

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP
IN THE 21st CENTURY

by

LAURIE A. N. VAN DUSEN
B.S. University of Central Florida, 1985
M.P.A. University of Central Florida, 1992

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall 2005

Major Professor: William C. Bozeman

© 2005 Laurie A. N. Van Dusen

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore with community college presidents of 292 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Level 1 institutions their perceptions as to the extent to which selected leadership styles presently required in the performance of presidential duties may be required in the future. Also investigated were leadership succession planning and professional development initiatives aimed at identifying and developing future leaders.

A total of 209 (71.6%) presidents completed a researcher designed survey. Data analysis resulted in the following major findings.

The presidents indicated a high level of support for each of the five leadership styles for current presidents as well as for future leaders. A consultative style of leadership was deemed to be the most important form of leadership for current leaders and increasing in importance for future leaders. Participative leadership was ranked second and could be considered as a transitional alternative for new presidents. The delegative and negotiative leadership styles were cited as the third and fourth most important forms of leadership for current and future leaders. Fifth ranked was the directive or autocratic style of leadership.

Three-fourths of community college presidents indicated that they were actively engaged in the identification and development of potential leaders. Presidents were highly supportive of six developmental areas (budgeting, financial management, fund raising, governing boards, internal governance, and politics/relationships) but perceived

politics and relationships as being the most critical area of development for future presidents.

Presidents, with less than 10 years of service, were more actively engaged in identifying potential future leaders than their longer tenured counterparts. Those planning to retire within the next 6 years indicated the highest level of engagement. Institutional leaders who had been identified for advancement in a succession plan during their careers were more likely to have a succession plan in place in their institution; however, succession planning was largely informal.

This dissertation is dedicated to my entire family, for the love, support, and patience they have shared with me throughout this process and my life, with special thanks to my husband for his boundless support and encouragement, and to my parents for their unwavering faith in me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The continuous support and encouragement that I received from the people in my life throughout my doctoral studies has made this dissertation possible. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my committee chair, Dr. William C. Bozeman, for his dedication and direction as my advisor. I would like to thank the very special individuals of my dissertation committee: Dr. Walter Bogumil, Dr. Debbie Hahs-Vaughn, Dr. Douglas Magann, and Dr. Kent Sharples. My sincere appreciation goes to each of them for sharing their expertise, valuable time, and continual guidance.

My heartfelt thanks belong to Dr. Mary Ann Lynn, my professor, confidant, and editor, for her assistance in bringing this dissertation to fruition, for her compassion and for her never-ending support. I would also like to thank my Panel of Experts for their time and expertise in helping me to finalize my survey. Additionally, I would like to express my appreciation to Dee Bozeman for her kindness and generosity of spirit.

I would like to offer my special thanks to Dr. Kent Sharples who initially encouraged me to obtain my doctorate and who offered his professional guidance throughout this program. Additionally, I want to thank Dr. Charles Carroll, my mentor, for his honesty and encouragement. Under the leadership of these two gentlemen, Daytona Beach Community College initiated the Beacon Leadership Program to develop potential future leaders. The members of the Beacon I cohort and financial support of this program were invaluable to the completion of my doctoral studies.

And finally, to my extraordinary friends and co-workers, thank you for all of the hugs and for never letting me give up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER 1 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND DESIGN COMPONENTS	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Research Questions.....	4
Definition of Terms	6
Study Population.....	8
Instrumentation	8
Data Collection and Analysis	9
Assumptions.....	11
Limitations	11
Significance of the Study	12
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Introduction.....	14
The Evolution of American Community Colleges and their Leaders	14
Key Roles and Responsibilities of Community College Leaders.....	18
Leadership Styles	20
Delegative Leadership.....	22
Directive or Autocratic Leadership.....	23

Inclusive, Servant, or Consultative Leadership	24
Negotiative Leadership	25
Participative or Democratic Leadership.....	27
Identification of Potential Leaders.....	28
Development of Potential Leaders.....	30
Succession Planning	35
Summary	38
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	40
Introduction.....	40
Purpose of the Study	40
Research Questions.....	40
Study Population.....	41
Instrument Development and Assessment	42
Pilot Test of Survey Instrument	43
Final Survey Instrument.....	46
Data Collection	48
Data Analysis.....	49
Summary.....	51
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	52
Introduction.....	52
Demographics of Survey Participants.....	52
Research Question 1	58

Research Question 2	60
Research Question 3	63
Research Question 4	65
Research Question 5	66
Research Question 6	70
Research Question 7	73
Research Question 8	75
Summary	77
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	78
Introduction.....	78
Purpose of the Study	78
Study Population.....	78
Instrumentation	79
Data Collection Procedures	80
Data Analysis	80
Summary and Discussion of Findings	81
Research Question 1	81
Research Question 2	83
Research Question 3	84
Research Question 4	85
Research Question 5	86
Research Question 6	88

Research Question 7	89
Research Question 8	90
Conclusions.....	91
Recommendations for Future Research.....	96
APPENDIX A UCF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	99
APPENDIX B SURVEY INSTRUMENT	101
APPENDIX C SURVEY ASSESSMENT FORM	106
APPENDIX D INITIAL CONTACT LETTER	108
APPENDIX E COVER LETTER FOR SURVEY MAILING.....	110
APPENDIX F POST CARD REMINDERS	112
APPENDIX G FOURTH COVER LETTER FOR FOLLOW-UP MAILING	114
APPENDIX H FIFTH COVER LETTER FOR FOLLOW-UP MAILING	116
APPENDIX I CONTINGENCY TABLES	118
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Research Questions, Variables, and Survey Items	47
Table 2 SACS Accredited Institutions Surveyed and Response Rates by State.....	53
Table 3 Response Rates by Public and Private Institutions.....	55
Table 4 Personal Demographics of Community College Presidents (N=209)	56
Table 5 Annual Operating Budgets of Surveyed Institutions	57
Table 6 Current and Future Importance of Leadership Styles: Frequencies and Percentages	59
Table 7 External Governance Models.....	61
Table 8 Interpretation of Leadership Styles based on External Governance Models.....	63
Table 9 Identification of Potential Future Leaders by Presidents' Years of Service.....	64
Table 10 Identification of Potential Future Leaders by Presidents' Years to Retirement	66
Table 11 Importance of Development Areas for Future Leaders	67
Table 12 Presidents' Prior Positions.....	69
Table 13 Succession Planning by Type and Gender.....	71
Table 14 Succession Planning by Type and Gender – Aggregated by Type.....	73
Table 15 Succession Plan by Presidents' Age	74
Table 16 Succession Planning by Presidents' Prior Advancement via a Plan.....	75

CHAPTER 1

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND DESIGN COMPONENTS

Introduction

Community colleges have been in a continuous state of growth and evolution from their commencement in the early 1900s. These institutions have operated under a set of core values since their inception: (a) to be adaptive, responsive, and connected to the community in which they resided; (b) to be focused on teaching; and (c) to maintain open doors to individuals seeking education beyond or outside that which they received during their K-12 years (Campbell & Leverty, 1999). According to the American Association of Community Colleges, community colleges became a national network in the 1960s with the opening of 457 public institutions. The unprecedented growth of the 1960s led to the establishment of more community colleges than the total number of institutions in existence prior to that decade. By 2002, there were 1,171 public, private, and tribal community colleges nationwide (American Association of Community Colleges Statistical Guide, 2002). Two-year colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutions have generally been referred to as community colleges since the 1960s.

During the 1990s, an analysis of the general leadership demographics of community college presidents revealed that they had changed very little over time. Weisman and Vaughan (2002) reported that in 1991, 89% of presiding community college presidents were Caucasian males with an average age of 54. However, they also

indicated that the number of institutions with a female president rose from 11% to 28% between 1991 and 2001.

The United States community college system has been projected to undergo a significant transition in its leadership during the first two decades of the 21st century. A number of authors (Evelyn, 2001; Shults, 2001; Vaughan & Weisman, 1998) have addressed this time frame as an era of crisis, while others have viewed it as a time of opportunity. Approximately one-half of the country's 1,171 public community college presidents indicated that they planned to retire within a 6-year period ranging from 2001 to 2007 (Shults, 2001). Additionally, these presidents reported that 25% or more of their chief administrative officers were also projected to retire by 2006 (Shults, 2001), consequently depleting the natural succession of future presidents. According to Vaughan and Weisman (1998), the problem of retiring leaders has been exacerbated by the fact that the average tenure of a community college president has been between 5 and 7 years. Thus, as these professionals have anticipated retirement, their institutions have been faced with the challenges inherent to the transitional issues associated with executive management positions and a shrinking pool of qualified applicants from which to draw.

Unfortunately, in 2005, the most common feeder positions to presidencies in the community college system were being filled with individuals of the baby-boom generation whose average ages were over 50 (Shults, 2001). Further compounding the issue was the fact that some of the possible replacements for these retiring leaders were

being lost to elementary and secondary schools that were experiencing leadership deficits of their own (Evelyn, 2001).

Recognizing the potential problems the community college system would face if this leadership deficit were to go unchecked, the American Association of Community Colleges authorized a study, the purpose of which was to promote a clear and shared understanding of the state of community college leadership and future challenges, to heighten awareness of initiatives underway, and to begin building a framework for a national plan of action (McClenney, 2001). The 2003 American Association of Community Colleges' annual meeting honed in on leadership identification and development issues.

According to the American Association of Community Colleges, Amey and VanDerLinden (2002), Little (2002), and Romero (2004), the success of 21st century community colleges was in part dependent upon the level of their active engagement in the identification, recruitment, and development of their potential future leaders. The need for future leaders to possess an in-depth understanding of the institutional culture as well as the skills and knowledge necessary to successfully lead their institutions into future decades has been well documented.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore with community college presidents their perception as to the extent to which (a) selected leadership styles presently required in the performance of presidential duties may be required in the future, (b) professional

development is aimed at identifying and developing future leaders, and (c) leadership succession planning is occurring.

Research Questions

This study was directed toward community college presidential leadership styles, professional development for potential leaders, and the use of succession plans as a vehicle to assist in this process. Research questions evolved around these themes in order to determine the relationship between specific variables in the study.

Two research questions were developed to explore community college presidents' beliefs in the current importance of five leadership styles as well as the importance those styles would play in the performance of their positions 5 years into the future. Existing survey instruments and questionnaires were examined during the literature review process. Many authors including Campbell and Leverty (1997) and Yukl (2002) repeatedly mentioned the following leadership styles: Delegative, Directive/Autocratic, Inclusive/Servant/Consultative, Negotiative, and Participative/Democratic. Surveyed presidents were asked to specify their perception of importance of the five different leadership styles in their present leadership role and the level of importance they believe these styles would likely have for future leaders. The second question permitted an examination of differences in leadership styles based on the institution's external governance model.

Research Question 1: What differences, if any, exist in the perceptions of community college presidents as to the current and future importance of selected leadership styles?

Research Question 2: What relationship, if any, exists between the external governance model under which an institution operates and presidential leadership styles?

Research Questions 3, 4, and 5 were used to explore a second area of interest relative to the identification and development of potential leaders and the extent to which professional development initiatives have been sponsored by community colleges to identify and develop future campus executives. Differences were explored based on number of years service as a community college president, number of years to retirement and prior experience as a community college vice president.

Research Question 3: To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years of service as a community college president and the identification and development of potential leaders?

Research Question 4: To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years to retirement and the identification and development of potential leaders?

Research Question 5: To what extent does a relationship exist between the areas of leadership development and community college positions held prior to the presidency?

Research Questions 6, 7, and 8 were used to address a third area of interest that was concerned with succession planning and the extent to which it was occurring on community college campuses. Gender, age, and respondents' identification for

advancement in a succession plan during their careers were the three variables considered.

Research Question 6: What relationship, if any, exists between gender and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Research Question 7: What relationship, if any, exists between age and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Research Question 8: What relationship, if any, exists between respondents' past advancement via a succession plan and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Definition of Terms

Community College--institutions offering associate degrees, career workforce degrees, vocational and technical certificates, remedial studies, in addition to continuing education, community services, and life long learning programs; historically referred to as Junior Colleges or Technical Institutions.

Delegative--interest in being personally involved is minimal, preference is to delegate tasks and responsibilities, sets limits or parameters for final outcomes.

Directive/Autocratic--interest in maintaining responsibility for planning and controlling in line with personal perception of priorities, giving guidance to subordinates.

Inclusive/Servant/Consultative--interest in the opinions and feelings of others is genuine, as is the ability to maintain a clear sense of objectives and to make the final decision.

Institutional Location--demographic categories established for this study urban, suburban or rural based on United States Census Bureau population data (2000).

Level I institutions--the 292 community colleges recognized by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools that offer Associate Degrees as their highest degree and include 2-year colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutions.

Negotiative--interest in influencing others by identifying their needs and by making deals.

Participative//Democratic--interest in decision-making by consensus, ensuring sufficient time is available for decision-making and that all relevant individuals are involved.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)--one of six regional accrediting agencies recognized by the U. S. Department of Education and accredits both private and public educational institutions, from pre-kindergarten through the university level, in the following 11 states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 2004).

Succession Planning--the process of strategically preparing an institution of the future by identifying critical positions within the institution and individuals with the potential for accepting the responsibilities of those positions in the future.

Succession Plans--a formal or semi-formal document, which includes a policy, procedures, and an official process.

Study Population

The population for this study included all 292 current community college presidents within the southeast region of the United States who presided over accredited public and private Level I institutions at the time of the present study. Associate Degrees were the highest degrees awarded by Level I institutions. The study population of community college presidents was drawn from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' list of accredited public and private 2-year colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. This population was selected, in part, based on the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' mission and focus on quality assurance.

Instrumentation

UCF's Institutional Review Board (Appendix A) initially approved this study. The 21st Century Community College Leadership Survey (Appendix B) was developed by the researcher and was used to collect data to ascertain the leadership styles favored by community college presidents and those they believed would be essential for emerging leaders. This survey was developed based on a review of the literature and emphasized Leadership Styles (Part 1), Professional Development (Part 2), and Succession Planning (Part 3). Part 4 was used to elicit demographic information from responding presidents.

A Panel of Experts in higher education assisted with the validation and reliability measures of this survey instrument. "Face validity is the degree to which the content of a

survey instrument appears to measure what it claims to measure” (Brown, 2001, p. 92). In addition to being provided with a copy of the questionnaire and research questions, each member of the panel received an assessment instrument for evaluating the document. The assessment form used by the Panel of Experts in reviewing the instrument is included in Appendix C.

The instrument was also distributed to 50 Florida Community College executives to test the reliability of the items used in survey questions 1 and 5. Additionally, this group assisted in determining the time required to respond to the survey.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher compiled a distribution list of the 292 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accredited Level I community colleges and mailed the instrument to the survey subjects. In an effort to increase the rate of return, an initial contact letter (Appendix D), informing potential respondents they had been selected as participants for this study, was mailed under the signature of a presidential colleague. The surveys and cover letter (Appendix E) were mailed to established community college presidents within 10 days of the initial letter. Three subsequent follow-up letters (Appendixes F-H) and a second copy of the survey were sent to each non-responding president. Data collection, data analysis, and documentation of the results were finalized Spring 2005.

Data analysis in this study was conducted using the statistical analysis software, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 11.5 (SPSS). Responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics and nonparametric test procedures. Descriptive

statistics were used to summarize the characteristics of the survey sample and the participants' response rates as well as the importance of current and potential future leadership styles of presidents, the identification and development of potential leaders, and the extent to which succession planning is occurring in community colleges. No sampling was used in identifying potential respondents. Rather, the entire population of community college presidents was surveyed. Since the response rate was less than 100%, respondents have been referred to as a sample. In addition, a cross tabulation was generated to determine if the response categories met the minimum required assumptions to conduct a chi-square of association. The variable levels were recoded in SPSS (11.5), where appropriate, to satisfy the required assumptions of chi-square. For example, the three age levels below age 49 (i.e., 35 and below, 36-42, 43-49) were aggregated to create the single age level of less than 49. Likewise, the two age categories of 64-70 along with 71 and above were combined into one category renamed 64 and above. Similar recoding processes were conducted to create value ranges for the reported annual operating budgets. Once the recoding processes were completed, chi-square of association was used to assist in determining possible relationships between specified variables for specific research questions.

Personal demographic variables were used to describe the responding population as well as to provide the basis of comparisons for the research questions. The institutional demographic variable of external governance model was used in comparing leadership styles. Personal demographic variables, such as years of service, years to retirement, and prior positions, were employed to assist in determining the processes

institutional leadership were utilizing to identify and develop potential future leaders.

Other selected personal variables (i.e., age, gender and advancement) were used in further analyzing data to determine the extent to which succession planning was occurring on college campuses.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were used to guide this study:

1. The population selected for this study responded to the survey honestly.
2. The population selected for this study was comprised of presiding community colleges presidents who were assumed to be effective leaders.
3. Presiding presidents of public and private Level I institutions accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools represented the southeast region only.

Limitations

The following limitations affected the manner in which this study was conducted:

1. A defined time frame in which this study was to be conducted and financial resource constraints limited the scope of this study.
2. Since the population of this study only encompassed presiding presidents within the southeast region of the United States, no attempt was made to generalize the findings to the entire community college system.
3. Only presiding community college presidents who were serving as chief executives during the spring of 2005 were asked to participate in the study.

4. This study did not seek to identify or control for factors relative to the maturity or experience of the presiding presidents being surveyed in their leadership roles or the stability of their respective institutions.

Significance of the Study

Higher education is “undergoing a phenomenal amount of change driven by various stakeholders” (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001, p. 1025). In addition, the impending retirements of both community college presidents and those in leadership positions, which have traditionally served as the feeder, pipeline, or career path positions leading to chief executive positions, have been predicted to create a significant leadership shortfall (Shults, 2001). The skills, talents, and knowledge needed by individuals at the executive level of leadership in a community college are extremely diverse. Many of the attributes of successful 20th century leaders may provide the same positive outcomes for future leaders. On the other hand, 21st century community college leaders may need to rely on new leadership styles in order to continue the momentum initiated by prior leaders in the community college system. Having information as to what has been effective in 2005, and what is or is not likely to be effective in 2010, could be very useful to present and future leaders (Blanchard, 1999).

A review of the literature indicated that an impending leadership crisis did exist and that more research was needed to ascertain the various directions a community college could take in order to achieve its goal of a successful future. Unfortunately, there has been little evidence of succession planning in higher education that would indicate

that individual institutions were preparing future leaders. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation has contributed \$1.9 million to support the American Association of Community Colleges initiative in grooming potential outstanding administrators and faculty (Patton, 2003). David Pierce, president of the American Association of Community Colleges, has addressed the importance of identifying “the knowledge, skills, abilities, and competencies community college presidents need to be successful in the next century (Campbell & Leverty, 1997, p. 34).

Numerous studies have been conducted to develop profiles of successful leaders, to identify the attributes of effective leadership styles, and to explore the characteristics of outstanding leadership skills. The anticipated leadership gap has provided numerous opportunities for leaders to work toward reducing the impact of that gap on their institutions. Likewise, the phenomenon has provided fertile ground for research in the domain of postsecondary education.

