INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quaiity of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

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

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9225901

An investigation of differences between effective U.S. university presidents and effective and representative Canadian university presidents

McKay, Linda Matthews, Ph.D.

Wayne State University, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

AN INVESTIGATION OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE U.S. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS AND EFFECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

by

LINDA MATTHEWS MCKAY

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1992

MAJOR: HIGHER EDUCATION

Approved by:

Larry W. Hillman 2/4/92
Adviser date

Roger C. Bellmont

Edward Simpkins

Phyllis Ashinger

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge those whose encouragement, assistance, and co-operation have been invaluable in the completion of this research. The writer is grateful to the major advisor Dr. Larry Hillman and the various members of the committee who have participated at various stages: Dr. Roger DeMont, Dr. Edward Simpkins, Dr. Joella Gipson-Simpson, Dr. Phyllis Ashinger and Dr. Bernis Hall, each of whom have contributed expertise and encouragement of which the writer is very appreciative.

Special appreciation is extended to the Canadian university presidents who were in office when the data was gathered and who participated in the nomination process as well as responding to the questionnaires. The researcher is well aware of the demands made on the office of the President and is genuinely thankful for their contributions.

Thanks are extended to the administration at the University of Windsor for the support and encouragement provided and for the confidence in the writer's ability to do the work. Thanks are also expressed to June Cline for her valuable assistance with statistical procedures.

Over the course of this work a number of support staff have provided services which have made this work possible. They include Doreen Bauld, Val Allard, Pat Roberts and Dolores Handsor. The writer is very appreciative of their contributions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the administrative structure of the Canadian university, the president is the key executive officer and must assume primary responsibility for the leadership of the institution. The University community is affected by presidential opinion, judgment, and direction. The University community reacts to the administrative style of the president as a result of his/her interpretation of institutional philosophy. The president's role today contains several dimensions that logically flow from the tasks to be performed. The tasks have remained essentially the same over the years. Yet, as change occurs, effective performance of these tasks requires different skills and competencies.

Colleges and universities are of great importance to society. Leadership of these educational institutions is a very important commodity. Although historically much has been written about the administrative, educational, and financial problems facing the universities, only recently has attention focused on those persons charged with the fundamental responsibility of facing these problems, the academic president.

While there is a considerable amount of literature available relatively little systematic knowledge has been established about the persons who head the institutions of higher education. A great deal of the published information regarding career patterns, roles, personalities, and socioeconomic characteristics has come basically from personal essays, speeches, and memoirs of former presidents, particularly those in the United States. Writings of this nature give rich insight into certain elements of the academic presidency but are lacking

in factual-empirical knowledge. Complementing these writings are a few published studies that provide a broader and more systematic investigation of various aspects of the role, selection process, demographic characteristics, and effective leadership profiles of university presidents. Very little systematic information is available on the Canadian University president.

Leadership is a primary task of the presidential role. The leadership role is separate from management and control. "Leadership will be a greater problem during the 1980s than inflation, increasing expenses, declining government support, curriculum rebuilding, or declining enrollments" (Fisher, 1984, p.16). The leadership function is to keep all concerned constituencies keenly aware of the purposes, values, and worth of the higher education enterprise. Individual presidents have unusual opportunities, with broad limits on their functions and the opportunity to define their own individual job descriptions. There is an unusual latitude for choice and great responsibility for the choices made since no standard job description controls what an individual president actually does.

Successful presidents generally develop the following pattern of leadership techniques. They assemble a strong group of assistants and delegate to them in substantial ways. A basic rule is not to do anything that others can do satisfactorily, and certainly nothing others can do as well or better. They keep for themselves the essential leadership over goals and priorities, the most essential contacts with board members, faculty, student and alumni leaders, and influential political authorities. They avoid allowing the routine to crowd out the non-routine, allowing others to set the president's personal calendar, allowing paper to substitute for personal contacts, and allowing the immediate and the small to drive

out the long-term and the large (Kerr and Gade, 1986, pp. 56-57).

The process of defining leadership roles in an institution cannot be done just once. The leadership role must be defined by each institution through open and clear communication and these roles should be redefined on a continuing basis.

Over time higher education has drawn more of its resources from public funds. Developments have brought more public involvement in the lives of higher education institutions that were once much more private. Increasing government controls have accompanied the rising flow of money. The government has taken an active interest in access, both for students and for potential faculty members drawn from minority groups and from the ranks of women. Government has become more intrusive into the making of budgets and the expenditure of appropriations. Increasingly more cases are being taken into the courts for decision making where once these decisions would have been made by internal processes.

The public confidence of people running major institutions dropped dramatically after the middle 1960s. This reduced confidence in leadership and has had several important repercussions. As a consequence, authority is less readily accepted and probably more so on campus than in most other institutions. Participatory democracy as a great theme of the student revolts in the late 1960s led to more groups forming, more groups demanding that they be consulted and these groups were demanding a veto on issues they did not like. This has resulted in a significant diminishment of authority for the university president. The opportunities for a free course of action by institutions and by their presidents

have been greatly reduced.

After World War II colleges entered a phase of intense competition and unparalleled opportunity for growth. It was evident from the literature in the 1950s that there was considerable conflict over the issue of presidential leadership in higher education. The later 1950s and early 1960s were a vintage period for most college and university presidencies. It was a good time for founders, planners, builders, and innovators (Kerr & Gade, 1986). Accelerating enrollments called for increased funding, new buildings, and the development of satellite or branch campuses. Public taxes were increased and new sources of revenue were sought to fund increased support for public higher education.

Higher education was a growth industry in the 1960s. A tidal wave of students and several smaller tidal waves of change swept over many institutions. Existing institutions experienced great growth, many new institutions were founded, and changing patterns for both old and new institutions created unusual opportunities for leadership. The late 1950s and early 1960s were among the best times ever for university and college presidents.

This great period of expansion in the early 1960s resulted in a shortage of qualified faculty. Those faculty who had established themselves as outstanding were very much sought after by government research funding agencies as well as other institutions. With the growing number of faculty members in the 1960s faculty power asserted itself in perhaps its most arrogant period of history. This resulted in the transfer of many powers to the faculty. Faculty and student protest was evident on many campuses.

The late 1960s and early 1970s were times of crisis and unrest for many

colleges and universities. A great deal of public attention was drawn to the campus due to the campus demonstrations. The police and local and state officials brought outside interference. The financial situation of universities deteriorated. Because of these processes the university president saw the role change substantially and consequently, the role suffered a great loss of power. The presidential role which was traditionally balanced between mediative and authoritative functions became primarily mediative.

The student revolts of the second half of the 1960s gave a tremendous jolt to the presidencies. Presidents were deposed by students and their faculty allies, indicating a shift in the power of the presidency. Presidential life after these revolts has been forever altered. The rising influence of the student market has made a more gradual and less dramatic impact than the student revolts. The student market has come to dominate academic policy with the freedom to choose among institutions and more freedom to choose among courses because of reduced course requirements. However, the faculty have made the biggest single long-run impact on the presidency (Kerr and Gade, 1986). With the rise of departments and professional schools with their chairs and deans, faculty have asserted control over the requirements for the major, over individual courses, and influence over faculty appointments and promotions. A great deal of academic authority has been given to the faculty. In addition to the authority over the curriculum and the selection and promotion of faculty there is also authority over research, over grades and student discipline, and over teaching loads. Many presidents deliberately build a structure to distance themselves from academic decision making. A positive result of the advance in faculty power and influence

is that faculty who enjoy greater participation in the decision-making process tend to be more involved citizens of the university (Gross and Grambsch, 1974).

