


1-1-2011

Background and Leadership Traits to Effectively Lead Faculty Senates in California Community Colleges

Julie Adams
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Community College Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Julie Adams

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Dale Swoboda, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Mark Stallo, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Wendy Andberg, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2014

Abstract

Background and Leadership Traits to Effectively Lead Faculty Senates in California

Community Colleges

by

Julie Adams

MBA, University of California Davis, 2003

BS, California State University, Sacramento, 1999

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2014

Abstract

Although the major responsibility for community college governance falls to presidents and administrators, researchers have recognized the integral role of faculty in governing higher education institutions. Few studies, however, have explored the effectiveness of contributions of faculty elected to community college academic senates. The purpose of this research was to investigate the background traits and leadership skills of elected academic senate presidents in order to identify both their perceptions of themselves as leaders and the perceptions of other faculty senate members. This study was based in the theory of transformational leadership in organizations and its impact on the effectiveness of organizations. The research question for this quantitative study focused on the extent to which the elected academic senate presidents' background and leadership traits affect the performance of faculty senates. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X; MLQ 5X) and supplemental demographic data were used with faculty at the 112 community colleges in a western state to measure the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational effectiveness. Data were analyzed using Pearson's correlation and z and t tests. Results indicated that there is a significant relationship between senate presidents who were transformational leaders and more effective in leading faculty senates. The implications for social change include informing community college faculty senates and their presidents about effective leadership styles and skills and providing resources to improve faculty governance. The anticipated results are improved college governance, enhanced college service to their communities, and enriched education for their students.

Background and Leadership Traits to Effectively Lead Faculty Senates in California

Community Colleges

by

Julie Adams

MBA, University of California Davis, 2003

BS, California State University, Sacramento, 1999

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2014

UMI Number: 3622969

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3622969

Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Dedication

I dedicate this research project to my family. My wonderful husband, my best friend, who has supported me for the past 31 years in whatever challenge I pursue; when I thought I had failed, in his eyes I was still a success. He is my rock. My mother who has believed in me, encouraged me, and still brags about my accomplishments. My grandmother who at 92 still believed that I would finish this journey; she died before she could see my accomplishment but I know she knew I would complete this part of my journey. My beautiful daughter who continues to inspire me as a wife, as a mother, and as a student, as well as through her dedication for helping families with children who are autistic. Finally, I dedicate this research to my granddaughter—Julianne—who I hope will pursue education as passionately as I have in my later years.

Acknowledgments

Many individuals have assisted me with accomplishing this research project. As an executive director of a nonprofit organization, my board has been supportive of my pursuit of a graduate degree through their continued encouragement. Several members of the board have volunteered to read drafts, provide feedback on survey instruments, and participate in a review of survey results. Their review was particularly helpful in guiding my research and providing me with insight that only senate leaders could. I would specifically like to thank Dr. Richard Mahon, Dr. Jane Patton, and Dr. Ian Walton. I would also like to acknowledge my newly appointed chair, Dr. Dale Swoboda, who within 5 weeks was able to shepherd my research through this process smoothly.

Finally, to everyone I spoke to about my research including faculty at the events, students in the 9100 course, and other students I met at Walden residencies. Meeting and working with others with similar goals regarding social change was an amazing experience—one I will not easily forget as it has changed who I am.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background and Faculty Senate Effectiveness	2
Problem Statement	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions and Hypotheses	7
Theoretical Framework of the Study	8
Nature of the Study	8
Definition of Terms.....	10
Assumptions.....	12
Scope and Delimitations	13
Limitations	13
Significance of the Study	14
Summary	16
Chapter 2: Literature Review	17
Literature Search Strategy.....	18
Shared Governance	18
Governance of Higher Education Institutions.....	19
California Community College Governance	20
Institutional Effectiveness.....	22

Theoretical Foundation	24
Transformational Leadership	25
Transactional Leadership	27
Situational Considerations	28
Summary	29
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	31
Research Design and Rationale	31
Researcher’s Role	34
Methodology.....	35
Population	35
Sampling and Sampling Procedures	35
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection.....	36
Operational Constructs.....	37
Supplemental Information	39
Data Analyses Plan	39
Threats to Validity (Trustworthiness).....	40
Ethical Procedures	41
Confidentiality Assurance.....	41
Summary.....	42
Chapter 4: Results	43
Introduction.....	43
Data Collection	43

Participant Responses to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X).....	44
Results.....	46
Methodology.....	47
Hypothesis 1.....	48
Hypothesis 2.....	51
Hypothesis 3.....	52
Summary.....	54
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	56
Interpretation and Findings.....	57
Research Question One.....	57
Research Question Two.....	60
Research Question Three.....	63
Limitations of the Study.....	66
Recommendations.....	66
Implications.....	68
Conclusion.....	69
References.....	71
Appendix A: Permission to use the Academic Senate Listserv.....	82
Appendix B: Invitation and Consent Forms.....	83
Appendix C: Supplemental Information.....	87
Appendix D: Permission to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X) Instrument.....	88

Curriculum Vitae89

List of Tables

Table 1. Leadership Experience – Elected Presidents	45
Table 2. Leadership Experience – Faculty Respondents	46
Table 3. Mean Values for Self-perceived Leadership Factors for the Senate President	49
Table 4. Self-perceived Leadership Factors: Independent-Samples t Tests	50
Table 5. Mean Values for Organizational Outcomes by Status.....	50
Table 6. Organizational Outcomes: Independent-Samples t Tests	51
Table 7. Correlations: Presidents’ Self-perceived Leadership Factors and Organizational Outcomes	52
Table 8. Correlations: Faculty’s Self-perceived Leadership Factors and Organizational Outcomes	53
Table 9. Comparison between Correlations.....	54

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Community colleges have been a part of California's economy since the first campus—Fresno Junior College—opened in 1910 (Fresno City College, 2012). As part of the tripartite higher education structure comprised currently of 112 community colleges, 23 state colleges, and eight research universities, California community colleges form a comprehensive system that offers an assortment of educational and workforce experiences in many disciplines, technical fields, and community service functions (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2014). The largest system of higher education in the world, California community colleges are the primary gateway to higher education, largest workforce preparer, as well as a pathway to postsecondary education for most Californians (American Association of Community Colleges, 2008). This comprehensive system provides opportunities for community colleges to partner with local industry, government, nonprofit organizations, and communities to respond to economic development opportunities (Amey, Jessup-Anger, & Jessup-Anger, 2008; Boggs, 2011; Dassance, 2011). These partners have different and often conflicting expectations that at times can be problematic for community colleges to reconcile.

Community colleges need highly effective governance and leadership to meet the rising and conflicting expectations of their multiple constituencies. Effective governance facilitates institutional change and growth, as well as provides a framework for defining institutional purpose, clarifying strategic direction, identifying priorities, and exerting sufficient control to manage outcomes (Amey et al., 2008). Consequently, effective governance is increasingly important for higher education institutions to function well.

Knowing this, many researchers have explored the role of college presidents, trustees, and faculty on effective governance in community colleges (Beckwith, Silverstone, & Bean, 2010; Garfield, 2008; Jones, 2011). While researchers have recognized the integral role of faculty in governing higher education institutions (Burgan, 1998; Gerber, Clausen, Poston, Perley, & Ramo, 1997; Minor, 2003), very few have explored the elected academic senate president's role on the effectiveness of faculty senates on the community college governance structure. The lack of focused research on this issue has resulted in an open question: To what extent do the elected faculty senate president's background and leadership traits relate to the performance of the faculty senate? This question is significant because of the important role community colleges now serve in educating the majority of individuals pursuing higher education, as well as in worker retraining, basic skills development, and citizenship.

This study could potentially contribute to social change by providing an important resource for improving the effectiveness of the faculty leadership at California community colleges, which might result in greater effectiveness of the overall college governance and greater ability to serve their communities. Given the important role faculty senates play in the governance of colleges, understanding how to develop future leaders is critical to ensuring these institutions are effective. The lack of evidence in this area may inhibit attempts to understand factors that could be critical to characterizing or defining effective leadership of faculty senates.

Background and Faculty Senate Effectiveness

Many colleges and universities across the nation have a formal structure for faculty participation in the governance of the institution. In California, community colleges have faculty senates involved in governance at the campus level, which is established in California Education Code (§70902 (b) (7) and Title 5 regulation (§53200). In a 1967 task force report titled *Faculty Participation in Academic Governance*, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) made one of the earliest recommendations about the importance of faculty governance. AAHE (1967) studied faculty-administrator relationships at 28 public and six private colleges and universities and recommended that effective higher education institutions need a structure to ensure effective faculty participation. Acknowledging that effective campus governance is built on the concept of shared authority between the faculty and administration, the task force argued that faculty members have a valid claim to faculty participation in specific areas of campus decision making. The claim is especially valid given the product of higher education institutions is students and the professional expertise of the faculty in creating the learning environment. Specifically, the report suggested an internal group such as a faculty senate or its equivalent combines professional values and standards with a formal decision-making process reflecting the views of all faculty members in the community college environment (AAHE, 1967).

While most colleges—both universities and community—have some form of shared governance policies, Twombly and Townsend (2008) recognized that little research existed regarding community college faculty members and the role shared

governance had in their lives or its importance to them. Research has demonstrated that many—both internal and external to academia—perceived faculty senates as ineffective (Amey et al., 2008; Birnbaum, 1989; Minor, 2004; Tierney & Minor, 2003). While researchers have explored reasons for this perceived ineffectiveness, such as reduced funding, ineffectual institutional processes or structures (Birnbaum, 1989; Minor, 2004), and undefined or unclear roles (Minor, 2004; Tierney & Minor, 2003), few researchers studied the role that the elected president had on the faculty senate's effectiveness (Firestone, 2010; Miller, 2003). It is important to understand the role of elected presidents on faculty senate effectiveness because of their influence on college governance and, ultimately, college effectiveness.

To navigate between representing the needs of the stakeholders and accomplishing the college mission while still ensuring the effectiveness of the faculty senate, a faculty senate president needs skills that are not necessarily inherent for most faculty in teaching positions. In her research, Firestone (2010) noted faculty members might not have the leadership experience needed to successfully perform their roles as volunteer leaders; for example, a faculty member who has taught for 5 years in the classroom may be willing to serve in a leadership role but may not in fact be qualified to lead.

Strong faculty-led decision-making is critical to making faculty senates function effectively (Miller & Pope, 2001). In most faculty senates, the members elect the officers, including the president, which makes it difficult to ensure that the incoming leadership has the necessary skills to navigate the decisions required to lead the senate. Part of the

problem might be that faculty senate members sometimes do not select their leaders based on the individual's ability to lead but instead on other criteria such as his or her service to the organization, tenure in the organization, popularity, experience, or other unknown factors. In addition, many faculty senates have reported difficulty filling volunteer leadership positions, which might result in some senates electing anyone willing, regardless of qualifications, to occupy leadership positions. This situation potentially results in having an inexperienced leader who might not have the appropriate skills to lead, which could be harmful to the college. Miller and Pope (2001) argued that, similar to other organizations, faculty governance bodies are only as strong as their leadership. To complicate matters, stakeholders might not even understand the criteria they use to reach their judgments on selecting individuals to serve in such leadership positions (Herman & Renz, 1998).

Ideally, faculty members need to understand the criteria required to lead faculty senates, as research has shown that organizational effectiveness was dependent on the leaders' effectiveness (Herman & Renz, 1998, 1999, 2000). However, limited research has been published regarding the characteristics of effective presidents of faculty senates. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of elected presidents and members of faculty senates regarding the background and leadership traits needed to lead faculty senates effectively, particularly the effectiveness of faculty senate leadership on the governance of California community colleges. As noted in Chapter 2, some previously published authors have claimed that faculty senates are ineffective. This viewpoint has implications for higher education because each California publically

funded community college has its own faculty senate; thus, improving the leadership effectiveness of faculty senates could influence the governance structure of public community colleges and, ultimately, the teaching and learning at higher education institutions in California. Implications for positive social impact of this study are important to California community colleges and possibly those in other states, as community colleges provide access to higher education, workforce development, citizenship, and an opportunity for a better life to the most diverse and underserved of most populations (Boggs, 2011; Dassance, 2011). In addition, through this study, I add to the body of literature for community college governance by linking the constructs of background and leadership traits to the perceived effectiveness of faculty senates.

Problem Statement

Leadership and governance of higher education institutions have been studied for many years (Boggs, 2011; Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, 2003; Jones, Shanahan, & Goyan, 2004). While there has been limited research on the effectiveness of faculty senates (Birnbaum, 1989; Burgan, 1998; Leach 2008; Minor, 2004; Schoorman & Acker-Hocevar, 2010; Tierney & Minor, 2003), the literature did not indicate whether the elected faculty president influenced the effectiveness of faculty senates and how this knowledge might have contributed to the election of individuals who lead faculty senates effectively. While faculty members have a broad range of exposure to leadership opportunities, such as chairing departments, college committees, or making presentations to their professional organizations, there is no guarantee they are good leaders. This is a problem for community colleges because faculty senates, given their significant role in

governance, influence critical key policy decisions. In this study, I addressed a gap in the literature by investigating the perceptions of faculty regarding the background and leadership traits of faculty leading senates. Faculty perceptions about the ideal background and leadership traits of individuals who lead faculty senates effectively might enable them to understand the criteria needed to lead faculty senates. This quantitative study contributes to the body of knowledge by exploring and measuring the full range of leadership variables and presenting findings useful to community colleges and students studying higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the perceptions of members of faculty senates about the leadership characteristics needed by the president elected to represent the faculty senate on the 112 California community college campuses. I examined the variables of leader effectiveness. The outcomes of this research will inform community college faculty as they elect local senate presidents.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study was directed by this research question: To what extent do the elected presidents' background and leadership traits relate to the performance of the faculty senate? The research involved the following three hypotheses:

*H*₀1: The mean values for self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes are the same for the elected president and faculty.