Organization of the Study

This chapter provided a description of the study, the purpose of which was to examine the self-reported leadership styles of presiding community college presidents in 2005 and the leadership style changes these leaders predicted might be needed by the next generation of community college leaders in order to successfully fulfill their duties and responsibilities. The following four chapters provide a review of relevant literature, a description of methods and procedures used in the study, the analysis of data, a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature briefly documents the evolution of American community colleges while exploring its future from a leadership perspective. Additionally, this review includes an overview of the key roles and responsibilities of community college leaders, the characteristics and definitions of leadership as well as the five leadership styles addressed by the researcher in the present study. Also addressed, and of particular interest, is the extent to which the identification and professional development of prospective community college leaders and succession planning has been occurring in community colleges.

The Evolution of American Community Colleges and their Leaders

“All 2-year institutions have consistently been lumped together in a single category, despite their large and increasing representation” (McCormick & Cox, 2003, p. 7). American community colleges began as junior colleges and technical institutions. With their roots in the early 20th century, they became increasingly involved with their communities and comprehensive in their programming. Major growth in community colleges occurred during the 1960s and 70s (Milliron & de los Santos, 2004, Shults, 2001).

Between 1901 and 2001, a wide variety of societal forces promoted the continuous growth and diversification of the community college’s initial mission to

provide an opportunity for equal access to higher education for all citizens based on an open-admission policy (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Nora, 2000; Rendón, 2000). One of the most prominent of the societal forces leading to the growth of these institutions was the necessity to broaden the skill sets of United States workers to meet the expanding needs brought about by the Industrial Age of the early 1900s. Additional forces, which spurred the growth of community colleges, included

. . . lengthening the period of adolescence, which mandated custodial care of the young for a longer time; and the drive for social equality, which supposedly would be enhanced if more people had access to higher education. (Cohen & Brawer, 1996, p. 1)

Providing an avenue for the general population to access higher education in an equitable manner soon became the mantra of the community college mission (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Rendón, 2000). The open-admission or “open-door” policy of these institutions offered community members new opportunities for improving their quality of life (Nora, 2000). Cohen and Brawer (1996) stated that since the inception of community colleges

. . . the United States has been more dedicated to the belief that all individuals should have the opportunity to rise to their greatest potential. Accordingly, all barriers to individual development should be broken down. Institutions that enhance human growth should be created and supported. (p. 10)

The 1940s led to three major changes in the United States that had a direct impact on education. These fundamental factors included a shift in the skill level necessary for the American work force, the birth of the “baby-boom” generation, and the passage of the G.I. Bill. Each of these historical events ultimately had a specific effect on community colleges. From their early beginnings until the 1940s, 2-year colleges were generally

known as junior colleges. In 1947, however, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education suggested changing the name of these institutions to community colleges due to their expanded functions. Community colleges again expanded their ever evolving mission to further embrace comprehensive community service, academic transfer courses to universities, vocational and technical training, remedial class work, continuing education, and life-long learning sessions to include work force development and economic development (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Many of the founding community college presidents who had established the mission and core values of their respective institutions were first-generation college graduates themselves (Hockaday, 1990). During the 1960s, these pioneers guided the steady growth of community colleges, which was being driven by the baby boomers' coming of age, a robust economy, and social support. By 1972, seven states, which would later represent five of the six Department of Education's regional institutional accrediting agencies, had developed into what Cohen and Brawer referred to as mature community college systems. The seven states within the mature community college system were identified as California, Florida, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Michigan, and Washington.

The 1972 study also revealed that most community colleges were built within 25 miles of the state's core population. This was considered to be a reasonable commuting distance (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). According to Wattenbarger, community colleges distinguished themselves from all other higher education providers through the commitment to quality shown by the founding leaders during the early development of

these institutions (Campbell & Leverty, 1999). The evolution of community colleges continued into the 1980s, a time when funding and growth declined and the United States entered into a lengthy recession. Alfred stated that colleges and universities saw their financial resources and public esteem plummet and their costs and challenges skyrocket throughout the 1990s (Honeyman, Wattenbarger, & Westbrook, 1996). Change was occurring more rapidly than ever before and influencing society, the economy, and technology (Campbell & Leverty, 1999). Community colleges were being overwhelmed with diverse and difficult demands that were not being addressed adequately by the old set of values (Campbell & Leverty, 1999).

As America's community colleges marked their centennial celebration in 2001, it was becoming increasingly obvious that leading these institutions into the 21st century would be more complex and would "demand a greater range of skills" (Romero, 2004, p. 31). Community colleges have played an essential role in the fabric of American education (Cohen and Brawer, 1996) as well as having an enormous impact on American society over the past century (Sullivan, 2001). They have opened their doors to provide formalized training and access to higher education. Community colleges have also contributed to the quality of life in communities across the nation as they have brought more programs to more students than any other type of higher education institution (Alfred, 2000/2001).

Sullivan (2001) reported in her study that the leadership styles of the new generation of presidents would be considerably different from those of their predecessors. In addressing college leadership, she identified four generations. The first generation of

founding fathers pioneered a new and democratic form of higher education. The second generation, good managers, referred to the individuals who led colleges through a period of rapid growth and abundant resources. The third generation, collaborators, were leaders with the ability to draw groups together to leverage scarce resources and make access to higher education truly universal. The fourth generation of leaders, according to Sullivan, was yet to be defined. However, she did assert that the generation of leaders for the 21st century would be required to inspire trust in followers as higher education continued to evolve and even reinvent itself.

This first centennial also marked a time of transition in the evolution of many community colleges in that leaders approaching 30 to 40 years of service in the system had begun to contemplate retirement (Sullivan, 2001). Shults indicated that approximately 50%, or 635 public community college presidents, planned to retire by 2007. This changing of the guard began occurring at a time when corruption and scandal in American business institutions had become prevalent, and the American public was demanding a new direction and a higher ethical standard of conduct for its leaders (Baum, 2004).

Key Roles and Responsibilities of Community College Leaders

The specific roles and responsibilities of community college leaders have been as varied as community colleges themselves. Daly (2003) stated that “understanding how the mission interacts with the external and internal environment” (p. 50) was a key responsibility of community college leaders. While Zimmerman (2001) agreed that a

macroscopic understanding of the organization and its stakeholders was key to successfully guiding an institution, he placed more emphasis on a leader's ability to provide overall influence and effectively articulate the institution's strategic direction. Brown (2001) viewed overall influence as the level of personal self-confidence a leader has "in fulfilling his or her roles and responsibilities" (p.11).

Additionally, leaders have been expected to be visionaries with the ability to see the big picture and inspire followers (Daly, 2003; HR Focus, 1998; Zimmerman, 2001). Bennis and Goldsmith (2003) have contended that a leader must maintain an equal balance of ambition, competence, and integrity "to be true to an ethical vision and make that vision real for others" (p. 2).

Beagrie and Couzins (2003) also included the ability of envisioning where the institution is going among their five attributes of leadership. They stated that a leader must also know how to identify and communicate the organization's goals, in order to help the organization realize its collective vision. They also emphasized the importance of respect and trust at all levels. A leader can inspire people within the organization by modeling best practices. In this way, "a thumbprint, or legacy, in which everyone in the organization can become his or her best self" (Smith & Sandstrom, 1999, p. 34) can be created. Since these characteristics are not gender specific, there is no reason to believe that women will continue to "remain underrepresented in leadership positions" (von Hippel, Zouroudis, Abbas, 2003, p. 148).

Thus, as organizations have focused on re-establishing core values and beliefs (HR Focus, 1998), leaders have been required to focus on fostering relationships founded

on trust and respect with all stakeholders, not just the shareholders of the organization” (Zimmerman, 2001). Establishing a foundation of trust has been critical to creating a following and requires a leader to “generate shared values, goals, visions, or objectives with those she wishes to lead” (Bennis & Goldsmith, 2003, p. 3). Trust has been cited as “the source of organizational integrity” (p.144) capable of inspiring followers and promoting change. Leadership tactics once seen as shrewd have been replaced in the 21st century with leadership strategies that elicit trust, respect, and integrity according to Baum (2004). In discussing transparent leadership, Baum stated that “integrity is an important part of business protocol” (p. 75) and that “good leaders work hard to set an example that shows they have the best intentions in mind” (p. 76).

O’Rourke (1997) wrote in regard to the changing pressures on community college leaders due to increased campus diversity, technology, and the need for new skills. Zimmerman expanded on this view by addressing the need for leaders to have vision, remain competitive, and serve as an articulate spokesperson with the ability to contend with the needs of 21st century learners (Ayers, 2002; Lewis, nd; Zimmerman, 2001).

Leadership Styles

The literature reviewed supported a plethora of views relating to the characteristics, definitions, and styles of leadership. Community college presidents, in providing leadership for their institutions, have been called on to combine their talents, skills, and knowledge in using appropriate and varying leadership styles as they respond to institutional and societal challenges that arise on a daily basis. No single definition

holistically defines leadership. According to Bennis and Goldsmith (2003), “the requirements for leaders have escalated and are infinitely difficult” (p. 1) due to the increasing complexities and demands of society. The characteristics of leadership that a leader might have employed vary depending upon the particular situation, the timing, and people involved (Daly, 2003). Community college presidents have been required to interact with a wide variety of people and have routinely faced vastly different situations requiring them to demonstrate flexible behaviors and exercise different leadership styles.

Broadly defined, leadership styles such as delegative, directive, negotiative, participative, or servant sufficiently permit style identification and have provided the basis for numerous research studies (Campbell & Levery, 1997; Yulk, 2002).

Community college presidents have often been called on to express their views regarding leadership styles, and researchers have sought to define, explain and expand understanding regarding the leadership of executives at various points in history (Campbell & Levery, 1997; Shults, 2001; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002).

Yukl (2002) defined leadership as “a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (p. 2). Bolman and Deal (1997) have viewed leadership as “a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values of both the leader and the led” (p. 296)

In experimental settings, early researchers suggested that gender-stereotypic patterns existed between men and women relative to leadership styles; however, this

theory has not been supported “when social behavior is regulated by leadership roles in organizational settings” (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 794). Researchers have found that “leadership style had a powerful impact on both productivity and morale” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.150). Definitions, terms, descriptions, and research on leadership styles have evolved over the years to serve changing societal and organizational needs. The five leadership styles, which provided the focus of the survey used to conduct the present study, provide a range of widely accepted leadership styles in use at the time the study was conducted. The following descriptions for each of the styles provides information related to the rationale for inclusion and the definitions respondents were asked to use in completing survey items related to the styles. These definitions were initially adopted from a 1997 study of community college presidents in Colorado conducted by Campbell and Levery and were later enhanced by this researcher for this study based on the work of other authors.

Delegative Leadership

For the purposes of this research, the delegative leader was defined as one whose interest in being personally involved is minimal. His or her preference would be to delegate tasks and responsibilities, and set limits or parameters for final outcomes. Largely set in the philosophy of Bolman and Deal’s (1997) Human Resource Frame, a delegative leadership style promotes the development and empowerment of followers through shared wealth, autonomy, teamwork, job security and enrichment, training and education, and ensures “egalitarianism and upward influence” (p. 123). Through

delegation, a leader provides followers or subordinates with a substantial amount of “responsibility and discretion in carrying out work activities, handling problems, and making important decisions” (Yukl, 2002, p.64). Leaders with a strong need for power and achievement, or who are insecure, or who have a difficult time forming trusting relationships may not chose this particular style of leadership even when it may be the most appropriate (Yukl, 2002). However, when followers or subordinates lack the necessary expertise or commitment, leaders may appropriately opt to avoid this particular form of leadership (Yukl, 2002).

Directive or Autocratic Leadership

The directive or autocratic leader is one with an interest in maintaining responsibility for planning and control in line with one’s personal perception of priorities and giving guidance to subordinates. This definition is supportive of the first two categories of Vroom and Yetton’s taxonomy, which refer to the decision-making process from an autocratic leadership perspective. In the first category, presented by Vroom and Yetton as AI, the leader decides using available information. In the second style, coded as AII, the leader elicits essential information from group members before making a decision. During the process of gathering information, the leader may or may not tell followers what the problem is (Owens, 2001). Exercising this form of dominance or control is why, according to Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), men have often been more closely aligned with the directive or autocratic style of leadership than women.

Directive or autocratic leadership was among the earliest of the leadership styles considered by researchers. The Ohio State University studies of the 1940s and 1950s were focused on the manner in which leaders provided direction (Sagie, 1996). Directive or autocratic derives its basic characteristics from Bolman and Deal's (1997) Structural or Bureaucratic Frame and has been described as a fading style in the employee-oriented environment of the 21st century. In expressing their beliefs, Bennis and Goldsmith (2003) stated "as bureaucracies defend themselves for survival, true leadership is seen as a threat to authoritarian rule and is shunned, attacked, and rejected" (p. 54). From a more positive prospective, Yukl (2002) stated that this leadership style promotes an increase in the efforts of followers or subordinates since its highly structural form "reduces role ambiguity, increases the size of incentives, and strengthens reward contingencies" (p. 215).

Inclusive, Servant, or Consultative Leadership

An inclusive, servant, or consultative leader's interest in the opinions and feelings of others is genuine, as is the ability to maintain a clear sense of objectives and to make the final decision. According to Greenleaf (as cited in Yukl, 2002), this form of leadership provided "the essence of ethical leadership" (p.404). The primary responsibility of servant leaders has been service to their followers. Service included attending to the needs of followers through nurturing and understanding their aspirations, pain, and frustrations as well as defending and empowering followers "to help them become healthier, wiser, and more willing to accept their responsibilities" (p.404).

It is through this process of building and maintaining “effective interpersonal relationships” (Yukl, 2002, p.70) that a leader is able to develop a culture that encourages, supports, and rewards individual and team achievements (Zimmerman, 2001). To maintain the confidence of their followers, leaders must consistently exhibit behaviors that exemplify trustworthiness, integrity, honesty, and respectfulness (Daly, 2003). While these characteristics are undoubtedly an asset for effective leadership, inclusive leaders must have the ability to examine a situation to determine if a more decisive style is appropriate or they “may trade credibility and even success for consensus” (Reardon, 1995, p. 73). A collaborative style of leadership creates a friendly and productive climate for goal achievement, according to Daly (2003). Daly further explained that respect and trust must exist between leaders and followers for a sincere collaborative approach to succeed. Finally, respect is built by behaving “professionally and courteously to each other” (Daly, 2003, p. 50).

Negotiative Leadership

A leader with a negotiative leadership style has interest in influencing others by identifying their needs and by making deals. As in previously discussed styles of leadership which appeared to be reflective of a specific time or culture, negotiative leadership was no exception. This particular style of leadership rests comfortably in the Political Frame as outlined in Bolman and Deal’s text on organizational theory (1997).

Influence is the key word in the working definition representing this form of leadership. It was Zimmerman’s contention that negotiative leaders react and adjust in a

positive manner of focused optimism. Conversely, based on Yukl's writings on the Power-Influence Approach, "leaders act and followers react" (2002, p.12). Regardless of the approach, these authors have agreed that a leader has learned how to influence others by simply understanding their needs and by addressing their wants and concerns (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Yukl, 2002; Zimmerman, 2001). The ability to influence others is a very powerful tool, which, according to Bolman and Deal (1997), should be used judiciously.

Yukl (2002) identified the following 11 proactive tactics for influencing others:

1. Rational persuasion: The agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to show a proposal or request is feasible and relevant for attaining important task objectives.
2. Apprising: The agent explains how carrying out a request or supporting a proposal will benefit the target personally or help advance the target person's career.
3. Inspirational Appeals: The agent makes an appeal to values and ideals or seeks to arouse the target person's emotions to gain commitment for a request or proposal.
4. Consultation: The agent encourages the target to suggest improvements in a proposal, or to help plan an activity or change for which the target person's support and assistance are desired.
5. Exchange: The agent offers an incentive, suggests an exchange of favors, or indicates willingness to reciprocate at a later time if the target will do what the agent requests.
6. Collaboration: The agent offers to provide relevant resources and assistance if the target will carry out a request or approve a proposed change.
7. Personal Appeals: The agent asks the target to carry out a request or support a proposal out of friendship, or asks for a personal favor before saying what it is.
8. Ingratiation: The agent uses praise and flattery before or during an influence attempt or expresses confidence in the target's ability to carry out a difficult request.
9. Legitimizing Tactics: The agent seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request or to verify authority to make it by referring to rules, formal policies, or official documents.
10. Pressure: The agent uses demands, threats, frequent checking, or persistent reminders to influence the target person.

11. Coalition Tactics: The agent seeks the aid of others to persuade the target to do something or uses the support of others as a reason for the target to agree. (p. 160)

Negotiative leaders, regardless of the tactic they have elected to use, are in a unique position of serving “as self-fueled process improvement ‘think tanks’ or change agent specialists, developing imaginative solutions” for the purpose of creating win-win results (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 11).

Participative or Democratic Leadership

Participative or democratic leaders are interested in decision-making by consensus. They would ensure that sufficient time would be available for the decision-making process and that all relevant individuals were involved. Bolman and Deal (1997), in their review, noted that human resource scholars such as McGregor and Argyris have discussed the pressure placed on subordinates to depend on their superordinates under a traditional management model while participation has provided workers with an “opportunity to influence decisions about their work and working conditions” (p. 128). Bolman and Deal viewed participation as important for its impact on style and climate as opposed to increased shared authority. Conversely, according to Yukl (2002), “participative leadership is concerned with power sharing and empowerment of followers” (p.13). Yukl further hypothesized that when tasks were unstructured, participative or democratic leadership could enhance follower satisfaction and effort by increasing role clarity. Bennis and Goldsmith (2003) have supported Yukl’s theory stating that leaders amplify follower productivity by considering the options and

suggestions of all those involved along with increasing responsibility, power, and authority in the decision-making process.

“Conceptually, democratic leadership resembles transformational leadership. Both democratic and transformational leaders emphasize active participation and intellectual stimulation of employees and encourage their involvement in decision-making” (van Engen, van der Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001, p. 583). Because of the emphasis on follower participation and intellectual stimulation, elements often associated with women, this has frequently been denoted as a feminine style of leadership.

“Demonstrating a charismatic self-assurance of ideas, judgment and capabilities, a leader tactically influences others through participation in all processes and decision-making” (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 11). Pfeffer cautioned that this form of leadership might mask political agendas as a leader builds motivation and commitment, which Pfeffer referred to as co-optation. Pfeffer defined co-optation as “a process of giving people something to induce them to ally themselves with organizational needs and purpose” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 199). Contraindicated political effects could be minimized if a leader created unity of vision, direction, and inspiration within the organization, thus sustaining group cohesion, through trust and respect (Zimmerman, 2001).

Identification of Potential Leaders

The challenge of identifying potentially successful leaders has been a recurring theme throughout the review of literature related to community college leadership (Dulewicz & Higgs, 1998). Byham (2003) has asserted that one can learn to identify

potential once one is able to recognize “exceptional job performance” and has an understanding of 10 key factors: (a) The propensity to lead; (b) the ability to bring out the best in people and treat others with dignity and respect; (c) traits of authenticity, integrity, trust, genuineness, and honesty; (d) receptivity to feedback; (e) ability to reinvent self; (f) the right cultural fit; (g) a passion for results and a desire to overcome obstacles; (h) adaptability and skill in juggling competing demands; (i) skill in conceptual thinking or visualizing possibilities without becoming over-involved in details; and (j) the ability to navigate ambiguity.