The 1970s saw a slowing of growth and resulted in a decline in the number of students. Strikes were becoming commonplace on campuses resulting in many powerful academic leaders being removed from office. The good times of the 1950s and early 1960s gave way to the bad times of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Planners, builders, and innovators gave way to managers and survivors.

The 1980s have been characterized by sharp declines in resources; slower growth has had to be accommodated. Enrollments have been unstable and the economy has been disruptive. Decline encourages conflict and the development of survival skills becomes crucial; placing a significant number of presidents in a survivor category out of harsh necessity. Contradictions and complexities of the role of the president increase under these conditions.

Given the conditions surrounding the position of today's university president, those concerned about the future of post-secondary education can benefit from finding out the personal characteristics, professional attitudes, and leadership behaviors that enhance presidential effectiveness. Studies of presidents in general combined with the study of effectiveness in the presidency add significantly to the understanding of the position.

Statement of the Problem

The selection and training of effective administrators is a pressing problem. There is very little agreement regarding what makes a good administrator. A limited amount of research has been conducted around the determination of the characteristics (behavioral and personal) of effective university presidents. The

information that is available is not derived from Canadian sources. The study of effectiveness in the university presidency is important in distinguishing traits or capacities that characterize successful leaders.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to determine whether behavioral and personal characteristics of presidents of Canadian Universities nominated as effective are different from other presidents. An effective presidential prototype has been identified by James L. Fisher and Martha W. Tack and published in 1988. The Canadian university presidents were divided into two categories: effective and representative. The categories were decided by a peer nomination process. The two categories, effective and representative, were compared with the Fisher/Tack prototype in management behavior and demographic characteristics. Management behavior includes management style, human relations, confidence, social reference and image. Demographic characteristics include professional credentials and experiences, scholarly activities, and personal profiles.

Need for the Study

Higher education needs leaders who are effective, visionary, and unafraid to take risks. These characteristics in leaders need to be identified. Information about factors that contribute to presidential success needs to be available to persons considering a presidency. The availability of such information should help those involved in the presidential selection process to identify personal and leadership characteristics. It adds to the knowledge base available regarding the characteristics considered necessary to serve effectively as a university president. In being able to more suitably select appropriate candidates both society and

higher education will be better served. Those concerned about the future of higher education can benefit from the knowledge of the personal characteristics, professional attitudes, and leadership traits found in the university president.

Information of this nature should be specifically useful to presidents in office who wish to become more effective, to persons who hope to become president, to board members who have the responsibility of selecting the key executive officer, and to higher education administration preparation programs as they educate leaders. The information should also be of interest to those wishing to learn more about general leadership principles.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses stated in operational terms were tested in the null at the .05 significance level:

Management Behaviors

H_1 There is a statistically significant difference between the responses of university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents nominated as effective regarding management style, human relations, confidence, social reference, and the image of the president.

H_2 There is a statistically significant difference between the responses of university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents identified as representative regarding managements style, human relations, confidence, social reference,

and the image of the president.

Demographic Characteristics

H_3 There is a statistically significant difference between university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents nominated as effective regarding professional credentials and scholarly activities.

H_4 There is a statistically significant difference between university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents identified as representative regarding professional credentials and scholarly activities.

Limitations

There were limitations that relate to this particular type of study. These limitations define the capability to extrapolate, extend, and generalize the knowledge gained from this study.

1. This study was limited to the Canadian University presidents who were in office in the year of the study.
2. This study was limited to the data derived from the survey instrument entitled Fisher/Task Effective Leadership Inventory which has been modified for Canadian applicability.
3. The list of presidential role elements presented in the data gathering instrument was not assumed to be exhaustive, however, these elements are those that appeared in Fisher/Tack Effective

Leadership Inventory. For that reason, these elements were deemed to be significant and, therefore, practical for the purposes of this research and study.

4. The study was limited in that results were based on specific dimensions of behavioral responses identified by the instrument and Specific demographic information identified by the instrument.

5. This study did not attempt to develop causality.

Assumptions

Establishing the theoretical base for this study required certain assumptions. The following assumptions were the theoretical base from which the hypotheses were drawn.

1. Studies support the theory that leadership patterns are persistent and relatively stable (Stogdill, 1948, p. 65).

2. Effective leadership patterns can be identified (Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler, 1988).

3. Management style, human relations, confidence, social reference, and image of the president reflect the effectiveness of the leadership characteristics of university presidents (Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler, 1988).

Definition of Terms

Within the context of the research narrative the following definitions apply:

College - can be used to refer to a number of different institutions; can designate part of a university, or institutions of post-secondary education offering

courses below degree level. It may simply be a university residence building or a specialized teaching unit within a university.

Degrees - There are three levels of degrees available at Canadian universities: bachelor's, master's and doctorate. A general (also called pass) bachelor's degree usually requires three years of study. An additional, or fourth year of study, provides a student with an honours degree. The minimum time required for a master's degree after an honours bachelor is one year, while a doctorate takes at least another two years.

Effectiveness - Doing the right things (Drucker, 1967). Activities of vision and judgment (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).

Faculty - members of the university teaching staff.

President - the chief executive officer as established by the Board of Governors responsible for leading a system with degree granting authority in postsecondary education.

Principal - the chief executive officer of the institution; used by some institutions instead of president.

Rector - the head of a university; used by some institutions instead of the terminology of president or principal.

University - used to describe degree-granting institutions and not synonymous with college.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to study effectiveness of the university president, leadership styles have been investigated. Effectiveness as an integrative view of leadership suggests that style (managerial style) and attitude (work motivation) form the process and each has a bearing on the capacity of the individual to respond to the demands of the position. Since there is a large body of literature, the review was limited to those aspects which are directly related to this study. Included are studies of the nature of leadership, effectiveness as competence, and the characteristics of the effective university president.

Theories of Leadership

Early theorists sought to identify traits which distinguished leaders from non-leaders. Comparison studies were done comparing the intellectual, physical, and personality traits of leaders. In very early research Carlyle (1841) advanced the idea that a leader has unique qualities that appeal to the masses. Galton (1879) studied heredity in order to attempt to explain leadership based on unique qualities such as inheritance, traits, or class. Wiggans (1931) suggested that biological aspects due to intermarriage among the aristocracy gave them an ability to survive and this accounted for their leadership. From these theories came the concept that leadership qualities could be identified in terms of personality and character. The trait theory of leadership was developed. Early theorists who explained leadership as being made of personality traits included Bernard (1926), Bingham (1927), Tead (1929), and Kilbourn (1935).

Another developing theory explained leadership as a product of the

environment. Mumford (1907) maintained that leadership will emerge by the virtue of having the abilities and skills enabling the person to solve social problems in times of stress. Murphy (1941) suggested that leadership is the function of the occasion. It was thought that crises such as war would provide opportunities for leaders to emerge.

An interactive approach to leadership combining these two trends explaining leadership deriving from the characteristics of the leader or being based on the demands of the situation grew out of the earlier research. Westburgh (1931) explored these concepts and suggested that leadership was an interactive process combining aspects of both theories. He suggested that leadership results from the successful interaction of particular abilities and traits under certain social conditions. Case (1933) added a third component to the explanation which he called the nature of the group. This theorized that personality traits, the event, and the nature of the group are the components which produce leadership.