*H*₀2: There is no correlation between the presidents' self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes.

*H*₀₃: There is no correlation between faculty's perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

The theoretical framework for this study was transformational leadership in relationship to the full-range leadership background and leadership skills of elected faculty senate presidents. Firestone (2010) argued there was a strong relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational effectiveness in the research on higher education. Other researchers have observed that transformational leadership was not only associated with organizational effectiveness but also with follower satisfaction (Bass, 2000; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Palmer, Wall, Burgess, & Stough, 2001; Wofford, Goodwin, & Whittington, 1998). In Chapter 2, I discuss existing theoretical and empirical research in an effort to understand the skills needed to lead faculty senates effectively. The intent of this study was to understand how recognizing the leadership qualities of potential candidates for the senate president's position might be improved if faculty understood the background and leadership traits needed to lead faculty senates effectively.

Nature of the Study

I employed a quantitative survey research method to explore the perceptions of faculty senate members on leadership characteristics needed to represent the faculty effectively to key constituents. In previous studies of faculty senates, researchers conducted both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection, including surveys and personal interviews of administrators and faculty, to determine organizational and

leadership effectiveness (Miller 2003; Miller & Pope, 2001; Minor, 2003; Tierney & Minor, 2003). A survey was appropriate for this study because faculty senate members would be more likely to respond honestly if the survey were confidential, which could be accomplished easily through an online survey.

The independent variables for this study were background and leadership traits of faculty as these were likely to cause, influence, or affect the effectiveness of faculty senates. The dependent variable was effective faculty senates as perceived by the leadership and membership of the organization, which could depend on or be the results of the influence of the background and leadership traits.

With this study, I sought to better understand the skills a person needed to lead faculty senates from the perspective of the participants, which included the faculty senate leaders and members. The population was the set of members of the 112 faculty senates at California's community colleges. The population selected was cross-sectional (collected at one point in time), quasi-experimental (nonrandom), and purposeful (all members were selected because of their experience with effective/ineffective senates).

A survey was used to gather data on the opinions of the faculty senate leaders and members about the backgrounds and traits needed to lead faculty senates effectively. Over the years, a number of researchers of higher education have used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X; MLQ 5X) to explore behaviors that transform individuals and organizations, as observed by associates at any organizational level (Bass & Avolio, 1993). The MLQ 5X has also been used to assess leadership behaviors that motivate associates to achieve agreed upon and expected levels of performance (Avolio

& Bass, 1999, 2004; Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, & Marx, 2007; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bodla & Nawaz, 2010; Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012). As its website notes, Mind Garden, Inc., an independent publisher of psychological assessments and instruments, owns the benchmark measure of transformational leadership developed by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio in 1993.

I used an online survey tool purchased from Mind Garden, Inc. for this study because this population communicates primarily via e-mail communication. The data gathered were analyzed using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine whether there were significant differences between the outcomes of background and leadership traits on the effectiveness of faculty senates. This survey was used to explore the leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) and organizational outcomes (effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction) of effective faculty senates. In addition, supplemental questions consisting of such factors as age, discipline, gender, educational background, race, tenure status, number of years at the current institution, full- or part-time employment status, and any past experience in a leadership position, professional or personal, were gathered. Through detailed survey responses from the faculty members of senates, the results of this research will inform senates about the background and leadership traits necessary for effective faculty senates and provide future leaders with strategies for effective leadership. In Chapter 3, I describe in detail the research methodology.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to ensure understanding of these terms throughout the study. I developed all definitions not accompanied by a citation as they were not defined in the literature review but are necessary to understand concepts presented in this study.

Elected president: The president of the faculty senate who is elected by the membership of the senate or the faculty at large.

Effective leaders: An individual who sets an example, inspires, challenges processes, enables others to act, and encourages (Kouzes & Posner, 2010).

Faculty senate: A faculty senate is a formal, representative governance body within a community college (Birnbaum, 1989).

Laissez-faire: Leaders demonstrate an absence of transactions such as avoiding making decisions, abdicating responsibility, and not using their authority (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003).

Organizational effectiveness: A social construct that exists in the minds of internal and external stakeholders of an organization (Murray, 2010). For the purposes of this study, organizational effectiveness is defined as those organizational behaviors, characteristics, and outcomes deemed important to members of faculty senates.

Representative senate: A senate whose membership is comprised of representative of academic departments or divisions. In these types of senates, the representative votes for their faculty constituents.

Senate of the whole: A senate whose membership is comprised of the entire faculty on a community college campus. In these types of senates, each member of the faculty body has a vote.

Shared authority: This study defines shared authority as the right of faculty participation in college governance while recognizing that others might assume the final decision making (AAHE, 1967).

Teaching discipline: The discipline in which a faculty member teaches on a college campus.

Tenure on campus: The length of time an individual has been employed by a specific college.

Transformational leadership: Proactive leaders who raise awareness for transcendent collective interests and help followers achieve extraordinary goals (Antonakis et al., 2003).

Transactional leadership: A process whereby the leader exchanges the needs of the organization with those of the follower through setting of objectives, monitoring for compliance, and controlling outcomes (Antonakis et al., 2003; Wofford et al., 1998).

Assumptions

I surveyed the leaders and members of faculty senates on 112 community college campuses in California about their perceptions of leaders of the organization who represented the body of faculty when meeting with administrators and other constituents about academic and professional matters. I assumed the respondents would be honest, reflecting their opinions about their experience with the faculty senate leadership. The

honesty of the faculty participating in the research was critical to understanding the qualities of individuals that lead faculty senates effectively because their interaction with the faculty leaders could help improve leadership selection and development of faculty pursuing leadership positions.

I also assumed faculty on the campus were aware of the existence of the faculty senate and were familiar with its role and responsibility in governance. This assumption was important to this study as faculty on a community college campus and unaware of the important role of the faculty voice in college governance would not understand the qualities needed to lead faculty senates effectively and would be providing their opinions without knowledge of the importance of governance in institutional effectiveness.

Scope and Delimitations

The scope of this study was the faculty perceptions on the leadership characteristics needed to lead faculty senates effectively and the delimitation was the selection of only the community colleges in California. The results of this research might apply to other faculty senates on community college campuses nationwide, and indeed any member-serving organization, regardless of the industry, could benefit from a study of the qualities needed to lead organizations when constituents elect leaders based on their industry performance and not necessarily their leadership ability. However, the results are not generalizable to other states, faculty professional societies, or faculty organizations.

Limitations

One limitation of this study was the potential that individuals may not respond to the study regardless of the fact that their responses would be confidential. This could have occurred because I work for the statewide organization that represents community college faculty. Because this would then limit the population and thus potentially influence the results, I controlled for any influence individuals might feel by protecting the identity of the participants and their college to ensure the confidentiality of the participants.

Another limitation of this study was I needed to control for bias that might have interfered with the understanding gained from this study, particularly since my experience with the statewide organization might influence my interpretation of the data. To guard against potential bias, I recruited a small subgroup comprised of past statewide leaders with over 50 years of collective experience with the population, both statewide and locally. These leaders reviewed the summary results of the survey to assist me in identifying potential bias by providing their unique experience with the population. Because I only had statewide experience, the leaders' local perspectives from five different campuses informed the results and guarded against bias.

Significance of the Study

Although a great deal of research on leadership has been compiled, researchers have conducted limited studies to determine the role of elected presidents on the effectiveness of member-serving nonprofit organizations (Harrison, Murray, & Cornforth, 2012), particularly faculty senates. No data could be found on the perceptions

of members regarding the effectiveness of elected presidents to lead faculty senates. I designed this study to discover the qualities of individuals who lead faculty senates effectively. Leaders of other member-serving volunteer organizations, not just faculty groups, may benefit from this study because they would have a quantitative explanation of those leadership competencies needed to lead similar organizations. The findings of this study may also enable elected chairpersons of other organizations to improve their leadership skills and to assist others in gaining skills to lead similar organizations. If the ability of leaders to be more effective and transformative is improved, then the organization, the industry, and individual communities are positively affected. Improving the effectiveness of the faculty leadership on community college campuses might result in the effectiveness of the overall college governance, greater ability to serve their communities, and most importantly the teaching and learning of higher education institutions.

This study is a contribution to the literature on community college governance by beginning a discussion about the role the elected president has on the effectiveness of faculty senates. Particularly, this research adds to the literature by identifying those qualities needed to lead faculty senates when the skills for leadership are less defined by the background and leadership traits versus the experience in the profession. Given the important role faculty senates play in the governance of colleges, understanding how to develop future leaders is critical to ensuring these organizations are effective. Finally, this study has implications for social change by providing a critical resource for members of faculty senates. Identifying characteristics of effective leaders for these types of

organizations may encourage faculty senates to reexamine their leadership development and effectiveness as they serve communities around the nation.

Summary

This chapter provided a summary of key points of the study, which included the need to understand the role of the elected presidents on the effectiveness of faculty senates. The literature review in Chapter 2 provides a synthesis of research in peer-reviewed journals to explore whether the background and leadership traits of the elected president matter with regard to the effectiveness of faculty senates on California community colleges. Chapter 2 also provides a contrast and comparison of different studies and includes a literature review of the role elected presidents have played in these types of organizations. Chapter 3 presents the research methodology and procedures used in this study, the population and data collection procedures, and the method of data analysis. In Chapter 4, I explain the statistical analysis of data, and in Chapter 5, I discuss the interpretation of the findings, limitations of the study, summary of findings, as well as describe the potential for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Faculty senates continuously recruit members to serve in leadership positions. From this pool of volunteers, the membership of faculty senates elects the president, who may or may not have leadership experience. While this is useful in building a pool of candidates to serve, without criteria for the qualities needed to lead faculty senates, there is no guarantee that faculty elected to serve as president have the qualities to lead these types of organization effectively (Firestone, 2010; Miller, 2003). In the 21st century, public education is experiencing pressures to respond to a number of forces including government funding cuts, public accountability, or accreditation standards requirements. Understanding the full range of leadership styles needed to influence faculty senates is essential when exploring the role of elected presidents in leading faculty senates effectively.

In this chapter, I review existing theoretical and empirical research in an effort to understand the skills needed to lead faculty senates. This literature review is divided into the six sections: (a) the history, role, and status of shared governance on higher education institutions including California community colleges and the role of faculty senates, (b) research on institutional effectiveness and the perceptions of the effectiveness of faculty senates on higher education institutions, (c) the theoretical foundation and factors within the full-range leadership model as measured by the MLQ 5X (Avolio & Bass, 1999, 2004), (d) the role of context on the effectiveness of individuals to lead an organization and motivate followers, (e) the literature search strategy, and (f) a summary of Chapter 2 and preview Chapter 3.

Literature Search Strategy

To complete the literature review, I searched a variety of databases including Academic Search Complete, Education Research Complete, Education Resource Information Center, ProQuest dissertations, and PsycINFO. Key words searched included *age, gender, generation, governance, influencers, faculty organizations, faculty senates, higher education, institutional effectiveness, leaders, leadership, leadership traits, local senates, member-serving organizations, organizations, organizational effectiveness, professional organizations, professional societies, and transformational leadership*. The search included literature that was seminal and peer-reviewed as well as reports by the higher education research centers. Because the research on the role of elected president, particularly of faculty senates, was limited, I also searched the dissertation database and found several exploratory studies on this topic. While it is not ideal to reference dissertations, I found valuable information within recent studies on similar topics and used these studies to augment the peer-reviewed research in an effort to close the gap in the literature on shared governance in higher education.

Shared Governance

Much has been written about shared governance of higher education institutions. Researchers pointed to the joint statement developed by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges as an important starting point for understanding what educators and administrators mean by *shared governance* (Birnbaum, 2004; Jones, 2011; Mallory, 2011). The fact that the groups representing the faculty,

administrators, and trustees endorsed this statement demonstrated to the higher education community that university governance is a collaborative effort and requires joint efforts among all university constituent groups. Developed in 1966, this statement reflected a recognition that universities would realize an increased capacity to solve educational problems when all college constituents recognized their mutual reliance, understood the need for communication across groups, and embraced the force of joint efforts (American Association of University Professors, 1966). The authors of the statement further defined the responsibilities and authority of administrators and faculty in the governance of universities. Specifically, in the joint statement they endorsed the notion that authority should be shared for decisions that require joint decision and segmented when one individual has primary responsibility (Jones, 2011). Jones (2011) noted that this principle of shared and segmented authority—after 35 years—is still the foundation of shared governance on higher education institutions today.

Governance of Higher Education Institutions

Researchers have described the organizational structure of most American colleges and universities as beginning at the top with a lay board of trustees who has policy and fiduciary responsibility for the college (McLendon, Deaton, & Hearn, 2007). The board hires a president/chancellor who operates as the chief decision maker. Jones (2011) stated that Harvard faculty members were the first to raise dissatisfaction with a top-down authority of the president of the institution. He noted that in 1826, a new set of statutes was developed giving faculty control over specific areas of the college such as admissions, student discipline, and the conduct of instruction. Over the next century, the

tradition of American higher education institutions expanded and provided that college constituencies, particularly faculty, should have a significant role in institutional decision-making (Jones, 2011; Minor, 2004). However, the role of faculty in governance of colleges and universities varies by institution and by state (McLendon et al., 2007; White, 1998). Most colleges and universities across the nation have a governance structure in which faculty members have a role in the decision making associated with their professional role as faculty and the people closest to the classroom and the students (Jones, 2011). Within the United States, the state legislature controls the governing structure of public universities. Vidovich and Currieb (2011) observed that public and private universities in the United States are relatively autonomous institutions with no one model that can describe their boards.