Despite the increasing complexity of community college leadership, degree programs for this segment of higher education leadership waned during the past two decades while K-12 training programs thrived. Shults’ 2001 study quantified this diminishing segment of higher education. He reported that less than one-quarter of the number of advanced degrees had been conferred between 1982 and 1997; thus, the leadership void continued to expand as the pool of prepared community college leaders declined (Klinger, 2001; Patton, 2004; Romero, 2004). According to Klinger, “leadership training, predicated on identification of the skills needed by leaders, and more savvy selection of leaders are critical” (p. 32) if institutions are to address the impending leadership shortfalls of their organizations. Though the quest to identify leadership qualities or traits began in the 1920s, leadership has remained an ill-defined and undeveloped discipline (Dulewicz & Higgs, 1998; Morley & Eadie, 2001). Notably, promotions and advancements have been mistakenly used to gage individual leadership skills (Buss, 2001). However, by nurturing prospective leaders through personal

introductions and shared anecdotes of personal leadership development experiences, current leaders have helped to mitigate the shortfall of leaders. This form of coaching, counseling, and mentoring has been referred to as “walking the talk” and encouraging leadership behaviors by example (Daly, 2003). Identifying emerging leaders and then maximizing their potential by helping them to build on their strengths and develop their weak areas has required foresight and planning in order to equip developed leaders with the skills and attributes necessary to achieve desired results (Byham, 2003; HR Focus, 1998).

Development of Potential Leaders

The most difficult challenge for leadership programs is not the development of specific skills, such as interpersonal communication, delegation, and conflict management. Rather it is the cultivation of attitudes and ethical codes that allows for the proper application of the common skills and talents developed by leadership programs. (Gibson & Pason, 2003, p. 23)

To avoid the development of individuals with the ability to manipulate followers in a manner deemed to be unethical, illegal, or destructive, exemplary leadership programs have stressed the importance of attitudes as well as skills. Gibson and Pason stressed the importance of leaders who viewed their organizations in an altruistic manner and as such were likely to work toward benefiting their organizations and communities.

In his 2001 study, Shults found that many community college presidents had received some form of leadership training prior to obtaining a presidency. Shults reported that presidents felt they were not fully prepared for all facets of the job in addition to feeling overwhelmed by the nature of the job itself. Areas in which presidents

stated a particular lack of preparation have included politics, fundraising, budgeting, financial management, relationship building, and work with governing boards. He further noted that in order to gain the skills and traits important to effective leaders, those in the community college leadership pipeline must have access to appropriate professional development. According to Little (2002), community college boards of trustees needed to take an active role in preparing community college leaders for the 21st century through supported opportunities for training and advancement. In an editorial, Little stated that community colleges needed to “sow their own future leaders” (p. 33). Daly (2003) pointed out that current leaders with positive skills were in the perfect position to have invested in the future by nurturing the next wave of leaders and by sharing their experiences.

The Saratoga Institute conducted a study in which 88% of the Fortune 1,000 participants replied that a shift had occurred in the areas of leadership and leadership development. The participating companies noted a change in leadership styles that had become more focused on an orientation of trust emphasizing that people were more important than activities (HR Focus, 1998). Companies that have developed plans designed to nurture employees found increased enthusiasm among the work force as they realized organizational leaders were interested in their career development, ideas, and expertise (Kufahl, 2004).

Authors have stressed the importance of evaluating high-potential candidates’ skills to determine their strengths and needs and then providing opportunities to practice (Kufahl, 2004). The performance factors that would be included in the evaluation

process are “job experiences, knowledge, competencies, and derailers (traits that can cause people to fail at higher levels)” (Byham, 2003, p. 9). The importance of identifying derailers was brought into specific focus during the late 20th century as corruption and scandal became more prevalent. Traits that may have once been viewed as shrewd and cunning business practices were no longer deemed as appropriate. By the beginning of the 21st century, the public had begun to demanding leadership traits such as ethics, trustworthiness, and respectability (Baum, 2004; Beagrie & Couzins, 2003).

The three factors that have driven leaders and top executives to identify developing leaders along with “attracting, retaining, and developing key contributors” (Zeiss, 2004, p. 34) as primary business concerns were resource constraints, the competitive employment market associated with the increase of globalization, and the impending retirements of the baby-boom generation (Evelyn, 2001; Romero, 2004; Smith & Sandstrom, 1999; Zeiss, 2004). Thus, training and retaining the best employees came to be seen as a cost effective mechanism through which institutions were better equipped to address varying issues while remaining highly productive (Lindquist, 2005; Shannon, 2004; Zeiss, 2004).

Smith and Sandstrom (1999) noted the strategic merits that could be derived from an entire organization developing its own workforce. They stressed the impact of leaders learning new skills, honing personal attributes, and functioning at a higher level. Reportedly, activities such these improve communication and help to diminish chaos within organizations. However, training alone has not been enough to develop peak performance. Solid foundations have also included trust and support in addition to

specific motivators such as recognition, fair compensation, and a sense of belonging (Buckingham, 2005; Zeiss, 2004).

Once potential leaders have been identified, Buss (2001) stated, an organization needed to focus on its culture and the types of leaders the institution's leaders wished to cultivate as well as how they planned to measure and recognize successes. Leaders within organizations also needed to establish the types of traits and skills that they would nurture in their prospective leaders to ensure success (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999; Buss, 2001). It has been incumbent upon these leaders to cultivate the skills that successful future community college leaders will need to balance the complex academic and business challenges they will face with integrity and self-determination (Buss, 2001; Daly, 2003; Romero, 2004).

High performing organizations have incorporated best practices into their leadership development programs with a focus on the activities that enable participants to develop the requisite skills necessary for success in the 21st century (Fulmer & Conger, 2004; HR Focus, 1998). Rodriguez (2004) believed that these assignments, if properly designed, would provide the building blocks for individuals to develop competencies over time. The National Institute for Leadership Development, however, has proposed specific leadership training designed for women in order to address presumed gender differences in leadership, learning, and communication styles (Townsend & Twombly, 1998).

Development programs, according to Miller (2001), should not be focused on changing people. Rather, such programs should encourage the development of desirable

skills and attitudes. Therefore, the first step any leadership development program needs to take would be to determine whether managerial or leadership skills are the focus of development. Managers transform and capitalize on individual talents as they “coach, counsel, teach, and guide” (Taylor, 2005, p. 68). Leaders, on the other hand, help individuals see how they can be involved in achieving the organization’s goals and “let others tackle a problem, design their own solutions, and take action” (Miller, 2001, p. 97).

Whether leaders are born or can be developed has long been debated. Authors such as Bolman and Deal, Maxwell, and Yukl have agreed that one can be educated in the area of leadership. Parsell and Bligh (2000) also spoke to the declining acceptance of the “born” premise. Buckingham (2005) summarized his mixed views by stating that while there are some initial qualities one must have to be a leader, everyone has the ability to learn to lead better. Buss (2001) had earlier expressed the importance of developing as well as identifying leaders in dealing with the impending shortage of leaders in an institution.

Butler (1999) wrote of the importance of leadership programs for individuals as well as groups of individuals or teams and the need for these programs “to focus on career paths and options, organizational commitment, coaching and mentoring, and long-term reward and recognition policies (HR Magazine, 2005, p .14). Coaching and modeling have been seen as important in preparing leaders to meet the challenges of increasingly complex organizations in a global society (Miller, 2001; Smith & Sandstrom, 1993).

Succession Planning

Effective succession planning has been an ever-evolving daily activity involving all aspects of the organization. It includes the identification of future needs and the impact on all employees. Leaders seeking to identify individuals with high potential may witness an increase in leadership aspirations within the overall organization (Lacey, nd). According to Caudron (1999), succession planning must be strategically driven and not simply focused on the selection of new leaders or the identification of talented executives. It must also be centered on creating a match between the institution's mission and the individuals best suited to execute its strategies. In other words, the fundamental goal of a succession plan would be to get "the right skills in the right place" (Fulmer & Conger, 2004, p. 39). By matching the talents and personalities of individuals with job descriptions, organizations could increase the effectiveness of their recruiting and hiring practices in addition to maximizing their retention of essential personnel (Zeiss, 2004).

According to Fulmer and Conger (2004), narrowly focused leadership development programs and succession plans that failed to identify and address skill deficiencies have been linked to the failure of talented leaders. Developing a formal succession plan focused on activities oriented toward the future could "produce leaders with a forward-looking vision" (p. 41) and minimize the potential of grooming emerging leaders with present day philosophies and skills, which would "be outdated by the time they reach the top" (Rodriguez, 2004, p. 81).

Additionally, a formal succession plan would help enhance the mind-set of employees throughout the organization in which jobs would be viewed as developmental rather than routine assignments. This could have a positive impact throughout the organization and increase the enthusiasm of its workforce as well as the overall employee contributions to the institution (Kufahl, 2004; Rodriguez, 2004). By incorporating the practical and financial facets of the organization's future, institutions have been able to create more depersonalized formal succession plans, thereby neutralizing many of the emotionally charged issues associated with developing successors (Lewis, 2000).

Unfortunately, even with the known concerns that the mass exodus of its executive branch and the critical challenges these retirements would pose, institutions of higher education have appeared to be minimally prepared to address the issues (Shults, 2001). The manner in which succession planning has been handled in higher education has often appeared to be haphazard at best, and plans were typically not known to those who could benefit the most (Amey, 2004; Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002). While underutilized in higher education, properly designed and implemented succession plans have occupied a powerful position in helping institutions transition into the future. At the time of the present study, succession plans were reported to be increasingly critical for community colleges who were faced not only with losing their chief executive officers to retirement, but with losing their traditional leadership pipeline, thus making the future presidential leadership of community colleges uncertain (Lewis, 2004; Shults, 2001). As leaders have retired, community colleges have lost the leaders who have been responsible for developing future leaders (Lewis, 2004). Additionally, these leaders have taken with

them the practical knowledge and skills they had acquired throughout their careers as well as their understanding of the organization's culture, rituals, and unspoken symbols (Lindquist, 2005).

Despite the fact that there has been a clear need to develop future leaders; the preparation of potential presidents and other community college leaders has declined. The number of individuals prepared to accept higher education leadership roles, including the presidency, has dramatically diminished (*Leadership 2020*, 2002). One indicator of this decline in the preparation of future leaders was noted earlier. The number of advanced degrees awarded in the area of community college administration between 1982-83 and 1996-97 decreased by 78% (Shults, 2001). Declines in formal preparation have created a double-edged sword of threats and opportunities for community colleges and higher education leadership development programs that face a greater burden of identification and development of future leaders. Key to a successful development process is affording individuals with opportunities to gain and practice new skills as they are being groomed for new and potentially different leadership challenges of the 21st century (Kufahl, 2004; Shults, 2001). Miller (2005) and Zeiss (2004) discussed succession in terms of the potential benefits to an organization in improved morale and productivity as well as retention of outstanding performers. Potential leaders have been lost when employees no longer had a sense of how their contributions impacted the organization's goals or when they began to feel ignored or unwanted (Lindquist, 2005; Miller, 2005).

Summary

From its inception in the early 1900s, the American community college has maintained its fundamental mission of addressing societal needs including access, equality, and opportunity for adults to acquire higher education through its open-door policy and close geographic proximity to community members. In 2001, the American community college was facing a new challenge as approximately 50% of the country's 1,171 public community college presidents, who had planned to retire by 2007, had begun their departure (Shults, 2001). This change had occurred simultaneously as colleges were being confronted by the needs of an ever-increasingly complex and global society.

As the 21st century had begun to unfold, corruption and scandal had become prevalent and the demand for ethical, trustworthy, and respectable leaders had grown (Baum, 2004; Beagrie & Couzins, 2003). Concurrently, the roles and responsibilities of leaders in higher education had already begun to change to keep pace with the evolving needs of the institution's diverse population along with the demands for new technology and skills. Ultimately, a presiding president had to have an acute understanding of and ability to articulate the college's mission while maintaining a keen awareness of how internal and external stakeholders could impact the institution's overall success (Daly, 2003; Zimmerman, 2001).

Leadership styles, while often situational, played a critical role in how a president chose to interact with the broad variety of individuals that defined the institution's

stakeholders. The five widely accepted leadership styles used to conduct this study were delegative, directive, negotiative, participative, and servant.

Identifying leadership potential, even with the growing number of vacating positions, has remained an ill-defined and undeveloped discipline (Dulewicz & Higgs, 1998; Morley & Eadie, 2001). Time, foresight, and nurturing are required to maximize the strengths of emerging leaders. Leadership development programs have sought to develop knowledgeable, competent, and experienced individuals capable of leading community college's into the next decade. Modeling ethical behavior along with coaching and mentoring have also been viewed as vital in the preparation of emerging leaders who seek to address the challenges associated with globalization and the diverse constituencies community colleges serve.

Succession planning is one method by which higher education can address the impending mass exodus being brought about by the retirement of its leaders. However, succession planning has remained an underutilized process of retaining potential leaders and of linking an institution's mission with the individuals fundamentally equipped to execute its strategies. Developing successors has been noted to be highly emotional, however, formalizing the process has been shown to neutralize sensitive issues while infusing employee enthusiasm and increasing institutional morale and productivity.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter 3 delineates all facets of the methodologies used to conduct this study. Specifically, the chapter includes (a) the purpose of the study, (b) research questions, (c) a description of the study population, (d) a description of the survey instrument development and pilot testing processes and results, (e) data collection and analysis procedures, (f) study assumptions and limitations, and (g) a summary.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore with community college presidents their perception as to the extent to which (a) selected leadership styles presently required in the performance of presidential duties may be required in the future, (b) professional development is aimed at identifying and developing future leaders, and (c) leadership succession planning is occurring.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following eight research questions:

1. What differences, if any, exist in the perceptions of community college presidents as to the current and future importance of selected leadership styles?

2. What relationship, if any, exists between the external governance model under which an institution operates and presidential leadership styles?
3. To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years of services as a community college president and the identification and development of potential leaders?
4. To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years to retirement and the identification and development of potential leaders?
5. To what extent does a relationship exist between the areas of leadership development and community college positions held prior to the presidency?
6. What relationship, if any, exists between gender and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?
7. What relationship, if any, exists between age and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?
8. What relationship, if any, exists between respondents' past advancement via a succession plan and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Study Population

There are six regional institutional accrediting agencies for community colleges in the United States, which include the (a) Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, (b) New England Association of Colleges and Schools, (c) North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, (d) Northwest Commission on Colleges and

Universities, (e) Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and (f) Western Association of Colleges and Schools. The target population for this study was comprised of the presiding presidents of the accredited Level I institutions within the Southern Association's region. This population included presidents of all public and private 2-year colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutions in the following 11 states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Associate Degrees, by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools definition, were the highest degree that a Level I institution could award at the time of this study. An analysis of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools directory revealed that 292 presidents met the aforementioned criteria for inclusion in this study.

Instrument Development and Assessment

A study proposal and initial survey instrument developed by the researcher were presented to and reviewed by members of her dissertation committee. The survey instrument (Appendix B) was developed based on a review of the literature. It emphasized three major categories including Leadership Styles (Part 1), Professional Development (Part 2), and Succession Planning (Part 3). A fourth component elicited demographic information from responding presidents. Once approved, the proposal and survey were sent to an external Panel of Experts for further review and evaluation. The Panel of Experts was comprised of a diverse group of individuals, each of whom held an earned doctorate and had served in a community college leadership role. Panel members

were selected based on their years of service in higher education and specific knowledge of community colleges. These professionals were able to offer varying perspectives based on their diversity of gender, race, community college tenure and positions. The panel's tenure ranged from that of a newly appointed community college academic vice president to a retired community college president. Also included on the panel were a vice president for planning and development and an educational leadership university professor.

In addition to being reviewed and evaluated by the members of both the dissertation committee and Panel of Experts, the survey was also pilot tested. The results of these assessments, including other research and statistical methodologies, were used to finalize the survey prior to its distribution to the 292 presiding community college presidents.

Pilot Test of Survey Instrument

A convenience sampling method was employed to survey 50 Florida community college executives for the pilot test. All of the pilot test participants were in leadership roles and potential future college presidents. The purpose of the pilot test was to assess item validity.

An executive vice president of a Florida community college distributed all of the surveys. This individual explained the purpose of the study and the pilot test to the pilot survey participants. The same procedure occurred in two different venues. The first test was administered during a president's cabinet meeting that included individuals with

titles such as vice president for academics, vice president for administration, vice president for planning, associate vice president for finance, and associate vice president for human resources. The second venue was that of a quarterly meeting of the Community College Business Officers, attended by individuals with titles including: vice president for finance and administrative services, vice president for human resources, finance, and information resources, vice president for business affairs, and chief financial officer. Recipients were asked to note on a Survey Assessment Form (Appendix C) the amount of time required to complete the survey and provide comments.

The members of the Panel of Experts and the pilot-test respondents offered the following feedback and recommendations:

1. Respondents indicated that the survey required approximately 10 minutes to complete.
2. A concern was voiced with regard to the respondents' sufficiency of knowledge to complete survey items 10 through 12 and the impact on the rate of return.
3. Respondents stated the survey was clear, concise, and well written.
4. One respondent said, "I would not change a thing."
5. While specifically asked, none of the respondents indicated a concern with the use of the 3-point Likert scale.
6. One respondent recommended an introductory letter prior to mailing the survey and stated a peer-to-peer letter would be most effective.

7. One respondent voiced a concern with the definitions used in relation to the geographic locations.
8. The diverse style and survey layout were said to be appealing and unique and would entice respondents to complete the survey.
9. Several respondents stated that they thought this survey/study would provide national value.

Face validity can only be tested in one manner, and that is by asking group of individuals if the instrument being used measures what it was designed to measure (Brown, 2001). If the design is supported and respondents indicate that the survey questions appropriately address what the instrument claims to measure, it is said that a degree of face validity has been met. The Panel of Experts and pilot-test respondents for this instrument upheld face validity. All respondents indicated that the questionnaire successfully addressed the proposed research questions. Additionally, with respect to the rate of return, all respondents confirmed they would be inclined to reply if they were to receive this survey.

Internal consistency for survey items 1 and 5 was also measured using Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha was employed to provide a measure of consistency on individuals' responses to items within an instrument. An alpha of .70 or higher is generally accepted as good or high, although, the number of survey respondents can affect alpha results.

For the purpose of this study, 50 pilot surveys were distributed. The goal was to obtain 20 to 30 completed questionnaires for analysis. A total of 21 (42%) of the surveys

were returned, thus providing 21 cases for review. SPSS, a statistical software package, was used to calculate Cronbach's Alpha, the coefficient of reliability, for survey items 1 and 5 yielding the following results. Survey item 1 contained 10 construct items pertaining to current and future leadership styles (i.e., Delegation, Directive/Autocratic, Inclusive/Servant/Consultant, Negotiative, and Participative/Democratic). The analysis resulted in an alpha of 0.7482, with a variance of 0.0550 and a mean of 2.3619. This indicated a moderately high degree of internal consistency. Survey item 5 contained six construct items pertaining to leadership development. The analysis resulted in an alpha of 0.5804, with a variance of 0.0082 and a mean of 2.5238. This indicated a low to moderate degree of internal consistency.

