale measured long term planning ability and follower involvement in the planning processes.
The correlation matrix in Appendix G shows that the ten scales on the instrument have high positive linear relationships with each other and that all are significant at the $p \leq .000$ level. The lowest correlation coefficient is between communications leadership and credible leadership at .603. The highest coefficient (.946) is between the capable management leadership scale and the confidence leadership scale. The correlation coefficients inform us that all of the leadership behaviors tested are strong and positively interrelated. Through these analyses, it has been shown that the situations and organization of the HBCU have had a significant impact on the communications leadership behavior at the HBCU and that this significance is likely to be predicted by institutional age. The null hypothesis is rejected because there are variances and significant differences in leadership behaviors by situation and organization factors.

**Question 3: Importance of Presidential Leadership to the University’s Future**

Do presidents of HBCUs perceive their university’s futures to be linked to their leadership, and how are these perceptions affected by differences in enrollment, age of the institution, leader age, and tenure of the leader in office? The null hypothesis was that there would be no relationship between the level of agreement with specific statements and the organizational and personal characteristics mentioned above.

The results shown in Table 9 from Part I of the Leadership Survey (LS), represent the level of agreement for all presidents and upper echelon administrators. The highest level of agreement was with the statements (1, 2, and 12) concerning the mission of the college or university. Over 80% (82.4) of the presidents agree that there is a continuing need to have a clear definition of their universities’ identities and missions.
**Table 9. Leadership Survey Results - Level of Agreement with Statements Specific to the HBCU and their Institutional Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1 Statement</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>UE Administrators</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) There is a continuing need for clear definition of our college/university identity and mission.</td>
<td>4.074*</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>4.345*</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This college/university has a clearly stated mission and strategy to achieve it.</td>
<td>4.407*</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The future of this college/university is directly related to the president’s leadership.</td>
<td>4.107</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Communication is clear and free flowing throughout this HBCU.</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The demands placed on the president of this HBCU far exceed those placed on presidents of other institutions in my state.</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>1.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The future of the HBCU is more dependent on outside/external influences than internal decisions and management.</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest source of pressure requiring attention from the president of this HBCU is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>UE Administrators</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7) Enrollment Decline</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>1.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Political Inhospitality</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>2.930</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Financial Support</td>
<td>4.280*</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>4.225*</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Governance/Board of Trustees, Central Administration</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>3.463</td>
<td>1.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Public HBCUs are in trouble throughout the country.</td>
<td>2.519</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>3.046</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) HBCUs meet or have the capacity to meet societal needs that have not been met by other segments in higher education today.</td>
<td>4.500*</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>4.523*</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= not true at all, 2= a little true, 3= somewhat true, 4= mostly true, 5= completely true

*One of the four highest mean scores for the group
Over 92% (92.6%) of the presidents agreed that the college or university where they worked had a clearly defined mission and strategy for achieving it. The mean president rating was 4.07, standard deviation 1.57, and upper echelon administrator rating was 4.41, standard deviation .888. Approximately 89.3% of the presidents agreed that the HBCUs meet or have the capacity to meet a societal need that has not been met by other segments in higher education. A similar percentage (89.6%) of upper echelon administrators also agreed. Both groups indicated the highest level of agreement with this statement. The group mean for the presidents was 4.50, standard deviation .793, compared to an observer mean of 4.523, standard deviation .694.

There was also a high level of agreement around financial support as a source of pressure requiring attention from the president. The presidents’ mean score was 4.280, standard deviation of .89, and the upper echelon administrators group mean was 4.225, standard deviation, .842. The statement concerning the importance of their leadership to the future of their college or university was also rated as mostly true. The group mean for the presidents was 4.107 with a standard deviation of 1.29, supports this finding. This rating reflects the scores of over 78% of the presidents; 53.6% of the presidents chose completely true, and another 25% chose mostly true. The upper echelon administrators gave this statement a high rating also. The group mean was 4.14, standard deviation .856. However, there is no significant relationship between the level of agreement among the presidents about the future of the university and its dependence on their leadership by governing structure, the institutions’ formation as a land grant college, and the level of education of the president at the \( p \leq .05 \) level of significance.
The correlation and analysis of the variance for the universities also indicate no variance at the \( p \leq .05 \) level of significance for enrollment, leader age, and the leaders' tenure in office. However there is variation by institution age in the level of agreement with the future related to the president's leadership \((p = .0301)\). This difference is explained by the difference in the extreme groups. Three (10\%) of the presidents labeled this statement as not true at all. The average institution age for those rating the statement as not true was 68.4 years, standard deviation 44.23. The average institutional age of those rating the statement as mostly true was 108.37, standard deviation 30.37. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Other statements on the LS related to the university's future also support this finding. The presidents and upper echelon administrators did not agree that outside influences affected the future of their college or university more than internal influences. On statement six of the LS which questions the external influences on the future, the presidents rating was 2.75, standard deviation, 1.206 and the observer rating was 2.909, standard deviation 1.157. Political inhospitality as a source of pressure was also not among the top pressures on the president with a rating of 2.76, standard deviation 1.234 from the presidents, and 2.93, standard deviation 1.313 from the administrators.

Enrollment decline was not rated highly (2.5, standard deviation 1.351) as a source of pressure for the HBCU by the presidents. In addition, the presidents do not agree that the public HBCUs are in trouble throughout the country as is evident in the rating of 2.519, standard deviation 1.281. In the interviews it was revealed that many HBCUs have not been supported with facilities and other infrastructure needs to keep pace with their aging physical plants and with other colleges and universities in their state.
and this directly impacts on their future. One president said, "We must make bricks out of straw; so what else in new? We've done it for years."

**Question 4: Espoused Definition of Effective Leadership by the Leaders**

How does the way in which presidents of HBCUs define leadership effectiveness compare with definitions found in leadership theory? It was hypothesized that the presidents espoused definitions of leadership effectiveness would be the same as found in leadership theory. This hypothesis is supported.

The review of the definitions submitted as part of the evaluation criteria for selecting the most effective leaders has shown that the leaders of HBCUs offer a variety of approaches to leadership. To determine if a consensus could be drawn from all of the espoused definitions, all of the written responses were content analyzed. Each respondent's definition was divided into segments based upon the variates identified in the literature and presented in the conceptual framework for this study. Each response was classified and paired to variates in the transactional or transformational leadership scales. All of the variates were represented. Although some leaders were more transactional in their approach, others chose more charismatic and personal attributes to amplify their choice for inclusion as a component of effective leadership. Some of the personal characteristics described by the presidents included phrases, such as, "political astuteness, and one who enjoys the general respect of the various constituencies and multitudes of communities with which he/she must interact."

The espoused definitions of leadership provided by the presidents of the HBCUs indicate that their views are grounded in leadership theory. The essence of many of their
comments is summarized in the following quote from one submission:

An effective leader is a person who can...
project priorities for the institution;
succeed in getting individuals to willingly buy into the priorities;
provide necessary resources needed to carry out priorities;
provide necessary freedom to enable individuals to accomplish the priorities; and,
set-up the necessary monitoring system(s) to ensure ascertainment of the priorities.

The content of this offering suggests that an effective leader establishes and works within the goals and mission of the organization, is principled, develops shared values and beliefs, is follower-centered, a capable manager, has the knowledge, skills and resources available, as well as exercises power and influence to accomplish the university’s mission. These ideas and variates are all part of the conceptual framework for this study and, in effect, are components of transactional and transformational leadership. The effective leader is aware of the need to be and is a culture builder.

Other responses supporting personal characteristics include awareness of the leader’s self-confidence, values and beliefs, power and influence. The need for and the ability to use power and influence were the most frequently submitted variates. In fact, one president offered that an effective leader must be “effective at convincing influential persons that they should support and fund the institution.” Another said that an effective president must “have the ability to inspire others and build an effective team as well as have the ability to express appreciation to team members. An effective leader is a person who can influence people.”

According to the HBCU presidents, the personal characteristics of an effective
leader also include “good management skills, faculty support, ability to persuade others, high performance, high standards and strive for excellence at all times.” An effective leader, they say, “focuses on the positive side and exhibits a positive attitude, has high self-esteem and a high level of self-confidence.” Honesty, integrity, and forthrightness were among the core values and at the top of these presidents’ scale for an evaluation of effectiveness.

The most frequently reported variates among the situation and organizational components of leadership were financial support and political climate. The presidents say that effective leadership should be based on...

Growth of the university;
Financial stability;
Accomplishments of the university under the leader’s administration;
Project priorities for the institution;
Size of the student body, academic programs and the faculty; as well as
Enrollment growth and campus development.

Many presidents agreed that necessary components of effective leadership include “graduating highly successful students, attracting a significant amount of federal and private sector resources and working effectively with state leaders.” One president said that “measures of effectiveness should include the student retention and employment rates for five, ten, and fifteen years later.” Others had difficulties naming the most effective leader because of a lack of awareness of the “circumstances under which they operate.” This points to the relative value that they place on the organizational context.