California Community College Governance

The California Community College System is the largest community college system in the world. Beginning in 1906 as part of the K-14 public education system, community colleges have served California's communities by providing education, workforce training, citizenship courses, activity classes, and much more. Unlike other community colleges in the nation, however, California community colleges have a unique governance structure. The California Community College System is a bilateral governance system overseen by the state Board of Governors and a Chancellor but managed locally by elected boards of trustees. In the California Community College System, like other states, the faculty members have a significant role in the governance of the college.

In 1963, the California State Legislature passed Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 48, which recognized the specific jurisdiction of local senates. Particularly, the resolution established an academic senate at each junior college for the purpose of representing the faculty on academic and professional matters. ACR 48 also specified that the faculty at the colleges would select their representatives to serve on the senates or councils (Garrigus, 1963). Between 1964 and 1967, the California State Board of Education adopted regulations to implement ACR 48 and strengthen the role of faculty senates.

In 1988, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 1725, which significantly changed the governance of California community colleges and empowered academic senate presidents to participate actively in community college governance (Levin, 2008). The advocates of AB 1725 had three goals in mind: (a) creation of a more collegial governance system, (b) increased power and influence of local academic senates, and (c) separation from K–12 by placing community colleges in a higher education model. White (1998) noted that the aim of the AB 1725 architects regarding shared governance was to bring institutionally disenfranchised faculty into a stronger position in which they would share authority in specific activities. Unlike other states, this landmark legislation elevated faculty governance by ensuring that faculty not only had an opportunity to express their opinions at the college level but also ensured these opinions were given reasonable consideration (Leginfo.com, n.d., §70902 article 7). In addition, the resultant Education Code provided that academic senates have the primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic

standards. While states have recognized the need to have faculty involvement in institutional governance, there are limited studies on the relationship between faculty participation in governance and institutional performance.

Institutional Effectiveness

Understanding the structure of an organization is important when evaluating its effectiveness. Faculty senates are participative organizations. Gortner, Nichols, and Ball (2007) defined participative organizations as organizations that operate on democratic principles. In other words, management does not have the ultimate authority. Instead, different constituents have authority and knowledge to solve problems. Generally, these types of structures work as teams and are collegial in structure. Gortner et al. noted that through democratic decision-making processes, colleges and universities operate under a collegial structure in which decisions are often made through formal votes. As with any democratic process, a shared decision-making structure can appear to be ineffective.

Prior research has demonstrated dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of faculty senates (Birnbaum, 1989; Burgan, 1998; Leach 2008; Minor, 2004; Schoorman & Acker-Hocevar, 2010; Tierney & Minor, 2003). Stakeholders—faculty, administrators, staff, and the community—have described this dissatisfaction in many ways including ineffective decision-making processes (Leach 2008); lack of faculty power to make decisions (Jones et al., 2004; Miller, 2003; Minor, 2004); or dysfunctional, underperforming, or impeding governance systems (Minor, 2004). The various opinions mentioned above demonstrated no consensus about what determines the effectiveness of

faculty senates. Given the role of faculty in the governance of the colleges, it is important to understand the possible dissatisfaction with faculty senates.

Birnbaum (1989) noted that some organizational structures, policies, or practices might be labeled as ineffective if they do not result in expected outcomes. While some practices do not appear to fulfill the expected outcome, these practices may, however, be fulfilling unintended or unrecognized important functions of the organization. Part of the reason some do not recognize the important functions is because many critics may not fully appreciate the functions and social contexts of the senate. In an analysis of senate critics, Birnbaum noted that senates are evaluated using three models of the college—bureaucracy, collegium, and political system. These models, however, do not take into consideration the latent functions faculty senates play in college governance.

Minor (2004) found similar results in his research. He added that the effectiveness of senates is difficult to determine without explaining the role of senates in governance. Specifically, he remarked that unless there are benchmarks to evaluate behavior, it is difficult to say a senate is effective or ineffective. His study considered four models of faculty senates including functional, influential, ceremonial, and subverted. Minor interviewed 42 senate presidents from 12 universities and associated each of his models to relationships with the administration ranging from cooperative, collegial, passive, and confrontational. In his study, Minor (2004) highlighted the importance of the interactions of individuals within the college community. Specifically, he provided comments from interviewees who shared the importance of interactions and the ability to influence the role of senates through a continuance of existing cultural norms or by creating new ones.

He concluded his research by noting the faculty senate performance could be either a catalyst or an obstacle in implementing successful institutional initiatives.

Other researchers have noted that effective organizations are only as effective as their leadership. Miller (2003) commented that strong faculty-led decision making results in effective faculty senates; the ability of the leader to garner faculty support enables senates to address difficult issues. Good leadership is not only a pivotal force behind successful organizations but is essential to ensure organizational effectiveness (Bennis, 2003; Bennis & Nanus, 2003). Thus, less effective presidents can negatively influence the overall effectiveness of the organization in fulfilling its mission (Harrison et al., 2011; Herman & Renz, 2000). Since the elected president has such an important role in leading faculty senates, understanding the characteristics for successful leaders is essential to effective presidents (Firestone, 2010; Miller 2003).

Part of the problem described in the literature about the effectiveness of faculty senates might be that the membership of faculty senates does not select the president based on his or her ability to lead the senate. Instead, members elect the leaders of faculty senates without criteria about the skills one needs to ensure the senate is effective. In addition, stakeholders may not realize the criteria they use in selecting leaders (Herman & Renz, 1998).

Theoretical Foundation

Research has connected transformational leadership with organizational satisfaction, commitment, and effectiveness (Bass, 2000). Demands in the global marketplace and workforce require leaders to become more transformational if they are to

remain effective in rapidly changing organizations (Bass, 2000; Weinberger, 2009). In his research, Bass (2000) found that future educational leaders would need to be transformational. This new work environment requires leadership beyond a basic transactional style; instead the global marketplace has a level of integration and interdependencies that requires a more intellectually stimulating, inspirational, and transformational leadership style, which results in higher levels of cohesion, commitment, trust, motivation, and performance. Public educational institutions are no different.

The theoretical foundation of this study is transformational leadership theory in relationship to the full-range leadership model. Conceptualized in 1985 by Bass and developed in 1991 by Avolio and Bass, the full-range leadership model broadens the range of leadership style, typically examined as exemplary, and attempts to describe the whole range of leadership from laissez-faire to transformational styles (Avolio & Bass, 2004). This section explores transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership factors as they relate to the full-range leadership model developed by Bass and measured by the MLQ 5X (Avolio & Bass, 1999, 2004).

Transformational Leadership

Given the volunteer nature of faculty senates, leaders need to have certain abilities to influence and motivate volunteers to make self-sacrifices and put the mission of the organization above their own self-interests or those of their department, for example. Transformational leadership skills involve influencing, inspiring, stimulating, and promoting others above themselves. Such leaders accomplish the above influencing by

considering follower needs over their own needs, which can be influenced by communicating high expectations that motivate followers through visions that add meaning and challenge to their work (Antonakis et al., 2003; Lindebaum & Cartwright, 2010). Part of the reason transformational leaders influence followers is because of the positive association with effect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect (Lee, 2005).

Idealized influence/charisma. Idealized influence/charisma has been attributed to transformational leaders who demonstrate conviction, display confidence, take stands on difficult issues, and are centered on values, beliefs, and mission (Antonakis et al., 2003; O’Shea, Foti, Hauenstein, & Bycio, 2009). These types of leaders have followers who admire, respect, and trust them; someone who the follower “idealizes” in a way he or she can identify and emulate (Bass & Avolio, 2003). The two forms of idealized influence are attribute—leaders receive trust and respect—and behavior—leaders exhibit excellent behavior and make sacrifices for the greater good (Moss & Ritossa, 2007).

Inspirational motivation. Transformational leaders inspirationally motivate others by clearly and confidentially communicating a vision for the future, which inspires followers to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the organization. Brown and Treviño (2009) commented that individuals are directed by their attitudes, behaviors, and decisions throughout their lives. Transformational leaders inspire others to action, build confidence, and instill belief in a cause that shifts the followers’ value to align with their own.

Intellectual stimulation. Leaders who demonstrate intellectual stimulation foster an environment in which assumptions are questioned, beliefs and principles can be safely challenged, new perspectives are welcomed, and others are empowered to take risks and challenge the status quo (Firestone, 2010; O'Shea et al., 2009).

Individualized consideration. Leaders who demonstrate individualized consideration pay close attention to the needs of individual followers for progression and achievement by coaching and mentorship (Bass & Avolio, 2003; Lindebaum & Cartwright, 2010). In the context of mentoring, this individualized contact or communication is expected to increase the follower's self-image, fulfill the followers' needs, and provide the follower with a sense of ownership of decisions or consequences (Bass, 1985). These leaders influence followers to ignore their own interests for the good of the organization in an effort to achieve organizational effectiveness (Antonakis et al., 2003).

Transactional Leadership

In contrast to the visionary or charismatic transformational leadership style, transactional leadership is more about transactions or exchanges between leaders and followers. This style is more practical because it emphasizes meeting goals and objectives, which allow successful transactional leaders to recognize and reward followers in a timely manner. However, followers of transactional leaders are not expected to think innovatively and are monitored based on predetermined criteria (Jung, 2001).

Contingent reward. Contingent reward describes the exchange of reward by the leader for efforts completed by the follower (Firestone, 2010; O'Shea et al., 2009).

Management-by-exception. Management-by-exception is both active and passive. Leaders who use active management-by-exception monitor the followers' performance and corrects if mistakes are made. Leaders who use passive management-by-exception do not intervene until a problem arises or standards are not met (O'Shea et al., 2009).

Laissez-faire. Leaders who avoid responsibility, are absent when they are needed, do not give feedback to followers, or put forth minimal efforts to meet the needs of followers follow a laissez-faire model of leadership (Firestone, 2010; Kirkbride, 2006; O'Shea et al., 2009).

Situational Considerations

Researchers have demonstrated that leadership style is not the only predictor of good leadership but effective leadership is appropriate to the situation. Osborn, Hunt, and Jauch (2002) commented that effective leadership depends on a wide variety of environmental and organizational conditions such as cultural, economic, strategy, structure, and size. These environmental and organizational conditions determine or dictate how the leaders perform or at least provide the context in which the expectations of the leader are defined. Vroom and Jago (2007) further remarked that effective leadership is dependent on the situation. Thus, context of leadership decisions plays an important role in any decision-making process. While Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer recognized in 1979 the importance of the situation in examining leadership, research in

this area is limited as formal leadership focused on the individual and what they do rather than on the context in which decisions are made (Osborn et al., 2002). Avolio's (2007) research found that most organizational theories do not consider the context in which the research is conducted. In other words, few researchers have studied the role of context or situation on the effectiveness of individuals to lead an organization and motivate followers, particularly followers who are not employees but colleagues or equals. Middlehurst (2008) disagreed and asserted that leadership research has considered context, but it was biased because it was based on leadership during the time that included mostly white, Anglo-Saxon males. Recent research has recognized the role context plays in today's leadership skills (Avolio, 2007; Hinkin & Tracey, 1999; Vroom & Jago, 2007). Other researchers noted that leadership is not only a function of the individual—both leader and follower—but also the complexity of the context (Middlehurst, 2008; Zaccaro, 2007). Zaccaro (2007) noted a leader who is effective in one situation might not be in another. Similarly, Vecchio (2002) argued that no single profile is the “best” predictor of leader effectiveness; rather attributes of the situation are likely moderators.

Summary

The elected president's role in leading effective faculty senates on community college campuses is poorly researched in the literature. Researchers have provided a number of theories and opinions about the influence the background and leadership traits have on leading organizations effectively. Organizing these theories and opinions to support research is challenging. This chapter summarized historical information about

governance in higher education and California community colleges in particular as well as themes in the literature, considering what is known, questioning what is unknown, as well as identifying gaps in the literature. Chapter 3 details the use of the MLQ 5X to gather information to explore the background and leadership traits necessary to lead faculty senates effectively.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Faculty at most colleges and universities participate in governance of the institution through faculty senates, which are formal governance structures comprised of elected representatives (Birnbaum, 1989). Leaders are instrumental in ensuring that faculty senates perform effectively; however, the leaders of these institutions are volunteers and may not necessarily have the skills to lead an organization. The intent of this study was to explore the background and leadership traits of elected presidents of faculty senates. In this chapter, I describe the research design and rationale, the role of the researcher, methodology, and efforts to reduce threats to validity. This chapter concludes with information about the study's ethical procedures, confidentiality assurances, and a summary of the chapter.

Research Design and Rationale

In previous studies on faculty senates, researchers have conducted both quantitative and qualitative data collection (Miller, 2003; Miller & Pope, 2001; Minor, 2003; Tierney & Minor, 2003), including surveys and personal interviews of administrators and faculty. Researchers also have used similar research methods to determine organizational and leadership effectiveness. In this study, I used a well-established survey instrument to understand the background and leadership traits needed to lead faculty senates effectively.