Final Survey Instrument

Table 1 displays the eight research questions used to guide this study. The table shows the relationship of each research question, the pertinent variables, and the associated survey items once the instrument was finalized.

Table 1
 Research Questions, Variables, and Survey Items

Research Questions	Variables	Items
1. What differences, if any, exist in the perceptions of community college presidents as to the current and future importance of selected leadership styles?	Leadership Styles	1
2. What relationship, if any, exists between the external governance model under which an institution operates and presidential leadership styles?	Leadership Style Governance	1 13
3. To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years of services as a community college president and the identification and development of potential leaders?	Identification & Development Years of Service	2 21
4. To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years to retirement and the identification and development of potential leaders?	Identification & Development Years to Retirement	2 24
5. To what extent does a relationship exist between the areas of leadership development and community college positions held prior to the presidency?	Identification & Development Positions	5 14
6. What relationship, if any, exists between gender and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?	Succession Planning Gender	6 22
7. What relationship, if any, exists between age and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?	Succession Planning Age	6 25
8. What relationship, if any, exists between respondents' past advancement via a succession plan and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?	Succession Planning Advancement	6 20

Subsequent to the pilot test of the instrument, a modification was made in the Likert scale. In order to increase the opportunity for variance, the 3-point Likert scale being used for items 1 and 5 was changed to a 5-point scale where 1 = the lowest level of importance and 5 = the highest level of importance. It was determined that a larger scale, such as a 7- or 10-point scale, would not provide statistical value. In addition to modifying the Likert scale for survey items 1 and 5, three new demographic items were added to the final instrument. The purpose of these items was to assist in determining the size and external governance of responding institutions.

Data Collection

Community college presidents who were presiding over the 292 accredited Level I institutions during the spring of 2005 were sent an initial letter (Appendix D) from a presidential colleague introducing the researcher and the forthcoming survey. The numerically coded survey, including a cover letter (Appendix E), was mailed to the identified community college presidents 10 days following the initial introductory letter. A personalized reminder post card (Appendix F) was sent to non-responding presidents approximately 2 weeks after the questionnaire and cover letter were mailed. A fourth letter (Appendix G), including a second numerically coded questionnaire, was sent to non-responding presidents 1 month after the first instrument mailing. Three weeks later, a fifth and final letter (Appendix H) was mailed to the presidents who had not yet responded. This mailing sequence was purposefully selected to elicit a high response rate

and was based on Dillman's (2002) Five Needed Elements for Achieving High Response Rates approach.

Each address in the researcher-developed database was numerically coded. The code was affixed at the lower left corner of each of the questionnaires prior to mailing. As the surveys were returned, the corresponding number was removed from the mailing list database to ensure that respondents would not receive subsequent mailings. This method of tracking was used to ensure survey respondents' anonymity and hopefully encourage a high rate of return.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in this study was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 11.5. The majority of survey item responses yielded categorical data and were analyzed using descriptive statistics and nonparametric tests procedures. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the importance of the five sets of current and potential future leadership styles of presidents, the number of institutions that stated they were actively involved in the identification and development of potential leaders, and the number of institutions with succession plans in place. Additional descriptive calculations for the respondents' age, gender, years of service as community college presidents, years to retirement, and the types of degree plus areas of specialization were conducted.

Demographic variable responses of presidents were categorized and enabled comparisons among groups. Since the goal of this research was to compare two or more

categorical variables to determine whether or not an association existed between the variables on a post-priori basis (Lomax, 2001), chi-square tests of association were conducted whenever appropriate. The inferential statistical test of chi-square of association was intended to be used to compare the relationship between current and future leadership styles and institutional demographic variables including those associated with the annual operating budget and governance (Research Questions 1 and 2). The initial tabulations resulted in a violation of a chi-square assumption that the expected frequencies, or number of observations per cell, equate to at least five; therefore, it was determined that the chi-square statistic would not provide statistically reliable information and Research Question 1 was revised. Budgetary data were presented only as descriptive demographic data, and differences in presidents' perceptions of the importance of current and future leadership styles were explored. Individual descriptive analyses were computed for the leadership styles.

It was also determined, in the preliminary analysis of data gathered to answer Research Question 2 that the chi-square statistic would not provide statistically reliable information pertaining to the relationship between external governance models and leadership styles. The chi square statistic, therefore, was not calculated. However, the effect size was computed, and Cramer's phi was reported.

Presidential data, including the number of years respondents had served as community college presidents and number of years until respondents planned to retire, were compared using the chi-square test of association to explore the identification and development of potential leaders (Research Questions 3 and 4). Prior community college

positions were also considered in comparing steps institutions had taken to identify and develop emerging leaders (Research Question 5). Using the chi-square test of association when appropriate, respondents' gender, age, and prior inclusion in a succession plan for advancement, were also used to further analyze the data to determine the extent to which succession planning had occurred on community college campuses (Research Questions 6, 7, and 8).

Summary

Cronbach's Alpha was the process selected for determining score reliability for survey items 1 and 5. The instrument was also determined, through the Panel of Experts and pilot study respondents, to have upheld the measures of face validity. Thus, the final instrument was deemed an appropriate vehicle with which to address the proposed research questions. Dillman's Total Design Method, with its five points of contact, was used and resulted in a high rate of return by survey respondents. Results of the data analysis described in this chapter are included in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Provided in this chapter are the results of the analysis of the data gathered in a survey of the community college presidents presiding over accredited Level I institutions in the southeast region of the United States during the spring semester of 2005. The intent of this study was to explore, using information from community college presidents, the extent to which (a) selected leadership styles presently preferred in the performance of presidential duties may be required in the future, (b) professional development is aimed at identifying and developing future leaders, and (c) leadership succession planning is occurring. Additionally, it was intended that this study would contribute to the existing body of community college general knowledge and research.

This chapter includes descriptive statistics regarding the surveyed community college presidents and their institutions. Nonparametric inferential statistical tests were used to calculate the results reflected in this chapter to specifically address the research questions pertaining to this study.

Demographics of Survey Participants

During spring 2005, surveys were mailed to each of the 292 presidents of the accredited public and private Level I institutions within the 11 states represented by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The highest degree that these 2-year institutions offered, at the time of the study, was the associate degree. Table 2

displays information relative to the numbers and percentages of SACS accredited Level I community colleges in the 11 states and information requesting returned and useable surveys: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Table 2
SACS Accredited Institutions Surveyed and Response Rates by State

States	All Institutions Surveyed		All Surveys Returned		Final Useable Surveys	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Alabama	22	7.5	15	6.9	15	7.2
Florida	25	8.6	21	9.7	19	9.1
Georgia	28	9.6	23	10.7	23	11.0
Kentucky	14	4.8	9	4.2	8	3.8
Louisiana	5	1.7	2	0.9	1	0.5
Mississippi	15	5.1	8	3.7	8	3.8
North Carolina	60	20.5	47	21.8	45	21.5
South Carolina	17	5.8	13	6.0	13	6.2
Tennessee	15	5.1	10	4.6	10	4.8
Texas	67	22.9	48	22.2	47	22.5
Virginia	24	8.2	20	9.3	20	9.6
Total	292	100.0	216	100.0	209	100.0

Table 2 also includes information regarding the total survey responses returned. Initial responses were received from 216 (74%) of the 292 presiding presidents. Upon review, 7 of the responses were excluded from the analysis for the following three

reasons: incomplete (2), incorrectly completed (2), or submitted too late to be included in the analysis (3). This brought the useable responses to 209 and resulted in a final useable return rate of 71.6%. The response rate met the recommended (70%) for mailed surveys in the area of education (Green & Boser, 2001).

Of the 209 total useable surveys, Texas provided the highest number of useable returns yielding a response of 47 (22.5%); Louisiana had the lowest final useable response of 1 (.5%). However, proportionally, based on the number of institutions per state, Virginia had the highest number of useable returns with 20 out of 24 (83.3 %) and Louisiana had the lowest number of useable returns (i.e., 1 out of 5 or 20.0%). The response rates, based on the total number of useable returns, for the remaining 9 states were: North Carolina (45, 21.5%), Georgia (23, 11.0%), Virginia (20, 9.6%), Florida (19, 9.1%), Alabama (15, 7.2%), South Carolina (13, 6.2%), Tennessee (10, 4.8%), and Kentucky and Mississippi, each with 8 (3.8%).

Information as to the types of institutions participating in the study is presented in Table 3. Of the 292 SACS accredited Level 1 community colleges surveyed, 281 (96.2%) were public, 9 (3.1%) were private not-for-profit, and 2 (0.7%) were private for-profit. Of the 209 responding presidents, almost all (96.6%) represented public institutions. Only 7 presidents indicated they represented private not-for-profit (5, 2.4%) and private for-profit (2, 1%) institutions.

Table 3
Response Rates by Public and Private Institutions

Type of Institution	All Institutions Surveyed		Final Useable Returned Surveys	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Public	281	96.2	202	96.6
Private Not-for-profit	9	3.1	5	2.4
Private for-profit	2	0.7	2	.9
Total	292	100.0	209	100.0

Table 4 displays personal and professional demographic information for each of the respondents. A large majority (156, 75.7%) of responding presidents were male, while approximately one-quarter (50, 24.3%) of the respondents were female. Additionally, over 90% of the responding participants indicated they were at least 50 years of age.

Presidents were also requested to indicate their highest degree earned. Table 4 indicates that the vast majority of presiding community college presidents in the southeast had completed a doctoral degree. Of the 209 responding, 92 (44%) indicated they had earned the Ph.D. degree, and 96 (46%) had completed the Ed.D. degree. Only 9 (4.3%) presidents indicated their highest level of education as a master's degree, while 12 (5.7%) cited Other as their highest degree. Other included responses such as jurist doctorate and military training.

Table 4
 Personal Demographics of Community College Presidents (N=209)

Descriptor	<i>n</i>	% of Useable Responses
Gender		
Male	156	75.7
Female	50	24.3
No response	3	
Age		
Less than 49	17	8.1
50-56	59	28.4
57-63	101	48.6
64 and above	31	14.9
No response	1	
Highest Degree		
Ph. D.	92	44.0
Ed.D.	96	46.0
Master's Degree	9	4.3
Other	12	5.7
No response	0	
Discipline of Degree		
Academic Specialization	26	12.6
Curriculum	6	3.0
Educational Leadership	143	69.4
Other	31	15.0
No response	3	

A total of 143 (69.4%) of the presiding community college presidents cited Educational Leadership as the discipline of their highest degree. Other major areas of study reported included: Academic Specialization (26, 12.6%), Curriculum (6, 2.9%), and Other (31, 15%). Only 43 (20.6%) of the 209 responding community college presidents indicated that they were community college graduates.

Community college presidents were asked to indicate the annual operating budgets for their institutions. Community colleges have long been known for their high rate of return on investment when comparing the number of students served to the funds required to provide the services (Honeyman, Wattenbarger, & Westbrook, 1996). The findings of this study supported this tenet. Table 5 indicates that nearly two-thirds (129, 63.5%) of the 203 responding presidents reported an annual operating budget of less than \$25 million while 45 (22.2%) indicated they operated their institutions with \$25.1 to \$50.0 million annually. Additionally, 18 (8.9%) cited budgets as \$50.1 to \$75 million; 4 (2%) reported \$75.1 to \$100 million and 7 (3.4%) presidents indicated annual operating budgets of \$100.1 million or above.

Table 5
Annual Operating Budgets of Surveyed Institutions

Budget	<i>n</i>	%
\$100.1 and above	7	3.4
\$75.1 to \$100.0	4	2.0
\$50.1 to \$75.0	18	8.9
\$25.1 to \$50.0	45	22.2
under \$25	129	63.5
Total	203	100.0

Note: Budget in millions of dollars

A total of 13 respondents provided multiple answers for various survey items requiring a single response; thus, the responses provided were not deemed to be useable and were not included in the calculations. For the purpose of analysis, multiple values along with survey items for which responses were not provided were converted to a discrete missing value in SPSS (11.5). However, if a survey item was appropriately skipped based on the instructions in association with the response to a previous survey item, a unique discrete value was assigned.

Research Question 1

What differences, if any, exist in the perceptions of community college presidents as to the current and future importance of selected leadership styles?

In order to respond to Research Question 1, presidents were asked to identify the level of importance of five leadership styles (survey instrument, part 1). They were asked to (a) indicate the importance to current community college presidents and (b) the importance they predicted these styles would play for community college presidents over the next 5 years. The five leadership styles to be evaluated were delegative, directive, consultative, negotiative, and participative. Respondents were asked to use a rating scale ranging from 1 to 5 with 1 representing the lowest level of importance and 5 representing the highest level of importance. The resultant frequencies and percentages have been displayed and discussed. Table 6 presents the respondents' rankings.

Table 6
Current and Future Importance of Leadership Styles: Frequencies and Percentages

Leadership Styles	Levels of Importance									
	1		2		3		4		5	
Current/Future (<i>n</i>)	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Delegative										
Current (208)	14	6.7	26	12.5	68	32.7	72	34.6	28	13.5
Future (208)	16	7.7	26	12.5	52	25.0	69	33.2	45	21.6
Directive										
Current (206)	37	18.0	59	28.6	58	28.2	38	18.4	14	6.8
Future (207)	55	26.6	54	26.1	47	22.7	36	17.4	15	7.2
Consultative										
Current (209)	4	1.9	9	4.3	30	14.4	77	36.8	89	42.6
Future (207)	4	1.9	6	2.9	19	9.2	59	28.5	119	57.5
Negotiative										
Current (207)	20	9.7	40	19.3	68	32.9	53	25.6	26	12.6
Future (207)	20	9.7	44	21.3	41	19.8	66	31.9	36	17.4
Participative										
Current (206)	3	1.5	15	7.3	30	14.6	86	41.7	72	35.0
Future (208)	3	1.4	13	6.3	24	11.5	74	35.6	94	45.2

Note. Levels of Importance: 1-2 = low importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4-5 = high importance. Not all respondents answered every item.

Rankings of 1 or 2 were considered to be of “low” importance. A ranking of 3 was interpreted as being of “moderate” importance. For purposes of discussion, and because so many of the presidents placed high importance on the majority of leadership styles, rankings of 4 and 5 have been aggregated and are referred to as being of “high” importance.

The consultative leadership style received the highest current and future importance rankings. It was identified as being of current high importance by 166 (79.4%) presidents and future high importance by 178 (86.0%) of responding presidents. The participative leadership style received the second highest current and future importance rankings. It was identified as being of current high importance by 158 (76.7%) presidents and future high importance by 168 (80.8%) of the responding presidents. A delegative leadership style was determined to be the third most important leadership style for both current (100, 48.1%) and future (114, 54.8%) presidents. The negotiative leadership style generated current high importance rankings by 79 (38.2%) of the respondents, while the future importance (102, 49.3%) was substantially increased. Presidents gave the smallest number of current high importance rankings (52, 25.2%) and future high importance rankings (51, 24.6%) to the directive style of leadership.

Research Question 2

What relationship, if any, exists between the external governance model under which an institution operates and presidential leadership styles?

In responding to this research question, the variables of interest were the external governance models with three levels (State Board of Regents, Institutional Board of Trustees, or Other) and the delegative, directive, consultative, negotiative, and participative leadership styles. Table 7 displays information related to the external governance models reported by the presidents.

Table 7
External Governance Models

Type of Model	<i>n</i>	%
Institutional Board of Trustees	131	63.0
State Board of Regents	27	13.0
Other	50	24.0
Total	208	100.0

Note: Other categories included: chancellor (31, 14.9%), commissioner (6, 2.9%), system president (6, 2.9%), state board of education (3, 1.4%), state board of technology and adult education (2, 1.0%), branch college (1, .5%), and not specified (1, .5%).

A large majority (131, 63%) of the 208 community college presidents indicated that they reported to an Institutional Board of Trustees, and 27 (13.0%) indicated they report to a State Board of Regents. Approximately one-fourth (50, 24.0%) of responding presidents selected Other and indicated the following alternative governance models: Chancellor (31, 14.9%), Commissioner (6, 2.9%), System President (6, 2.9%), State Board of Education (3, 1.4%), State Board of Technology and Adult Education (2, 1.0%), and one each (.5%) for each Branch College and not specified. A nonparametric chi-square of association test was planned in order to evaluate whether or not a relationship existed between the external governance model under which an institution operated and presidential leadership styles. However, a cross tabulation of the variables revealed that the expected frequencies were less than 5 in some cells, thus violating a required assumption of chi-square. Upon further analysis, it was determined that there was not a consistent manner in which the categories of governance or the levels of leadership styles could be appropriately collapsed to perform a chi-square test. It was, therefore,

determined that the chi-square statistic would not provide statistically reliable information pertaining to the relationship between external governance models and leadership styles and was therefore not calculated. However, the effect size was computed, and the results of the effect size analysis, based on Cramer's Phi, for each of the current and future leadership styles and the types of external governance is presented in Table 8. The 10 contingency tables that support the effect size analysis are contained in Appendix I.

Spatz (2001) provided the following guideline for determining the degree of relationship between two variables: (a) a small effect size = .10, (b) a moderate effect size = .30, and (c) a large effect size = .50. The distance of the phi value between 0 and 1 determines the existence of a relationship based on the effect size index. Effect sizes closer to zero indicate no relationship, whereas an effect size closer to one represents a near perfect relationship between the two variables. However, since the chi-square assumption, of a minimum of 5 per cell, was violated, caution should be used when evaluating this set of statistics.

A small to moderate positive effect size was calculated for external governance models and both the current (.238) and future (.209) directive leadership style. Based on the small effect sizes, weak relationships were found between all of the other forms of leadership styles and external governance models. The small effect size indicated only a slight possibility that the type of external governance may influence the leadership styles of current and future presidents.

Table 8
 Interpretation of Leadership Styles based on External Governance Models

Leadership Styles	Cramer's V	Effect
Current		
Delegative	.119	Small
Directive	.238	Small to Moderate
Consultative	.143	Small
Negotiative	.177	Small
Participative	.080	Small
Future		
Delegative	.071	Small
Directive	.209	Small to Moderate
Consultative	.154	Small
Negotiative	.155	Small
Participative	.150	Small

Research Question 3

To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years of service as a community college president and the identification and development of potential leaders?

Presidents were asked to indicate if their institutions were actively engaged in identifying the next generation of community college leaders (survey part 2, item 2) and to reveal the number of years they had served as community college presidents (survey part 4, item 21). Their responses indicating the number who responded positively (155, 74.9%) and negatively (52, 25.1%) and the years of service are displayed in Table 9. Almost one-third of all responding presidents (65, 31.4%) were in the first 5 years of

their presidency, and an additional 57 (27.5%) had completed between 6 and 10 years as presidents.