"An effective leader," another president said, "is good at articulating the needs of the institution and all HBCUs as well as securing funding for the institution from a
variety of sources. The effective leader is a great fund-raiser and recruiter of students and faculty for the school."

Above all, one president said, an effective leader is...

One who recognizes the need to institute a political model, one that caters to appropriate constituents and is effective in achieving the mission of the organization, provides national representation, restructures the campus when necessary, and is recognized nationally, statewide, and has gubernatorial support. The effective leader has a public posture on the national scene, political know-how with Congress, the White House, and state legislatures.

There was also considerable agreement on the variates comprising leader behavior. Communication skills and management ability surfaced as the most frequently expressed components although the importance of credibility, vision, and creativity were also cited. The relatively high importance of communication was confirmed earlier in the ratings on the communications leadership scale. Some of the statements follow. An effective leader...

Hires good people at the Vice Presidential level;  
Is responsive, a visionary and a good communicator;  
Manages the university well and has a solid audit;  
Is charismatic and inspires people;  
Is caring, concerned, inviting, devoted;  
Has professional credibility; and,  
Is a people person.

Concerning vision, the presidents agreed that "awareness that change is irrevocable is required." One said, "effective leadership includes a commitment to insure success, consistency, focus, competency, and action research. Our youngsters must be prepared and ready." Another president said, "unity and continuity of effort are needed to realize a vision."
An effective leader was also said to be effective at keeping faculty, staff and students on task at their university, and at avoiding petty squabbles in addition to showing good financial stewardship and leading curriculum development. The leadership and management style of an effective leader also includes delegation of authority, good human relation’s skills, a team approach and a commitment to excellence. Collectively the presidents have expressed definitions of leadership that are grounded in transformation and visionary leadership theory.

**Question 5: Variance in Definitions by Situation and Organization**

Do differences in governing structure, enrollment, age of the institution affect leader perceptions of effectiveness among the presidents?

A content analysis of all definitions was reviewed after the HBCUs were categorized based on size, governing structure, age of the institution, leader age, leader educational level and background, and the tenure of the leader in office. The results revealed that all groups included components of the three variables in the conceptual framework. However, the definitions provided by the presidents nominated by their peers as highly effective had a pronounced focus on leader behavior variates. One president in this group stated that an effective leader has the…

- Ability to state a clear vision, establish short and long-term goals and make remarkable progress towards their achievement in a short period of time [visionary];
- Ability to inspire others and to build an effective team [confidence];
- Ability to delegate authority to get the job done [management ability];
- Ability to express appreciation to team members [principled, values and beliefs];
- Ability to clearly communicate his/her vision so it is understood
intellectually and emotionally [communication];
Ability to project a sense of urgency to do what needs to be done [creativity];
Ability to relate to individuals at all levels of the institution [caring, concern for others]; and,
Makes one feel good to work for her/him [interpersonal, caring and respectful].

When interviewed the two presidents nominated most frequently by their peers as most effective had a clear focus on the long range vision and positioning of the university in higher education, as well as the need for good internal management. The value-added concept was an important component for those nominated as most effective among them. The need to have national influence and political acumen and savvy were among the most important behaviors. An awareness of and the ability to manage internal and external communities were highlighted. Knowing the faculty, the students, as well as state officials are necessary components of effective leadership according to them.

During the personal interviews, when questioned about how leadership in a HBCU differed from leadership at prominently white institutions, the general response was that the components of leadership were the same but the “social context and history of the institutions require a different approach to management,” summarized one president. “Leadership in the HBCU is more difficult because institutional relationships are exacerbated by the lack of resources,” said another; “a more involved and hands-on approach is required.” Moreover, another president stated that “many people don’t have the respect for mid-level management. They want you (the president) to tell them what to do. They want direction from the top.” One president said that fund raising was difficult because, “I have to be there day-to-day to manage and we have not traditionally sought endowments.”
One president described the difference this way. "The fundamental difference is race; the difference is based on the historic origin of the colleges and universities. The HBCU was created to perpetuate a racial dichotomy in society." Education, this president said, "is an exclusionary process." Another president said that "in efforts of managing and leading the HBCU, there is a different upward pressure (from inside and outside) to maintain the racial integrity." This president concluded that management of the HBCU is "compounded by the race factor," also. The presidents explained that having a racial identity among the university's core values limits the HBCU president's flexibility to provide leadership. In fact, several presidents said, "Race is a variable that impedes leadership." One leader summed it this way, "the HBCU president must be more creative because they have challenges unique to the racial dichotomy." These challenges include developing a unique niche in higher education, a vision and programs that they are able to sell to and attract students, and develop unique features that will set them apart from other colleges and universities. On the one hand, they explained that because access to majority colleges and universities increased students who would have chosen the HBCU now have more options open. On the other hand, it was also explained, that because of the recent challenges to affirmative action and race based admissions and financial aid, students who were admitted on those bases and are affected will return to the HBCU. One leader concluded, "We often forget our history but we must remember what we have to preserve." (A place for our youth in higher education).

The presidents nominated as being most effective said that it is important to know the faculty as well as the students and, to the extent possible, have them involved in the institution's governance. The definitions offered by the presidents did not vary according
to organizational situation or institutional characteristics but did vary by leader characteristics. The older leaders and the leaders holding the position of president for a longer tenure were more transformational in their focus and contributions to the definition of effective leadership. The younger leaders and the leaders with less tenure expressed greater emphasis on transactional leadership and the need for good management. The more seasoned presidents were also concerned about institutional leadership in scholarship and teaching. They associated the image of the university with leadership effectiveness. An important component in determining effective leadership they said is the number of students that graduate each year and the contributions they make to society.

The presidents said the graduates of HBCUs are an important component of the national image and the perception of their overall effectiveness as leaders. Their commitment to advancing the number of graduates with a quality education is one of their primary goals. The number of national merit scholars at their college or university, their ability to raise funds for their college or university, and a strong athletic program are important aspects of effective leadership too. Throughout the interviews with those nominated as most effective, student success and the need for the HBCU in higher education was highlighted. The presidents also state that the university size affects the leadership because the level of nurturing and interaction with the faculty and students changes.

The presidents of HBCUs definition of leadership includes all of the components of leadership as defined in the literature and they have recognized culture building as a major component of leadership. There were no expressed differences in the collective
Question 6: The Most Effective Leader According to Peer Nominations

How does the leadership behaviors of the most effective leaders as nominated by their peers compare with those not nominated; and what are the similarities, if any, in the situations and governing structure? It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the behaviors and characteristics between the presidents nominated and those not nominated.

Part II of the Leadership Survey requested that the presidents name their most effective peer and include the criteria for their selection in their espoused definition of leadership effectiveness. Seven different eligible names were returned. Only one emerged with a distinct plurality of the nominations, receiving 42.90% of all peer nominations. The next highest ranked leader received 21.40%. The upper echelon administrators selected the same president as the most effective leader, with 42.30% of the eligible nominations. The second most frequently nominated president by the upper echelon administrators received only 13.46% of the eligible nominations. This was not the same president selected by presidential peers. However, the third most frequently nominated president (11.53%) by upper echelon administrators was the second choice of the presidents. Table 10 provides a summary of the TLP standard scores by university for each scale according to the observer’s perceptions of the seven nominated as more effective by their peers. The standard scores for the two most frequently nominated by their peers as more effective are highlighted in the table.
Table 10. TLP Standard Scores for all Presidents Nominated as Most Effective by
Their Peers –Ten Scales and Three Overall Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Measured Behaviors and Leadership Scales</th>
<th>University ID Observer Group Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>43.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Capable management</td>
<td>40.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Reward Equity</td>
<td>46.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>43.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Communication</td>
<td>43.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Credible</td>
<td>41.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Caring</td>
<td>42.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Creative</td>
<td>45.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>45.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Confident</td>
<td>38.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Follower-Centered</td>
<td>52.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Visionary</td>
<td>46.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Principled</td>
<td>45.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most frequently nominated
** Second most frequently nominated

For the most effective leader nominated, the ten sub-scale standard scores had means ranging from a low of 41.45 on the visionary leadership scale to the high (51.88) on the principled leadership scale, producing an overall balanced profile. The most effective leader nominated has an average and balanced profile showing little difference among the overall scales with means of 45.93 for transformational leadership, 48.57 for transformational behaviors, and 46.43 for transformational characteristics. The overall sub-scale score was highest for transformational behaviors. The most frequently
nominated leader had highest standard scores from the upper echelon administrators on
the principled leadership (51.88), communications leadership (51.28), and creative
leadership (49.85) scales.