Researchers have studied transformational leadership for years since Burns introduced it in 1978 (as cited in Bass, 1999). However, in 1985, Bass explored the idea that effective leaders demonstrate more than just transformational leadership; instead,

both transformational and transactional leadership are needed to enhance performance (Bass, 1985). Trottier, Van Wart, and Wang (2008) claimed that the full-range leadership model was developed based on the belief that transformational and transactional leadership are patterns of behavior all leaders possess and use in differing amounts. I determined the MLQ 5X, first piloted in 1985 and refined during the past 25 years, would be best to explore the leadership traits needed to lead faculty senates effectively. The MLQ 5X is explained later in this chapter.

I employed a quantitative survey research method to describe the opinions of members of faculty senates by studying a sample of that population to determine whether there were significant differences between the outcomes of background and leadership traits on the effectiveness of faculty senates. The goal of this research was to understand the necessary relationships and patterns to lead faculty senates and not to generalize. I designed this study to measure the perceptions of elected presidents and faculty rather than matching faculty to elected presidents at a specific college. I did not attempt to control the conditions or manipulate the variables. Instead, the survey provided data for testing the research hypotheses. A survey also allowed me to collect the data efficiently by asking the same questions in the same manner.

There are disadvantages to using a survey rather than other methods such as observation or interviews. Kelley, Clark, Brown, and Sitzia (2003) noted a researcher might neglect the significance of the data by focusing too much on the size of the population without adequate consideration for the implications of those data in terms of relevant issues or problems. Understanding the concern noted by Kelley et al., I also

considered a qualitative research method using interviews and observations because the data gathered via a survey could have lacked the details or depth that interviews could provide. In addition, the survey response rate might not have provided an adequate representation of the population that would be achieved through face-to-face or phone interviews. However, given my position as the executive director of the statewide organization representing faculty on California community colleges, I determined a survey would allow me to collect confidential information while still gathering data important to the success of faculty senates. A survey versus interviews was especially suited to this population because the population would more favorably respond to a confidential survey, as it encourages respondents to answer truthfully and not the way they think the researcher wants them to respond.

The independent variables for this study were background and leadership traits of faculty. The dependent variable was effective faculty senates as perceived by the leadership and membership of the organization. I determined the variables were conducive to determining the role an elected president has on the effectiveness of faculty senates because the leadership experience members have at the member level may influence his or her effectiveness as a leader of the faculty senate. I used an online survey tool developed by Mind Garden, Inc. for use with the MLQ 5X because this population communicates primarily via e-mail. I e-mailed a web-based link to the survey to the faculty senate presidents across the state. Once the senate presidents responded, I searched participants' college websites and recruited faculty members through e-mail

solicitation. It would have been both cost- and time-prohibitive to conduct the same survey with paper, leading to poorer response rates and uneven coverage.

Researcher's Role

In a quantitative approach, the researcher's role is to test a theory through narrow hypotheses and a collection of data to support or refute the hypotheses. At the time this study took place, I was the executive director of the statewide organization representing 112 California community college faculty senates and their membership. Although the executive director provides support for the organization by overseeing the operations, coordinating events, and communicating with the population about issues of concern, the executive director does not set the policy direction for the organization as the elected president does based on policy positions adopted by the statewide delegates. Thus, respondents would not be providing opinions about the qualities of an effective executive director; rather, they would be providing opinions about the effectiveness of the leaders of the local faculty senates, not necessarily the current presidents. Although there was no collection of data about me specifically, the population's familiarity with my name through e-mail communications and events was a factor to consider as well as my extensive knowledge of particular members of the organization. I took precautions to protect the confidentiality of the participants. In addition, the design of this study was not to match up leaders to followers but instead to measure the perceptions of elected presidents and faculty members on the background and leadership traits needed to lead faculty senates effectively.

Methodology

Population

There were two subsets of this population—the elected presidents and the members of the faculty senate on the 112 California community colleges. These members were selected because of their experience with effective and/or ineffective senates. To date, no comprehensive data were available regarding how many participants were members of their faculty senate. Thus, using a sample size online calculator (<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>) with 5% margin of error and 95% confidence level and the population of 112 local senates, I tried to get the elected president of at least 87 faculty senates to respond and five members from each college.

Sampling and Sampling Procedures

I used a single-stage sampling procedure to sample the population directly through a listserv because I had access to the names. I used a listserv to invite elected presidents to participate voluntarily in the survey. I did not specifically select individuals; instead, by using the listserv, the results were a nonrandom purposeful selection of individuals because the survey was sent to all elected presidents of the 112 local senates. The president of the organization that owns the listserv, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, approved this access (see Appendix A).

Once the elected presidents agreed to participate in the study, faculty respondents from the campuses of these presidents were recruited through e-mail solicitation. I obtained names and e-mails of faculty members from the college websites.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

The data were collected using a web-based survey created by Mind Garden, Inc. for use with the MLQ 5X. The survey was e-mailed to the Academic Senate's elected presidents' listserv with an invitation to participate and the informed consent information through a statement included at the beginning of the survey (See Appendix B). This statement reiterated that their participation was voluntary and that by participating in the survey, they were providing their consent.

Instrumentation. The MLQ 5X form purchased from Mind Garden, Inc. (Menlo Park) was used as the primary data collection instrument for this research. As Avolio and Bass (2004) noted in the survey manual, the current MLQ 5X contains 45 items that identify and measure key leadership and effectiveness behaviors in nine leadership areas. These behaviors have been shown in prior research to be strongly linked with both individual and organizational success as explained in the following section. Avolio and Bass provided that "Each of the nine leadership components along a full range of leadership style is measured by four highly inter-correlated items that are as low in correlation as possible with items of the other eight components" (p. 12).

Two surveys were used in this study—one for the elected presidents and one for the faculty respondents. The elected presidents were asked to evaluate how frequently or to what degree they believed they engaged in the same types of leadership behavior toward the faculty in the local senate. Similarly, the faculty respondents were asked to evaluate how frequently or to what degree they had observed the elected president engage in 32 specific behaviors, which were rated based on additional attributes. As noted in the

MLQ manual (Avolio & Bass, 2004), the attribute ratings are the four items of idealized attributes that contribute to the nine components of transformation leadership, or passive/avoidant leadership.

In addition to the MLQ 5X form, each survey participant was asked to provide supplemental information designed by me (see Appendix C). This supplemental information included age, discipline, gender, educational background, race, tenure status, number of years at the current institution, full- or part-time status, and any past professional or personal experience in a leadership position. This supplemental information was analyzed to determine if there was a relationship between this demographic information and perceived leadership behavior.

Participants were debriefed about the results of this survey through the official publication of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC)—the *Rostrum*. I summarized the results and provided a report to all local senates, as it is anticipated this study will inform their leadership recruitment and development practices. I also provided a report to the ASCCC executive committee and constituents at their official events.

Operational Constructs

Given the unique nature of this study, I used a published instrument augmented with supplemental demographic data. The published instrument was the MLQ 5X, initially developed by Bass and Avolio in 1991. The MLQ 5X measures how often a leader and followers perceive the leader to exhibit a range of leadership behaviors within three broad categories: transformation, transaction, and laissez-faire (Firestone, 2010).

Since its inception, researchers have used the MLQ to differentiate highly reliably effective leaders from those who are ineffective in a number of areas in public and private, profit and nonprofit, and national and international venues, including a variety of government agencies, educational institutions, and volunteer organizations (Avolio & Bass, 1999, 2004; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bodla & Nawaz, 2010; Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012).

The MLQ has been validated since it was first developed in 1991. Bass and Avolio conducted a series of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using an earlier version of the MLQ as a base for selecting those items showing similar constructs. Using studies conducted by other researchers and relevant literature, Bass and Avolio augmented the original MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Bass and Avolio then asked six scholars in the field of leadership to review this revised version of the MLQ. Judging whether these items referred to behavior or impact, these scholars made recommendations to modify or eliminate items guided by the original full range of leadership model. All these recommendations are included in the final version of the MLQ 5X (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The final version of the MLQ 5X was then tested using a CFA and the 1999 data set to determine if the data from the initial and replication sample sets confirmed the six-factor model of leadership for small and homogenous groups. Several researchers have validated the MLQ 5X over the years using a variety of audiences (Antonakis et al., 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004). Antonakis et al. (2003) argued the validity of the MLQ 5X and noted it is a reliable instrument to adequately measure the full-range theory of leadership. Other researchers have come to similar conclusions about the validity of the MLQ 5X (Khoo & Burch, 2008; Schriesheim, Wu, & Scandura, 2009). One conclusion

demonstrated a significant and positive relationship between dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership and leadership effectiveness (Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012). The third edition of this survey was published in 2004 and is available for public use at a nominal fee. Mind Garden, Inc. currently publishes the MLQ 5X (<http://www.mindgarden.com/products/mlq.htm>). I purchased a license from Mind Garden, Inc. to use for this research. Mind Garden, Inc. also provided an online survey tool to administer the survey. Proof of permission to use the survey is included in Appendix D.

Supplemental Information

I also asked supplemental questions to seek data unique to participants and community colleges to enable me to understand how other variables might influence the effectiveness of faculty senates. The supplemental data included demographic questions about age, discipline, gender, educational background, race, tenure status, number of years at the current institution, full- or part-time status, and any experience in a leadership position professional or personal. See Appendix C for a list of the additional questions.

Data Analyses Plan

I determined an ANOVA should be used to decide whether there are significant differences between the outcomes of background and leadership traits on the effectiveness of faculty senates. The Mind Garden, Inc. data were exported into SAS Statistical software and evaluated. I tested the following three null hypotheses:

H_{01} : the mean values for self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes are the same for the elected president and faculty,

H_02 : there is no correlation between the presidents' self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes, and

H_03 : there is no correlation between faculty's perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes.

I was committed to protecting the confidentiality of the respondents. Since I have a relationship with the participants, an online survey was used to gather information normally collected via an interview. The survey gathered demographic data about the participants. Only I had access to the original survey data. The final information will be reported in aggregate to local senates in a *Rostrum* article or via a presentation at a conference held by the ASCCC.

Threats to Validity (Trustworthiness)

Threats to validity can raise questions about the researcher's ability to make conclusions that one factor will affect an outcome and not some other factor. I considered threats and identified two possible threats that might arise in this study—one internal (selection) and one external (interaction of setting and treatment). One possible internal threat was which faculty chose to respond to the survey. If only those faculty intimately involved in the leadership of the faculty senates responded, my ability to make correct inferences from the data could be threatened. I attempted to prevent this internal threat by surveying those involved in leadership as well as faculty randomly selected from websites. Thus, certain leadership characteristics had the probability of being equally distributed. An external validity threat was also identified. The participant pool used for this research is unique to California because of the governance structure on California

community colleges and thus a threat to external validity may exist because the findings of this study could not be generalized to other community colleges or professional societies in the United States.

Ethical Procedures

I had the ethical responsibility of safeguarding the identity of the participants. Since I work for the statewide organization representing the faculty senates on California community colleges, precautions were made to ensure the confidentiality of the respondents. Now that the research study and process is completed, I will maintain the data for a 5-year period and then destroy the data. In addition, as noted earlier, the email invitation sent to the potential participants—local faculty senate leaders and members—communicated that the survey was voluntary and confidential. No potential participants were contacted until approval from the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB) and I received permission to begin research. Once IRB approval was received, invitations to faculty senate presidents were sent via the Academic Senate listserv and collection of data began.

Confidentiality Assurance

Since I work with some these individuals on a regular basis, confidentiality is critical to the success of this research. To ensure the confidentiality of the respondents, I protected the identity of the individuals and their respective college. Individuals responding to the survey were aware the survey was voluntary and confidential.

Summary

This chapter presented an overview of the research method used to measure the perceptions of elected presidents and faculty members on the skills needed to lead faculty senates effectively. This study employed a quantitative survey research method by studying a sample population of faculty members on 112 California community colleges to determine whether there are perceived differences between the outcomes of background and leadership traits on the effectiveness of faculty senates. The population selected was cross-sectional, quasi-experimental, and purposeful and were selected because of their experience with effective and/or ineffective senates. This chapter also provided rationale for using a quantitative research design versus other methodology and the null hypotheses that guided this study. In addition, I summarized the instrument and data collection method as well as the steps to be taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of participants. Chapter 4 presents other detailed data collection, processing, and analysis procedures.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

This chapter includes the results of a survey of leaders and faculty of the 112 California community colleges to address the following question: To what extent do the elected presidents' background and leadership traits relate to the performance of the faculty senate? In analyzing these results, I explored the following three hypotheses:

H₀1: the mean values for self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes are the same for the elected president and faculty,

H₀2: there is no correlation between the presidents' self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes, and

H₀3: there is no correlation between faculty's perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes.

This chapter provides the data collection, demographics, survey results, as well as summarizes the answers to research questions and provides transitional material from the findings. This chapter concludes with an introduction to the prescriptive material in Chapter 5.

Data Collection

Beginning June 2013, I e-mailed an electronic survey to faculty leaders of California community colleges with follow-up surveys in August and September. Using the ASCCC listserv as noted in Chapter 3, 112 local senate presidents were surveyed with 65 presidents responding to the survey and 55, or 49%, completing the survey. Correspondingly, 183 faculty responded with 99 surveys, or 54% completed.

In Chapter 3, I discussed soliciting faculty respondents via random selection through college websites. In June 2013, 25 leaders responded to the survey and more than 250 faculty were randomly invited to participate in the survey. After 1 month, however, no faculty responded to the survey. Thus, I asked leaders who responded to the survey to forward the member survey and approved consent form to their college listserv with the understanding that participation was voluntary and that their college or name would not be used in any results to protect their school or individual identity.