Studies of leadership increased and the theoretical base was greatly expanded. Interaction-expectancy theories were developed. Homans (1948) developed a theory of the leadership role using three basic variables: action, interaction, and sentiments. Hemphill (1954) theorized that leadership arises in situations in which component parts of group tasks are dependently related to one another and to the solution of a common problem among group members. According to Stogdill (1948), as group members interact and engage in mutual task performance, they reinforce the expectation that each will continue to act and interact in accord with his previous performance resulting in a role attainment theory. Bass (1960) introduced a reinforced change theory. He proposed that

leadership is the observed effort of one member to change the motivation and understanding of other members or to change their behavior. If a member is successful, a change is observed in other members accepting leadership. A contingency theory was developed by Fiedler (1967). According to this theory the demands imposed by the situation dictate the effectiveness of a given pattern of leader behavior. House (1971) proposed in his path-goal theory of leadership that leaders enhance the psychological states and arouse subordinates to perform and achieve satisfaction from the job to be done. In a multiple screen model Fiedler (1967) suggests and provides empirical evidence to support the hypothesis that various interpersonal factors block or screen the relationship between leader intelligence and group performance. Personal-situational theories were developed by Cattell (1951), Gerth and Mills (1952), Gibb (1954), Stogdill and Shartle (1955), Bennis (1961) and Hollander (1964).

Building on these were the humanistic theories. McGregor (1960, 1966) postulated theories X and Y. Theory X is based on the assumption that people are passive and resistant to organizational needs. Theory Y is based on the assumption that people are motivated and desire responsibility, and that people attempt to arrange organizational conditions in such a manner as to make possible fulfillment of their needs while directing their efforts toward achieving organizational objectives. Argyris (1957, 1962, 1964) advanced the concept that it is the nature of organizations to structure member roles and to control performance in the interest of achieving specified goals, while it is the nature of the individual to be self-directive and to seek personal fulfillment through initiative and responsibility. Leadership was conceptualized by Likert (1961, 1967) as

leaders taking into account values, interpersonal skills, and expectations of those with whom they are interacting. According to Blake and Mouton (1964, 1981), leadership forms a managerial grid on which concern for people represents one axis and concern for production represents the other axis.

Advocates of exchange theory include Homans (1950) and Thibaut and Kelly (1959). The exchange theories are based on the assumption that social interaction represents a form of exchange in which group members make contributions at a cost to themselves and receive returns at a cost to the other group members.

Other theories include behavioral theories, perceptual and cognitive theories, attribution theories and the rational-deductive approach theory (Vroom and Yetton, 1973). Early research in leadership emphasized the identification of leadership traits. This expanded into the research of styles of management. The work of Likert was most important in this field. His exploration of management systems impacted heavily on the research carried out by Blake and Mouton and Hall. The systems perspective which developed in the 1960s resulted in research on leadership which explored the environment, behaviors, and situations. As situational aspects were studied a concept of normative leadership emerged. The literature on leadership theory can be categorized generally into four approaches: traits, leadership styles, leadership situations and behaviors, and normative models.

Literature supportive of the situational model includes research by House (1971) on the Path-Goal theory. Leadership decision-making is viewed situationally. A decision is made that motivates the subordinates towards

organizational goals. The administrator can adjust behavior to clarify the path-goal.

The Normative Model of leadership was based on the premise that the behavior of the leader changes from the results of choices to be made in various situations. The type of problem determines the amount of constituent participation in the problem-solving process. This model developed by Vroom (1973) rejects personality and behavior styles. Vroom, as did Fiedler, assumed that there is not a single leadership style which is appropriate for all situations. Vroom indicated that leaders must develop a variety of styles and adapt an appropriate style for a situation. Integrative models of leadership style indicate there is one best style of leadership while subtractive models conclude there is not one best way.

Hollingworth (1939) found in his study that a leader is likely to be more intelligent than the average of the group led. The leader also exceeded the average in scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibilities, social participation and socioeconomic status. Generally, the leader was regarded as a superior person who possessed qualities and abilities that furthered specific leadership characteristics. This research also found leaders to be the eldest child in a family, taller than average, presented a better appearance, a confident tone and pleasant voice.

In further addressing characteristics, Stogdill (1981) indicated that the personal characteristics should have a relevant relationship to the characteristics of the followers. In studying leaders and their traits Stogdill changed the view of what a leader is. His research countered the concept of a traits approach to

leadership. His research has been cited as support for the theory that leadership is situational in origin and that personal characteristics are not predictive of leadership. Since the middle 20th Century research has emphasized the situational aspect of leadership much more strongly than the personal nature of leadership. It is clear that an analysis of leadership involves not only a study of leaders, but a study of the situation as well.

Many diverse fields of scholarship have yielded studies of leadership. Although various disciplines are represented the research can generally be grouped into psychological, sociological, and behavioral approaches to the analysis of leadership. The psychological approach to the study of leadership recognizes that the behavior of an individual is determined in part by personality structure. Lipham (1964) advocated that leaders are different personality-wise from non leaders. In a sociological approach to the study of leadership the emphasis changes from an analysis of personality traits to a study of the roles and relationships involved. The concern shifts from the characteristics of the individual to the characteristics of the group. A sociological approach asserts that leadership is determined by the requirements of the social system rather than by the characteristics of the individual.

Hemphill (1949) studied situational factors in leadership with an extensive comparison among groups. His study was designed to measure the impact of the leader by distinguishing which groups differ. Groups differed in variables such as size, homogeneity of group members, intimacy and cohesion within the groups. Concepts such as potential leadership, permissive leadership, persuasive leadership, and emergent leadership derived from his studies. From his work it is

recognized that an analysis of leadership cannot be limited to situational factors.

A behavioral approach to the study of leadership acknowledges that both individual and situational variables are significant components of leadership behavior. An important conceptual distinction is made between the leader and the behavior of the leader in the behavioral approach. A substantial body of research supports the behavioral pattern theory.

Three behavioral leadership styles were defined by Getzel and Guba (1957). These include nomothetic - normative, idiographic - personal, and transactional - alternate emphasis. The nomothetic - normative style is perceived as being derived from the nature of the institutional structure rather than in a particular person. The requirements of the institution, the role and the expectations determine the behavior rather than the requirements of the individual and the personality traits of the individual. The idiographic - personal style of leadership derives from the personal dimension of behavior accommodating the personality and the requirements of the individual rather than the role expectations and the requirements of the institution. The transactional - alternate style of leadership is one style under a given set of circumstance and another style under another set of circumstances.

A review of the literature demonstrated that the primary functions of leadership are planning, organizing, and controlling. An analysis of administrative functions provides a more detailed picture of what leaders do. While leadership remains a major component of the work being done, not all of what they do is leadership. MacKenzie (1969) illustrated a wide variety of activities that leaders do. There are many elements, tasks, functions, and activities that are embedded

in an administrative position. These functions of problem analysis, decision making, and communication permeated the entire work process. Additionally, other functions usually occurred in a predictable sequence. These include planning, organizing, staffing and directing. The diversity of activities and the tasks of management preclude the use of any simple approaches to the leadership process.