With the best rating being in principled leadership, it is evident that the observers
in this university believe that this president reflects the values and beliefs of their
organization to an average extent and is equally able to manage change; the capable
management standard score is 48.72. The principled leadership scale also measured the
perception of the president’s ability to develop effective teamwork and to get the job
done with internal consensus as well as manage outside pressure for change. This
president is perceived to exercise average communications leadership through focused
interpersonal communications, expressed knowledge, and a clear understanding of key
issues and priorities internal and external to the university. The creative leadership score
(49.85) speaks to the perception about this president’s willingness to take risks and create
opportunities for the university and the followers. This score indicates that the upper
echelon officers have an average feeling about being empowered and believe that the
president has taken adequate measures to insure their success at meeting challenges
provided to them. The credible leadership score of 48.47 supported this finding. The
credibility scale measured perceptions about the reliability and integrity of the president
through promise keeping, consistency of actions, and trust of others over a period of time.

According to the nominations, this leader is more effective from the external
perspectives than is indicated by the TLP observer scores. Effectiveness, according to
the literature, is believed to be significantly associated with the presence of both
transaction and transformation leadership. The president most frequently nominated, as
being more effective is perceived to be more effective by peer as well as the upper echelon administrators of all four-year public HBCUs in the sample. Yet, according to the TLP overall standard scores, this president displays an average level of transaction and transformation leadership behaviors and characteristics. Figures 5 and 6 present similar results for the second most frequently nominated president. The TLP standard scores place these two presidents in the average range on all scales; meaning the most effective HBCU presidents, according to their peers and external HBCU upper echelon administrators, are viewed as exhibiting an average level of leadership by their own staffs. These behaviors correspond to the aspiring leader characterization by the TLP diagnostic triangle.

Figure 5, graphically displays the three overall observer standard scores for each university and shows that of the seven leaders nominated, three exceed the midpoint on the TLP scale. The two most frequently nominated have overall scores just below the midpoint and the remaining two nominated have overall standard scores at or near the mean. The three overall leadership scale scores, given by the upper echelon administrators to all seven leaders, show deviation across the scales. When the overall standard scores for the seven are compared to the entire sample (Figure 2), it reveals that of the 13 university presidents that exceeded the mid-point on the TLP (putting them in the effective range) only three received nominations from their peers as most effective.

Figure 6 presents the overall observer rating of each leader nominated as being more effective by their peers in contrast to the overall observer profile developed for the sample.
Figure 5. The LeadershipProfile Scale Scores of the Presidents Nominated as Effective by their Peers

* Most frequently nominated  ** Second most frequently nominated
Figure 6. TLP Overall Scale Score Comparison for the More Effective Presidents
Copyright (c) 1996 by Rosenbach, Sashkin, and Harburg
A review of this group through the diagnostic triangles indicates that according to the instrument's authors, the standard scores for five of the presidents including the two most frequently nominated fall around the average range and are considered "aspiring;" two others fall into the self-actualizing characterization. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Some of the institutional characteristics of the two most frequently nominated by their peers are listed below in Table 11. Both leaders are from universities that were formed as land grant colleges. The mean age of the universities is 108 years; this is slightly lower than the mean of the remaining sample. The mean enrollment for these two is more than twice the mean for other universities in the sample. One of the universities is part of a statewide multi-campus, centrally directed system of higher education and the other works with an independent governing board. The most frequently nominated of the two was from the independently managed university organizational structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic / Variable</th>
<th>Other Presidents (n=29)</th>
<th>Most Frequently Nominated (n=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Age</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Mean</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>9092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the two self-actualizing leaders who were nominated by their peers and reached the transformational leadership effective level according to the TLP were both from schools with combined enrollments under 7,000 students. One of the leaders was a female and one of the universities was also formed as a land grant college. The female that was nominated by peers was said to be caring, energetic, concerned and devoted. The other leader was described by peers as “well trained and having understanding about the management and authority of the HBCU”. This same leader was said to work well with the faculty, students, and administrators. External upper echelon administrators nominated this president as well. The external upper echelon administrators said he was nominated because “he provides the vision and allows others to carry out their responsibilities.” This leader was said to embody the essence of effective leadership. He was presented as a president who possessed all the characteristics of a transformational leader and good sound manager. This leader’s age fell below the mean age for the presidents. His scores are listed in position six of Figures 5 and 6.

The two leaders that received high marks on the TLP, and were nominated through the peer nomination process, also have a national presence in the community of higher education. They also obtained their terminal degrees from predominately white institutions.

In supplemental analyses the scores of the responding presidents were reviewed as a group. Table 12 reveals that collectively the presidents rated themselves higher on the leadership scales than did their upper echelon administrators.
Table 12. The Leadership Profile Scores for the Sample – Group Means
Ten Scales Means with Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Measured Behaviors and Leadership Scales</th>
<th>Presidents Raw Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Upper Echelon Administrators Raw Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Capable management</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Reward Equity</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Communication</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Credible</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Caring</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Creative</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Confident</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Follower-centered</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Visionary</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Principle-centered</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two most effective presidents rated themselves higher than their observers also, highlighting their self-awareness and confidence. On the transformational characteristics' measures, the confidence leadership scale was second only to the scale measuring vision.

The difference between the two group means on the ten leadership scales was not statistically significant but the occurrence is different from the national test norms that reveal that many leaders are modest in their self-assessment. In this case, where the self perceptions are higher, the HBCU leaders (as indicated in the interviews) may be rating themselves on a set of actions that are broader and not fully understood by their internal administrators.

The TLP scale that measures confidence leadership had a self perception raw mean score of 22.04, standard deviation 2.03 compared to the upper echelon officer raw
mean of 18.07, standard deviation of 3.88. The test for differences among the presidents based on institutional situations and organizational contexts indicated no significant differences at the $p < .05$ level of significance except for communications leadership where the older universities tended to have the lower the communications leadership scale scores. The same result was found in the upper echelon administrators’ perceptions. The highest raw scale score mean of the upper echelon officers was on the communications leadership scale. This scale measures when the upper echelon officers have good contact with their presidents and they are kept abreast of key issues as well as have the opportunity to give and receive ideas. Transformational leaders have good communication skills and practice them. One president summed it up by saying “you must always endeavor to speak to a person on their level, to make them feel comfortable, to hear their ideas and give them opportunities to be heard.”
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter contains a summary of the findings, the conclusions drawn from the findings, recommendations and a discussion of the study results. The discussion includes implications for theory, practice and future research.

Summary of the Findings

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the leadership behaviors of the presidents of public historically black colleges and universities formed before 1954 and to document the espoused definition of effective leadership of these presidents. It was also designed to identify the behaviors and characteristics of the most effective presidents in the population as perceived by their peers and to examine the effect of various institutional characteristics on presidential behavior. The study assessed the level of agreement among the presidents and the upper echelon administrators with certain statements found in the literature regarding their management and leadership of the HBCU.

The literature revealed that much of leadership in higher education is dependent on the match between the institution and the president and that effectiveness was dependent on the congruence between the characteristics of the institution's governance pattern and
the style of the particular leader. Past research (Sashkin and Burke, 1996; Bensimon, 1993) has proposed that a combination of actions, transformational and transactional, are required for effectiveness in higher education leadership. Kofter and Hassett (1992) concluded that leadership effectiveness was based on leaders' influence over culture and their ability to change organizational culture. Here, in this study of HBCU leadership, attention was also given to the leaders' recognition of unmet social needs and the persistence of inequity in the distribution of opportunities as a variate of organizational culture. The level of agreement with statements specific to the organization and cultural ethos of the HBCU was assessed.

The leadership behaviors were assessed using visionary leadership theory as the foundation for the conceptual model. The conceptual model centered on three main independent variables: personal characteristics, leader behavior, and context. Variates reflecting personal characteristics were self-confidence, values and beliefs, vision, power and influence, educational level, and age. Those reflecting behavior included communication skills, credibility, creativity, caring, management ability, rewards achievement. Length of term in office was an intervening variate. Variates reflecting context included organization and governing structure, size/enrollment, political climate, financial support, organizational goals and mission, and control and level of the institution. The dependent variable was leadership style/effectiveness.

The study was conducted through analysis of data collected using the Leadership Survey (LS), the Leadership Profile (TLP), and personal interviews. Thirty-one out of a possible 34 universities participated. The surveys and the personal interviews involved 88.9% of the eligible respondents, 30 presidents and 91 upper echelon administrators.
The LS was designed for use with this group of presidents by the researcher and was used to collect nominations, espoused definitions of effective leadership, and demographic and background data. The TLP was designed by Sashkin and Rosenbach, (1996) and used with their permission. The TLP was used to obtain style and behavior data; it was designed to provide measures of transactional and transformational leadership and transformational behavior. The instrument produced scores for each of the three dimensions and for ten scales. The ten leadership scales are capable management, reward equity, communication, credible, caring, creative, confident, follower-centered, visionary, and principle centered leadership. The capable management scale and the reward equity scales were used to assess transactional leadership. The capable management scale measured how well the leader accomplished the day to day basic administrative tasks. The reward equity scale measured the degree to which leaders made clear their goals and performance expectations as well as how well they delivered on the rewards promised.

The transformational leadership behavior assessment consisted of four scales to measure effectiveness: 1) communications leadership, 2) credible leadership, 3) caring leadership and 4) creative leadership. The communications leadership scale measured the ability to manage and direct the attention of others through clear and focused interpersonal communications; it assessed the way in which the president got complicated ideas across and whether they were able to focus others on key ideas.