Participant Responses to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X)

Demographics

Leader respondents—senate presidents. Leader respondents reported they were all full-time faculty members representing 24 different academic disciplines. Twenty-five respondents (45%) were male and 28 (51%) were female with two respondents (4%) choosing not to answer. The age range of respondents was 29 to 70 with the median age of 51. Two (4%) of the respondents indicated a bachelor's degree was their highest degree, 37 (67%) had a master's degree, and 16 (29%) had a doctorate. Of the 55 senate presidents, all but one was tenured. Those who were tenured received their tenure between the years of 1972 and 2013 with the median of 2004. Leader respondents were hired between 1969 and 2013 with the median date of 1999. Table 1 shows that most of the leader respondents have held prior leadership positions.

*Table 1**Leadership Experience – Elected Presidents*

<i>Title</i>	<i>%</i>
Senate President	91
District Senate President	4
Local Senate Executive Committee	58
Curriculum Committee Chair	27
Other Committee Chair	62
Department Chair	27
Senate Officer	55
Union Officer	22
Professional Organizations	33
Other	25
Dean	0

Faculty respondents. Faculty respondents reported that 74 (73%) were full-time, 23 (23%) were part-time, and two chose not to answer. Of these respondents, 49 different academic disciplines were represented with 47 (46%) male, 50 (49%) female, and two respondents choosing not to answer. The age range of the respondents was 57 to 75 with the median age of 56. Five (5%) of the participants had a bachelor's degree, 62 (61%) had a master's degree, 30 (29%) had a doctorate, and two respondents chose not to answer. Of the 99 respondents, 61 (62%) were tenured, 31 (30%) were not tenured, and seven (7%) chose not to answer. Those who were tenured received their tenure between the years of 1972 and 2013 with the median of 2005. Faculty respondents were hired between 1969 and 2013 with the median date of 2005. Most of the faculty respondents had not held leadership positions as noted in Table 2.

Table 2

Leadership Experience – Faculty Respondents

	%
Senate President	10
District Senate President	1
Local Senate Executive Committee	10
Curriculum Committee Chair	7
Committee Chair	34
Department Chair	28
Senate Officer	24
Union Officer	19
Professional Organizations	36
Dean	4
Other	6
No Answer	8

Results

The following results are based on two MLQ surveys—one completed by the elected president and the other by the faculty respondents. The information presents the full-range leadership aggregate scores for how each group responded. The leadership data provided information about how each leader perceived the frequency of his or her own behavior for each leadership style and organizational outcomes. The faculty respondent data provided information about how the faculty respondents perceived the frequency of behaviors exhibited by the elected president for each leadership style and organizational outcome. The average frequencies for the full-range leadership style can be interpreted using the following scale: 0 = *never*; 1 = *once in a while*; 2 = *sometimes*; 3 = *fairly often*; and 4 = *frequently, if not always*.

Methodology

In Chapter 3, I noted an ANOVA would be used to determine whether there were significant differences between the outcomes of background and leadership traits on the effectiveness of faculty senates and that the data would be exported into SAS Statistical software and evaluated. After reviewing the data in consultation with dissertation committee methodologist, Dr. Mark Stallo, I determined an ANOVA would not be the best method of analysis. While it would not have been incorrect to use an ANOVA when analyzing only two groups, normally the ANOVA is used when there are three groups or more. Instead, we found that the independent-samples t test is typically used in cases in which there are only two groups. Essentially, the t test is suitable for cases in which you have two groups being compared, while the ANOVA is a generalized version of the t test that can be used for two groups or more.

Thus, the Mind Garden, Inc. data were exported into SPSS 21 software and evaluated. The data gathered were analyzed using independent-samples t tests to determine whether there were any significant differences between self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes on the basis of elected president or faculty status. Additionally, Pearson's correlations were used to determine the extent of the association between self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes separately for elected presidents and faculty. A series of z tests were also used to determine whether significant differences were present with respect to the strength of the correlations conducted with faculty members and elected presidents. The following sections provides the details about the results of these tests.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis included in this study consisted of the following: The mean values for self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes are the same for the elected president and faculty. Table 3 summarizes descriptive statistics on the self-perceived leadership factors based on president or faculty status. This table includes the associated sample sizes (*N*), means, standard deviations (*SD*), and standard errors of the mean (*SEM*) for each measure. In all cases, with the exception of management-by-exception measures and laissez-faire, a higher mean was indicated for presidents.

Table 3

Mean Values for Self-perceived Leadership Factors for the Senate President

<u>Measure</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
Idealized Influence–Attributes	0	78	2.814	1.007	0.114
	1	55	3.216	0.470	0.063
Idealized Influence–Behaviors	0	76	2.872	0.881	0.101
	1	55	3.302	0.519	0.070
Inspirational Motivation	0	82	2.844	0.862	0.095
	1	55	3.291	0.538	0.073
Intellectual Stimulation	0	71	2.586	1.153	0.137
	1	55	3.356	0.451	0.061
Individual Consideration	0	55	2.380	1.144	0.154
	1	55	3.435	0.406	0.055
Contingent Reward	0	57	2.449	1.181	0.156
	1	55	3.115	0.598	0.081
Management by Exception–Active	0	51	1.837	0.963	0.135
	1	55	1.705	0.611	0.082
Management by Exception–Passive	0	63	1.057	1.013	0.128
	1	55	0.916	0.520	0.070
Laissez-Faire	0	71	0.561	0.788	0.093
	1	55	0.327	0.375	0.051

Table 4 summarizes the independent-samples *t* tests conducted for these analyses. This table summarizes the *t*-statistics, degrees of freedom (*df*), and probability (*p*) level associated with each test, along with the mean difference (Mean Diff.) associated with each measure and the standard error of the difference (SE Diff). Statistical significance was indicated in the difference between these means in all cases with the exclusion of the two management-by-exception variables. Specifically, with regard to laissez-faire, a significantly higher mean was found among faculty as compared with elected presidents, while a significantly higher mean was indicated among presidents for all remaining significant measures.

Table 4

Self-perceived Leadership Factors: Independent-Samples t Tests

<u>Measure</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>Mean Diff.</u>	<u>SE Diff.</u>
Idealized Influence–Attributes	3.083	116.067	.003	-.402	.130
Idealized Influence–Behaviors	3.494	124.490	.001	.429	.123
Inspirational Motivation	3.736	134.406	<.001	-.447	.120
Intellectual Stimulation	5.147	95.546	<.001	-.770	.150
Individual Consideration	6.441	67.355	<.001	-1.055	.164
Contingent Reward	3.782	83.598	<.001	-.665	.176
Management by Exception–Active	.834	83.563	.407	.132	.158
Management by Exception–Passive	.967	95.134	.336	.141	.146
Laissez-Faire	2.195	105.327	.030	.233	.106

Table 5 summarizes descriptive statistics relating to the organizational outcome measures based on the elected president or faculty status. Among these items, in all cases, a higher mean was found among presidents as compared with that of faculty.

Table 5

Mean Values for Organizational Outcomes by Status

<u>Measure</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SEM</u>
Extra Effort	0	72	2.272	1.381	0.163
	1	55	2.849	0.680	0.092
Effectiveness	0	70	2.746	1.188	0.142
	1	55	3.335	0.439	0.059
Satisfaction with the leadership	0	84	2.863	1.255	0.137
	1	52	3.423	0.447	0.062
Five I's of Trans. Leader	0	45	2.720	0.876	0.131
	1	55	3.313	0.350	0.047

Note. Five I's of Transformational Leadership are idealized influence–attributes, idealized influence–behaviors; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; and individual consideration.

Table 6 illustrates the results of the independent-samples t tests conducted on the organizational outcomes. Statistical significance was found in every case, with senate presidents having significantly higher scores as compared with those of faculty members. In sum, the results of these analyses indicate that this first null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 6

Organizational Outcomes: Independent-Samples t Tests

<u>Measure</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>Mean Diff.</u>	<u>E Diff.</u>
Extra Effort	3.087	108.821	.003	-.577	.187
Effectiveness	3.826	91.558	<.001	-.589	.154
Satisfaction with the leadership	3.726	112.809	<.001	-.560	.150
Five Is of Trans. Leader	4.270	55.495	<.001	-.593	.139

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis included in this study consisted of the following: There is no correlation between the presidents' self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes. A series of Pearson's correlations were conducted between these measures, focusing specifically upon presidents in order to test this hypothesis. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 7. First, positive, significant, and moderate correlations were found between effectiveness and the following measures: idealized influence–attributes, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward. Next, the regarding extra effort measure was found to have positive and significant correlations of moderate strength with idealized influence–attributes and idealized influence–behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Finally, additional

significant, positive correlations of moderate strength were found between satisfaction and idealized influence–attributes and idealized influence–behaviors, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. The results indicate the second null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 7

Correlations: Presidents' Self-perceived Leadership Factors and Organizational Outcomes

<u>Measure</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u>	<u>Extra Effort</u>	<u>Satisfaction</u>
Idealized Influence–Attributes	.357**	.364**	.402**
Idealized Influence–Behaviors	.190	.397**	.317*
Inspirational Motivation	.457***	.465***	.505***
Intellectual Stimulation	.299*	.301*	.318*
Individual Consideration	.435**	.397**	.189
Contingent Reward	.357**	.234	.166
Management by Exception–Active	.140	.080	.017
Management by Exception–Passive	-.022	-.148	-.106
Laissez-Faire	-.148	-.026	-.179

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis included in this study consisted of the following: There is no correlation between faculty's perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes. This hypothesis was also tested using a series of Pearson's correlations between leadership factors and organizational outcomes, this time focusing on faculty members. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 8. As shown, a substantially greater number of significant correlations were found, with the correlations also being substantially stronger than those indicated with respect to the analyses conducted on

presidents. With regard to effectiveness, extra effort, as well as satisfaction, statistically significant and strong to very strong correlations were indicated in all cases with the exception of the three correlations conducted with management by exception–active. With regard to the correlations conducted with idealized influence–attributes and idealized influence–behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward, positive, statistically significant, and very strong correlations were indicated in all cases. With regard to the correlations conducted with management by exception–passive and management by exception–laissez-faire, significant, negative, and strong to very strong, correlations were found in all cases. The results of the analyses indicate the third null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 8

Correlations: Faculty's Self-perceived Leadership Factors and Organizational Outcomes

<u>Measure</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u>	<u>Extra Effort</u>	<u>Satisfaction</u>
Idealized Influence–Attributes	.918***	.855***	.937***
Idealized Influence–Behaviors	.797***	.677***	.767***
Inspirational Motivation	.760***	.699***	.739***
Intellectual Stimulation	.904***	.849***	.916***
Individual Consideration	.906***	.844***	.915***
Contingent Reward	.819***	.847***	.848***
Management by Exception–Active	.011	.074	-.122
Management by Exception–Passive	-.740***	-.633***	-.728***
Laissez-Faire	-.745***	-.595***	-.716***

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Additionally, further analyses were conducted to determine whether significant differences existed with respect to the strength of the correlations conducted with faculty members and presidents. These analyses consisted of a series of z tests, with statistical

significance denoting a significant difference in the strength of the correlation indicated between these two samples. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 9. In all cases, with the exception of the management by exception–active correlations, statistical significance was found, indicating significant differences in the strength of these correlations. Specifically, when comparing these two sets of correlations, it was found that the strength of all remaining correlations, when focusing upon faculty members, were significantly higher as compared with the correlations focusing on presidents.

Table 9

Comparison between Correlations

<u>Measure</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u>	<u>Extra Effort</u>	<u>Satisfaction</u>
Idealized Influence–Attributes	6.348*	4.766*	6.909*
Idealized Influence–Behaviors	4.740*	2.130*	3.654*
Inspirational Motivation	2.683*	1.930	2.124*
Intellectual Stimulation	6.231*	5.009*	6.545*
Individual Consideration	5.132*	4.071*	6.762*
Contingent Reward	3.998*	5.135*	5.457*
Management by Exception–Active	-0.638	-0.030	-0.684
Management by Exception–Passive	-4.757*	-3.088*	-4.249*
Laissez-Faire	-4.163*	-3.453*	-3.785*

* $p < .05$.

Summary

This chapter reported the results of a survey of leaders and faculty of the 112 California community colleges to answer the question: To what extent do the elected presidents' background and leadership traits relate to the performance of the faculty senate? The intent of the research question was to understand the background traits and

leadership styles needed to lead faculty senates effectively. This chapter provided the data collection, demographics, and survey results. In answering the primary question, three hypotheses were tested and rejected. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the findings, limitations of the study, and implications for further research.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Community colleges need effective governance and leadership structures to meet the rising and often conflicting expectations of their constituencies. Researchers have recognized the integral role of faculty in governing higher education institutions, but no researchers had previously explored the role of elected presidents on effective contributions of faculty senates to community college governance. I investigated the background and leadership traits of elected presidents of faculty senates to determine elected presidents' self-perceptions and those of faculty members as they related to effective leadership.