Table 9
Identification of Potential Future Leaders by Presidents' Years of Service

Presidents' Years of Service	Actively Engaged in Identification		Not Actively Engaged in Identification		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
0-5	48	23.2	17	8.2	65	31.4
6-10	48	23.2	9	4.3	57	27.5
11-15	23	11.1	8	3.9	31	15.0
16-20	17	8.2	10	4.8	27	13.0
21-25	13	6.3	4	1.9	17	8.2
26+	6	2.9	4	1.9	10	4.8
Total	155	74.9	52	25.1	207	100.0

A cross tabulation of variables (i.e., identification of leaders and years of service as a community college president) revealed one cell with an expected frequency of less than 5. In order to meet the assumptions required to calculate a chi-square of association statistical test and to determine to what extent a relationship existed between the number of years of service as a community college president and the identification and development of potential leaders, the latter two age categories (21-25 and 26+) were merged into a single category via the recoding process in SPSS (11.5).

While 155 (74.9%) of the 207 respondents indicated they actively identified potential leaders, years of service as a community college president was not found to be

statistically significant in the identification of emerging leaders, Pearson X^2 (4, $N = 207$) = 5.013, $p = .286$, Cramer's phi = .156. The Cramer's phi statistic indicated a small effect and further supported a lack of a relationship between the number of years served as a community college president and the active participation in the identification of emerging leaders. The contingency table supporting the effect size analysis appears in Appendix I.

Research Question 4

To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years to retirement and the identification and development of potential leaders?

In order to explore further the identification and development of potential future leaders by presidents, respondents were asked to indicate the number of years until they planned to retire (survey part 4, item 24). Their responses indicating the number who responded positively (152, 74.9%) and negatively (51, 25.1%) and their years to retirement are displayed in Table 10.

Of the 203 community college presidents who responded, almost 40% (77, 37.9%) anticipated 4-6 years to retirement. An additional 50 (24.6%) indicated impending retirements within 1-3 years. Slightly over one-third of all respondents (37.5%) indicated that they anticipated remaining in their positions for more than 6 years.

Table 10
 Identification of Potential Future Leaders by Presidents' Years to Retirement

President's Years to Retirement	Actively Engaged in Identification		Not Actively Engaged in Identification		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
1-3	37	18.2	13	6.4	50	24.6
4-6	52	25.6	25	12.3	77	37.9
7-10	35	17.2	9	4.4	44	21.7
11+	28	13.8	4	2.0	32	15.8
Total	152	74.9	51	25.1	203	100.0

A chi-square test of association was conducted to evaluate whether or not a relationship existed between presidents' number of years to retirement and active involvement in the identification and development of potential leaders. No statistically significant relationship was found between the number of years a community college president had to retirement and their level of engagement in identifying and developing potential leaders, Pearson $X^2(3, N = 203) = 5.449$, $p = .142$, Cramer's phi = .164. The results of the Cramer's phi also indicated a small effect. The contingency table supporting the effect size analysis is presented in Appendix I.

Research Question 5

To what extent does a relationship exist between the areas of leadership development and community college positions held prior to the presidency?

Research Question 5 was focused on the development of potential leaders.

Presidents were asked (survey part 2, item 5) to identify the level of importance of

community college leadership development for the following areas: budgeting, financial management, fund raising, governing boards, internal governance, and politics/relationships. Respondents were asked to use a rating scale ranging from 1 to 5 with 1 representing the lowest level of importance and 5 representing the highest level of importance. Table 11 presents the respondents' rankings. Rankings of 1 or 2 were considered to be of "low" importance. A ranking of 3 was interpreted as being of "moderate" importance.

Table 11
Importance of Development Areas for Future Leaders

Development Areas	Levels of Importance									
	1		2		3		4		5	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Budget (n=207)	6	2.9	7	3.4	28	13.5	65	31.4	101	48.8
Finance (n=207)	4	1.9	7	3.4	20	9.7	59	28.5	117	56.5
Fund Raising (n=206)	2	1.0	14	6.8	30	14.6	65	31.6	95	46.1
Governing Boards (n=203)	3	1.5	9	4.4	25	12.3	75	36.9	91	44.8
Internal Governance (n=206)	3	1.5	5	2.4	29	14.1	82	39.8	87	42.2
Politics/Relationships (n=207)	3	1.4	3	1.4	16	7.7	58	28.0	127	61.4

Note. Levels of Importance: 1-2 = low importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4-5 = high importance.

Many of the presidents placed high importance on all of the development areas. Therefore, for purposes of discussion and analysis, rankings of 4 and 5 have been aggregated and are referred to as being of “high” importance. In aggregating the individual values of the two highest levels of importance for each of the six areas, it was clear that all six areas were highly valued by responding presidents.

Politics/relationships received the highest combined importance ranking (185, 89.4%) followed closely by finance (176, 85%). Over 80% indicated a high level of importance for internal governance (169, 82%), governing boards (166, 81.7%), and budget (166, 80.2%). Though fund raising was lowest ranked among the six, over three-fourths (160, 77.7%) of the presidents believed that it was of high importance. Perhaps most notable in Table 11 is the lack of low importance (levels 1 and 2) rankings, as evidenced by combined percentages that only occasionally reached 5% and in no instance reached 10%.

Presidents were asked (survey part 4, item 14) to select from five potential responses the position best describing the community college position held immediately prior to their first presidency. Table 12 displays information related to presidents’ prior positions. The positions from which the presidents could choose were: (a) chief academic officer/vice president, (b) chief financial officer/vice president, (c) chief planning officer/vice president (d) chief student services officer/vice president, and (e) other. Of the 206 respondents to this item, almost half (101, 49.0%) indicated their immediate position prior to assuming their first presidency was that of academic vice president.

Table 12
 Presidents' Prior Positions

Position	<i>n</i>	%
Vice President		
Academic	101	49.0
Finance	16	7.8
Planning	8	3.9
Student Services	14	6.8
Other	67	32.5
Total	206	100.0

Note: The Other category included a wide range of leadership positions from educational institutions at all levels and outside agencies.

Vice president of finance was the position that produced the second highest number of presidents (16, 7.8%) followed by 14 (6.8%) vice presidents of student services, and 8 (3.9%) vice presidents of planning. A relatively large group (67, 32.5%) indicated that they held other positions. These positions included the titles such as vice president of administration, economic development, institutional advancement, and vice chancellor (21, 10.2%); campus president, provost, dean, and director (15, 7.3%); executive vice president, assistant to the president, senior chancellor, and counsel to the president (9, 4.4%); plus system and state positions (6, 2.9%), corporate chief executive officer, president, and management (5, 2.4%); public school superintendent and principal (4, 1.9%); university administrators and faculty (4, 1.9%); along with a department chair, a faculty member, and a pastor (3, 1.5%).

A chi-square analysis had been anticipated, and a cross tabulation was produced in SPSS of the different areas of skill development and the positions presiding presidents had previously held. The results showed deficient expected frequency counts of less than 5. Further analysis of the data revealed that collapsing elements would not have created an expected frequency to satisfy the required assumptions, thus halting plans to conduct a nonparametric chi-square statistic test.

Cramer's phi for each area of leadership development produced by the positions previously held by community college presidents were as follows: budget = .145, finance = .177, fund raising = .141, governing boards = .187, internal governance = .164, and politics/relationship = .105, all of which were considered to be reflective of a small effect. The small effect size indicated little to no relationship between the positions previously held by community college presidents and the level of importance presidents placed on each area of leadership development. Caution should be exercised when evaluating Cramer's phi, since the assumption of chi-square having a minimum of 5 per cell was violated. Contingency tables supporting the effect size analysis for these findings appear in Appendix I.

Research Question 6

What relationship, if any, exists between gender and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Presidents were initially presented with an explanation of succession planning in order to provide a common frame of reference from which to respond. Succession planning was described as the process of strategically preparing an institution for the

future by identifying both critical positions within the institution and the individuals with the potential for accepting the responsibilities of those positions in the future. Presidents were then queried as to the extent to which succession planning was occurring at their institutions (survey part 2, item 6). Presidents were asked to indicate if: (a) a board approved formal document was in place; (b) a semi-formalized document had been developed and was being utilized; (c) an informal, verbally communicated, and generally known process was in place; (d) no succession planning was taking place; or (e) if some other process was in place. Table 13 displays information related to succession planning for all respondents and by gender. A little over half of the respondents (115, 55.8%) indicated their institution had some form of succession plan, while 91 (44.2%) indicated their institutions did not have any form of a succession plan in place.

Table 13
Succession Planning by Type and Gender

Type of Plan	Male		Female		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Formal	19	9.2	2	1.0	21	10.2
Semi-formal	13	6.3	2	1.0	15	7.3
Informal	54	26.2	20	9.7	74	35.9
Other	2	1.0	3	1.4	5	2.4
None	68	33.0	23	11.2	91	44.2
Total	156	75.7	50	24.3	206	100.0

The types of succession plans varied from board approved formal plans to other non-specified types of plans. Institutions with a formal succession plan represented 21 (10.2%) of the 115 colleges with a plan in place, and 15 (7.3%) institutions reported having a semi-formal succession plan. Over one-third, 74 (35.9%) indicated that they had an informal succession plan, and 5 (2.4%) categorized their plans as other. One of the presidents who indicated having an Other type of succession plan in place stated that a formal plan was being developed for board approval.

This research question was intended to investigate the relationship between gender and whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place. Responses to survey item 6 by gender are also presented in Table 13, which depicts three-quarters (156, 75.7%) of the community college presidents who provided information in regard to succession planning were male, and 50 (24.3%) were female. A majority of male (88, 56.4%) and female (27, 54.0%) presidents indicated that their institutions had some form of a succession plan in place with informal succession plans being the most prevalent for both genders. Results are displayed in Table 14.

The results from the four types of succession plans (i.e., formal, semi-formal, informal, and other) were aggregated into a single variable, indicating the institution had some form of a succession plan, via the recoding feature on SPSS. Once this was completed, a chi-square of association was conducted to evaluate whether or not a relationship existed between a president's gender and whether or not their institution had some form of a succession plan in place.

The results of the chi-square of association suggested the president's gender was not statistically significant as to whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place, Pearson $X^2(1, N = 206) = .089, p = .765, \phi = -.021$. The phi statistic indicated a weak effect. This suggested that there was little to no relationship between the president's gender and whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place.

Table 14
Succession Planning by Type and Gender – Aggregated by Type

Type of Plan (<i>N</i> = 206)	Male		Female	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Succession Plan	88	56.4	27	54.0
Formal	19	12.2	2	4.0
Semi-formal	13	5.3	2	4.0
Informal	54	34.6	20	40.0
Other	2	1.3	3	6.0
No Succession Plan	68	43.6	23	46.0
Total	156	100.0	50	100.0

Research Question 7

What relationship, if any, exists between age and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

In an effort to determine if a community college president's age influenced whether or not a succession plan was in place, respondents were asked to indicate their age range in one of the following seven categories (a) 35 or below, (b) 36-42, (c) 43-49, (d) 50-56, (e) 57-63, (f) 64-70, and (g) 71 or above. Because there were no presidents under 43 years of age and only 2 presidents over 71 and above, the age groups were

reduced to four categories for analysis and display purposes. Data regarding presidents' ages are presented in Table 15. Of the 208 responding presidents, almost half (101, 48.6%) indicated that they were between 57 and 63 years of age. The second largest age group was comprised of the 59 (28.4%) of presidents in the age range of 50-56. The smallest group (17, 8.1%) consisted of the youngest group (43-49), and those 64 and above (31, 14.9%) comprised the second smallest group.

Table 15
Succession Plan by Presidents' Age

President's Age	Succession Plan		No Succession Plan		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
43-49	9	4.3	8	3.8	17	8.1
50-56	25	12.0	34	16.3	59	28.4
57-63	60	28.8	41	19.7	101	48.6
64 and above	23	11.1	8	3.8	31	14.9
Total	117	56.2	91	43.8	208	100.0

A correlation between the reported age of the responding community college presidents and those who indicated their institutions had some form of a succession plan in place was computed. Essentially, 117 (56.2%) of the 208 respondents replied to having some form of succession plan in place within their institution while 91 (43.8%) responded that they did not have a succession plan in place. A chi-square of association was conducted to evaluate the possible relationship between the president's age and

whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place. The age of the president was determined to be statistically significant in regard to whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place, Pearson's X^2 (3, $N = 208$) = 9.157, $p = .027$, $\phi = .210$. The phi statistic indicated a small to moderate effect or a small to moderate positive relationship existed between a president's age and whether or not a community college had a succession plan in place.

Research Question 8

What relationship, if any, exists between respondents' past advancement via a succession plan and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Research Question 8 sought to explore whether or not presidents' past advancement via a succession plan was influential in succession planning for their own campuses. Information on prior participation in succession planning is displayed in Table 16. Presidents were asked (survey part 4, item 20) if they had ever been identified for advancement through a succession plan.

Table 16
Succession Planning by Presidents' Prior Advancement via a Plan

Participation	Current Succession Planning					
	Yes		No		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Prior Participation	29	14.2	8	3.9	37	18.1
No Prior Participation	85	41.7	82	40.2	167	81.9
Total	114	55.9	90	44.1	204	100.0

Only 37 (18.1%) of the 204 responding presidents replied affirmatively. The remaining 167 (81.9%) of the presidents indicated they had not been so identified.

A cross tabulation in SPSS (11.5) of the two variables (i.e., identified for advancement in a succession plan and a succession plan in place--recoded) reflected that over three-fourths (29, 78.4%) of the 37 presidents who had formally been identified for future advancement in a succession plan had some form of a succession plan in place in their institutions, while only 8 (21.6%) reported their institution had no succession plan in place. In contrast, only half (85, 50.9%) of the 167 presidents who had not previously been identified for advancement in a succession plan reported their institution had some form of a succession plan, and 82 (49.1%) of the presidents who had not been identified for advancement in a prior succession plan also did not have a succession plan in place at their present institution.

A chi-square of association was calculated to evaluate whether or not a relationship existed between president's who had been previously identified for future advancement via a succession plan and whether or not their current institution had some form of a succession plan in place. A statistically significant relationship was found to exist between presidents who had previously been included in a succession plan and the existence of a succession plan in the institution over which they presently presided, Pearson's $X^2(1, N = 204) = 9.278, p = .002, \phi = .213$. The phi statistic supported a small to moderate effect. This indicated a small to moderate relationship between a president's prior advancement via a succession plan and a succession plan being in place in a president's institution.

Summary

This chapter presented an analysis of the data obtained from the responses of 209 presidents of the accredited public and private Level I institutions within the 11 states represented by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The study was focused on presidents' leadership styles, the professional development of future leaders, and succession planning by institutions. An analysis of the data was presented for the study's eight research questions.

The following chapter provides a summary and discussion of findings. Also included are conclusions, implications for practice, and recommendations for research.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides a brief review of the purpose and design of the research. The chapter also contains a summary and discussion of the findings for each of the research questions. Conclusions related to the research questions are presented along with implications for practice in community colleges and recommendations for future research.

Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted to explore with community college presidents their perceptions as to the extent to which (a) selected leadership styles presently required in the performance of presidential duties may be required in the future, (b) professional development was aimed at identifying and developing future leaders, and (c) leadership succession planning was occurring at their institutions.

Study Population

The study population was comprised of the 292 presiding community college presidents, of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accredited Level I institutions in the southeast region of the United States at the time of this study. Associate Degrees are the highest degrees awarded by Level I institutions.

A preponderance (281, 96.2%) of the 292 surveyed colleges were public institutions. These public and private institutions included 2-year colleges, junior colleges, and technical schools, generally known as community colleges, within the following 11 states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Nearly half of the SACS accredited level-one institutions are located in Texas (67, 22.9%) and North Carolina (60, 20.5%).

Almost three-fourths (216, 74%) of the 292 surveyed presidents responded. The final useable returns totaled 209 (71.6%). As anticipated, based on the review of literature, this population was predominantly represented by male presidents who numbered 156 (75.7%).

Instrumentation

A researcher developed survey containing three major components including Leadership Styles (Part 1), Professional Development (Part 2), and Succession Planning (Part 3), along with a section eliciting demographic data, was presented to and reviewed by the members of the dissertations committee. Additionally, a Panel of Experts evaluated the survey for content validity. Face validity and internal consistency for the two Likert scale survey items (e.g., item 1 and item 5), were also measured, using Cronbach's Alpha, following receipt of the 21 (42.0%) pilot test surveys. Minor adjustments were made to create the final survey (Appendix B).

Data Collection Procedures

To facilitate a high return rate, Dillman's (2000) Total Design Method was employed. This method consists of 5-points of contact with survey participants. Additionally, to increase the response rate, the mailing list, corresponding surveys and letters were numerically coded providing identification of the survey population only to the researcher thus protecting the participant's anonymity. No other form of identification was used.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the characteristics of the survey sample and the participants' response rates as well as the importance of current and potential future leadership styles of presidents, the identification and development of potential leaders, and the extent to which succession planning is occurring in community colleges. Data analysis, for both descriptive statistics and nonparametric procedures, was conducted using the statistical analysis software package SPSS (11.5).

Personal demographic variables were used to describe the responding population as well as to provide the basis of comparisons for research questions. A chi-square of association was used to assist in determining possible relationships between specified variables for specific research questions. A summary and discussion of the findings, organized around the research questions that guided the study, are presented in the following section.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Research Question 1

What differences, if any, exist in the perceptions of community college presidents as to the current and future importance of selected leadership styles?

The five Leadership Styles used in the instrument were defined for study participants to ensure a consistent understanding and measurement of each element. The five styles, (delegative, directive, consultative, negotiative, and participative) and definitions were based on a review of the literature.

The presiding presidents surveyed were asked to rank the level of importance that each of the five leadership styles played in their current role as president as well as how they believed these styles might influence future leaders. Survey participants (n = 209) deemed a consultative leadership style to be the most important for both current and future leaders. A participative leadership style for current and future leaders was ranked as the second most important style, followed by a delegative style, then a negotiative style, and finally a directive style. These findings correspond to the literature, which suggested that leadership styles over the past four decades have been navigating towards a more collaborative horizontal style, which commenced during the human relations frame, as defined by Bolman and Deal (1997).

The five leadership styles employed in this study can be compared and contrasted on many different levels based on the unique attributes, skills, and behaviors associated with each. For instance, trust is a critical attribute for leaders who prefer a consultative or participative leadership style, whereas this particular attribute would be deemed as a

much less important feature for a leader who prefers a more negotiative or directive style of leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2001; Daly, 2003; Zimmerman, 2001). A second continuum could be built on a leader's ability to develop and utilize relationships. Relationship skills, including the ability to influence others, are keenly important to the leader who relies on a negotiative style of leadership, whereas this skill is of less importance to a delegative or a directive leader who is more apt to utilize the power associated with their position rather than negotiative skills to accomplish a task (Bennis & Goldsmith, 2003; Yukl, 2002; Zimmerman, 2001). Yet, the ability to develop relationships with followers is a key ingredient to establish trust, thus creating a slightly different link between this skill and a consultative or participative form of leadership. Thirdly, these five leadership styles have been associated with the leader's gender. According to van Engen, van der Leeden, & Willemsen (2001), consultative and participative styles of leadership are more often associated with female leaders than their male counterparts. Likewise, male leaders have been more closely aligned to delegative or directive leadership styles than their female counterparts. A negotiative leadership style tends to be more gender neutral.