The credible leadership scale dealt with the president's perceived integrity. The five questions used for this measurement focused on reliability and trustworthiness. The caring leadership scale focused on the concern for others and the degree of that concern. It assessed the consistency with which a president demonstrated respect and concern for
others. It questioned the extent of the respect for other people's feelings, as well as the value and respect they showed for differences. The creative leadership scale assessed the entrepreneurial actions of the president by questioning the extent to which they took risks, accepted challenges, created opportunities, and spent time and energy worrying about failure.

The leadership characteristics were assessed using four scales also. They included 1) visionary leadership, 2) follower-centered leadership, 3) confident leadership, and 4) principled-centered leadership. The visionary leadership scale measured the president's ability to define and express clearly a future for the organization. The questions in the assessment related back to the president's ability to deal with ambiguity and complexity as well as the knowledge required to achieve the vision. The scale also assessed the involvement of followers in the planning and implementation process.

The follower-centered leadership scale focused on the positive use of power and influence to see if group and organizational goals were achieved. This scale measured the degree to which the president saw followers as empowered partners.

The confident leadership scale assessed the degree of self-assurance of the president and the level to which they believe they control their own fate. This scale also measured the extent to which the president was able to instill the same self-confidence in followers. The principle-centered leadership scale measured whether a leader helps develop and support shared values and beliefs with the organization. It assessed their management of change, whether they could create consensus or develop effective teamwork.

The ten scales that make up this instrument were tested for reliability using the raw
scores and were shown to be internally reliable. In fact, the results obtained from this sample were consistently higher than those obtained from a broader administration of the instrument. The personal interviews were used to clarify findings and to identify unique leadership attributes of the most effective among the presidents.

Thirteen of the HBCUs in the sample were formed as land grant colleges. The majority are small, under-funded, and have a high percentage of African-Americans and economically and socially disadvantaged students. The focus on the African-American and the economically disadvantaged student has been a large part of the historical mission of this segment of higher education, which represents only three percent of American colleges and universities but 28% of all African-Americans who obtain bachelor's degrees. Today about 80% of all African-Americans who attend HBCUs attend those in this sample. The student bodies of the majority (87%) of the universities in the sample are predominately African-American. Several of the respondents indicated that their universities are finding it increasingly more difficult to remain predominately black as well as maintain African-Americans in upper echelon administrator roles.

The results of this study revealed that the presidents of HBCUs are predominately African-American men with an average age of 56 years. They have held the office of president within their current university for an average of seven years, with one third serving in their current position for over 13 years. The average tenure in office provided insight regarding the concern with turnover in recent years. Many of the current presidents have been in office less time. The median tenure in office is five years.

Seventy percent of all presidents are alums of a HBCU and 93% percent hold terminal degrees; however, only three percent of the earned doctorate degrees were
obtained from HBCUs. Ninety percent obtained their highest degree from predominately white colleges and universities. According to one group of presidents interviewed, this is a trend which was an outgrowth of access in higher education and program availability. As more HBCUs expand their degree programs, students will not have to leave the HBCU as these presidents did to obtain doctorates. The past practice of preparing students to leave the HBCU for a predominately white college or university in order to obtain a terminal degree has decreased with the increase in state and federal investments in programs on the HBCU campuses. Today HBCUs offer terminal degrees across a variety of programs.

The upper echelon administrators are slightly more diverse than the presidents. Approximately 75% (74.7) are male and 84.5% are African-American. Of the 73.8% that have earned doctorates, 80.3% received their highest degree from predominately white institutions. Two of the presidents were American Council of Education fellows and six of the upper echelon administrators have served in this capacity. The average upper echelon administrator was about 52 (51.78) years old.

The upper echelon administrators’ perceptions of their president varied from institution to institution as to the level of leadership behaviors and characteristics, but was considered average for the total sample. The individual university scores show that a variety of characterizations are possible; in fact, they ranged from self-actualizing and aspiring to under-developed and too low to classify. As a group, the presidents were perceived to have the strongest behaviors in follower-centered and principled leadership. Statistical analyses for significant differences and relationships indicated that there is little to no significant difference in the ten leadership scales measured across the array of
leadership variates, with the exception of institutional age and communications leadership. The combined perceptions about the presidents in the sample according to the TLP portray them as average managers or transactional leaders that must balance the requirements for management and the demands for leadership. Most are having an average level of success. The distribution of the upper echelon rating using the standardized scores on a larger national sample of organizational leaders also showed that this sample of presidents includes a normal distribution of styles with transformational and transactional behaviors dominating.

The responses to both instruments revealed that the variates in the conceptual framework are important components in the study of leadership. The personal characteristics tested, self-confidence, values and beliefs, vision, and power and influence, were all shown to have significant positive correlations with the variables identified in leader behavior. Although not significant, the leader's age was negatively correlated with all of the leadership scales, both transactional and transformational. The low coefficients indicate that the relationships between leaders' age and the leadership behaviors tested are not strong. Chi-square and analysis of variance tests indicated that educational level was not a statistically significant determinant in leadership behavior either, although, the personal interviews did provide some evidence that personal approaches to leadership varied across leader age and were affected by length of term in office. The more seasoned presidents, those holding office longer than the mean of seven years and older than the mean age, were more focused on long range planning and political relationships for the university. Supplemental Chi-Square tests for relationships between behaviors and educational level revealed no significance, probably due to the
fact that there was little difference in the presidents' educational levels.

The situation and organizational context variates examined included size of enrollment, governing structure, organizational goals and mission, political climate, and financial support. Institutional control and level of the university are also variates that are reported to affect leadership behavior; but they were not tested in this study because the sample selection included homogeneity for both variates. The LS and the personal interviews enriched much of the data for the research in this area. The leadership behaviors varied by organization (land grant status) and governing structure but the means were not shown to be significantly different, although governing structure approached significance with the power and influence measures, a variate of personal characteristics.

The correlation coefficients for enrollment indicated low but positive linear relationships on all but the caring leadership behavior scale. The caring leadership scale correlated negatively at \( r = -.006 \). Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected for enrollment land grant status and governing structure. However, it was rejected for institution age, which was shown to have a significant negative linear relationship with communication leadership behavior. Although not strong, institution age also had negative linear relationships with all other presidential behaviors tested. The responses to the statements on the LS that addressed the political climate, goals and mission, and financial support indicated that there is agreement among the presidents and upper echelon administrators about the relative importance of these variates. The interviews revealed that organizational culture as expressed through considerations of race and university history also have major impacts on effectiveness. The results of the research
support the inclusion of the variables and variates in the conceptual model for the study of leadership.

The personal interviews revealed that visionary leadership was of greater concern among the older college and university presidents. Although not significant at the p < .05 level for the sample, the concern with the future of the HBCU was prevalent in the LS ratings of both groups. The rating on the TLP's visionary leadership scale and the responses on the LS indicate that the followers are involved in the planning and implementation process of the university's mission. According to the LS, the presidents were said to have defined and clearly expressed a future for the organization. However, the transactional scales on the TLP indicate that the presidents as a group may not be dealing effectively with the ambiguity and complexity required to transform the university through implementation of their vision. There were seven presidents perceived as performing as transformational leaders, eight as good managers with transformational potential, eight underdeveloped managers, three inspirational idealists, and one visionary thinker. Four did not exhibit sufficient levels of leadership or managerial behaviors to permit characterization.

The TLP results indicate that several leaders have under-developed managerial skills and several show very few leadership characteristics and behaviors at all. It is also possible that some may not have the knowledge to achieve the vision once it was formed and communicated. During the personal interviews, it was revealed that today's society has demanded that they (the presidents) broaden their vision of the future, emphasize total quality, and embrace the global community. The presidents and the upper echelon administrators concur with the statement that the HBCU has the capacity to meet needs...
for education that have not been met by other segments of higher education today. The interviews revealed that access to higher education outside of the HBCU is still exclusive and without the HBCU access to higher education for the economically and socially disadvantaged would remain illusive.

Several of the presidents expressed concern about the way their leadership is viewed by their constituents. They reported that their leadership is not respected, that it has been put on a higher plateau than presidents of predominately white colleges, that they find themselves always having to defend themselves and answer questions about their credibility more frequently than presidents of other colleges and universities. However there were different opinions about the role of the HBCU president today. Some proposed that the HBCU president was not overburdened with external commitments while others disagreed and stated that leadership of a HBCU extended beyond the walls of the academy into the community, the state and other social organizations. Leadership in the HBCU was seen as more difficult than leadership in similarly situated predominately white institutions because the social context and history of the institutions require a different approach to management.