In Chapter 1, I identified the research problem: how the elected presidents' background and leadership traits relate to the performance of the faculty senate. While leadership and governance of higher education institutions have been studied for many years (Boggs, 2011; Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, 2003; Jones et al., 2004), limited research has been conducted on the effectiveness of faculty senates (Burgan, 1998; Birnbaum, 1989; Leach 2008; Minor, 2004; Schoorman & Acker-Hocevar, 2010; Tierney & Minor, 2003). This is a problem for community colleges because faculty senates influence critical key policy decisions such as governance, grading policies, and budget. Chapter 1 also set forth the purpose of the study as investigating the perceptions of members of faculty senates on leadership characteristics needed by the elected president to effectively represent the faculty senate to key constituents on the 112 California community college campuses. Chapter 2 summarized historical and theoretical information about governance in higher education and

California community colleges in particular, established the importance of the elected presidents' role in leading effective faculty senates on community college campuses, and shared the ongoing conversations about theories and opinions on the influence the background and leadership traits have on leading organizations effectively.

Chapter 3 described the research design and rationale, researcher's role, methodology, and data analyses plan, as well as summarized the instrument and data collection method and steps taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of participants. Chapter 4 reported the data collection, demographics, and survey results, which rejected all three hypotheses. This chapter presents my interpretations of the findings, limitations of the study, and implications for further research.

Interpretation and Findings

The conclusions in this study supported research found in other studies about leadership. Corresponding to the results demonstrated in Chapter 4, here I address the research question (To what extent do the elected presidents' background and leadership traits relate to the performance of the faculty senate?) by presenting conclusions with three subsections: Leadership Factors and Organizational Outcomes, Limitations, and Recommendations.

Research Hypothesis One

The mean values for self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes were the same for the elected president and faculty. The aim of this question was to explore whether elected presidents and faculty had similar opinions about what leadership factors result in effective organizational outcomes. The results of this study

demonstrated some differences between the perceptions of elected presidents and faculty about those skills needed to lead faculty senates effectively. In all cases, as noted in Table 3, with the exception of management-by-exception measures and laissez-faire, the means of all five transformational leadership skills and contingent reward were higher for elected presidents ($3.435 \pm .406$ to $3.115 \pm .598$) compared to faculty ($2.872 \pm .881$ to 2.380 ± 1.144). Similarly, the data related to the organizational outcome measures based on president or faculty status showed statistical significance in every case, with senate presidents ($3.423 \pm .447$ to $2.849 \pm .680$) having significantly higher scores compared with those of faculty members (2.863 ± 1.255 to 2.272 ± 1.381). Overall, the data indicated that elected presidents and faculty had similar opinions about what leadership factors resulted in effective organizational outcomes and demonstrated that the leadership behaviors of elected presidents were predominantly transformational.

Conversely, Table 3 indicated that the faculty differed from elected presidents in the frequency with which they observed the management by exception factors: active ($1.837 \pm .963$ to $1.705 \pm .611$) and passive (1.057 ± 1.013 to $0.916 \pm .520$) as well as laissez-faire ($0.561 \pm .788$ to $0.327 \pm .375$). In each of these factors, the faculty mean was higher with only laissez-faire significantly higher for faculty than for elected presidents, which indicated their different opinions about the relationship of these two leadership traits with regard to organizational outcomes.

One explanation of this difference might be that elected presidents had more experience in leadership as demonstrated by their demographics. All elected senate presidents had held at least one leadership position, were older, and may have served as

faculty senate president previously, as well as currently serving in the position of president, so one would assume they were more intimately involved with those qualities needed to lead faculty senates. Conversely, most of the faculty members surveyed in this research did not have leadership experience—only 10% had senate president experience, which may have influenced their perception about those behaviors they deemed effective.

While the means of all five transformational leadership skills and contingent reward were higher for elected presidents than for faculty respondents, both groups agreed that faculty senates were more effective when led by transformational leaders. These results indicated a connection between those leaders who exhibited behaviors associated with the five transformational factors including idealized influence, both attributes and behaviors; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; and individual consideration, as well as the transactional factor of contingent reward and organizational outcomes factors extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction with leadership.

Transformational leaders influence change in their colleagues' awareness of what is important and help them see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Transformational leaders do not just recognize the needs of their colleagues but instead develop their colleagues into leaders. Many faculty serve only 1- or 2-year terms as the president, which some have said is a structural flaw that inhibits effectiveness of faculty senates (Minor, 2004, p. 359). Similar to other organizations, faculty senates are only as good as their leaders (Miller, 2001). Therefore, transformational leaders who begin early on to build future leaders of the senate are seen as more successful as they view their greatest task as developing a sense

of direction for their organization and understand that the most important skill is sound judgment (Miller, 2001, p. 421).

Research Hypothesis Two

There was no correlation between the presidents' self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes. The aim of this question was to explore the leadership factors elected presidents perceived were necessary for effective local senates. The data exhibited moderate ($p < .05$), positive ($p < .01$), and significant ($p < .001$) correlations between effectiveness and the following measures: idealized influence–attributes, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward. Regarding extra effort, this measure was found to have positive ($p < .01$) and significant ($p < .001$) correlations of moderate strength with idealized influence–attributes and idealized influence–behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Additional significant, positive ($p < .01$) correlations of moderate strength were found between satisfaction and idealized influence–attributes and idealized influence–behaviors, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. These results indicated a connection between the presidents' self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes, which confirmed other research indicating a strong relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational effectiveness in research on higher education (Bass, 2000; Firestone, 2010).

Miller (2003) commented that strong faculty-led decision making results in effective faculty senates; the ability of the leader to garner faculty support enables senates

to address difficult issues. Good leadership is not only a pivotal force behind successful organizations, but is essential to ensure organizational effectiveness (Bennis, 2003; Bennis & Nanus, 2003). Conversely, less effective presidents can negatively influence the overall effectiveness of the organization in fulfilling its mission (Harrison et al., 2011; Herman & Renz, 2000). Because the elected president has such an important role in leading faculty senates, understanding the characteristics for successful leaders is essential to effective presidents (Firestone, 2010; Miller, 2003).

The results suggested that inspirational motivation was statistically significant for effectiveness ($p < .001$). Out of all the transformational leadership skills needed to lead local senates effectively, elected presidents indicated the most significant skill elected presidents exhibited most frequently was to inspire others to achieve their full potential. Bass (2000) described an inspirational leader as one who creates a vision for the future, articulates how to reach the vision, sets high standards, and provides an example that others respect and want to emulate. The results of this hypothesis also suggested that idealized influence-attributes (trusted and respected), individual consideration (develops followers into leaders), and contingent reward (sets clear expectations and rewards achievement) were statistically significant ($p > .01$), while intellectual stimulation (challenge others to achieve innovative thinking) was only moderately significant ($p > .05$) when correlated with organizational outcomes (effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction).

As the leader of the local senate, the elected president has a key role in the governance of the college mostly in academic and professional issues along with the

college president and board of trustees. In California, while the elected board of trustees and college president have the ultimate authority for the direction of the college, the local senate has been delegated in law the primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards (leginfo.com, n.d., §70902 article 7). In making these decisions, the elected president needs to work with the local senate membership to provide direction on faculty areas of concerns and to delegate tasks appropriately. In facilitating this guidance, the elected president is responsible for appointing faculty to committees, approving reports, communicating effectively with the faculty and local senate members as well as other college constituents and the public.

In identifying research about effective leaders of faculty senates, the most recent data, albeit over 10 years old, has shown different factors than those identified in this study for effective leaders of faculty senates. As an example, in 2001, Miller found in his study of 181 faculty senate presidents that their perception of being effective was they must have strong positive oral communication skills, must have the skills to organize the work of the senate, must have the patience and tolerance to handle stressful situations and be willing to serve as a leader. He further noted that these are the same types of skills needed for college administrators but the difference is that faculty senate presidents step into this quasi-administrative post with little or no training and no added compensation. He concluded there is a need to develop faculty-based leadership with the same vigor that administrative techniques are taught to college administrators. Similarly, Minor (2003) found the predictors of perceived senate effectiveness included high levels of faculty involvement and faculty interest in senate activity as well as having significant influence

over issues related to faculty tenure and promotion, the selection of the provost and president, and in setting strategic and budget priorities. Tierney and Minor (2004) made a similar conclusion; they noted, “The influence of faculty senates will continue to languish until they improve their modes of communication, including written, oral, and symbolic forms” (p. 20).

The studies by Miller and Minor are consistent with the leadership factors found in this study. Likewise, the perceptions noted by Minor are in alignment with at least four transformational leadership factors idealized influence (behaviors), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration as well as the transactional factor contingent reward. While the leadership skills noted by Miller do not directly correspond to transformational leadership, his research is consistent with transformational leadership. Instead, Miller’s results more closely linked to the management-by-exception factors, which the faculty members rated higher and is discussed next.

Research Hypothesis Three

There is no correlation between faculty’s perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes. Similar to Hypothesis 2, the objective of this question was to explore the leadership factors faculty perceive are necessary for elected presidents to have for the effective leadership of local senates. The data (Table 8) showed a greater number of significant correlations that were substantially stronger than those indicated for the elected presidents. Effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction were correlated significantly ($p < .001$) with all transformational leadership traits and strong to very

strong correlations ($p < .01$) indicated in all cases with the exception of the three correlations with management by exception–active. Idealized influence–attributes and idealized influence–behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward, in all cases, positive, statistically significant, and very strong correlations were indicated. With regard to the correlations with management by exception–passive and laissez-faire, significant, negative, and strong to very strong correlations were found in all cases. These results indicated that the faculty’s perceptions of leadership factors were found to be substantially higher than those indicated by elected presidents and that there is a connection between the faculty’s self-perceived leadership factors and organizational outcomes (see Table 8).

An interesting finding is the faculty’s low response rate to the management by exception (passive) factor compared to presidents. In her study, Firestone (2010) reported that faculty rated the factor management by exception higher than chairpersons did. Miller (2001) acknowledged the need for senate presidents to have some experience in managing. O’Shea et al. (2009) remarked that leaders use active management-by-exception practices to monitor the followers’ performance, make corrections if mistakes are made, but do not intervene until a problem arises or standards are not met. Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) described management by exception–passive and laissez-faire as essentially nonexistent leadership or where the manager only intercedes when performance is not as expected (p. 508).

The findings suggested that elected faculty presidents might need to have some management skills as faculty members generally do not supervise others and may be

hesitant to take on this role, which might cause some to think the elected president is a passive leader. Since transformational leadership is not only correlated with organizational effectiveness but also follower satisfaction (Bass, 2000; Lowe et al., 1996; Palmer et al., 2001; Wofford et al., 1998), elected presidents would be well served by sharing with faculty their communication skills and leadership decision-making processes.

Further analyses were conducted to determine whether significant differences existed with respect to the strength of the correlations with faculty members and presidents. The data showed a significant difference in the strength of the correlation between the elected presidents' responses and the faculty observations. In all cases, with the exception of the management by exception (active) correlations, statistical significance ($p < .001$) was found, indicating significant differences in the strength of the correlations between leadership factors and organizational outcomes. The strength of the correlations found when focusing on faculty members was significantly higher compared with the correlations focusing on presidents. In other words, faculty more often observed the leadership factors associated with organizational effectiveness outcomes than elected senate presidents who actually performed the leadership responsibilities.

Fulton-Calkins and Milling (2005) noted that faculty naturally assume leadership roles, as their job in the classroom is to influence others. Thus, those who become leaders do not necessarily need training in leadership but in performing more routine tasks such as managers are required to perform as well as strategic planning, evaluation,

recruitment, conflict resolution, team building, working with multiple constituencies, and budgeting.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation to this study was the use of a sampling of faculty from community colleges in California. As noted in Chapter 2, California has a unique governance structure grounded in legislation, education code, and regulations. It is possible that because of this governance structure, the perceptions of the faculty and elected presidents would not be representative of other states, other community colleges, or higher education institutions.

Another limitation was the survey was voluntary with elected presidents and faculty invited to participate in the survey. Faculty members who did not respond might have a different opinion than those familiar with the role and responsibility of the local senate. In addition, those leaders and faculty who did participate possibly responded because of their experience with faculty senates. Respondents not familiar with faculty senates might also provide a different perspective.

Recommendations

The research in this study adds to the body of knowledge about the background and leadership traits faculty need to lead faculty senate effectively and supports evidence that the transformational leadership theory in relationship to the full-range leadership theory model is appropriate to use in further research on local senates. In his report, George Boggs (2011) described the changing environment for community college

leaders. While Boggs's article was about developing college presidents, he recognized that the environment for community college is changing:

Resources are constrained, accountability requirements are increasing, labor relations are becoming more contentious, and society is more litigious than ever before. Learning opportunities and services are now expected to be offered twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Distance learning technologies are erasing geographical boundaries, and competition for students will increase. (p. 13)

This research demonstrated a need for local community college senates to have a well-developed succession plan given the 1-year terms as well as leadership training to assist faculty with skills associated with transformational leaders and management. Boggs (2011) further argued that in developing professional development activities, colleges should use what is known about leadership competencies and current problems leaders are facing.

Local senates should also consider clear job descriptions, orientation programs, succession planning as well as lengthening the mentoring process for future leaders. For example, instead of allowing individuals to be elected to lead the local senate without any local senate experience, require that faculty begin as a member and move up the leadership ladder to the elected president position. This would provide an opportunity for individuals to learn the culture, develop the necessary skills, shadow other leaders and receive training for several years. As noted previously, Miller (2001) argued that senate presidents are required to perform many quasi-administrative functions expected of

college administrators with very little or no training and no compensation. Local senates should develop faculty-based leadership with the same vigor that administrative techniques are taught to college administrators. Other researchers (Boggs, 2011; Strom, Sanchez, & Downey-Schilling, 2011) suggested administrators foster faculty leadership by promoting opportunities for networking among faculty—inter-departmental symposia, workshops, or via “grow your own leaders” programs, and professional conferences; motivating faculty to assume administrative and leadership roles; and creating an environment where faculty members feel free to pose questions and express concerns.