Power contributes to leadership in organizations and groups. Two interdependent elements of power are motive and resource. Each component is essential and each is difficult to attain. Power has been described and defined by various approaches. Power is seen as the capacity of a person to influence (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Power may be viewed as the tool that enables a person to induce compliance from or influence others. Power manifests itself in many forms. The current definitions of social power, the bases of such power, and how it contributes to leadership in the university presidency were explored in this study.

Two main definitions of power were classified as 1) power as potential social force; and 2) power as potential social exchange (Thibault & Kelly, 1959). Power is presented as an exchange relationship in which one member has either behavioral control or fate control over the behavior of another. Power is also defined as the ability to manipulate or control the activities of other people to serve one's own purposes.

French and Raven (1959) identified five types of power: reward power depending on ability to provide rewards; coercive power based on the perception that the leader can provide penalties for nonconformance; legitimate power based

on the internalization of common norms and values; referent power based on identification with and respect for the leader; and expert power based on competence. Leaders who communicate persuasively are using informational power. The degree to which administrators are able to convince constituents is indicative of the extent of the informational power they possess. When members of the group identify with the leader because of similarity in background or who are perceived as competent, powerful and attractive, the leader has referent power. Referent power gives an individual influence over others who identify with this leader. A leader with a past reputation for being knowledgeable has power based on formal credentials, experience, or success.

Power can be determined by the person or by the position. Personal power can be derived from a variety of sources. It can take the form of a charismatic leader whose ability to lead endows the constituents with motivation and purpose. The charismatic leader has an extraordinary influence over the followers through self-confidence, a sense of purpose, and the ability to verbalize goals and objectives. Charismatic leaders often emerge in times of crises. A democratic leader builds power on an exchange or reciprocal relationship (Adams & Yoder, 1985).

A second important source of power, position, is the degree of legitimate authority that is inherent to the position itself. Presidents of universities have strong positions within a formal structured organization. Since authority is invested in the position itself, some of their influence arises from the position. This is referred to as legitimate power. Many researchers such as Bennis (1970) have come to acknowledge the importance of understanding power relationships

to understanding leadership.

Research suggests that generalizations cannot be made in determining the most influential power base and further indicates that the most appropriate use of power is situation specific. While the research indicates that expert and legitimate power bases seem to be the most important reason for compliance, and that expert and referent power bases are strongly related to subordinate performance and satisfaction measure, the research results are not definitive enough to determine one best power base.

Leadership was conceptualized in terms of a managerial grid by March and Simon (1958) and Blake and Mouton (1964, 1965). On this grid concern for people represented one axis and concern for production represented the other axis in a leadership continuum of either task or people orientation. Further research conceptualized leader behavior with two axes representing consideration and initiating structure dimensions, with four quadrants showing the leadership style from high to low in relation to both dimensions. This conceptualization of the model as a quadrant rather than a continuum influenced future leadership research.

Research results indicate that most managers give direction and tell subordinates how to do the work (autocratic leadership) or share problem solving with the subordinates (democratic leadership). Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) suggested that autocratic leadership and democratic leadership are two halves of a continuum with many possible gradations in between. At one extreme the leader gives directions without explanations and expects compliance. At the opposite extreme the leader abdicates responsibility.

Likert (1961) and his associates at the University of Michigan researched an outstanding project of democratic leadership as opposed to autocratic leadership in the organization. He conceived four systems of interpersonal relationships in large organizations. They included: (1) exploitative autocratic; (2) benevolent autocratic; (3) consultative; and (4) democratic. Likert demonstrated that moving organizations that were 1 and 2 toward 3 and 4 resulted in increased employee productivity and employee satisfaction. Likert's research supported the idea of employee-centered relationships. Concurrently Tannenbaum (1961) found that organizational effectiveness is primarily influenced by the quality of interpersonal relationships between leaders and their constituents.

The literature on academic administration included models of leadership that were similar to the Blake and Mouton Grid styles. Hodgkinson and Meeth (1971) identified four types of academic leaders: autocratic, servant of the faculty, academic leader, and change agent. Bennis (1973) used a grid system to identify several types of academic administrators. The literature on the evaluation of academic administrators identified the criteria for good leadership. Various authors used different terminology but they included the dimensions of concern for people and production. Hillway (1959) surveyed faculty members and found that the desirable leadership style was democratic, while dictatorial, paternalistic traits were undesirable. The empirical research of Skipper (1978) identified effective leader skills as knowledge of position, planning ability, willingness to act, human relations, ethics, and flexibility. Additional research on effective administrators was conducted by Ehrle (1975), Tucker and Mautz (1979), Enarson (1979), and Lutz (1979).

Effectiveness

Effectiveness depends on a relationship between expectations and behavior. The criterion for effectiveness is made up of the expectations held for the behavior. Effectiveness becomes a measure of the agreement of the role behavior and the role expectations. Behavior may be deemed effective at one point in time and ineffective at another, depending on the expectations applied to the behavior. Barnard's (1964) concept of effectiveness refers to the degree of success for the organization. Superior leadership behavior is associated with above-average performance. The significant distinctions of effectiveness may be viewed in terms of relationships. The effectiveness of leaders depends on how their leadership styles interrelate with the situation in which they operate. When the style of a leader was appropriate to a given situation it was perceived to be effective (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Reddin (1970) was the first to add an effectiveness dimension to the earlier attitudinal models. He postulated that styles may be effective or ineffective relative to the event. If the effectiveness of the leadership behavior depends on the situation, all styles of leadership may be effective or ineffective - depending on the situation. The effective president would then be one whose actions are most appropriate most often to the environment in which they occur. It is the interaction of the leadership style with the situation or environment that results in the effectiveness or lack of it. This study does not attempt to measure effectiveness by any criteria other than the peer nomination process. No single ideal leader behavior style is suggested as being appropriate in all situations. Empirical studies tend to show that there is no one best style of leadership, but

that effective leaders adapt their behavior to meet the needs of their constituents and the environmental situation.

Effectiveness is the attainment of goals (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). There is a distinction between leadership and management, with leadership being a broader concept than management. Management was perceived as a special kind of leadership where the objective was to accomplish organizational goals. Theories of leadership have been addressed in a previous section of the review of literature.

Universal principles of a human style of management were discovered in the Hawthorne research and developed later through behavioral science research. Roethlisberger et al. (1939) found that organizations as social systems have dual functions -- production and satisfaction; that the style of supervision and degree of employee involvement have a bearing on these functions; and all these impact on the informal and the formal organizations. Likert's research was based on what he considered to be fundamental principles of Lewin (1939). These and other universal principles of behavioral science from several disciplines formed the basis for what was considered good management. These include: 1) informed choice, 2) shared participation in problem-solving and decision-making, 3) trust, 4) management by goals and objectives, 5) open lines of communication, 6) adequate conflict resolutions, 7) self-responsibility, and 8) efforts applied to work (Blake & Mouton, 1981, pp. 18-22). The work of Hall (1982) and his model of competence provided an integration of these theories. Hall's work was premised on the concept of the competence response which is found in the literature.

As early as 1943 competence motives, managed as motivation processes,

are discussed by Maslow. He suggested that the workplace can be a place of self-actualization for the individual. There was an adaptive fit of the individual to the organization. Management which allowed people to pursue their competence motives was created when the environment and working conditions were conducive to this. Maslow's need hierarchy affirmed that the higher level needs of belonging, ego-status, and actualization were dominant. This was verified in research by Hall (1980).