In order to lead a HBCU one president said, "You cannot be timid, and you cannot be a dictator." This points to the apparent differences in the self and observer ratings for this sample. Information obtained from the LS, during the personal interviews, and participant observation of many of the leaders at national conferences provided some clarity to this finding. The LS results revealed that the presidents understand that the future of their universities is directly related to their leadership; therefore they believe that it is their personal responsibility to make a difference by putting people and
programs in place to advance their universities in higher education. The presidents are self-assured and seek administrators and faculty with the same type of commitment. Having self-confidence is an important characteristic of an effective leader. The presidents' awareness of public scrutiny and the lack of respect for their leadership inside and outside of their particular universities demand a level of self-confidence that may not be indicative or required of others that have completed the TLP. One president said, "Others outside of their immediate organization look to them for guidance and leadership. They are role models for the community of blacks in higher education and their demeanor is important to their power and influence." In the interviews, it was revealed that the leaders nominated as more effective by their peers made their visions known inside and outside of their organizations and were careful to communicate to all constituents in development of plans for their universities futures.

It was clear that there was a pattern of communication that was open and the presidents were not seen as aloof or untouchable. The presidents provided opportunities through open meetings, special planned events and open door policies for faculty, students and their administrators to increase the dialog with them.

The follower-centered leadership scale focused on the positive use of power and influence to determine if organizational goals were achieved. The scale score revealed that HBCU presidents saw the upper echelon administrators as empowered partners and have attempted to instill that same self-confidence in them as followers. The HBCU presidents, according the upper echelon administrators, help develop and support to an average extent shared values and beliefs in and across the variety of organizational variates. From observation of the most effective leaders and unstructured interviews with
peers and upper echelon administrators, it was revealed that the self-actualizing leaders had empowered their administrators and that they shared the same values and vision for their universities.

Based on the upper echelon administrators' observations, none of the leaders of the HBCUs could be classified as charismatic; rather their use of power and influence was viewed as transformational because it was used to bring about change and to implement a collective vision of the future. The most effective among them as nominated by peers also recognized the need to provide leadership within national organizations through representation on national boards and policy making bodies that affect higher education nationwide and their universities as a special interest group. This gave them the added distinction of being effective managerial leaders as well.

Those nominated as more effective by their peers were self-confident and had power through personal achievement but were primarily motivated by the need to ground their university and the other HBCUs in the broader system of higher education. These presidents focused on building their universities and using their power to educate as many students as possible and to set an example for future leaders. On the self-evaluation, the most frequently nominated leader had the highest scores on the visionary leader scale. Overall, the ten sub-scale score means were close in value producing a balanced but average profile. The second most frequently nominated president had very similar results. Both leaders rated themselves higher than their observers, highlighting their self-awareness and confidence. On the transformational characteristics measures, the confidence leadership scale was second only to the scale measuring vision.

The self-perception data and the interviews with the presidents indicated that most
considered themselves as visionary leaders to a greater degree than did their upper echelon administrators. The presidents themselves placed high value on contacts outside of their universities as a means to move their institutions forward effectively. In the personal interviews, value was placed on having a national presence and involvement with the federal government. Many saw the more effective presidents as leaders with political savvy at the local, state, and federal levels. While good sound management was expressed as a necessary component of effective leadership, much was to be realized through the use of communication skills. The presidents believed that communication down through the ranks was clear and free flowing. The upper echelon administrators concurred but to a lesser degree. One president described an effective president as being "...well known to the faculty and the students, and one that strives to know all of the faculty by name."

The idea of value added action was a main component of their operating styles. The ideas expressed in the written and verbal responses indicated that the presidents nominated as most effective were well liked and respected across the campus and were seen as contributors and mentors to the larger community of higher education. They were seen as committed to the maintenance of the HBCU as a valued segment of higher education. The presidents did not agree that the HBCUs were in trouble; rather they believed that the enrollment pressures and financial stress placed on other institutions would in fact be a source of strength for the HBCU. One president said that, "It wasn't until the 1980's that HBCUs really had to start recruiting black students because it wasn't a question about whether or not a student was going to a black school. Today more than 1.4 million blacks attend predominately white colleges and universities." They stated
that the HBCU has a history of educating those who, before entitlement programs, had been denied access to higher education and as such welcomes students to a low-cost, quality higher education. The presidents and upper echelon administrators agree that HBCUs meet a need that is not being met by other segments of higher education. Enrollment decline and political in-hospitality were not seen as major sources of pressure requiring attention from the HBCU president; rather, financial support was the major source of pressure.

Traditional sources of funding from the state government have been low and the presidents have achieved some success from nationwide campaigns and federal initiatives to provide funding for programs, research, and instruction. Getting an equitable share of the federal and state funding was seen as the biggest challenge. The presidents and upper echelon administrators indicated that alumni of the HBCUs give roughly at the same rate as alumni of predominately white institutions but the dollars do not compare because the resource base is small. Funding was not seen as a high pressure point for those HBCUs that were part of multi-campus statewide systems of higher education. The public institutions that operated independently placed a higher concern on this as a source of pressure.

It was clear that those nominated as most effective HBCU presidents had established a network of communication that considered the sociology of the population that they serve and the resources they manage. A heavy emphasis was placed on shared values and beliefs. The mission of the institution and the cultural ethos of the faculty and staff require an approach to management that is more interactive than was experienced by presidents when they served as leaders in other organizations. Throughout the process
both upper echelon administrators and presidents pronounced the loyalty to the mission and purpose of the HBCU. There was a clear consensus that the HBCU is a critical national resource and that they must be maintained and supported because access to higher education is still not open to all. The network of HBCU presidents supported each other in their roles and the majority participated in national forums collectively.

In a larger sense, it was clear from the agenda and discussions at the national conferences that the HBCU presidents and upper echelon administrators shared beliefs, values, and visions about the HBCU. They were banned together collectively and individually for the advancement of the HBCU agenda of providing opportunities and quality education for the African-American and the socially and economically disadvantaged student.

Conclusions

This study has highlighted the nature of the public HBCU president as a sound manager and an average leader exhibiting some transformation characteristics. Transformational behavior is seen as an area for growth. Collectively, they are average managers and leaders. Some have potential for growth and others do not exhibit the requisite behaviors or characteristics to be good managers or effective leaders without additional training and personal development in management and leadership.

The array of leadership classifications found in this sample of four-year public HBCU presidents clearly form a normal distribution across the leadership characteristics. The combined perceptions about the presidents portray them as transactional leaders that must balance the requirements for management and the demands for leadership. The past
concerns expressed in the media and by casual observers of leadership in higher education lack merit. The leadership provided in the HBCU is no more or less ineffective than can be found in other segments of society throughout the study of organizational leadership. Higher education as an industry has been subject to more scrutiny in recent years as accountability for results increase. Most of the HBCU presidents are having an average level of success with a few exhibiting an unusual level of transformational leadership behaviors when compared with their peers and according to national test norms.

The presidents nominated as more effective have been deemed so because they have demonstrated a combination of transactional and transformational patterns of behaviors and characteristics that have been judged through qualitative measures by their peers and external administrators to be dominant. These presidents give equally close attention to the national agenda as well as the need to involve others outside of their institution in policy formulation for their universities. These presidents have been successful at communicating their needs and the needs of other HBCUs. There is a high level of commitment to the HBCU and their unique mission, which was born out of the separate but equal philosophy of higher education. Because of a need to highlight access problems, the leaders and presidents in HBCUs have developed important community and political resources to assist with preservation and expansion of the programs they offer. This type of involvement makes them more visible to peers and others in a position to comment on their management and leadership behaviors.

The varied results between the TLP and the LS relating to the classifications of the diagnostic triangles highlight a distinction between management and leadership.
Management is reported to be action and outcome oriented while leadership also involves working with and through people on long range goals (personal and organizational) to realize some agreed upon or accepted vision. Another important distinction resulting from the variations in the TLP and LS results is that the definitions obtained from the LS and the nominations appear to be based on successful achievements while the TLP measures are based on a variety of behaviors. Hersey and Blanchard (1972) suggested that there is a clear distinction between successful and effective leadership. Success has to do with how the individual behaves and effectiveness embodies the disposition of the organization and is attitudinal and cultural in nature. Successful leaders are good managers who exercise position power but effective leaders tend to delegate down through the organization and depend more on personal power. Effective leaders exhibit both position and personal power and their influence tends to lead to long-run productivity and organizational development. The HBCUs are part of an organized network of higher education that focuses on current issues in higher education as well as the need to maintain the HBCU.

These presidents have said that effective leadership is determined by observers and is judged by the quality of results over the long term. The process of reaching this outcome was said to be determined by the degree to which the leader had the ability, know-how, and influence to mobilize resources to achieve an agreed upon vision for the university and convince others outside of their organization to contribute to and support them. This definition of leadership expressed by the presidents as a group is supported in leadership theory. Since 1954, the HBCUs have embodied the essence of transformational leadership. It is through the leadership of these colleges and universities that the case for
the continued operation of the HBCU has been made. Collectively and in many cases individually these leaders have led and prevailed against what seemed to be insurmountable odds to keep their doors open. Not all have survived, some have been plagued by mismanagement but others have grown to excellence and provide quality programs. Many have responded to the call for change and excellence. Through leadership and management these colleges and universities have developed a capacity to respond to public policy changes and trends in higher education to maintain access for the widest array of students.