It is recommended that (a) qualitative research including interviews be conducted to determine other factors that might contribute to the effectiveness of local senates including culture, teaching discipline, experience, or gender of elected presidents; and (b) investigate the use of succession planning, job descriptions, management training, and professional development in preparing elected presidents to lead effective local senates.

Implications

As public institutions, California Community Colleges receive a majority of their funds from California taxpayers, as distributed by the Governor of California and Legislature. The Department of Finance (2013) reported that the state budget dedicated to higher education was about 12% of the overall 2014–15 California budget of \$107 million, of which community colleges receive \$7.5 million. As noted earlier, California law and regulation delegate certain responsibilities to local academic senates, such as participating in accreditation self-studies, evaluating faculty, or developing standards and policies regarding student success. Significant public policy decisions are associated with

the budget process including prioritizing curriculum and services. The local senate role is to protect the quality and integrity of education for students and the institution. For example, faculty should be concerned about restricting library services, laying off faculty, cutting classes, or moving courses from in-person to distance education, all of which affect faculty and students and potentially student success.

The implication of this research for positive social change is that it potentially provides critical resources to faculty for understanding what it takes to improve their effectiveness in governance of California community colleges. Providing faculty with the resources to achieve greater effectiveness of overall college governance, improved services to their communities, and enriched education for their students, will benefit society by providing a more educated and informed citizenry.

Conclusion

In addition to adding to the existing body of literature, this study has provided evidence that transformational leadership in relationship to the full-range leadership model is useful to stimulate more research about the role of elected presidents on effectiveness of local senates. Through correlation analysis, I found that the background and leadership traits of elected presidents of faculty senates determine their self-perceptions and those of faculty members as they relate to effective leadership. Hartley (2003) argued that universities have one system of governance comprised of three representative groups: boards of trustees, administration, and faculty, who each compete to be heard. Each group has its own leadership development processes. Lester and Lukas (2008) found, “The ideal shared governance model is collegial, provides rewards, assists

in maximizing system efficiency and assists in the sharing of resources” (p. 59). If faculty senates are to be effective, given that their leadership is transient and generally changes each year, elected presidents need to be trained to lead local senates and to identify future leaders as soon as they begin their term. Further inquiry is needed to understand how implementing professional development, succession planning, and management training might enhance the ability of faculty to move into leadership positions successfully. Additional qualitative research including interviews is needed to understand other components that might influence leadership of local senates.

References

- American Association for Higher Education, (1967). *Faculty participation in academic governance*. Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED018850)
- American Association of University Professors. (1966). *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/governancestatement.htm>
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2008). *Community colleges: Past to present*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx>
- Amey, M. J., Jessup-Anger, E., & Jessup-Anger, J. (2008). Community college governance: What matters and why? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2008(141), 5-14. doi:10.1002/cc.310
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261-295.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 25-33. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.

- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sample set* (3rd ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Barbuto, J. E., Jr., Fritz, S. M., Matkin, G. S., & Marx, D. B. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. *Sex Roles, 56*(1-2), 71-83. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9152-6
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(1), 9–32.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(3), 18–30.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly, 17*(1), 112-121.
- Beckwith, E. G., Silverstone, S., & Bean, D. (2010). Creating a culture of academic assessment and excellence via shared governance. *Contemporary Issues in Education Researcher, 3*(2), 35–48.
- Bennis, W. (2003). *On becoming a leader*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books Group.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (2003). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper Row.
- Birnbaum, R. (1989). The latent organization functions of the academic senate. *The Journal of Higher Education, 60*, 423-443.

- Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2004*, 5–22. doi: 10.1002/he.152
- Bodla, M. A., & Nawaz, M. M. (2010). Comparative study of full-range leadership model among faculty members in public and private sector higher education institutes and universities. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*, 208-214. Retrieved from <http://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/docview/821297110?accountid=14872>
- Boggs, G. R. (2011). Community colleges in the spotlight and under the microscope. *New Direction for Community Colleges, 2011*(156). doi:10.1002/cc.462
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2009). Leader-follower values congruence: Are socialized charismatic leadership better able to achieve it? *American Psychological Association, 94*(2), 478–490. doi:10.1037/a0014069
- Burgan, M. (1998). Academic citizenship: A fading vision. *Liberal Education, 84*(4), 16-21.
- Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report*. Los Angeles, CA: Author.
- Dassance, C. R. (2011). The next community college movement? *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2011*(156), 31–39. doi:10.1002/cc.464

- Department of Finance. (2013, July) *Chart C, general fund program distribution*. Retrieved from http://www.dof.ca.gov/budgeting/budget_faqs/information/documents/CHART-C.pdf
- Firestone, D. T. (2010). A study of leadership behaviors among chairpersons in allied health programs. *Journal of Allied Health, 39*(1), 34–42.
- Fresno City College. (2012). *Facts & history*. Retrieved from <http://www.fresnocitycollege.edu>
- Foundation for California Community Colleges. (2014). *Facts and figures*. <http://www.foundationccc.org/AbouttheColleges/FactsandFigures/tabid/636/Default.aspx>
- Fulton-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2005). Community college leadership: An art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*, 233–250. doi: 10.1080/10668920590901176
- Garfield, T. K. (2008). Governance in a union environment. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2008*(141), 25-33. doi: 10.1002/cc.312
- Garrigus, C. (1963). *Assembly concurrent resolution (ACR)*. Sacramento: California State Legislature.
- Gerber, L. G., Clausen, D. M., Poston, M. E., Perley, J. E., & Ramo, K. (1997). Behind closed doors? Reaffirming the value of shared governance. *Academe, 83*(5), 14-29.

- Gortner, H. F., Nichols, K. L., & Ball, C. (2007). *Organization theory: A public and nonprofit perspective* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth Publishing.
- Harrison, Y., Murray, V., & Cornforth, C. (2012). *What shapes perceptions of board chair leadership effectiveness in nonprofit organizations? Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary Nonprofit Organizations*, 24, 688-712.
- Hartley, M. (2003). The promise of peril of parallel governance structures. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 46, 923-946.
- Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1998). Nonprofit organizational effectiveness: Contrasts between especially effective and less effective organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 9(1), 23-38.
- Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (1999). Theses on nonprofit organizational effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(2), 107-126.
- Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2000). Board practices of especially effective and less effective local nonprofit organizations. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 30(2), 146-160. doi: 10.1177/02750740022064605
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. (1979). Situational leadership, perception, and the impact of power. *Group & Organizational Studies (pre-1986)*, 4, 418-428.
- Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). A theoretical and empirical examination of the transactional and non-leadership dimensions of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 501-513. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.001

- Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (1999). The relevance of charisma for transformational leadership in stable organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*(2), 105–119. doi: 10.1108/09534819910263659
- Jones, G. A., Shanahan, T., & Goyan, P. (2004). The academic senate and university governance in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 34*(2), 35–68.
- Jones, W. A. (2011). Faculty involvement in institutional governance: A literature review. *The Journal of the Professoriate, 6*(1), 117-135. Retrieved from http://jotp.icbche.org/2012/6_1_Jones_117_finalBBJ.pdf
- Jung, D. I. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal, 13*(2). doi: 10.1207/S15326934CRJ1302_6
- Kelley, K., Clark, B., Brown, V., & Sitzia, J. (2003). Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 15*(3), 261–266.
- Khoo, H. S., & Burch, G. S. J. (2008). The ‘dark side’ of leadership personality and transformation leadership: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*, 86-97. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2007.07.018
- Kirkbride, P. (2006). Developing transformational leaders: The full-range leadership model in action. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 38*(1), 23–32. doi: 10.1108/00197850610646016

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). The five practices of exemplary leadership. In J. L. Perry (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass reader on nonprofit and public leadership* (pp. 25–37). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Leach, W. D. (2008). *Shared governance in higher education: Structural and cultural responses to a changing national climate*. Sacramento: California State University, Sacramento, Center for Collaborative Policy.
- Lee, J. (2005). Effects of leadership and leader-member exchange on commitment. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 26, 655–672. doi: 10.1108/01437730510633728
- Leginfo.com. (n.d.). *Education code sections 70900-70902*. Retrieved from <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&group=70001-71000&file=70900-70902>
- Lester, J., & Lukas, S. (2008). The actors behind the curtain: Representation of women faculty in community college institutional decision making. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2008(142), 57–68. doi: 10.1002/cc.325
- Levin, J. S. (2008). Yanks, Canucks, and Aussies governance as liberation. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2008(141), 67-78. doi:10.1002/cc.313
- Lindebaum, D., & Cartwright, S. (2010). A critical examination of the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leader. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47, 1318–1342. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00933x

- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385-425.
- Mallory, B. L. (2011). Practicing what we preach: Democratic practices in institutional governance. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2011*(152), 91–97. doi: 10.1002/he.417
- McLendon, M. K., Deaton, R., & Hearn, J. C. (2007). The enactment of reforms in state governance of higher education: Testing the political instability hypothesis. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*, 646–675.
- Middlehurst, R. (2008). Not enough science or not enough learning? Exploring the gaps between leadership theory and practice. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*, 322–339. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00397.x
- Miller, M. T. (2003). The status of faculty senates in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27*, 419–428. doi: 10.1080/10668920390129022
- Miller, M. T., & Pope, M. L. (2001). *Faculty senate presidential skills: Identifying needs for training and professional development*. College of Education, San Jose State University, 1–12. San Jose, CA: Author. Retrieved from Education Resource Information Center. (ED456699)
- Minor, J. T. (2003). Assessing the senate: Critical issues considered. *The American Behavioral Scientist, 46*, 960–977. doi: 10.1177/0002764202250122

- Minor, J. T. (2004). Understanding faculty senates: Moving from mystery to models
Review of Higher Education, 27, 343-363.
- Moss, S. A., & Ritossa, D. A. (2007). The impact of goal orientation on the association
between leadership style and follower performance, creativity and work attitudes.
Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 3, 433-456. doi:
10.1177/1742715007082966
- Murray, V. (2010). Evaluating the effectiveness of nonprofit organizations. In D. O. Renz
(Ed.), *Nonprofit Leadership and Management* (pp. 431–458). San Francisco:
Jossey Bass.
- O’Shea, P. G., Foti, R. J., Hauenstein, M. A., & Bycio, P. (2009). Are the best leaders
both transformational and transactional? A pattern-oriented analysis. *Leadership,*
5(2), 237-259. doi:10.1177/1742715009102937
- Osborn, R., Hunt, J., & Jauch, L. (2002). Towards a contextual theory of leadership.
Leadership Quarterly 13, 797-837.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and
effective leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 22*(1),
5-10. doi: 10.118/01437730110380174
- Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z. A. L. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive
effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social*
Science, 3(7). Retrieved from Proquest database.

- Schoorman, D., & Acker-Hocevar, M. (2010). Viewing faculty governance within a social justice framework: Struggles and possibilities for democratic decision-making in higher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*, 310–325. doi: 10.1080/10665684.2010.494493
- Schriesheim, C. A., Wu, J. B., & Scandura, T. A. (2009). A meso measure? Examination of the levels of analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*, 604–616. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.04.005
- Strom, S., Sanchez, A. & Downey-Schilling, J. (2011). Inside-outside: Finding future community college leaders. *The Community College Enterprise, Spring*, 9–21.
- Tierney, W. G., & Minor, J. T. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report*. Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California. Retrieved from <http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa>
- Trottier, T., Van Wart, M., & Wang, X. (2008). Examining the nature and significance of leadership in governmental organizations. *Public Administration Review, 68*(2), 319-333. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00865.x
- Twombly, S., & Townsend, B. K. (2008). Community college faculty: What we know and need to know. *Community College Review, 36*(1), 5–24. doi: 10.1177/0091552108319538
- Vecchio, R. P. (2002). Leadership and gender advantage. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 643-671. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00156-X
- Vidovicha, L., & Currieb, J. (2011). Governance and trust in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(1), 43–56. doi: 10.1080/03075070903469580

- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 17-24.
- Weinberger, L. A. (2009). Emotional Intelligence, leadership style, and perceived leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *11*, 747–772. doi: 10.1177/1523422309360811
- White, K. B. (1998). Shared governance in California. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *1998*(102), 19–29.
- Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L., & Whittington, J. L. (1998). A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(1), 55-84.
- Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 6-16. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X62.1.6

Appendix A: Permission to use the Academic Senate Listserv



President
Michelle Pilati
Rio Honda College

Vice President
Beth Smith
Grossmont College

Secretary
David Morse
Long Beach City College

Treasurer
Wheeler North
San Diego Miramar College

Area A Representative
Julie Biuno
Sierra College

Area B Representative
Dolores Davison
Foothill College

Area C Representative
Lesley Kawaguchi
Santa Monica College

Area D Representative
Stephanie Dumont
Golden West College

North Representative
Dianna Chabott
Napa Valley College

North Representative
Dan Crump
American River College

South Representative
Kevin Bontenbal
Cuesta College

South Representative
John Stankas
San Bernardino Valley College

At Large Representative
Michelle Gimes-Hillman
Mt. San Antonio College

At Large Representative
Phil Smith
American River College

Julie Adams, CAE
Executive Director

December 10, 2012

Subject: Access to the ASCCC Senate President Listserv

Dear Ms. Adams:

This letter serves to confirm that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has granted permission for you to send your research surveys to our Senate President listserv.