White (1959) called attention to competence as opposed to incompetence as a motive in organizational behavior. His definition of competence was the key to adaptive fitness which allowed one to respond productivity to demands. White indicated a "competence motive" and provided substantial data that people need to behave in a competent manner for growth and self-enhancement to occur. This was further conceptualized by Maslow (1943), Herzberg (1966), Argyris (1957), McGregor (1960) and later translated into models by Likert (1961), Blake and Mouton (1964) and Hall (1980).

Argyris (1957) studied personality development in the work place. His theory suggested that there was a continuum of self-actualization with seven developmental trends towards maturity. He postulated that organizations under Theory X philosophies prohibit growth and maturity. He stated that unintended activities result from workers who were in conflict with the organization and who were not motivated to achieve organizational goals. He further defined a competent organization as taking human capacities into account and focusing on personality and development.

McGregor (1960, 1967) discussed managerial philosophy as the cornerstone

of managerial competence. He saw it as the key to behavior and performance of the individual. The perception of the manager regarding the relationship between people and their work determined the kind of organizational structures and management strategies thought to be the best way of getting the job done. His theories showed how perceptions about people gave expectations which resulted in particular types of managerial actions.

Herzberg's (1966) model of satisfiers as motivators addressed higher level needs as well. He suggested that the five criteria of job satisfaction were related to content and nature of work, while the five dissatisfiers were related to job context. It is the manager's responsibility to manage for participation, commitment, and creativity by creating the proper context. While participation represented the activities of an organization, commitment was the feelings that were created.

The competence process has a structure and principles of proper sequential management. The structural elements which were needed in the organization were participation which develops heightened commitment on the part of the participants. This paved the way for creativity and gave the response of competence. Donnell (1980) indicated that short-circuiting the competence process was characteristic of low performance organizations.

Presidential Effectiveness

After reviewing the research regarding the characteristics of effective university presidents, most of the information found related to identifying roles and functions. Bolman (1965), Ferrari (1970) and Cohen and March (1986) provided data about presidential profiles. Nason (1980) and Fisher and Quehl

(1984) wrote about presidential evaluation. There were a few studies on effective institutions by Astin and Scherrei (1980), Gilley, Fulmer, and Reithlingshoefer (1986), and Whetten and Cameron (1985). The relationship that should exist between the president and the board of trustees was explored by Kerr (1984). Presidential selection procedures were presented by Nason (1984); the concept of leadership and ambiguity by Cohen and March (1986); the use of power in the presidency and a variety of other items by Fisher (1984).

Various position papers have been developed on presidential effectiveness, but empirical research on the topic is limited. A noteworthy study was completed by Pruitt (1974) and another by Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988). Pruitt's work with 25 presidents generated conclusions about the personal and professional characteristics of effective chief executive officers. A limitation of Pruitt's study was that he did not study differences in the leadership behaviors. Until the study by Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler, no research involving more than 50 presidents had been conducted to determine why university presidents are considered to be effective. The two-year study examined the personal characteristics, professional backgrounds, and attitudinal differences that personified 412 persons identified by their peers as the most effective presidents in the United States. Pruitt and the Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler study served as prototypes for this research effort.

Additionally, Benezet, Katz, and Magnusson (1981) explored the intricacies and human dynamics of the presidency. Researchers at George Mason University identified and studied 20 institutions that were established as innovative and successful. As part of this study conclusions were drawn about the characteristics of the presidents (Gilley et al., 1986).

Several scholars have provided a framework for ideas about effectiveness. Drucker (1967) defined effectiveness as doing the right things, whereas efficiency is doing things right. Bennis and Nanus (1985) wrote:

> No clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders,and perhaps more important, what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders ...(p.4)

The same authors added that effectiveness is activities of vision and judgment and is the mastering of routines.

The definitions of effectiveness often created ambiguity. Many scholars argued that everything, including effectiveness, was relative. The situational theory of leadership suggested that conducting research on characteristics of effective leaders is futile. However, Stogdill (1948) emphasized the value of such studies:

> ... studies which provide the strongest arguments for the situational nature of leadership also supply the strongest evidence indicating that leadership patterns as well as non-leadership patterns of behavior are persistent and relatively stable. (p.65)

A review of the literature on effective leadership produced studies which first identified the characteristics of successful organizations. From this information the researchers drew conclusions about the individual leaders of the organizations. The studies (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Whetten & Cameron, 1985) assumed that the effective organization was established by an effective leader and that by studying the organization, you were in fact studying the leader.

In the extensive study on effective university presidents done by Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) the following characteristics of effective presidents were identified:

* Less collegial and more distant
* Less likely to be spontaneous in speech and actions
* Less restricted by organizational structure or by the consensus of those to be led
* Less likely to appear to make decisions easily
* More confident
* More inclined to rely on gaining respect than on being liked
* More inclined to take calculated risks
* More committed to an ideal or a vision than to an institution
* More inclined to work long hours

In analyzing the literature on effective leaders certain characteristics emerged. Successful presidents had high self-esteem. An inner security was established which manifested itself as confidence in competence on the job. A sense of self-worth and personal identity engendered respect from constituents. Self-confidence enabled presidents to stand apart from the group and to handle the loneliness of the job at the top (Tead, 1951; Greenleaf, 1977). This presidential image of self confidence was not left to chance. Effective leaders managed their image of confidence which increased subordinate compliance and faith in them. The confidence image was increased by success. Whetten and Cameron (1985) indicated that effective leaders focus on winning; they developed resistance to failure. They avoided taking excessive risks that produced an image of irresponsibility. While agreeing that effective leaders believed in winning, Kotter (1982) cautioned that an overly confident attitude must be kept in perspective. Strong and successful leaders can foolishly think they are invincible. This syndrome can destroy the careers of those who do not manage their success. Presidents must maintain a maturity of outlook and control their egos in order to continue to make appropriate decisions. Stogdill (1948) indicated that great

leaders were not typically modest people. They were extremely self-confident. Successful leaders believed in their ability to get things done, they focused on winning and did so consistently.

Due to the nature of their position presidents interact with the public domain. According to Gilley et al. (1986) and Peters and Waterman (1982) effective presidents engendered confidence by being seen frequently at public functions, both on campus and in the outside world. Fisher (1984) wrote extensively about the importance of presidential visibility to effectiveness. Mortimer and McConnell (1978) pointed out that administrators which are not visible will become targets of hostility and Cox (1985) substantiated this concept with the idea that presidents who are not visible are ultimately harmful to the university.

Effective presidents recognize that visibility, when properly managed, enhances their effectiveness and develops confidence in themselves and their institutions. Dressel (1981) said that too much visibility for the president when it does not showcase the institution can be detrimental to the president because it can produce feelings of distrust. The motivation of this type of behavior can be called into question. Astin and Scherrei (1980) admonished presidents to share visibility and success with others as a means of enhancing their leadership. Through acknowledging the accomplishments of others constituent loyalty is developed. Chief executive officers are called upon to make difficult and far-reaching decisions. They must have the courage, inner strength, and intelligence of make these decisions. Cox (1985) stated that the executive achiever must be willing to make bold decisions. Kotter (1977) added prudence to the act

of risk-taking. Dressel (1985) indicated that administrators must take risks and be decisive if they are going to be effective. Several other authors support risk taking as an important component of effectiveness. They include Argyris and Cyert (1980), Carbone (1981), Enarson (1984), Fisher (1984), Peters and Austin (1985), Townsend (1985), and Whetton and Cameron (1985).