The HBCU presidents have been required to adjust their leadership priorities frequently over a period of time. The rate of presidential turnover is not significantly different for the HBCU than that found across the system of higher education. As the national agenda for higher education evolves, the HBCU remains in its role as an important provider of higher education for the socially and economically disadvantaged. In spite of the social, economic, and political challenges the HBCUs continue to face they remain a viable provider of higher education.

Not all of the presidents expressed a complete understanding of leadership in their definition but the definitions provided fit into the literature and are meaningfully relevant to the three main variables studied. Each president interviewed expressed that there is no theoretical difference in the way you lead at an HBCU but that cultural awareness and history are important elements that must be considered in the analysis of effectiveness and outcomes. Effective leadership as expressed by the HBCU president includes personal characteristics, situation, organization, and leader behaviors. All are components of the conceptual framework outlined in this research for the study of
leadership. These findings are consistent with the literature on the presence of a combination of behaviors for leaders that have been shown to be effective across a variety of organizational types and whose influence tends to lead to long-run productivity and organizational development.

Collectively the leadership in HBCUs exhibits exceptional stamina in responding to national agenda changes and challenges to their existence brought through federal as well as state legislation. The HBCU continues to provide programs that remediate academic deficiencies and to graduate some of the nation's prominent and distinguished citizens. Much of the HBCU strategy for success may be attributed to their history of organizing around a need from past experience with social movements.

This study has shown and the HBCU presidents and the upper echelon administrators agree that the literature and past studies on leadership have not fully addressed the impact of culture or race on leadership. Established principles of management are applied to evaluating managerial styles and the components of effectiveness but the cultural ethos is seldom, if ever, considered except as it relates to the structure within the organization. This research has highlighted that there is an external culture and a personal cultural ethos that is brought to bear in most decision making and administrative processes. Some are historical in nature and some are personal to the people involved. It is not clear how much of it is sociological or environmental. The match between the organization and the leader as well as the power and authority can be enabling factors in leadership quality. Fisher and Koch (1996) said that the influence of race and gender is one of the most overblown issues in discussions of presidential leadership and performance. The HBCU presidents did not agree. The fact that leadership across all of higher education has been
predominately white and male suggests that the characteristics of effective leadership are not androgynous and does not exist without the consideration of race. Leadership in the public HBCUs remains predominately male but the president in the sample with the highest overall rating based on the national scale was female. The research on the leadership of women indicates that women do lead differently although this study did not examine differences or variances based on race or gender.

Through interviews, the presidents revealed that the leadership paradigm at the HBCU has a cultural foundation that has not been documented or studied thoroughly. The way HBCU leaders operate can be accommodated in leadership theory but the characterizations do not reflect a complete account of all of the variations on leadership style based on the situation or context. The personal history of the leader and the followers are not considered. The situation and context of the organization as well as the sociology of the students, the leaders, and the community is a much needed dimension in future study. Leadership at the HBCUs has been heavily scrutinized in the media and in higher education circles; but little attention has been given to a full discussion of the alternatives available to the population they serve. Most HBCU presidents are perceived as successful managers and only a few are successful managers and effective leaders.

**Recommendations**

Through the review of the literature and analyses of the results of this study, we find that the study of leadership is embedded in quantitative measures. The study confirmed that two major categories of variables affect leader behavior: personal characteristics and
situation and organizational context. The patterns of behavior are then used to classify a leader as exhibiting a particular style and provide a measure of effectiveness. It was also revealed through the differences in the qualitative methods that culture is perceived to have a much larger impact than is accounted for in style classifications or characterization labels. This points out the need for additional research on the impact of culture on leadership behavior, and additional research on the organizational response based on the cultural ethos.

This study identified several situational and contextual issues that must be considered in the study of leadership. There is a need for future research to focus on contextual issues in conjunction with personal characteristics and behavior variables. Much of the theory in the past has vacillated between a study of traits and social exchange with the leader being the central focus. However, the context has been shown to play a significant role in the behaviors of those in leadership positions. Perhaps, a return to the focus on the impact of situation is in order.

In the study of leadership, the focus has been on the development of theory; but richness and value of effective and exceptional leadership is found in the diversity brought into the equation through the culture of the leader and the organization. Little attention has been given to the impact of culture on leadership. The academy has acknowledged that perhaps the most intangible variate in the study of leadership is culture. It is widely accepted that the leaders bring culture to the organization and are responsible for creating and or changing the organizations' culture; but there are no agreed upon ways to measure the impact on leaders behavior or organizational outcomes. There needs to be convergence of the two for research and study.
The impact of values and beliefs of the leader must continually be evaluated and their importance to leadership as societal values and beliefs evolve. The same is true for organizations. In the development of theory, continued awareness is needed of the impact of context and situation on the desired outcomes. Leadership is not required or expected from every position given to a leader. Some organizations seek managers, some leaders, and others may seek neither. It is important to understand the power and authority associated with each position assessed as well as the mission of the organization or institution. Additional comprehensive research is needed on presidential leadership in higher education.

In characterizing the leadership styles, several implications for practice surfaced. The review of the educational backgrounds of the leaders revealed that few received formal training in the leadership development. In fact, most presidents agreed that there is no training that prepares you to become president of an institution of higher education. Many of the training programs today focus on management but most of the measures of effective leadership center on variates that are not managerial in nature but behavioral. Most programs on leadership highlight the behavioral components conceptually and usually collectively. There is a need to develop an approach to the study of leadership that centers on the organizational frames as conceived by Bowman and Deal (1984) while studying the behaviors as they occur within a particular context. The idea of reframing organizations may add value to the study of leadership in organizations when leadership is evaluated from different organizational perspectives.

Leadership training is needed as a component in every discipline so that it is conceptually understood from a broad array of perspectives. Perhaps there is a need for
more distinction between leadership and management in academic and training programs.

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are proposed. Further study and investigation is necessary into the transactional behaviors involved with leadership of HBCUs. This is needed to enable leadership development training and to clarify the sociological factors that have direct bearing on the style required to lead in a HBCU. This study has concentrated on assessing the results of individual presidents and their personal behaviors. Perhaps additional research should be done on the response of the followers to the initiatives of the president.

Clearly, the many problems HBCUs are wrestling with, from inadequate state funding, to increased competition for enrollment and retention of their top achievers, bear addressing in a follow-up assessment of the leadership behaviors. Further study on this topic should include student perceptions of the presidents and assessment of the educational quality of the universities through national rankings and accreditation boards. An evaluation of presidents by their governing boards would enrich the data also.

It was evident from the standard scores that the leadership behaviors most valued and required in HBCUs were different from those required to be labeled "effective" or self-actualizing, according to societal norms. The variance in overall behavior and rating of effectiveness point out the need for more research on predominantly black organizations that are part of a large service network.
Appendix A

Letters to the Survey Participants
January 9, 1997

Title- FirstName- LastName-
JobTitle-
Company-
Address-
City-, State- PostalCode-

Dear JobTitle- LastName-:

I am writing to ask you for your assistance in completing the research for my doctoral dissertation. I am studying the leadership behaviors of the current leaders of the thirty-six public Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The purpose of this research is two-fold, first to fulfill part of the requirements for my degree and most importantly to document the perceptions of and about a body of leaders who have been largely excluded from the development of leadership theory. This study will provide information on leadership of the HBCU that is currently not available to rising scholars interested in a complete picture of effective leadership in higher education. It will assist future leaders in their understanding of leadership and include the perspective of the HBCU. This research is comprehensive and includes the president or chancellor of each college or university in the public HBCU population as well as the perceptions of their upper echelon officers. I am hopeful that you, as JobTitle-, will agree to participate so that I can get a complete assessment from your college/university and encourage your
senior officers to return the surveys sent to them under separate mailing.

As a graduate of a public HBCU conducting scholarly research I hope to continue to pursue this area for inclusion in the academy for years to come. It is important that the surveys enclosed be forwarded directly to me in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible to minimize follow-up costs and to insure the confidentiality of your responses. Because there are only 40 of you, your assessment is critical to the success of this research. I have discussed the need for this information with several of your colleagues in NAFEO, at the ACE, and other students and professors in higher education. The expectations are high.

JobTitle- LastName-, I can assure you that your responses will be kept confidential and will in no way be attributed to you personally. The surveys have been pre-coded for follow-up purposes only. All findings and reports will be made in the aggregate form to develop an overall understanding of public HBCU leader behavior and styles. JobTitle- LastName-, won’t you please take 15 minutes and complete the surveys now?

Thank you sincerely, in advance, for your time and effort in completing the two surveys. If you have any questions or concerns at all please contact me at home or at my office; my numbers are at home ___________ and at work ___________.