Sincerely,

Michelle L. Pilati

Michelle Pilati, Ph.D.
President

Appendix B: Invitation and Consent Forms

Letter of Invitation and Consent Form for Faculty Senate Presidents

You are invited to take part in a research study to explore the background and leadership traits needed to lead faculty senates on California community colleges effectively. This study provides an opportunity for you to help inform a discussion regarding effective faculty leadership. Individual results will remain confidential but compiled results will be made public and may ultimately help to identify and develop strong faculty leaders both locally and state wide.

You were chosen for the study because you are the academic senate president at your college. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

The study is being conducted by a researcher named Julie Adams, who is a doctoral student at Walden University. Ms. Adams is employed as the executive director of Academic Senate for California Community College in Sacramento, California.

Background Information: The purpose of this survey is to gather information from California community college faculty members on their perceptions of leadership characteristics needed to lead local senates effectively. The survey data will be used to inform local senates about those characteristics needed to lead faculty senates, as well as assist the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in developing training and resources for faculty senate leaders.

Procedures: All faculty senate presidents will be asked to answer a few demographic questions and complete 36-item survey. The entire process should take approximately 20 minutes. Once the senate presidents have taken the survey, faculty respondents from the campuses of these presidents will be recruited through email solicitation. Names and emails of faculty members will be obtained from the college websites. Faculty participants will be asked to provide their perceptions about the background and leadership traits of past or present faculty leaders for your campus. They will NOT be evaluating you as a leader.

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Your participation in this study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate in the study now, you can still change your mind during the study. If you feel stressed during the study you may stop at any time. You may select not to answer any questions that you feel are too personal.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study: Your participation in this study involves minimal risk to you. You will receive no personal benefit for your participation in this study. However, your participation may contribute to an understanding of the effective practices in leading faculty senates at community colleges and may therefore ultimately benefit your district, your college, and your local academic senate.

Compensation: No monetary or non-monetary compensation is offered for participating in this study, as the study is a requirement towards the completion of a doctoral degree program at Walden University.

Confidentiality: The researcher is committed to protecting the confidentiality of the respondents. The research will not release or publish any information about the college in any analysis, report out, or any other documents. The purpose of gathering the college name is only for the purpose of matching constituents from the same college.

The researcher will not use your information for any purposes outside of this research project. The name of the college will be collected only to understand the demographics of the college. Nothing will include your name or anything else that could identify you in any reports of the study. The data will be kept by the researcher and will be shredded five years after the completion of the study.

The final information will be reported in aggregate to local senates in a *Rostrum* article or via a presentation at an institute held by the Academic Senate.

Contacts and Questions: You may ask any questions you have now or later by emailing the researcher via e-mail: Julie.adams@waldenu.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a participant, you may also contact the Walden's Research Participant Advocate at 612-312-1210 or irb@waldenu.edu.

Walden University's approval number for this study is 06-13-13-0078496 and it expires on June 12, 2014.

Statement of Consent: If you are willing to complete the survey, please read the following information that provides survey instructions to do so. If you complete the survey, you automatically grant permission for the researcher to use your answers.

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By responding to the survey, I am agreeing to the terms described above.

For your records, please keep/print a copy of this consent form.

Please click here to take the survey: https://www.mindgarden.com/assess/SAMPLE_new_self/945



Letter of Invitation and Consent Form for Faculty Participants

You are invited to take part in a research study to explore the background and leadership traits needed to lead faculty senates on California community colleges effectively. This study provides an opportunity for you to help inform a discussion regarding effective faculty leadership. Individual results will remain confidential but compiled results will be made public and may ultimately help to identify and develop strong faculty leaders both locally and state wide.

You were chosen for the study because the academic senate president at your college participated in a survey about their perception of the background and leadership traits needed to lead the local senate on your campus. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

The study is being conducted by a researcher named Julie Adams, who is a doctoral student at Walden University. Ms. Adams is employed as the executive director of Academic Senate for California Community College in Sacramento, California.

Background Information: The purpose of this survey is to gather information from California community college faculty members on their perceptions of leadership characteristics needed to lead local senates effectively. The survey data will be used to inform local senates about those characteristics needed to lead faculty senates, as well as assist the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in developing training and resources for faculty senate leaders.

Procedures: Faculty participants will be asked to answer a few demographic questions and complete 45-item survey. The entire process should take approximately 20 minutes. You will be asked to describe the leadership style of the elected faculty senate president (past or present) as you perceive it .

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Your participation in this study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate in the study now, you can still change your mind during the study. If you feel stressed during the study you may stop at any time. You may select to not answer any questions that you feel are too personal.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study: Your participation in this study involves minimal risk to you. You will receive no personal benefit for your participation in this study. However, your participation may contribute to an understanding of the effective practices in leading faculty senates at community colleges and may therefore ultimately benefit your district, your college, and your local academic senate.

Compensation: No monetary or non-monetary compensation is offered for participating in this study, as the study is a requirement towards the completion of a doctoral degree program at Walden University.

Confidentiality: The researcher is committed to protecting the confidentiality of the respondents. The research will not release or publish any information about the college in any analysis, report

out, or any other documents. The purpose of gathering the college name is only for the purpose of matching constituents from the same college.

The researcher will not use your information for any purposes outside of this research project. The name of the college will be collected only to understand the demographics of the college. Nothing will include your name or anything else that could identify you in any reports of the study. The data will be kept by the researcher and will be shredded five years after the completion of the study.

The final information will be reported in aggregate to local senates in a *Rostrum* article or via a presentation at an institute held by the Academic Senate.

Contacts and Questions: You may ask any questions you have now or later by emailing the researcher via e-mail: Julie.adams@waldenu.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a participant, you may also contact the Walden's Research Participant Advocate at 612-312-1210 or irb@waldenu.edu.

Walden University's approval number for this study is 06-13-13-0078496 and it expires on June 12, 2014.

Statement of Consent: If you are willing to complete the survey, please read the following information that provides survey instructions to do so. If you complete the survey, you automatically grant permission for the researcher to use your answers.

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By responding to the survey, I am agreeing to the terms described above.

For your records, please keep/print a copy of this consent form.

Please click here to take the survey: https://www.mindgarden.com/assess/SAMPLE_new_self/946



Appendix C: Supplemental Information

Please provide the following information:

1. Current California community college: [Open-ended response]
2. Year born: [Closed response: drop down menu of span of years]
3. Male/Female [Closed response: Check box]
4. Race [Closed response: Check box]
5. Discipline [Open-ended response]
6. Year hired at current college [Closed response: drop down menu of years]
7. Full-time/Part-time [Closed response: Check box]
8. Tenured [Closed response: Check box Yes/No]
 - a. If yes, year received tenure [Closed response: drop down menu of year]
9. Education (please select highest level): [Closed response: drop down menu with high school graduate or equivalent, associate's degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, doctoral degree]
10. Past experience in a leadership position professional or personal. Respond to all questions that apply. [Closed response: drop down menu with the following: senate president, district president, local senate executive committee, curriculum chair, committee chair, dean, department chair, senate officer, union officer, professional organization, other (please list all)].

Appendix D: Permission to use the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X)
Instrument

The researcher has received the following email regarding written permission to use the MLQ 5X Short Instrument. Once the study has been approved by the IRB, the research will purchase the instrument and insert the permission into this document.

-----Original Message-----

From: info@mindgarden.com [mailto:info@mindgarden.com]

Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 1:26 PM

To: Julie Adams

Subject: Permission to use the MLQ

Dear Julie Adams,

This is to confirm that upon purchase of a license to use the MLQ, you will have Mind Garden's permission to use it in your dissertation research.

Best,
Valorie Keller
Mind Garden, Inc.
650-322-6300

Curriculum Vitae

Julie Adams

EDUCATION

PhD candidate in Public Policy and Administration	Expected May 2014
Walden University	
Master of Business	May 2003
University of Davis	
Bachelor of Science	May 1999
California State University, Sacramento	

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Executive Director
 The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
 Sacramento, California 95816
 February 1997 – present

Office Manager
 The California District Attorney Association
 Sacramento, California 95816
 August 1994 – February 1997

Analyst/Disaster Grants Consultant
 David M. Griffith (DMG) and Associates
 Sacramento, California 95814
 August 1993 – August 1994

Disaster Claims Coordinator
 The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
 Los Angeles, California 90012
 February 1986 – August 1993

Specialist IV – Company Commander Administrator
 The United States Army
 Fort Gordon, Georgia 30905
 1981 – 1983

PROFESSIONAL HONOR AND RECOGNITION

Pi Alpha Alpha National Honor Society of Public Policy and Administration

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP

The American Society of Association Executives (ASAE)
 The California Society of Association Executives (CalSAE)
 Rotary International

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Academic Senate Adopted Resolutions: 1.02 F01

PUBLICATIONS AND ARTICLES

Adams, J. (2013). Vendor's at senate events. *Rostrum (November)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/content/vendors%E2%80%99-resources-senate-events>

Adams, J. (2013). Showing gratitude – Recognizing good work. *Rostrum (September)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/content/showing-gratitude-%E2%80%93-recognizing-good-work>

Adams, J. (2010). How green is the senate. *Rostrum (December)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/content/how-green-senate>

Adams, J. (2010). Academic Senate Website. *Rostrum (September)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/content/academic-senate-website>

Adams, J. (2009). An Academic Senate Foundation—Why?. *Rostrum (March)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/content/academic-senate-foundation-why>

Adams, J. (2006). Status and accountability. *Rostrum (December)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/node/176712>

Adams, J. (2005). It's summer and you have nothing to do. *Rostrum (May)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/node/176438>

Adams, J. (2005). Do you know who will take your place? *Rostrum (March)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/node/176459>

Adams, J. (2004). Disciplines list revision. *Rostrum (September)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/node/176479>

Adams, J. (2004). Honoring excellence. *Rostrum (March)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/node/176485>

Adams, J. (2003). From the executive director. *Rostrum (December)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/node/176516>

Adams, J. (2001). Senate websites. *Rostrum (October)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/node/176566>

Adams, J. & Rasskazova, R. (2001). *Rostrum (April)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/node/176552>

Adams, J., & Simpson, H. (1999). Landslides and squeakers: Spring elections produce new executive Committee. *Rostrum (June)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author: Retrieved February 24, 2014, from <http://asccc.org/node/176597>

North, W. & Adams, J. (2011). To lick it or click it: That is the question. *Rostrum (March)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/content/lick-it-or-click-it-question>

Simpson, H. & Adams, J. (2002). Ignore us at your peril!: The san francisco accreditation hearing. *Rostrum (February)*. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento: CA: Author. Retrieved February 24, 2014 from <http://asccc.org/node/176536>

PRESENTATIONS

Adams, J. & Bontenbal, K. *Resolutions, the Cornerstones of Local and State Senates' Democracy and Governance*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 19, 2012 and Irvine, California on November 9, 2012.

Adams, J. *Classified Staff Roundtable Discussion*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 14, 2011.

Adams, J., & Crump, D. *Senate Website*. Presented to the membership at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Anaheim, California on November 11, 2010.

Adams, J. & Kawaguchi. *Understanding the Brown Act and Parliamentary Procedure*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 16, 2010.

Adams, J. & Morse, D. *Senate Tool kit*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 16, 2010.

Adams, J. & Crump, D. *Senate Resources at Your Service*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 16, 2010.

Adams, J., Crump, D. Tuller, R. & Vogel, S. *From nominations to outreach and recruitment*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 16, 2010.

Adams, J. & North, W. *Staff Breakout: Understanding the Brown Act and Parliamentary Procedure*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Ontario, California on November 12, 2009

Adams, J. & Crump, D. *Staff Breakout: Senate Resources*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Ontario, California on November 12, 2009.

Adams, J. & Crump, D. *Staff Breakout: Developing a Senate Tool Kit*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California

Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Ontario, California on November 12, 2009.

Adams, J., Cox, C., & Eshom, E. *Senate office organization: A staff discussion*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Los Angeles, California, November 6, 2008.

Adams, J., & Lieu, M. W. *Senate resources at your service*. Presented to the membership of and classified staff attendees at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Los Angeles, California, November 6, 2008.

Adams, J., *Getting Involved at the State Level*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 17, 2008.

Crump, D., Adams, J., Myers, S., Smith, B., & Welch, L., *Extreme Makeover: The Single Discipline List*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Anaheim, California on November 1, 2007.

Patton, J., & Adams, J., *Getting Involved at the State Level*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Anaheim, California on November 1, 2007.

Adams, J., *Getting Involved at the State Level*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 19, 2007.

Crump, D., Adams, J., Daar, K., & Snowwhite, M., (2007). *Disciplines list structure: Exploring new approaches*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 19, 2007.

Crump, D., Adams, J., Mo, E., Tahvildaran, R., Turni, B., & Vogel, S., *What Does This All Mean? An Update on Legislation and Legislative Alerts*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 27, 2006.

Patton, J., Adams, J., & Hanz, P. *Articulation Two Ways: With Universities and High Schools*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 28, 2006.

Crump, D., & Adams, J., *Legislation: Issues and Answers*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Spring Plenary Session, San Francisco, California on April 8, 2005.

Holton, G., Adams, J., Linn-Watson, T., & Messina, K., *Standards and Practices Gone Wild: Reconsidering the Disciplines List Process and Senate Awards*. Presented to the membership of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges at their Fall Plenary Session, Pasadena, California on April 8, 2005.