However, the findings of this study would not substantiate the van Engen, van der Leeden, and Willemsen (2001) hypothesis, since a consultative leadership style was found to be the most important style of leadership for current and future leaders and a participative leadership style was identified as the second most important style and nearly three-fourths of the survey respondents were male. Notably, less than one-fourth of the

responders indicated that they supported a directive leadership style for current or future leaders.

Research Question 2

What relationship, if any, exists between the external governance model under which an institution operates and presidential leadership styles?

The second research question was designed to determine if a relationship existed between the types of external governance models (e.g., state board of regents, institutional board of trustees, or other) under which an institution operated and the delegative, directive, consultative, negotiative, and participative leadership styles. This particular area of study had a limited body of literature available. Nearly two-thirds (131, 63%) of the 208 responding presidents indicated they reported to an institutional board of trustees. State board of regents provided governance over 27 (13%) institutions and 50 (24%) presidents replied that they reported some other form of external governance. Of the 50 other respondents, 31 (14.9%) cited reporting relationships which included chancellor, commissioner, system president, state board of education, state board of technical and adult education and branch college.

The strength of the relationship between the external governance models and leadership styles for current and potential future leaders was also investigated. Overall, a small effect size or relationship was found to exist between many of the external governance models and current and future leadership styles, based on Cramer's phi. The exceptions to this were found in the directive leadership style. A slightly larger effect size, found for both current and future leaders, indicated that a small to moderate

relationship could exist between the external governance models and the directive leadership style. Since the assumptions of the chi-square of association were violated, the results of phi should be considered carefully.

Research Question 3

To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years of service as a community college president and the identification and development of potential leaders?

Over half (122, 58.9%) of the 207 reporting presidents had under 10 years of service as a community college president; however, of the 207 respondents it was found that these presidents were by far more actively engaged in identifying potential future leaders (96, 46.4%) than their peers. The identification of emerging leaders was not found to be attributable to the youngest presidents, since it was found that nearly half of the responding presidents (101, 48.6%) were between 57 and 63 years of age.

Less presidential involvement in identifying emerging future leaders actually occurred for those leaders with 11 to 15 years of service (23, 11.1%) and with 16 to 20 years of service (17, 8.2%). Institutions with presidents of 21 years or more of service were slightly more actively engaged in the identification of future leaders (19, 9.2%).

Summarily, it was determined that nearly three-fourths (155, 74.9%) of the responding presidents indicated their institutions were actively involved in identifying and developing emerging leaders. Although, a chi-square test of association found no statistical significance between the number of years of presidential service and the level of engagement in identifying and developing potential future leaders.

Research Question 4

To what extent does a relationship exist between the number of years to retirement and the identification and development of potential leaders?

The literature review suggested a mass exodus of community college leaders was imminent due primarily to the impending retirements of the baby-boom generation (Shults, 2001). The results of this study further supported those findings as nearly two-thirds (127, 62.5%) of the 203 responding presidents indicated they plan to retire within 1 to 6 years and as previously stated over half (122, 58.9%) of the 207 respondents had less than 10 years of community college service as a president. Coupled with the finding that nearly half of the 208 useable responses indicated an age range of 57 to 63, these results seem to imply, at least at Level I institutions in the southeast, that presidents are not accepting their first presidency until the latter portion of their careers and they have a planned tenure of approximately 6 years to retirement.

Fortunately, a majority (152, 74.9%) of the 203 presidents also specified that their institutions were actively engaged in identifying and developing potential future leaders, with only 51 (25.1%) stating no such activity was occurring at their colleges.

If findings of future studies indicate that a limited presidential tenure has emerged, institutions of the future will need to maintain or increase their activities of identifying and developing potential leaders.

However, the results of the calculation of both the chi-square test of association and the effect size based on Cramer's phi for this study yielded little evidence of a relationship existing between presidents' years to retirement and their engagement as

community college presidents in the identification and development of emerging future leaders.

Research Question 5

To what extent does a relationship exist between the areas of leadership development and community college positions held prior to the presidency?

Research Question 5 was designed to evaluate the possible existence of a relationship between the position a community college president had previously held and the emphasis they placed on six specific areas of leadership development for emerging leaders. The six areas of leadership development included: budgeting, financial management, fund raising, governing boards, internal governance, and politics or relationships. The survey participants were asked to rank each of these areas of leadership development using a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 represented the lowest level of importance and 5 equated to the highest level of importance. For the purpose of analysis, ranking levels 1 and 2 were combined to represent a low level of importance; a ranking of 3 represented a moderate level of importance, and the aggregated values of rankings 4 and 5 represented a high level of importance.

All six areas of leadership development were deemed to be of high importance by the presiding presidents who responded to the survey. Politics and relationships (185, 89.4%) received the highest rankings, and fund raising (160, 77.7%) received the lowest combined rankings of importance for leadership development. It should be noted that this lowest area received a high importance rankings from more than three quarters of the survey participants. The other four areas received the following high importance ratings:

finance (176, 85%); internal governance (169, 82.0%); governing boards (166, 81.7%); and budget (166, 80.2%). Notably, no area of leadership development was considered to be of low importance by responding presidents as evidenced by the small number of low importance rankings that rarely reached 5%.

In addition to ranking the levels of importance for the six specific areas of leadership development, presiding community college presidents were asked to identify the position they held prior to accepting their first presidency. The participants were given the following five position titles from which they could select: (a) chief academic officer/vice president, (b) chief financial officer/vice president, (c) chief planning officer/vice president, (d) chief student services officer/vice president, and (e) other. Nearly half, of the 206 respondents, indicated that they had held the position of chief academic officer/vice president prior to accepting their first presidency. The other three vice presidential positions each provided less than 10% of the training for presiding presidents (e.g., finance (16, 7.8%), student services (14, 6.8%), and planning (8, 3.9%). An additional 21 (10.2%) presidents were formerly vice presidents with titles encompassing areas such as: administration, economic development, institutional advancement, and vice chancellor; with another 9 (4.4%) advancing from titles including executive vice president, assistant to the president, senior chancellor, and counsel to the president. The data also indicated other paths to a community college presidency were possible as 15 (7.3%) of presiding presidents had served as a campus president, provost, dean, or director prior to becoming a president. Smaller percentages of responding presidents indicated they were external candidates who came from system and state

positions (6, 2.9%), corporate America (5, 2.4%), public schools (4, 1.9%), and the clergy (1, 0.5%). Two presidents were able to progress directly from department chair and faculty positions to a presidency. These findings were supportive of literature reviewed indicating that there was no single path to a community college presidency (Hockaday, 1990; Vaughn & Weisman, 1998). The diversity of the positions previously held by the respondents resulted in insufficient groupings to conduct a chi-square of association test or phi for each area of leadership development.

Research Question 6

What relationship, if any, exists between gender and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Survey respondents' gender and whether or not their institution had a succession plan in place were of interest in determining if a relationship existed between these variables. Presidents identified their institutions' succession plans by using one of five options: formal (21, 10.2%); semi-formal (15, 7.3%); informal (74, 35.9%); and other (5, 2.4%); and no succession plan (91, 44.2%).

For the purpose of analysis, all of the aforementioned response items except no succession plan were combined into a single variable. Thus, of the 206 respondents, just over half (115, 55.8%) signified that their organization did have some form of a succession plan, while 91 (44.2%) stated their institution did not have any type of a succession plan in place. As anticipated, based on the review of the literature (Vaughn & Weisman, 1998), three-fourths (156, 75.7%) of community college presidents were male and slightly less than one fourth (50, 24.3%) of the community college presidents were

female. To substantiate a possible relationship between a president's gender and whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place, a chi-square of association test was calculated. The results of the analysis suggested that presidents' gender was not statistically significant in regard to whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place. The results of the application of the phi statistic also suggested little to no relationship between a president's gender and whether or not an institution had a succession plan in place.

Research Question 7

What relationship, if any, exists between age and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Research Question 7 was used to determine whether or not a relationship existed between the presence of a succession plan at an institution and president's age. A majority of the responding presidents (101, 48.6%) indicated they were between 57 and 63 years of age while none denoted being less than 43 years of age. The youngest group (43-49) was the smallest group (17, 8.1%). Almost one-third of the responding presidents, (59, 28.4%) were 50-56 years of age, and only 31 (14.9%) of the presidents were older than 63 years of age.

Once again, the succession planning options were combined into a single variable, and slightly more than half (56.2%) indicated that some form of succession plan was in place. The remaining 43.8% did not have a plan. A chi-square of association was calculated based on these responses, and it was determined that statistical significance did exist between the age of a community college president and whether or not the institution

had a succession plan in place. Phi (.210) also supported a small to moderate relationship between the two variables.

Research Question 8

What relationship, if any, exists between respondents' past advancement via a succession plan and whether or not an institution has a succession plan in place?

Research Question 8 was used to explore the extent to which a relationship existed between presidents' participation in a succession plan prior to their appointments and whether their current institution had a succession plan in place. The total number of presidents who had participated in succession plans during their careers was relatively low (37, 18.1%, $N = 204$). Of the 37 presidents who had participated in a succession plan, however, 29 (78.4%) indicated they had a succession plan in place at their current institutions, while only 8 (21.6%) presidents did not have a plan. For the majority of presidents (167, 81.9%) who had not been identified for advancement via a succession plan, the likelihood of their organizations having succession plans in place was lower than their colleagues who had participated in a plan. One half (85, 50.9%) had a plan and 82 (49.1%) did not have a succession plan in place.

A chi-square of association showed that a statistically significant relationship existed between those who had previously been identified for advancement via a succession plan and their current institutions' having a succession plan in place. The phi statistic also supported the existence of a small to moderate positive relationship between these two variables.

Presidents were afforded the opportunity to offer their insights relative to leadership styles and development of future leaders. Several respondents signified that this was a timely topic at a critical point of leadership transition based on the pending retirements of community college presidents and other executives. Others stated that they would like to see additional research and documentation of succession planning in higher education. Many presidents noted that leadership styles tend to be situational rather than based on a personal preference. A few presidents offered suggested readings for future leaders including Covey's *Principle Centered Leadership* (1991) and Vaughn's *Balancing the Presidential Seesaw* (1998). Others suggested future researchers should consider different criteria for determining the geographic population as many institutions provide services beyond the physical location in which they reside. One respondent noted that he thought the impending shortfall of leaders was nothing more than hype much like that of the Y2K scares of the late 1900s as the new millennium approached. Finally, one president gleefully announced, for any emerging leaders, he was retiring at the end of the 2005 summer session.

Conclusions

This study endeavored to achieve three goals, the first of which was to reveal the different perspectives of community college presidents with respect to current and future leadership styles. It also sought to define the level of involvement community college president's had taken in the identification and development of potential future leaders.

Thirdly, it endeavored to determine the extent to which succession planning was taking place, at the time of this study, within the surveyed institutions.

It was concluded that the southeastern community colleges surveyed and the presidents presiding over them shared many commonalities. These common features may account for the similarities of the presidents' responses, thus limiting the necessary variances in their replies to satisfy the chi-square of association assumptions for several of the research questions. The congruencies among the responses were reflected in both institutional features and personal characteristics.

From an institutional perspective, 281 (96.2%) of the 292 SACS accredited Level I colleges were public institutions. Nearly two-thirds of these institutions were operating on an annual budget of less than \$25 million with another 22.2% (45) operating on \$25.1 to \$50.0 million per year. Furthermore, 131 (63.0%) of the 208 responding presidents indicated that they reported directly to an institutional board of trustees. Finally, over half of the 207 (122, 58.9%) colleges were being led by presidents with less than 10 years of experience. The literature indicated that a shift had begun to occur with the retirement of presidents and other executives leading to a younger more diverse regime in these top positions.

Five unique leadership styles were defined in the survey, for the purpose of this study, to create a basis of understanding among the respondents. The presidents indicated a high level of support for each of the five leadership styles for current practices as well as for future leaders.

Not surprisingly, based on the review of the literature and current events, a consultative style of leadership was deemed to be the most important form of leadership for current leaders (166, 79.4%) and increasing in importance for future leaders (178, 86.0%) according to the perceptions of presiding presidents. One implication this style of leadership holds for the leaders wishing to successfully utilize a consultative leadership style is one of sincere commitment. A consultative leadership style is built over time on a foundation of trust, interpersonal relationships, respect, and a supportive culture (Daly, 2003; Yukl, 2002; Zimmerman, 2001). Hence, a newly appointed president, unknown to the masses may have a difficult time initiating a consultative style of leadership.

However, if a new president wishes to build a reputation as a consultative or servant leader, a transitional alternative might be predominantly to employ the second highest scoring form of leadership, namely that of a participative or democratic leader (current: 158, 76.7%; future: 168, 80.8%). This form of leadership is also based on respect, relationships, and trust and is more situational in nature (Bolman & Deal, 2001). It is focused on building a consensus through shared power and empowering followers and can increase motivation and commitment (Yukl, 2002).

One possible draw back to each of the aforementioned forms of leadership is the possible perception that the leader is not capable of making decisions. The consultative or participative styles of leadership require a secure individual with the ability to form trusting relationships. These characteristics are not necessarily associated with a delegative leader. The delegative leadership style, cited as the third most important form of leadership for current (100, 48.1%) and future (114, 54.8%) leaders, promotes minimal

personal involvement by the leader and empowers others. The implications for leaders employing this form of leadership may be more egregious than the other forms of leadership discussed in this study. To avoid potentially catastrophic results it is crucial for delegative leaders to carefully evaluate tasks, skill sets, and experience before delegating responsibilities to subordinates or followers who may be ill equipped to accept them. If properly and thoughtfully utilized, a delegative leader can create a strong team of subordinates prepared for upward mobility. This may be extremely advantageous as the pool of qualified applicants diminishes through the retirements of top executives.

Somewhat surprisingly, a negotiative leadership style (current: 79, 38.2%; future: 102, 49.3%), with its win-win approach to leadership, was viewed by respondents as less important than a delegative leadership style even with its potential pitfalls. Regardless, a leader with an innate ability to influence others yields a powerful tool for leading (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Yukl, 2002; Zimmerman, 2001).

Finally, presidents ranked a directive or autocratic style of leadership as the least important (current: 52, 25.2%; future: 51, 24.6%) form of leadership. These results affirmed the work of Bennis and Goldsmith (2003), which indicated an exodus of authoritarian rule as true leadership gains strength.

Identifying and developing potential future leaders has been defined as a complex yet critical task (Dulewicz & Higgs, 1998; Klinger, 2001). It was concluded, however, that the 155 newer presidents, with less than 10 years of service, were more actively engaged (96, 46.4%) in identifying potential future leaders than their longer tenured counterparts. Likewise, of the 152 respondents who signified that they were actively

involved in the identification of emerging future leaders, presidents planning to retire within the next 6 years (89, 43.8%) indicated the highest level of engagement. This combination of results could possibly be attributed to the fact that these respondents had themselves been identified for advancement to the top leadership position within a community college and while considering their plans for retirement were also mindful of preparing future leaders.

Analysis of the six areas for leadership development, based on the 209 useable responses, revealed a very high level (77.7-89.4%) of support for each area by the responding presidents. Notably, the presidents ranked politics and relationships as the highest level of importance for potential future leaders. This finding provided further support for the importance of a consultative or participatory leadership style for future leaders.

Finally, it was discovered that slightly more than half (117, 56.2%) of the 208 respondents indicated that they had some form of a succession plan in place. Although, a formal succession plan has been documented as having a positive effect throughout an institution and its workforce, the majority (74, 35.9%) of plans in place in community colleges were identified as being informal (Kufahl, 2004; Rodriguez, 2004). This result further substantiates previous findings of the minimal attention being paid to higher education succession planning and the lack of knowledge employees have of the plan in their institution (Amey, 2004; Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002). It was also concluded that very few (37, 18.1%) of the responding presidents had previously been identified for advancement through a succession plan. Nevertheless, this did not seem to influence

whether or not institutions had a succession plan in plan. Approximately the same results were calculated (e.g., 85, 41.7%, with a plan had been identified for advancement and 82, 40.2%, without a plan had not been identified for advancement).

Recommendations for Future Research

Analysis of the data for the present study as well as review of the literature and related research led to the development of findings, conclusions and implications for policy and practice. The following recommendations for future research are proposed based on the results of this study.

1. A follow-up study of community college presidents could be initiated with respect to leadership styles to determine (a) if the perceptions of presiding presidents were accurate in forecasting the leadership styles future presidents would need; (b) how leadership styles might change again, if at all; (c) if leadership styles are more in tune with one's personal preference or the situation in which one is involved.
2. This study provided further support to previous researchers who cited politics and relationship skills as critical areas of leadership development. Additionally, nearly two-thirds of the presidents in this study indicated that they reported to an institutional board of trustees. A follow-up study with this population could be conducted to determine to what extent, if any, these skills vary when dealing with different groups of people such as an

institutional board of trustees, internal governing unit, or external stakeholders.

3. It would appear from the results of this study that newer presidents (i.e., less than 10 years experience) were more actively engaged in identifying potential future leaders than presidents with more tenure. A follow-up study could be conducted to explore (a) successful methods of identifying potential future leaders and (b) developmental steps being initiated after identification.
4. The results of the study have contributed further evidence to prior research results indicating that approximately two-thirds of community college presidents plan to retire within the next 6 years. As the applicant pool of identified qualified potential future leaders diminishes, the level of engagement of presiding leaders in identifying and developing their own internal pool of candidates may change and be suitable as a topic for future research.
5. A national study of community college presidents could be conducted to determine if the areas of leadership development are consistent across the United States and deemed the most important areas of leadership development.
6. A comparative study examining the most critical leadership development skills, as viewed by community college presidents and higher education leadership doctoral programs, could be conducted.

7. A comparative follow-up study could be conducted with institutions engaged in succession planning.
8. Since both age and previous identification in a succession plan were found to be statistically significant in this study, a national study of community college presidents could be conducted to determine if (a) these findings could be generalized nationally, (b) the number of newly appointed presidents who were previously identified for advancement via a succession plan was increasing, (c) newly appointed presidents were initiating or enhancing internal leadership identification and development programs, and or (d) the newly appointed presidents were establishing or solidifying the institution's succession plan.
9. This study provided further support to previous research in regard to succession planning which is occurring on a very limited basis in community colleges. A follow-up study could be conducted to investigate why formal or semi-formal succession planning is not occurring more frequently in educational institutions.

APPENDIX A

UCF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



Office of Research and Commercialization

February 14, 2005

Laurie Van Dusen
3539 Bareback Trail
Ormond Beach, FL 32174

Mrs. Van Dusen:

With reference to your protocol entitled, "Community College Leadership in the 21st Century" I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office.

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur. Further, should there be a need to extend this protocol, a renewal form must be submitted for approval at least one month prior to the anniversary date of the most recent approval and is the responsibility of the investigator (UCF).

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 407-823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

Barbara Ward

Barbara Ward, CIM
IRB Coordinator

Copies: IRB File

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

21st Century Community College Leadership Survey

Laurie Van Dusen

PART 1. LEADERSHIP STYLES

1. Please identify the level of importance for the following 5 Leadership Styles, first the importance to current Community College Presidents and then the importance that you predict these styles will play for Community College Presidents over the next 5 years, with 1 being to lowest level of importance and 5 being the highest level of importance.