A very important characteristic for effectiveness in the presidency is good human relations skills. Compassion, persuasion, and communication skills help develop and maintain a feeling of trust. When there is trust consituent members work enthusiastically to achieve mutually established goals. Leading a university is a people business, therefore, human relations skills are essential. They must be experts in dealing with people. Gilley et al. (1986) found that effective presidents were people oriented. Other authors emphasizing the necessity for effective presidents to be humanistic and compassionate include Prator (1963), Hesburgh (1979), Fisher (1984), and Wakin (1985). The effective president, as explained by Townsend (1985), looks for the very best in people.

Increasingly, presidents must have good communication skills in order to gain the support of all constituents, both internal and external. As leaders, they should enable employees to think, perform effectively, and take necessary risks which would have a positive impact on their motivation to succeed.

In the act of communicating, the social and psychological distance of the office of the president must not be lost. Various researchers confirm the importance of maintaining distance between leaders and groups. Among these are Fiedler (1955), Shaw (1965), and Richman and Farmer (1974). Many difficulties are avoided when leaders maintain social distance. Fisher (1986)

maintained that it was important not to behave as if there was a colleague who happened to be president and to maintain social distance to preserve the legitimacy of the office. Respect is far more important to the effective president than popularity. Whether a president leans more toward privacy in dealing with constituents can dramatically affect the style of governance. When faculty respect the president it certainly promotes the president's ability to accomplish the mission of the office (Prator, 1963).

Earlier literature (Pray, 1979) suggested that effective presidents should be friends with their associates but that the issue of friendship is one of degree and that the president should not become a buddy. Later researchers strongly advocated a distance between familiarity and privacy. Fisher (1984) suggested that presidents should never get off the presidential platform with anyone that knows them as president. Dressel (1981) advocated maintaining social and psychological distance. Presidents often have few close friends and must be able to deal effectively with loneliness.

Effective leaders are accountable to their constituents, concerned for equality among individuals, equity in the workplace and straightforward and upright in their dealings with other people. They use honesty to build trust (Wenrick, 1980). Stogdill (1948) established a relationship between good leadership and the personal integrity of the leader. Argyris and Cyert (1980) and Kamm (1982) further promoted the concept of integrity affecting the leadership potential of the president. Peters and Austin (1985) confirmed that integrity must be present to enhance the leadership position. A reciprocal arrangement of trust is essential between the president and the constituent groups which are served by

the institution. Reliability and predictability are essential factors in the development of that trust.

Personal and physical characteristics have impact on the leadership styles of presidents. Effective presidents have been identified as more inclined to work long hours (Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler, 1988). A high energy level, enthusiasm and dedication enable the accomplishment of long work hours. They are willing to spend inordinate amounts of time on their responsibilities. Wells (1980) in his reflections on the presidency said that extraordinary effort was exhilarating. McClelland and Burnham (1976) suggested that effective leaders work long hours because they enjoy their work. Cohen and March (1986) found that chief executive officers work approximately 60 hours a week. Samartino (1982) cautioned against excessive work time and advocates a balance between work and leisure. Some of the personal characteristics that have been identified as being important to maintaining the gruelling schedule of the presidency include keeping a sense of humor and not taking themselves too seriously (Carbone, 1981; Cox, 1985; & Townsend, 1985).

Kotter (1982) concluded that effective leaders begin their jobs with concepts and early in the job develop specific agendas to focus the organization. Peck (1983) found that presidents have a clear sense of what their institutions are and what they want them to become. Effective presidents have to have the concept of what the future of the institution is to be and must use their abilities to move the institution along that course. This is done by exercising creativity, using intelligence, and being idealistic (Whetten, 1984).

In assessing the leadership styles, Wells (1980), advised academic

administrators to lead rather than to command. Shared governance is a pattern that is frequently identified in the literature. This type of administration allows faculty participation in decision making (Dressel, 1981; Kamm, 1982). Fisher (1984) advised presidents to seek expert advice but cautions that a leader is compromised when they are perceived to be led rather than leading. Authors that recommended participation by faculty cautioned that authority and final responsibility must remain with the president. Pruitt (1974) advocated consensus building by involving constituents in the process of governance but stopped short of advocating a completely democratic leadership style.

Astin and Scherrei (1980) identified five administrative styles used by four presidential types. The administrative styles they identified were humanistic, hierarchical, entrepreneurial, insecure, and task-oriented. The presidential types are the intellectual, the bureaucrat, the non-authoritarian-egalitarian, and the counselor. The counselor-type was perceived to be the most satisfactory by using humanism and a personal approach to administration. Effective presidents believe in participatory decision making but understand that the ultimate responsibility for the decision is theirs. They seek input from those who will be affected by the decisions and use this information to make the best possible decisions (Kotter, 1982). Effective leaders are receptive to information and suggestions, however, the leader may not always be able to follow the advice (Dressel, 1981). Administrators have to make decisions, with or without consensus, after deliberating the information. Kotter (1977) acknowledged that effective leaders have a great deal of power and influence over the lives of other people. He admonished that leaders should not use this power incorrectly. Personal gain must

not be a goal. Maturity and wisdom must be used in exercising the power of the office. Some researchers considered the use of power in academic settings as inappropriate but most acknowledge that the creative use of power is a quality that separates the effective leader from the typical or representative.

Dressel (1981) summarized the successful president as

> approachable, articulate, attractive (in appearance and personality), charismatic, confident, considerate, decisive, deliberate, emphatic, fair, firm, flexible, imaginative, persuasive, rational, reliable, sensitive, self-assured, sympathetic, tactful, and tolerant. In addition to this profusion of adjectives, such phrases as sense of humility, concern for quality, awareness and acknowledgement of personal and institutional weaknesses, inspires confidence, listens attentively, and morale builder appear frequently. (p.196)

Effective presidents are able to lead because of their appreciation for and understanding of the cause of higher education. They believe that higher education does make a difference to individuals and society. They understand why universities were created, supported, and held in such high regard. Fisher (1984) said the future of the university rests on the decisive leadership of university presidents. The leader is perceived to be the critical ingredient in the success of failure of the institution.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The central theory of this study was that the personal characteristics, professional backgrounds, and attitudinal differences identify the level of leadership effectiveness of the persons holding the positions of Canadian university president. A peer nomination process was used to divide the group into effective and representative presidents. A survey instrument created by James L. Fisher and Martha W. Tack called the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory was administered to those persons holding positions of University president in Canada. This approach enabled the researcher to compare the nominated effective Canadian university president and the representative Canadian university president with the Fisher/Tack effective presidential profile.

The researcher surveyed several instruments and selected the Fisher/Tack Inventory because it appeared to give greater latitude in obtaining the information needed to test hypotheses related to what constitutes effectiveness in university presidents. The instrument provides an analysis of the Management Style Index, Human Relations Index, Image Index, Social Reference Index, and Confidence Index. The information drawn from this instrument was analyzed through the use of a variety of statistical methods and this statistical manipulation was used to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance.

Study Design

The design of the study was non-experimental. No experimental or control group was used. The researcher used survey research to compare and contrast

university presidents with results from a previous study. The dependent variables came from the responses to attitudinal and perception questions. The independent variables were the demographics. Those presidents nominated as effective were compared to similar presidents in the original study.