With anticipation and hope, I am

Elmira Mangum-
Doctoral Student
University at Buffalo
February 1, 1997

Dear Title-LastName-:

A few weeks ago I asked for your assistance in gathering information about the leadership of Company-. Many of your colleagues and many presidents have chosen to participate. I am writing this as a reminder for you to return the surveys I sent to you. I am hopeful that you, as JobTitle-, will agree to participate so that I can get a complete assessment for your college/university.

Title- LastName-, I can assure you that your responses will be kept confidential and will in no way be attributed to you personally. The surveys were pre-coded for follow-up purposes only. For your convenience I have enclosed photocopies of those previously sent. Because these copies do not have the coding I am asking you to use the original set...
or return this letter with your response on these forms so that I can continue more effectively with the follow-up. I can assure you that your responses will be kept confidential and will in no way be attributed to you or your president personally.

Title- LastName-, won't you please take 15 minutes and complete the surveys now? I will take your responses by telephone if it will be more convenient for you.

Thank you sincerely, in advance, for your time and effort in completing the two surveys about the current leader of Company-. If you have any questions or concerns at all please contact me at home or at my office; my numbers are at home ____________ and at work ______________.

Sincerely,

Elmira Mangum

Doctoral Student

University at Buffalo
Dear Title- LastName-:

At the beginning of this year, I asked you for your assistance in completing the research for my doctoral dissertation on the leadership behaviors of the current leaders of the thirty-six public Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). As an African-American student that graduated from an HBCU I have worked hard for this opportunity to document the perceptions of and about a body of leaders who have been largely excluded from the development of leadership theory. This is my third and final appeal because my research will not be complete without your perceptions and participation.

I am sure you know that this step of getting surveys returned is one of the most critical steps in the degree process. If you do not have the coded survey forms I sent previously I have enclosed copies of them for your use. Because these forms do not have the coding I am asking you to use the original set or return this letter with your response.
on the enclosed copies so that I will be able to continue with the follow-up.

Because there are only 36 of you, your assessment is critical to the success of this research. At this time I have received responses from only 23 institutions. JobTitle- LastName-, won’t you please take 15 minutes and complete the surveys now.

JobTitle- LastName-, I can assure you that your responses will be kept confidential and will in no way be attributed to you personally. The surveys have been pre-coded for follow-up purposes only.

Thank you sincerely, in advance, for your time and effort in completing the two surveys. If you have any questions or concerns at all please contact me at home or at my office; my numbers are at home _____________ and at work ______________. I apologize if this letter crosses your return in the mail.

Sincerely,

Elmira Mangum
Doctoral Student
University at Buffalo
Appendix B

Leadership Survey
Institutional Leadership Survey

Part I. Please review the statement below and think about how it applies to you personally or the person you are assessing as a leader of a four-year Historically Black College or University. How generally would you respond to the statement? Please write in the appropriate number for each of the statements which follow that corresponds with your perception of agreement / disagreement using the following key.

5 = Completely true
4 = Mostly true
3 = Somewhat true
2 = A little true
1 = Not true at all

1. I believe there is a continuing need for a clear definition of our college/university identity and mission
   a. This college/university has a clearly stated mission and strategy to achieve it.

2. I believe that the future of this college/university is directly related to my / the president's leadership.
   a. Communication is clear and free flowing throughout this college/university.

3. I believe the demands placed on me/ the president of this HBCU far exceed those placed on presidents of other institutions in my state.

4. I believe the future of the college/university is more dependent on outside/external (outside of the campus) influences than internal decisions and management.
5. I believe the greatest sources of pressure requiring attention from leadership in the position of president of this HBCU are...

   a. Enrollment Decline
   b. Political Inhospitality (for example: ________________________________)
   c. Financial Support Generally
   d. Governance / Board of Trustees, Central Administration
   e. Other _________________________________________________________

6. I believe HBCUs are in trouble throughout the country.

7. I believe HBCUs meet or have the capacity to meet a societal need that has not been met by any other segment in higher education today.

Part II

There are 36 public four-year HBCUs formed before 1954. Which do you consider to have the most effective president?

Name the one most effective leader of a public HBCU and their institution.

Most Effective Leaders of the Public Institutions:

__________________________________________

What criteria did you use in making your selections? How do you define effective leadership?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Part III. Some demographic information about you.

1. Time in office as president or upper echelon officer of this institution: ___ Years ___ Months

2. Highest Degree __________
   a. Name of College/University from which degree was earned. __________
      1. Predominately black, or 2. predominately white
   b. What was your academic field of study? __________________________

3. Were you an American Council of Education fellow at any time in your career? __

4. HBCU Graduate -Yes or No ?, If yes. What degree(s) did you earn? __________

5. Age ______ Gender ______ Race_____

Thank you responding to this research questionnaire. If you have any questions or concerns about any of the items listed above please contact me.
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The Leadership Survey (TLP)
The Leadership Profile

Mansha Sasnun, Ph.D.
and
William E. Rosenbach, Ph.D.

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS
- Use a No. 2 PENCIL only.
- Darken the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.
- Do not make any stray marks on this form.
- Do not fold or staple.

Each of the following statements describes a certain leadership behavior, characteristic, or effect that a leader might have on a group or organization. Read each statement carefully and decide to what extent it is an accurate description of the person you are describing. For each statement, mark the response that best describes to what extent that statement accurately characterizes the actual leadership behavior of the person being described.

NAME OF PERSON BEING DESCRIBED

For Office Use Only

RELATIONSHIP TO PERSON BEING DESCRIBED

I am the person being described.

I am an associate of the person being described.

Copyright © 1995 Mansha Sasnun and William E. Rosenbach. All rights reserved.
THIS PERSON ...

1. makes sure people have the resources they need to do a good job.
2. rewards people fairly for their efforts.
3. pays close attention to what others say.
4. can be relied on.
5. respects people's differences.
6. creates opportunities for people to succeed.
7. acts in ways that have impact.
8. enjoys making others obey her or his orders.
9. considers how a specific plan or action might be extended to benefit others.
10. encourages others to act according to the values and beliefs we share.
11. provides information people need to effectively plan and do their work.
12. recognizes good performance with rewards people value.
13. communicates a clear sense of priorities.
14. follows through on commitments.
15. shows he or she cares about others.
16. designs situations that permit people to achieve their goals.
17. can see the results of her or his actions.
18. expects others to obey without question.
19. concentrates on clear and short-term goals.
20. demonstrates that group goals are her or his own.
21. helps people get the training they need to perform their jobs effectively.
22. expresses appreciation when people perform well.
23. grasps people's attention focusing on the important issue in a discussion.
24. keeps promises.
25. shows concern for the feelings of others.
26. involves others in new ideas and projects.
27. makes a difference.
28. uses power and influence to benefit others.
29. explains long-range plans and goals clearly.
30. supports effective coordination by working cooperatively with others.
31. supports and encourages people to get the job done well.
32. knows the rewards people value.
33. listens for feelings as well as ideas.
34. acts in ways consistent with her or his words.
35. treats others with respect, regardless of position.
36. helps others learn from mistakes.
37. is confident in her or his own abilities.
38. seeks power and influence to attain goals people agree on.
39. expresses a vision that engages people.
40. encourages people to support their views and positions with concrete evidence.
41. makes sure people have clear and challeging goals.
42. makes sure that people know what to expect in return for accomplishing goals.
43. is able to get complicated ideas across clearly.
44. can be trusted.
45. makes others feel a real part of the group organization.
46. gives people the autonomy they need to fulfill their responsibilities.
47. is in control of his or her life.
48. shares power and influence with others.
49. has plans that extend over a period of several years or longer.
50. values action over maintaining the status quo.
Appendix D

Letter and Instructions to the Validation Panel
December 13, 1996

Dear:

Seasons Greetings! I hope you will agree to be a member of the validation panel which is assisting me in validating the two questionnaires enclosed, The Leadership Profile, and the Leadership Survey.

It is my hope to use these instruments to measure the leadership behaviors of the thirty-six public four year HBCU presidents. This study is very important to me as a graduate of a public HBCU; and your evaluation will help me in this effort. All of the responses are confidential and will in no way be attributed to you personally. The responses will assist me in evaluating the leadership of this population of leaders and also assist me in focusing questions for the personal interviews that will be conducted on the most effective leaders as identified by their peers at another stage in this research.

I am asking you to please complete the enclosed questionnaires and return them before January 1, 1997. Thank you for your assistance. I hope to see you at the NAFEO conference in the spring.

Merry Christmas and Happy Kwanzaa,

Elmira Mangum
NCCU Alum (1975)
Doctoral Student
University at Buffalo
Instructions for Validation Panel

Thank you for agreeing to assist me in validating these two questionnaires for my doctoral research. Please complete the enclosed Leadership Profile (TLP) and the Leadership Survey (LS). After completing the questionnaires, please respond to the following questions. Your comments and suggestions will aid me in evaluating the overall quality of this instrument in my research.