Leadership Styles

Delegative

Interest in being personally involved is minimal, preference is to delegate tasks and responsibilities, sets limits or parameters for final outcomes

Directive/Autocratic

Interest in maintaining responsibility for planning and controlling in line with personal perception of priorities, giving guidance to subordinates

Inclusive/Servant/Consultative

Interest in the opinions and feelings of others is genuine, as is the ability to maintain a clear sense of objectives and to make the final decision

Negotiative

Interest in influencing others by identifying their needs and by making deals

Participative//Democratic

Interest in decision-making by consensus, ensuring sufficient time is available for decision-making and that all relevant individuals are involved

Level of <u>Importance</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Current Importance					
Future Importance					
Current Importance					
Future Importance					
Current Importance					
Future Importance					
Current Importance					
Future Importance					
Current Importance					
Future Importance					

PART 2. IDENTIFICATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF POTENTIAL LEADERS

2. Is your institution actively engaged in identifying the next generation of community college leaders? Yes No – if no, please skip to question 5

3. What process is your institution utilizing to identify potential leaders? (Check all that apply)
 Administrative/Supervisor identification Self-identification
 Executive level identification Other, please specify: _____

4. What action occurs once a potential leader is identified? (Check all that apply)
 Assessment of professional development level Enrollment in a formal training program
 Assignment of a coach and/or mentor In-house training program participation
 Attends conferences and seminars Other, please specify: _____

5. Identify the level of importance for community college leadership development, for each of the following areas, with 1 being the lowest level of importance and 5 being the highest level of importance.

<u>Levels of Importance</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Budgeting					
Financial Management					
Fund Raising					
Governing Boards					
Internal Governance					
Politics/Relationships					

Other, please specify: _____

PART 3. SUCCESSION PLANNING

Succession planning is the process of strategically preparing your institution for the future by identifying both critical positions within the institution and the individuals with the potential for accepting the responsibilities of those positions in the future.

6. To what extent is succession planning occurring at your institution? (Check only one response)
 A Board approved formal document is in place including a policy, procedures, and an official process
 A semi-formalized document has been developed and is utilized by the executive management team
 An informal, verbally communicated, and generally known process, but no documentation exists
 No succession planning is taking place (If no, please skip to question 8.)
 Other, please specify: _____

7. If your institution has a succession plan, what positions are included? (Check all that apply)
 President
 Executive management team
 Specified Professional positions
 Other, please specify _____

Please feel free to include any policies, procedures, or plans that your institution may have in place.

PART 4. DEMOGRAPHICS

8. What is the local population size of the community your institution serves? (Check only one response)

- Rural** – population of less than 2,500
- Suburban** – population of 2,501 to 49,999
- Urban** – population of 50,000 or more & in excess of 1,000 people per square mile

9. Does your institution operate at a **single site or on** **multiple sites?**

10. What is your institution's 2005 fiscal year operating budget? \$ _____

11. Based on 30 credit hours per FTE, not including non-credit equivalent FTE, what is your anticipated FTE for the 2005 fiscal year? _____

12. What was the first year your institution began offering degrees? _____

13. As President of the institution, whom do you report to?

- State Board of Regents
- Institutional Board of Trustees
- Other, please specify: _____

14. Which one of the following best describes the community college position you held immediately prior to your first Presidency? (Check only one response)

- (a) Chief Academic Officer/Vice President
- (b) Chief Financial Officer/Vice President
- (c) Chief Planning Officer/Vice President
- (d) Chief Student Services Officer/Vice President
- (e) Other, please specify: _____

15. Which of the positions in question 14 do you believe would have best prepared current presidents? (Please circle only one)

- a b c d e – Comment _____

16. Which of the positions in question 14 do you believe will best prepare future community college presidents? (Please circle only one)

- a b c d e – Comment _____

Your personal information will be kept confidential and used only for aggregate analysis.

17. Highest degree earned:

Ph.D. Ed.D. M.A. /M.S. Other, please specify: _____

18. Highest degree earned in:

Academic Specialization Educational Leadership
 Curriculum Development Other, please specify: _____

19. Are you a community college graduate? Yes No

20. Have you ever been identified for advancement through a succession plan? Yes No

21. Number of years that you have served as a community college president:

5 or less yrs. 6-10 yrs. 11-15 yrs. 16-20 yrs. 21-25 yrs. 26+ yrs.

22. Number of institutions at which you have served as a community college president:

1 2 3 4

23. Age: 35 or below 36-42 43-49 50-56 57-63 64-70 71 or above

24. Number of years until you plan to retire: 1-3 yrs. 4-6 yrs. 7-10 yrs. 11+ yrs.

25. Gender: Female Male

Thank you for participating in this research project. Completing and returning this survey is tantamount to providing your consent to use this information in aggregate form for the purpose of this study.

Please provide any additional information that you would like to share regarding leadership styles, the identification and development leaders, or succession planning.

Laurie Van Dusen
lvdpeace@aol.com
386-506-4420 (work)
386-506-4316 (fax)

Please return to:
c/o A.J. Newton

APPENDIX C
SURVEY ASSESSMENT FORM

21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP
SURVEY ASSESSMENT FORM

1. After reviewing the survey instrument and research questions, in your opinion, will this questionnaire successfully address the proposed questions? (Please check one).

Yes No

Comments: _____

2. If there are critical elements within the 3 primary areas of Leadership Style, Leadership Identification and Development, and Succession Planning that not addressed in the survey, which you believe are essential for emerging leaders and therefore should be included in this instrument, please describe them below.

Additions: _____

3. If you believe any item should be deleted from the survey, please indicate the item number and provide an explanation below as to why it should be removed from the instrument.

Deletions: _____

4. If an item(s) was ambiguous, please indicate the number of the item and suggestions for clarification below.

Item #: _____ Suggestion: _____

Item #: _____ Suggestion: _____

5. A high return rate of the survey instrument will increase the value of the corresponding research. Based on your review of the questionnaire, would you be inclined to reply?

Yes No

Comments: _____

6. Your expertise and insight are important, any additional comments you might have would be greatly appreciated.

Comments: _____

APPENDIX D

INITIAL CONTACT LETTER

March 6, 2005

Dear :

A few days from now, you will receive in the mail a request to complete a brief questionnaire pertaining to an important research project in the area of community college leadership being conducted by Laurie Van Dusen.

As you are most likely aware, it is anticipated that the community college system will face a critical leadership shortfall beginning the latter part of this decade. Ms. Van Dusen's study seeks to ascertain the skills we, as presiding community college presidents, deem as important for the development of potential future leaders.

I would like to assure you that Ms. Van Dusen will keep all responses in confidence and results will be published only in the aggregate.

I am contacting you in advance because I know exactly how busy you are. Nonetheless, I am asking that you take a few moments to complete this special questionnaire upon its arrival. It is hoped that this important study will lend assistance in the development of training programs and workshops, the refinement of existing higher education curriculum, and future management decisions.

I would like to thank you in advance for sharing your valuable time and insight. As a presiding community college president, your contribution is essential not only in helping this study to succeed, but also in helping to define the future of our institutions as we help to identify and develop potential leaders of the 21st century.

Best Regards,

D. Kent Sharples
President

P.S. As our way of saying thank you, a small token will be enclosed with the questionnaire, to show our appreciation for the time you have taken out of your busy schedule to voluntarily assist in the aforementioned research.

DKS:LVD

APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER FOR SURVEY MAILING

March 9, 2005

Dear

I am writing to request your assistance in a study of Community College Leadership in the 21st Century. Approximately 1 week ago, you received a letter from Dr. Kent Sharples, Daytona Beach Community College President, advising you of this study. Presiding community college presidents of accredited level-one institutions in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, such as yourself, are being contacted to help identify the leadership attributes that will be needed to guide the community college system through the next decade.

This vital study seeks to ascertain the skills that established leaders deem as important for emerging leaders to develop. Additionally, the responses from this study will hopefully assist in improving preparation programs and refining existing curriculum for the identification and development of potential future leaders. Studies such as this one are an essential part of helping to offset the impending leadership crisis being brought about by the projected retirement of 45% of community college president's by 2006 and an estimated 25% of their chief executive officers, according to research conducted by Shult, in 2001.

I want to assure you that your answers will be kept strictly confidential. No personally identifiable responses will be released. Only summary aggregated data will be published. You may notice a number in the lower left corner of your survey; your responses will be noted only by this number once you have returned your completed questionnaire.

Sharing your valuable time and expertise about your leadership experiences will be extremely helpful. This survey, which will take less than 10 minutes to complete, is absolutely voluntary. However, if you have any questions about this research, you may contact me directly or my faculty supervisor, Dr. William Bozeman, at 386-506-3128. Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the UCFIRB Office, UCF Office of Research, Orlando Tech Center, 12443 Research parkway, Suite 207, Orlando, FL 32826. The telephone number is (407) 823-2901. If you would prefer to not participate, simply return the questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope for auditing purposes. Receipt of the completed survey will serve as your consent to use the data collected in the aggregate form as previously indicated.

As my way of saying thank you for your time and contribution to this project, I have enclosed a small token of appreciation along with the questionnaire. Again, if you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call me at (386) 506-4420, or if you would prefer you may direct your written response to my attention at the address above.

Best Regards,

Laurie Van Dusen
University of Central Florida
Doctoral Candidate

P.S.: I would like to offer my sincere thanks for your assistance in making this vital study a success.

APPENDIX F
POST CARD REMINDERS

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

Your response and insights are needed to help develop Community College Leaders for the 21st Century!

Last week you received a questionnaire seeking your insight as to the skills, talents, and knowledge that you believe the next generation of community college leaders will need to lead their institutions' into the coming decades.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, I would like to offer my sincere thanks. If your busy schedule has not afforded you an opportunity to complete the survey, perhaps you will be able to do so today. If you need a new questionnaire, please do not hesitate to call me, I will be happy to send you a replacement questionnaire today.

Laurie Van Dusen, Educational Leadership Doctoral Candidate
Phone 385.506.4420 • FAX 386.506.4316
vandusl@dbcc.edu

APPENDIX G

FOURTH COVER LETTER FOR FOLLOW-UP MAILING

March 22, 2005

Dear Dr./Mr./Ms. (lastname):

As you may recall, approximately three weeks ago, I sent you a questionnaire and requested your assistance as a current community college leader. To the best of my knowledge, your response has not yet been received. Dr. (lastname), your assistance in this study is critical to its success. Therefore, I hope you will take a few minutes to respond. The questionnaire was designed to obtain the maximum amount of information in the least amount of time possible. It will only take you 10 minutes to complete the survey.

The study is progressing quite well; I have collected numerous responses from your colleagues. Each president has offered their insights on future community college leadership styles, the identification and development of potential leaders, and succession planning. I believe that these results will be very useful in identifying the key leadership attributes and competencies for the creation and the refinement of community college leadership development programs.

Your response to this questionnaire is very important. In addition to the aforementioned reasons, your response will assist me in ensuring that I have obtained representative results to the survey. For your convenience, I have enclosed a second survey. You may have noticed a number in the lower right hand corner of your questionnaire. The purpose of this code is simply to allow me to indicate in my mailing list database that I have received each response. All responses will be kept strictly confidential.

If you are no longer a Community College President in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools region, please let me know by returning the questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope, indicating your change. This information will assist me in accurately reporting survey results.

Your assistance in making this vital research project a success would be greatly appreciated, however, if for some reason you would prefer to not participate, please let me know either by returning the blank questionnaire or with a personal note.

Sincerely,

Laurie Van Dusen
University of Central Florida
Doctoral Candidate

P.S. If you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (386) 506-4420, or if you would prefer you may direct your written comments to my attention at the address above.

APPENDIX H

FIFTH COVER LETTER FOR FOLLOW-UP MAILING

April 19, 2005

Dear Dr./Mr./Ms. (last name):

Over the past two months you have received several mailings in regards to a valuable research study being conducted in reference to community college leadership and succession planning.

Its purpose was to assist in the understanding of leadership styles, the identification and development of potential leaders, and succession planning based on the insights of presiding community college presidents. The results of this study will be very useful in identifying the key leadership attributes and competencies emerging leaders will need to develop, as well as for the creation and the refinement of community college leadership development programs.

This study is coming to a close. Therefore, this will be my last contact to the selected community college leaders of this study, such as yourself, who I have not yet received a response.

I am sending this final letter by priority mail because your contribution is important to me. I would appreciate a response by either receiving your completed or blank questionnaire back in one of the postage paid envelopes that I provided with each of the questionnaires. Receipt of all surveys will help me ensure that the survey results are accurately reported.

If you are no longer a Community College President of an accredited level-one institution in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools region, please let us know by indicating your change and returning the blank questionnaire in the postage paid envelope that you received with the survey. Again, I would like to assure you that all responses to this study are voluntary and will be kept strictly confidential.

In closing, as I conclude my study to assist in the development of future community college leaders, your willingness to consider participating in this study is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

Laurie Van Dusen
University of Central Florida
Doctoral Candidate

P.S.: If you should have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (386) 506-4420, or if you would prefer you may direct your written comments to my attention at the address above.

APPENDIX I
CONTINGENCY TABLES

RESEARCH QUESTION 2—CONTINGENCY TABLES (10)

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Delegative – Current

Leadership Style and Level of importance		Presidents report to Institutional			Total	
		State Board of Regents	Board of Trustees	Other		
Delegative - Current	1	Count	3	9	2	14
		% of Total	1.4%	4.3%	1.0%	6.8%
	2	Count	2	16	8	26
		% of Total	1.0%	7.7%	3.9%	12.6%
	3	Count	7	46	14	67
		% of Total	3.4%	22.2%	6.8%	32.4%
	4	Count	9	45	18	72
		% of Total	4.3%	21.7%	8.7%	34.8%
	5	Count	6	14	8	28
		% of Total	2.9%	6.8%	3.9%	13.5%
Total		Count	27	130	50	207
		% of Total	13.0%	62.8%	24.2%	100.0%

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Delegative – Future

Leadership Style and Level of importance		Presidents report to Institutional			Total	
		State Board of Regents	Board of Trustees	Other		
Delegative - Future	1	Count	3	10	3	16
		% of Total	1.4%	4.8%	1.4%	7.7%
	2	Count	4	17	5	26
		% of Total	1.9%	8.2%	2.4%	12.6%
	3	Count	5	33	13	51
		% of Total	2.4%	15.9%	6.3%	24.6%
	4	Count	8	44	17	69
		% of Total	3.9%	21.3%	8.2%	33.3%
	5	Count	7	26	12	45
		% of Total	3.4%	12.6%	5.8%	21.7%
Total		Count	27	130	50	207
		% of Total	13.0%	62.8%	24.2%	100.0%

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Directive – Current

Leadership Style and Level of importance		Presidents report to			Total	
		State Board of Regents	Institutional Board of Trustees	Other		
Directive - Current	1	Count	11	18	8	37
		% of Total	5.4%	8.8%	3.9%	18.0%
	2	Count	9	37	13	59
		% of Total	4.4%	18.0%	6.3%	28.8%
	3	Count	3	45	10	58
		% of Total	1.5%	22.0%	4.9%	28.3%
	4	Count	3	18	16	37
		% of Total	1.5%	8.8%	7.8%	18.0%
	5	Count	1	10	3	14
		% of Total	.5%	4.9%	1.5%	6.8%
Total	Count	27	128	50	205	
	% of Total	13.2%	62.4%	24.4%	100.0%	

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Directive – Future

Leadership Style and Level of importance		Presidents report to			Total	
		State Board of Regents	Institutional Board of Trustees	Other		
Directive - Future	1	Count	13	28	14	55
		% of Total	6.3%	13.6%	6.8%	26.7%
	2	Count	7	38	9	54
		% of Total	3.4%	18.4%	4.4%	26.2%
	3	Count	2	34	11	47
		% of Total	1.0%	16.5%	5.3%	22.8%
	4	Count	4	17	14	35
		% of Total	1.9%	8.3%	6.8%	17.0%
	5	Count	1	12	2	15
		% of Total	.5%	5.8%	1.0%	7.3%
Total	Count	27	129	50	206	
	% of Total	13.1%	62.6%	24.3%	100.0%	

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Consultative – Current

Leadership Style and Level of importance			Presidents report to Institutional			Total
			State Board of Regents	Board of Trustees	Other	
Consultative - Current	1	Count	2	1	1	4
		% of Total	1.0%	.5%	.5%	1.9%
	2	Count	1	4	4	9
		% of Total	.5%	1.9%	1.9%	4.3%
	3	Count	4	18	8	30
		% of Total	1.9%	8.7%	3.8%	14.4%
	4	Count	8	53	16	77
		% of Total	3.8%	25.5%	7.7%	37.0%
	5	Count	12	55	21	88
		% of Total	5.8%	26.4%	10.1%	42.3%
Total	Count	27	131	50	208	
	% of Total	13.0%	63.0%	24.0%	100.0%	

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Consultative – Future

Leadership Style and Level of importance			Presidents report to Institutional			Total
			State Board of Regents	Board of Trustees	Other	
Consultative - Future	1	Count	2	1	1	4
		% of Total	1.0%	.5%	.5%	1.9%
	2	Count	0	3	3	6
		% of Total	.0%	1.5%	1.5%	2.9%
	3	Count	2	10	7	19
		% of Total	1.0%	4.9%	3.4%	9.2%
	4	Count	8	38	13	59
		% of Total	3.9%	18.4%	6.3%	28.6%
	5	Count	15	77	26	118
		% of Total	7.3%	37.4%	12.6%	57.3%
Total	Count	27	129	50	206	
	% of Total	13.1%	62.6%	24.3%	100.0%	

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Negotiative – Current

Leadership Style and Level of importance		Presidents report to Institutional			Total	
		State Board of Regents	Board of Trustees	Other		
Negotiative - Current	1	Count	6	8	6	20
		% of Total	2.9%	3.9%	2.9%	9.7%
	2	Count	7	21	12	40
		% of Total	3.4%	10.2%	5.8%	19.4%
	3	Count	4	50	14	68
		% of Total	1.9%	24.3%	6.8%	33.0%
	4	Count	7	32	13	52
		% of Total	3.4%	15.5%	6.3%	25.2%
	5	Count	3	18	5	26
		% of Total	1.5%	8.7%	2.4%	12.6%
Total	Count	27	129	50	206	
	% of Total	13.1%	62.6%	24.3%	100.0%	

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Negotiative – Future

Leadership Style and Level of importance		Presidents report to Institutional			Total	
		State Board of Regents	Board of Trustees	Other		
Negotiative - Future	1	Count	6	8	6	20
		% of Total	2.9%	3.9%	2.9%	9.7%
	2	Count	8	25	11	44
		% of Total	3.9%	12.1%	5.3%	21.4%
	3	Count	3	28	10	41
		% of Total	1.5%	13.6%	4.9%	19.9%
	4	Count	6	44	15	65
		% of Total	2.9%	21.4%	7.3%	31.6%
	5	Count	4	24	8	36
		% of Total	1.9%	11.7%	3.9%	17.5%
Total	Count	27	129	50	206	
	% of Total	13.1%	62.6%	24.3%	100.0%	