Population

The Commonwealth Universities Yearbook lists fifty-eight universities in Canada. The presidents of these fifty-eight universities comprise the population from which this study derived. A list of these institutions is included in the Appendix. Two institutions were deleted from the study because the position of president was filled on an interim basis.

The population is comprised of a group of individuals who lead a variety of types of institutions. Historically, a high proportion of the universities of Canada were begun by churches and some were still under church auspices. Included in this category were: Saint Mary's University and Mount St. Vincent University in Halifax, Nova Scotia; and University of Waterloo in Ontario. A good many of the universities which began under church control became secular institutions, particularly during the present century. Another large number of universities in Western Canada were established by the provinces and were commonly referred to as provincial universities, a term roughly equivalent to the state universities of the United States. Examples of this type of university included the University of British Columbia and the University of Saskatchewan. A third type of university was represented by institutions which were not established by either church or state but were created by interested groups of citizens. Examples of these were McGill University in Montreal, Dalhousie University in Halifax, and Carleton

University in Ottawa.

The language of instruction in most Canadian universities is English. L'Universite Laval and l'Universite de Moncton are among those French language universities. There were a few universities in which both English and French were languages of instruction. These included the University of Ottawa and Laurentian University of Sudbury. In addition to the variation induced by language and religion, variation was induced by these major influences: pre-revolutionary France, Oxford, Cambridge, London, the Scottish universities, the American liberal arts college, and in the west in particular, the American land-grant college.

In Canada post-secondary education was the responsibility of the province and as such, there was no "system" of post-secondary education. Canadian universities have enjoyed a remarkable degree of autonomy, and although the degree granting institutions which developed in the last few years tended to be more regulated by the provincial governments, they were developed without much regard for the overall system. There was great variety in Canada's universities and the country lacked a national system. National policies or plans for higher education did not include a federal ministry of education because education was a provincial responsibility.

In the majority of cases the leader of these institutions was called the president. However, the terms principal and rector were sometimes used to designate the chief executive officer responsible for leading the institution. The total population excluding the two interim presidents, consisted of fifty-six persons.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used to gather the data was a self-report inventory

with three sections. It was chosen because it dealt specifically with university presidents. Part I was a series of statements containing forty items to which respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of themselves as leaders. A five-point Likert scale using 1 as "strongly agree" and 5 as "strongly disagree" was used. Unanswered questions were assigned the value of 3 and designated as "undecided".

In Part II a series of questions was used to elicit professional data. This category included information relative to degrees earned, previous experience, scholarly activity, and current position.

Part III was used to collect demographic data including age, sex, race, religious preference, marital and familial data, political affiliation, place of birth, current residence, and parent's education.

The Fisher/Tack inventory was modified to reflect Canadian content. This modification included deletion of Institutional Codes, the changing of geographical terminology from state to province, and description of political affiliation to reflect Canadian political parties.

The information provided by the instrument allowed the researcher to do a comparative analysis of the personal attitudes and leadership styles of effective presidents as identified by Fisher/Tack and the personal attitudes and leadership styles of Canadian university presidents who were nominated as effective and identified as representative.

Validity-Reliability

In the original study Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was used to determine internal consistency for the factors. Reliability coefficients were as follows:

Management Study Index, alpha = .63; Human Relations Index, alpha = .51; Image Index, alpha = .52; and Social Reference Index, alpha = .10.

Data Collection

A letter explaining the purpose of the study, along with a nomination sheet and a stamped self-addressed envelope, was mailed to the fifty-six persons holding the position of university president in Canada. The complete population was originally included in the study. Each president was requested to indicate from the list of presidents the five most effective university presidents in the country. No preconceived definition of the term "effective" was offered in order not to place restrictions or personal biases. The nominations were indicated by checking the names on the list of presidents. After two weeks a follow-up letter with another nomination sheet was forwarded to those who had not responded. When the nominations were returned and tallied random cut points were established to determine the number of the population in the effective category.

The anonymity of the respondent was safeguarded by the use of code numbers. The names and codes were kept in a secured place and were destroyed when the survey was complete. Neither the name of the president nor the institution was associated with responses.

The second mailing included the Fisher/Tack Leadership Effectiveness Inventory (FTLEI) along with a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. After two weeks a follow-up letter with another FTLEI was forwarded to those who had not responded.

Data Analysis

The data were processed using appropriate statistical methods according to

type and number of groups to be compared. Appropriate descriptive statistics for all variables were done. Measures of central tendency and dispersion were calculated for responses to Part I.

T-tests were used to test the hypotheses. T-tests were used to determine differences in mean scores. Significance was calculated at the .05 probability level. The differences between groups were determined for the following:

Leadership styles
- Effective Canadian - Effective U.S.
- Representative Canadian - Representative U.S.
- Representative Canadian - Effective U.S.
- Effective Canadian - Representative Canadian
- Total Canadian - Total U.S.

Professional credentials
- Effective Canadian - Effective U.S.
- Effective U.S. - Representative Canadian
- Effective Canadian - Representative Canadian

Scholarly activities
- Effective Canadian - Effective U.S.
- Effective U.S. - Representative Canadian
- Effective Canadian - Representative Canadian

Summary

The methods and procedures used to carry out this study are addressed in this chapter. Reasons for selecting the instrument are identified. The design of the study is discussed. The population is defined along with the types of institutions from which this population derives. Details of the survey instrument are covered and the methods of data collection and analysis are given. The following chapter will present the results of the statistical findings.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Chapter IV presents the results of the statistical findings. These results are presented in two sections, descriptive statistical results to describe the sample and results of inferential statistical tests to answer the research hypotheses.

The respondents were nominated through a process to determine which university presidents were considered effective. In accordance with the research design, a letter explaining the study and the peer nomination process was sent to fifty-six Canadian university presidents. The Commonwealth Universities Yearbook lists fifty-eight universities in Canada. These fifty-eight universities comprised the population from which this study derived.. At the time the data was gathered two universities were headed by interim presidents. These two universities were deleted from the study resulting in a population of fifty-six Canadian university presidents. A list of these institutions is included in Appendix D. Nominations were requested from presidents listed in the Commonwealth Universities Yearbook. A list of presidents in this publication was forwarded to each president as a reference list. Each president was requested to indicate with a check mark the five presidents considered to be the most effective university presidents in Canada. No preconceived definition of the term "effective" was offered in order not to place restrictions or facilitate personal biases. The choices were not rank ordered.

The first mailing of the nomination process produced thirty-five responses and the second mailing produced fifteen responses for a total of fifty responses.

This provided a response rate of 89%. The results of the peer nomination process are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

PEER NOMINATION

Number of Votes	Number of Presidents
0	16
1- 5	29
6-10	7
11-15	2
16-20	0
21-25	0
26-30	2

Forty presidents received at least one nomination. The number of nominations ranged from one to twenty-eight. Two presidents received twenty-six and twenty-eight nominations and the next highest number was thirteen. Seven presidents received ten or more nominations while sixteen received no nominations. For purposes of this study those presidents receiving seven or more nominations were considered to be the effective category. Nine presidents or 16% were in this group. The remaining 84% were labelled the representative group.

All of the university presidents in Canada were sent surveys for completion. Six of the nine presidents who were nominated as effective and thirty-one of the forty-seven university presidents considered representative responded. This provided a response rate of 67% of the effective and 66% of the representative.