1. Do you feel that these questionnaires assess leadership behavior?
   ______ Yes ______ No
   Comments: _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________

2. Are the questionnaires well organized? ______ Yes ______ No
   Comments: ___________________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________________

3. Approximately how many minutes did it take you to complete each questionnaire?
   _____ TLP _____ LS

4. Are there any items on the questionnaires that should be eliminated?
   ______ Yes ______ No    Which ones?
  _________________________________________________________________________

5. Are there items that should be added to the questionnaires? ______ Yes ______ No
   Please list the items you would add.
   _______________________________________________________________________

6. Are there any items that should be modified or clarified? ______ Yes ______ No
   How?
   _______________________________________________________________________

7. Do you feel these standardized questionnaires are appropriate for measuring leadership behaviors of HBCU presidents? Please add any other comments or suggestions you might have in the space provided or attach additional sheets.
   _______________________________________________________________________

Return to: Elmira Mangum, 105 Chapel Woods, Williamsville, New York, 14221
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Appendix E

Observer Standard Scores for the Sample
### Leadership Styles - Individual Evaluations of Upper Echelon Officers by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Transactional Scales (2)</th>
<th>Transformational Behavior Scales (4)</th>
<th>Transformational Characteristics Scales (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capable Management</td>
<td>Reward Equity</td>
<td>Sub-score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>30.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>37.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.42</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>43.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>45.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61.18</td>
<td>66.98</td>
<td>64.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>61.18</td>
<td>48.64</td>
<td>54.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>65.14</td>
<td>66.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>59.79</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>59.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36.27</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>37.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>38.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.42</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>40.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>56.89</td>
<td>55.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>48.64</td>
<td>49.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>61.18</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>60.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>63.31</td>
<td>65.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>47.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.12</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>34.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.48</td>
<td>74.31</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>48.64</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>54.14</td>
<td>52.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>57.81</td>
<td>56.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.49</td>
<td>52.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>34.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>56.89</td>
<td>52.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>30.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.11</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td>49.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.64</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td>52.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>42.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>48.72</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>45.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transactional Scales</th>
<th>Transformational Behaviors</th>
<th>Transformational Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix F

Summary of the Diagnostic Triangles by Observer Ratings

And

Leadership Characterization Descriptions
### Summary of Overall Leadership Styles from Diagnostic Triangles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style/ Characterization</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores too low to Classify</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No leadership qualities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdeveloped</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiring</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Architect</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Idealist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic Manager</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Thinker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Underdeveloped Manager. With this balanced profile, no matter which direction one chooses there is a clear path to personal development. While there are no strong imbalances to overcome, one must first determine whether the job calls for management or leadership. If the answer is management, the next step is to examine one’s transactional leadership skills and effectiveness, in depth, and make plans for personal development. If the position is one in which leadership is required and if the person is already developing her or his managerial skills, the first action would be to raise one’s awareness of the nature of leadership, as distinct from good management. The next step is to plan for leadership development, beginning with a focus on the personal characteristics required for effective transformational leadership.

The Aspiring Leader. The person with a profile that is average in each of the three areas of leadership is in an excellent position for growth and development. Like the underdeveloped manager, this person is not overly focused on any one area. The aspiring leader has sound (if basic) managerial capabilities and may already look toward the challenge of transformational leadership. This person may feel a degree of frustration, too, having some idea of what he or she is reaching for but not seeing a clear path to that goal. A common strategy is to try even harder as a manager; but this only creates more frustration. What is effective in a managerial role is not necessarily relevant for successful leadership. An initial action step might be to continue to build management skills while assessing one’s abilities and development needs as a transformational leader. 
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The Self-Actualizing Leader. This ideal profile is unusual: very few people have extremely high scores across the board. Such scores are strong evidence that one is currently acting as an effective leader. Research shows that individuals in responsible positions, who score quite high in all three areas, have followers who report a high level of satisfaction as well as high productivity. While individuals with this profile are effective leaders, they are not necessarily perfect. Even those who score high in each of the three areas are likely to find that their scores on one or another of the scales that make up the three areas show room for improvement.

The Organizational Architect. This profile shows an individual who has both leadership and management skills. This person, however, lacks the ability (or perhaps has not paid much attention to the need) to develop a vision. The organizational architect may also be uninterested in power and influence, failing to understand that it is only through the use of influence that people work together to accomplish goals in a group or organization. It is possible that this individual has a strong desire for personal power, for domination over others, rather than the desire to empower others to become “owners” of the vision. It is even possible that, despite having exceptional skills, this person really does not believe that he or she can have an impact on the group. While this person may operate effectively in the organization, he or she does exhibit but is not doing transformational leadership.
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The Strategic Planner. A person with this profile is likely to be self-confident and have a clear vision for the organization. This individual, however, does not have the interpersonal skills needed to involve followers in building the vision or to communicate the vision to others in a way that empowers and excites them to action. Because followers never become involved in owning the vision, it will always be seen as belonging to the leader. The planner's strategies may have some effect on the organization but they will never serve as the basis for organizational transformation.

The Inspirational Idealist. The person with this profile has a vision and the skills to communicate it to others. Inspirational idealists excite followers, who may — as individuals — become committed disciples. What the inspirational idealist lacks is an understanding of how organizations function and how to use that knowledge to manage change. The inspirational idealist does not have the management skills needed to build a vision into a group or organization's culture.
The Pragmatic Manager. This profile describes individuals who are good managers. They know the ins and outs of the organization and its policies. They know how to manage organizational circumstances to get things done right. Thus they are often considered to be model managers. Pragmatic managers know how to keep things on track and are adept at guiding followers to attain organizational goals. But, they have neither an organizational vision nor the skills needed to empower followers to carry forward such a vision.

The Charismatic Leader. This profile suggests that the person is able to engage in the specific behaviors that transformational leaders use to get their visions across to followers. This individual probably does not have a clearly thought-out vision. The charismatic leader neither knows how nor is able to build organizational culture, a crucial element of transformational leadership. Thus, the person with this profile may come across quite strongly -- and positively -- on an interpersonal level. Nevertheless the charismatic leader is neither a good manager nor a transformational leader. In fact, charismatic leaders can often be dangerous, damaging both followers and organizations.
**The Visionary Thinker.** A person with this profile has great ideas and may have a clear picture of how those ideas could become real in the group or organization. The visionary thinker, however, lacks the managerial and leadership skills needed to involve followers and the organization in creating and implementing the vision. This person may be convinced that the vision can actually be implemented, and may well realize the importance of empowering followers to become “owners” of the vision. The visionary thinker, however, cannot engage in the management or leadership actions required to transform a vision into reality.
Appendix G

Correlation Matrix of the TLP Ten Leadership Scales
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>ECAPMGT</th>
<th>ECAPNFD</th>
<th>EFELLOW</th>
<th>EVISION</th>
<th>EPRINCIP</th>
<th>EREWARD</th>
<th>ECOMMNRN</th>
<th>ECRED1B</th>
<th>ECREATIV</th>
<th>ECARING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECAPMGT</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.9456</td>
<td>9190</td>
<td>9030</td>
<td>.8213</td>
<td>.9229</td>
<td>.7195</td>
<td>.7086</td>
<td>.8165</td>
<td>.8787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONFIDE</td>
<td>.9456</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.9272</td>
<td>9029</td>
<td>.9026</td>
<td>.9397</td>
<td>.7392</td>
<td>.7406</td>
<td>.8404</td>
<td>.8859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFELLOW</td>
<td>.9190</td>
<td>.9272</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>8555</td>
<td>.8923</td>
<td>.9366</td>
<td>.7552</td>
<td>.7153</td>
<td>.8015</td>
<td>.8695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVISION</td>
<td>9030</td>
<td>9029</td>
<td>8555</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.8566</td>
<td>.8659</td>
<td>.7699</td>
<td>.7377</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td>.8390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRINCIP</td>
<td>.8213</td>
<td>.9026</td>
<td>.8923</td>
<td>.8566</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.8983</td>
<td>.7183</td>
<td>.8213</td>
<td>.7637</td>
<td>.8095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EREWARD</td>
<td>.9329</td>
<td>.9379</td>
<td>.9366</td>
<td>.8659</td>
<td>.8983</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.7737</td>
<td>.7581</td>
<td>.8185</td>
<td>.8723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOMMNRN</td>
<td>.7195</td>
<td>.7392</td>
<td>.7552</td>
<td>.7699</td>
<td>.7183</td>
<td>.7737</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.6034</td>
<td>.7778</td>
<td>.7100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECREDIB</td>
<td>7086</td>
<td>7406</td>
<td>7153</td>
<td>7377</td>
<td>8213</td>
<td>.7581</td>
<td>.6034</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.6903</td>
<td>.6950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECREATIV</td>
<td>8165</td>
<td>8404</td>
<td>8015</td>
<td>8201</td>
<td>7637</td>
<td>8185</td>
<td>.7778</td>
<td>.6903</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.7803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECARING</td>
<td>8787</td>
<td>8859</td>
<td>.8695</td>
<td>.8390</td>
<td>.8095</td>
<td>.8723</td>
<td>.7100</td>
<td>.6950</td>
<td>.7803</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 2-tailed Significance) " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed
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