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Participative – Current

Leadership Style and Level of importance			Presidents report to			Total
			State Board of Regents	Institutional Board of Trustees	Other	
Participative - Current	1	Count	1	1	1	3
		% of Total	.5%	.5%	.5%	1.4%
	2	Count	1	9	5	15
		% of Total	.5%	4.3%	2.4%	7.2%
	3	Count	4	19	7	30
		% of Total	1.9%	9.1%	3.4%	14.4%
	4	Count	12	57	20	89
		% of Total	5.8%	27.4%	9.6%	42.8%
	5	Count	9	45	17	71
		% of Total	4.3%	21.6%	8.2%	34.1%
Total	Count	27	131	50	208	
	% of Total	13.0%	63.0%	24.0%	100.0%	

Contingency Table for Leadership Styles and External Governance Models: Participative – Future

Leadership Style and Level of importance			Presidents report to			Total
			State Board of Regents	Institutional Board of Trustees	Other	
Participative - Future	1	Count	1	1	1	3
		% of Total	.5%	.5%	.5%	1.4%
	2	Count	0	7	6	13
		% of Total	.0%	3.4%	2.9%	6.3%
	3	Count	2	18	4	24
		% of Total	1.0%	8.7%	1.9%	11.6%
	4	Count	13	46	15	74
		% of Total	6.3%	22.2%	7.2%	35.7%
	5	Count	11	58	24	93
		% of Total	5.3%	28.0%	11.6%	44.9%
Total	Count	27	130	50	207	
	% of Total	13.0%	62.8%	24.2%	100.0%	

RESEARCH QUESTION 3—CONTINGENCY TABLE

Contingency Table for Identifying Leaders and Presidents' Years of Service

	00-05	06-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+	Total
ID Leaders							
Yes							
Count	48	48	23	17	13	6	155
% of Total	23.2%	23.2%	11.1%	8.2%	6.3%	2.9%	74.9%
No							
Count	17	9	8	10	4	4	52
% of Total	8.2%	4.3%	3.9%	4.8%	1.9%	1.9%	25.1%
Total							
Count	65	57	31	27	17	10	207
% of Total	31.4%	27.5%	15.0%	13.0%	8.2%	4.8%	100.0%

RESEARCH QUESTION 4—CONTINGENCY TABLE

Contingency Table for Identifying Leaders and Presidents' Years to Retirement

	1-3	4-6	7-10	11+	Total
ID Leaders					
Yes					
Count	37	52	35	28	152
% of Total	18.2%	25.6%	17.2%	13.8%	74.9%
No					
Count	13	25	9	4	51
% of Total	6.4%	12.3%	4.4%	2.0%	25.1%
Total					
Count	50	77	44	32	203
% of Total	24.6%	37.9%	21.7%	15.8%	100.0%

CONTINGENCY TABLES—RESEARCH QUESTION 5

Contingency Table: Leadership Development and Positions Previously Held by Presidents – Budget

		Position previously held						
			Academic	Financial	Planning	Student Services	Other	Total
Budget	Lowest Level of Importance	Count	1	0	0	0	4	5
		% of Total	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	2.5%
	2	Count	3	0	0	0	4	7
		% of Total	1.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	3.4%
	3	Count	13	3	3	3	6	28
		% of Total	6.4%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	2.9%	13.7%
	4	Count	35	5	3	6	16	65
		% of Total	17.2%	2.5%	1.5%	2.9%	7.8%	31.9%
	Highest Level of Importance	Count	48	8	2	5	36	99
		% of Total	23.5%	3.9%	1.0%	2.5%	17.6%	48.5%
Total	Count	100	16	8	14	66	204	
	% of Total	49.0%	7.8%	3.9%	6.9%	32.4%	100.0%	

Contingency Table: Leadership Development and Positions Previously Held by Presidents: Finance

		Position previously held						
			Academic	Financial	Planning	Student Services	Other	Total
Finance	Lowest Level of Importance	Count	0	0	0	0	3	3
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	1.5%
	2	Count	4	0	0	0	3	7
		% of Total	2.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	3.4%
	3	Count	12	2	1	1	4	20
		% of Total	5.9%	1.0%	.5%	.5%	2.0%	9.8%
	4	Count	27	5	3	6	18	59
		% of Total	13.2%	2.5%	1.5%	2.9%	8.8%	28.9%
	Highest Level of Importance	Count	57	9	4	7	38	115
		% Total	27.9%	4.4%	2.0%	3.4%	18.6%	56.4%
Total	Count	100	16	8	14	66	204	
	% Total	49.0%	7.8%	3.9%	6.9%	32.4%	100.0%	

Contingency Table: Leadership Development and Positions Previously Held by Presidents – Fund Raising

Fund Raising	Lowest Level of Importance	Count	Position previously held				Other	Total
			Academic	Finance	Planning	Student Services		
		Count	0	0	0	0	2	2
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	2	Count	7	0	0	2	4	13
		% of Total	3.4%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	2.0%	6.4%
	3	Count	12	3	0	3	12	30
		% of Total	5.9%	1.5%	.0%	1.5%	5.9%	14.8%
	4	Count	33	5	5	6	16	65
		% of Total	16.3%	2.5%	2.5%	3.0%	7.9%	32.0%
	Highest Level of Importance	Count	48	8	3	3	31	93
		% of Total	23.6%	3.9%	1.5%	1.5%	15.3%	45.8%
Total		Count	100	16	8	14	65	203
		% of Total	49.3%	7.9%	3.9%	6.9%	32.0%	100.0%

Contingency Table: Leadership Development and Positions Previously Held by Presidents: Governing

Governing	Lowest Level of Importance	Count	Position previously held				Other	Total
			Academic	Financial	Planning	Student Services		
		Count	0	0	0	0	3	3
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	1.5%
	2	Count	5	1	0	0	3	9
		% of Total	2.5%	.5%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	4.5%
	3	Count	13	2	1	3	5	24
		% of Total	6.5%	1.0%	.5%	1.5%	2.5%	12.0%
	4	Count	39	3	0	10	22	74
		% of Total	19.5%	1.5%	.0%	5.0%	11.0%	37.0%
	Highest Level of Importance	Count	42	10	7	1	30	90
		% of Total	21.0%	5.0%	3.5%	.5%	15.0%	45.0%
Total		Count	99	16	8	14	63	200
		% of Total	49.5%	8.0%	4.0%	7.0%	31.5%	100.0%

Contingency Table: Leadership Development and Positions Previously Held by Presidents: Internal Governance

		Position previously held						
			Academic	Financial	Planning	Student Services	Other	Total
Internal Gov.	Lowest Level of Importance	Count	0	0	0	0	2	2
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	2	Count	1	1	0	0	3	5
		% of Total	.5%	.5%	.0%	.0%	1.5%	2.5%
	3	Count	14	1	4	0	10	29
		% of Total	6.9%	.5%	2.0%	.0%	4.9%	14.3%
	4	Count	38	8	2	9	24	81
		% of Total	18.7%	3.9%	1.0%	4.4%	11.8%	39.9%
	Highest Level of Importance	Count	46	6	2	5	27	86
		% of Total	22.7%	3.0%	1.0%	2.5%	13.3%	42.4%
	Total	Count	99	16	8	14	66	203
		% of Total	48.8%	7.9%	3.9%	6.9%	32.5%	100.0%

Contingency Table: Leadership Development and Positions Previously Held by Presidents – Politics/Relationships

		Position previously held						
			Academic	Financial	Planning	Student Services	Other	Total
Politics/ Relation	Lowest Level of Importance	Count	1	0	0	0	2	3
		% of Total	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	1.5%
	2	Count	1	0	0	0	2	3
		% of Total	.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.0%	1.5%
	3	Count	6	2	0	1	6	15
		% of Total	2.9%	1.0%	.0%	.5%	2.9%	7.4%
	4	Count	25	6	4	5	18	58
		% of Total	12.3%	2.9%	2.0%	2.5%	8.8%	28.4%
	Highest Level of Importance	Count	67	8	4	8	38	125
		% of Total	32.8%	3.9%	2.0%	3.9%	18.6%	61.3%
	Total	Count	100	16	8	14	66	204
		% of Total	49.0%	7.8%	3.9%	6.9%	32.4%	100.0%

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Alfred, R.L. (1996). Competition for limited resources: Realities, prospects, and strategies. In D.S Honeyman, J. L. Wattenbarger, & K.C. Westbrook (Eds.), *A struggle to survive: Funding higher education in the next century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Alfred, R.L. (2000/2001). Strategic Thinking: The untapped resource for leaders. *Community College Journal*, 24-28.
- American Association of Community Colleges (2000). *Past and Present*. Retrieved September 29, 2004, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu>
- American Association of Community Colleges (2002). *Statistical Guide*. Retrieved September 29, 2004, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu>
- Amey, M. (2004, February/March). Learning leadership. *Community College Journal*. 6-9.
- Amey, M.J. & VanDerLinden, K.E. (2002). Career paths for community college leaders. *American Association of Community Colleges, Research Brief*, 2, 1-16.
- Antonioni, D. (2003, November/December). Leading with responsibility. *Industrial management*, 8-15.
- Appleton, J. & Larson, P. (2002). Coaching process meets development needs of three types of leaders. *The Right Communiqué*, 7, 1-5.
- Axelrod, A. (1999). *Patton on leadership: Strategic lessons for corporate warfare*. Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall Press.
- Ayers, D.F. (2002). Mission priorities of community colleges in the southern United States. *Community College Review*, 30-33.
- Baum, H. (2004). *The transparent leader*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.
- Beagrie, S. & Couzins, M. (2003). How to ...maximize your leadership capabilities. *Personnel Today*, 25-29.
- Bender, B.E. (2002). Benchmarking as an administrative tool for institutional leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 118, 113-120.
- Bennis, W. (1991). Learning some basic truisms about leadership. *National Forum*, 71(1), 12-16.

- Bennis, W. (1991). Managing the dream: Leadership in the 21st century. *Antioch Review*, 49(1), 22-29.
- Bennis, W. & Goldsmith, J. (2003). *Learning to lead* (3rd ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Blanchard, K. (1999). *The Heart of a Leader*. Escondito, California: Honor Books.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Brown, L.C. (2001). *Community college leadership preparation: Changing needs, current perceptions, and recommendations*. (Doctoral Dissertation, New Mexico State University, 2001).
- Brown, L., Mario, M., & Daniel, D. (Summer 2002). Community college leadership preparation: Needs, perceptions, and recommendations. *Community College Review*, 30(1), 1-22.
- Buckingham, M. & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules: What the world's greatest managers do differently*. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Buckingham, M. (2005). *The one thing you need to know*. New York: Free Press a Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Buss, D. (2001, December). When managing isn't enough: Nine ways to develop the leaders you need. *Workforce*, 80(12), 44-48.
- Butler, A.S. (1999, November). Developing leaders. *Executive Excellence*, 19.
- Byham, W.C. (2003). Identifying potential: Achieve gold medal results. *Executive Excellence*, 9.
- Campbell, D.F. & Levery, L.H. (1997, February/March). Developing and selecting leaders for the 21st century. *Community College Journal*, 64(4), 34-36.
- Campbell, D.F. & Levery, L.H. (1999, August/September). Future concerns key values for community college. *Community College Journal*, 18-24.
- Caudron, S. (1999, September). The looming leadership crisis. *Workforce*, 78(9), 72-76.
- Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (1996). *The American Community College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

- Daly, N.R. (2003, January). Characteristics that count: Nine leadership traits that translate to on-target actions. *Association Management*, 49-52.
- Davies, J., Hides, M.T., & Casey, S. (2001). Leadership in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, 12 (7 & 8), 1025-1030.
- Dillman, D.A. (2002). *Mail & Internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dulewicz, V. & Higgs, M. (1998, October 1). Soul researching. *People Management*, 4(19), 42-46.
- Eagly, A.H. & Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 781-797.
- Evelyn, J. (2001). Community Colleges Face a Crisis of Leadership Retrieved September 29, 2004, from <http://webluis.fcla.edu>
- Fulmer, R.M. & Conger, J.A. (2004, July/August). Developing leaders with 20/20 vision. *Financial Executive*, 38-41.
- Getty, C. (1993, November). Planning successfully for succession planning. *Training and Development*, 31-33.
- Green, K.E. & Boser, J.A. (2001, April). *Trends in postal mailing survey response rates through 1999*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, Washington.
- Gibson, F.W. & Pason, A. (2003, September/October). Levels of leadership: Developing leaders through new models. *Journal of Education for Business*, 23-27.
- Honeyman, D.S., Wattenbarger, J.L. & Westbrook, K.C. (Eds.). (1996). *A struggle to survive: Funding higher education in the next century*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Hockaday, J. (Spring 1990). An essay review: George Vaughan's leadership in transition: The community college presidency. *Community College Review*, 17(4), 1-4.
- Hockaday, J. & Puyear, D.E. (2000). Community college leadership in the new millennium. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.aacc.nche.edu>
- HR Focus (1998, January). Developing leaders for the 21st century. *American Management Association International*, 75, 2.
- HR Magazine* (2005, January). Leadership development challenges in Asia Pacific, 50(1), 14.

- Katsinas, S.G. (1994a). Is the open door closing? The democratizing role of the community college in the past-cold war era. *AACC Journal*, (64)5, 22-28.
- Katsinas, S.G. (1994b). A review of the literature related to economic development and community colleges. *Community College Review*, 21(4), 67-80.
- Klingler, D. (2001, June). Taking the lead: Collaborating to address strategic workforce issues. *NACUBO Business Officers*, 30-33.
- Kufahl, P. (2004, February). Growing leaders. *Management Notebook*, 52-53.
- Lacey, K. (nd). Succession planning in education. Retrieved April 28, 2005, from www.apapdc.edu.au/2002/downloads/2002/Lacey_succession_planning.pdf
- Leadership 2020: Recruitment, preparation, and support (2002, November 8). *American Association of Community Colleges*.
- Leadership*. (2004). W.K. Kellogg Foundation: Overview. Retrieved September 29, 2004, from <http://www.wkkf.org>.
- Lewis, N. (nd.). Developing leaders: You'll need a new strategy. *Executive Excellence*, 13-14.
- Lewis, B.O. (2004, July). Performance-based succession planning. Retrieved April 28, 2005, from http://www.clomedia.com/content/templates/clo_feature.asp
- Little, G.W. (2002, August/September). Resolving the leadership crisis. *Community College Journal*, 33.
- Lindquist, M. (2005, April). How to keep quality people in your organization. *Benefits & Compensation Solutions*, 2(4), 16.
- Lomax, R.G. (2001). *An introduction to statistical concepts for education and behavioral sciences*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Maxwell, J.C. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- McClenney, K.M. (2001). Converting crisis to opportunity: The AACC Community College Leadership Summit. *Community College Journal*, 24-27.
- McCormick, A.C. & Cox, R.D. (2003). Classifying two-year colleges: Purposes, possibilities, and pitfalls. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 122, 7-15.
- Miller, A. (2005, March). Succession planning: It's not just for your executive team. Retrieved April 28, 2005, from <http://www.learningcircuits.org/2005/mar2005/miller.htm>

- Miller, J.G. (2001). *QBQ: The question behind the question: Practicing personal accountability at work and in life*. Denver: Denver Press.
- Milliron, M.D. & de los Santos, G.E. (2004). Making the most of community colleges on the road ahead. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 28, 105-122.
- Morley, J. & Eadie, D. (2001, June). Moving from manager to leader. *NACUBO Business Officer*, 22-25.
- Murry, J. W., Jr. & Hammons, J. (1995). Assessing the managerial and leadership ability of community college administrative personnel. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 19, 207-216.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nora, A. (2000). Reexamining the community college mission. *American Association of Community Colleges: New Expeditions. Issue Paper*, 2, 1-7.
- O'Rourke, T.G. (1997). *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders*. ERIC Digest. (ERIC identifier: ED409929).
- Owens, R.G. (2001). *Organizational behavior in education: Instructional leadership and school reform* (7th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Parsell, G. & Bligh, J. (2000). Encouraging education leadership. *Medical Education*, 34, 199-200.
- Patton, M. (2003, November 25). AACC holds first leading forward summit. *Community College Times*.
- Patton, M. (2004, January). Initiative seeks to inform and prepare new leaders. *Community College Times*. Retrieved April 9, 2005, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu>.
- Raisman, N.A. (1994). Plan for change before someone else plans it for you. *Trusteeship*, 2(4), 23-26.
- Reardon, K.K. (1995, November/December). Is your leadership style holding you back? *Executive Female*, 18(6), 72-75.
- Rendón, L.I. (2000). Fulfilling the promise of access and opportunity: Collaborative community colleges for the 21st century. *American Association of Community Colleges: New Expeditions. Issue Paper*, 2, 1-15.

- Rodriguez, R. (2004, September). Filing the human resources pipeline. *Human Resources Magazine*, 78-84.
- Romero, M. (2004, November/December). Who will lead our community colleges? *Change*, 30-34.
- Sagie, A. (1996). Effects of leader's communication style and participative goal setting on performance and attitudes. *Human Performance*, 9(1), 51-64.
- Satterfield, T. (2005, April). Employer Performance: A product of leadership. *Benefits & Compensation Solutions*, 2(4), 14.
- Shannon, H.D. (2004, October 29). Hiring employees and motivating teams. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Community Colleges*, B12-B13.
- Smith, L. & Sandstrom, J. (1999). Executive leader coachin as a strategic activity. *Strategy and Leadership*, 33-36.
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Retrieved September 29, 2004, from <http://www.sacs.org>
- Shults, C. (2001). The Critical Impact of Impending Retirement on Community College Leadership. *Research Brief Leadership Series*, no.1, AACC-RB-01-5. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Spatz, C. (2001). *Basic statistics. Tales of distributions* (7th ed.). Blemont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Sullivan, L.G. (2001). Four generations of community college leadership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25, 559-571.
- Taylor, K. (2005, April). Unconventional Wisdom. *NACUBO Business Officer*, 18.
- Townsend, B.K. & Twombly, S.B. (1998). A feminist critique of organizational change in the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 102, 77-85.
- United States Census Bureau (2000). Retrieved September 29, 2004, from <http://www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/glossary.html#urbanandrurl>.
- Vaughan, G.B. (1998). *Balancing the presidential seesaw: Case studies in community college leadership*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Vaughan, G.B. & Weisman, I. (1998). *The community college presidency at the millennium*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

- van Engen, M.L., van der Leeden, R., & Willemsen, T.M. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 581-598.
- Von Hippel, C., Zouroudis, A., & Abbas, F. (2003). The influence of stereotype threat on leadership performance of men and women. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 148.
- Weisman, I.M. & Vaughan, G.B. (2002). The community college presidency 2001. *American Association of Community College, Leadership Series. Research Brief (3)*, 1-15.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Zeiss, P.A. (1994). A case for reassessing priorities. *Trusteeship*, 2(4), 27-30.
- Zeiss, T. (2004, February/March). Attracting, developing, and retaining peak. *Community College Journal*, 14-17.
- Zimmerman, E.L. (2001, August). What's under the hood? The mechanics of leadership versus management. *Supervision*, 62, 10-12.