Crosstabulations of each of the demographic variables by group membership were performed. The results of these analyses are presented on the following tables. For purposes of this study demographic variables were broken down by type of respondent.

The first personal data question the university presidents were asked to respond to was their current age. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 2.

Table 2

CROSSTABULATION OF AGE BY GROUP

Age of Respondent	Nominated	Representative	Total
Under 45	0	1	1
46-50	2	5	7
51-55	2	11	13
56-60	2	8	10
61 and over	0	6	6
Total	6	31	37

Table 2 displays the results of the analysis of age by nominated or representative group membership. The university presidents who were nominated effective were evenly distributed between 46 and 60 years of age. One of the representative presidents was less than 45 and 6 were older than 61. Of the thirty-one presidents who were considered representative, three were less than 50 years old. Due to the small sample size, chi square analysis on this data was not

performed to determine if the differences in age was significant. The second question regarding personal characteristics of the respondents was to determine the sex of the respondent. The results of this question are found in Table 3.

Table 3

CROSSTABULATION OF SEX BY GROUP

Sex of Respondent	Nominated	Representative	Total
Male	6	30	36
Female	0	1	1
Total	6	31	37

A review of the data in Table 3 revealed that thirty-six of the thirty-seven respondents were male. One female participated in the study. All respondents in the nominated category were male.

Each respondent was asked to identify their race. An analysis of the ethnicity of the population is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

CROSSTABULATION OF ETHNICITY OF RESPONDENT BY GROUP

Ethnicity of Respondent	Nominated	Representative	Total
Caucasian	6	29	35
Spanish/ Hispanic	0	2	2
Total	6	31	37

All of the nominated group listed their race as Caucasian. The representative group was made up of twenty-nine or 94% Caucasians and two or 6% Spanish/Hispanic ethnicity. No other ethnic groups were indicated by the respondents.

A question to determine the religious preference of the respondent was asked. The question was to determine if there is a difference of religious preference between the nominated and the representative president. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

CROSSTABULATION OF RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE BY GROUP

Religion of Respondent	Nominated	Representative	Total
Jewish	1	1	2
Roman Catholic	1	8	9
Protestant	2	20	22
Refused to Answer	2	2	4
Total	6	31	37

The predominant religious preference was Protestant. Twenty-two presidents or 59% gave their religious preference as Protestant. Roman Catholic was the preference given by nine presidents or 24% of the respondents. Two nominated and two representative presidents refused to answer. The only other religious preference indicated was Jewish with two respondents, a nominated and

a representative president, indicating this preference.

In the sixth question of the demographic information sheet the marital status of the respondent was requested. This crosstabulation is provided in Table 6.

Table 6

CROSSTABULATION OF MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BY GROUP

Marital Status	Nominated	Representative	Total
Never Married	0	2	2
Now Married	6	29	35
Total	6	31	37

Of those responding, two have never married and thirty-five of the thirty-seven respondents are now married. All of those in the nominated category are now married. The two respondents who have never been married are in the representative category.

Thirty-five of the respondents indicated they had been or were now married. These respondents were asked to indicate the number of times they had been married. Results of this analysis are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

CROSSTABULATION OF NUMBER OF MARRIAGES BY GROUP

Number of Marriages	Nominated	Representative	Total
0		1	1
1	6	22	28
2	0	4	4
4	0	1	1
	6	28	34

Three of the respondents failed to indicate the number of marriages. All of the nominated presidents had one marriage and twenty-two or 65% of the representative had one marriage. Four of the representative had two marriages. One representative president had never been married and one representative president had been married four times.

The thirty-five respondents who had indicated they were married were asked to give the occupation of their spouse. Since thirty-six of the thirty-seven respondents in the study were male the occupation of the spouse would be the occupation of the wife in all but one situation. These results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

CROSSTABULATION OF SPOUSES' OCCUPATION BY GROUP

Occupation of Spouse	Nominated	Representative	Total
Professional	3	15	18
Homemaker	2	11	13
Other	0	3	3
Total	5	29	34

The occupation of the spouse was in the professional category for eighteen of the respondents or 53%. The category of homemaker was given for thirteen or 38% of the respondents. Three of the nominated and fifteen of the representative respondents had a spouse with a professional occupation.

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of children they had. The results are found in Table 9.

Table 9

CROSSTABULATION OF NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY GROUP

Number of Children	Nominated	Representative	Total
0	0	2	2
1	0	1	1
2	3	6	9
3	2	10	12
4	0	5	5
5+	1	5	6
Total	6	29	35

Missing = 2

The number of children ranged from zero to more than five. All of the nominated presidents had children and twenty-seven of the twenty-nine representative respondents had children. Sixty per cent of the respondents had two or three children. One of the nominated presidents and five of the representative presidents had five or more children.

The province or foreign country of birth was determined. Respondents were asked to list their place of birth. The results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

CROSSTABULATION OF AREA OF BIRTH BY GROUP

Place of Birth	Nominated	Representative	Total
British Columbia	0	3	3
Alberta	0	3	3
Saskatchewan	1	1	2
Manitoba	1	2	3
Ontario	1	7	8
Quebec	1	4	5
Nova Scotia	0	2	2
Newfoundland	0	1	1
Pakistan	0	1	1
New Zealand	0	1	1
U.S.A.	0	1	1
The Netherlands	0	1	1
United Kingdom	1	2	3
Total	5	29	34

Missing = 3

Eight of the ten Canadian provinces were given as birthplace as well as the countries of Pakistan, New Zealand, United States, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. Ontario was the birthplace of eight or 24% of the total respondents. None of the five nominated respondents had a birthplace in common. Quebec was the second most frequently indicated place of birth. The population of this study consisted of the Canadian university presidents in office at

the time of the study. The province of current residence would coincide with the location of the university. The crosstabulation provides a comparison of the location of the nominated respondent with the representative respondent.

The province of current residence was asked of the respondent. The information shown in Table 11 provides a geographical comparison of the location of nominated and representative respondents.

Table 11

CROSSTABULATION OF PROVINCE OF CURRENT RESIDENCE BY GROUP

Province of Current Residence	Nominated	Representative	Total
British Columbia	1	2	3
Alberta	0	4	4
Saskatchewan	0	2	2
Manitoba	1	1	1
Ontario	1	10	11
Quebec	1	3	4
New Brunswick	1	0	1
Nova Scotia	1	7	8
Prince Edward Island	0	1	1
Newfoundland	0	1	1
Total	6	31	37

Each of the six nominated respondents came from a different province. Canada is represented from the East Coast to the West Coast. Respondents were

asked to identify their political affiliation. The results are found in Table 12.

Table 12

CROSSTABULATION OF POLITICAL AFFILIATION BY GROUP

Political Affiliation	Nominated	Representative	Total
None	3	2	5
NDP	0	1	1
Liberal	0	6	6
PC	0	4	4
Other	0	4	4
Refused to Answer	3	14	17
Total	6	31	37

Respondents were reluctant to identify a political affiliation. Twenty-two respondents or 59% refused to answer or gave their political affiliation as none. One hundred per cent of the nominated respondents gave no political affiliation. Six representative respondents listed the Liberal Party, four representative respondents listed the Progressive Conservative Party, and one representative respondent listed the National Democratic Party.

The educational background of parents was studied. The formal education of both father and mother was asked of the respondent. The father's education level is found in Table 13 and the education level of the mother is found in Table 14.

Table 13

CROSSTABULATION OF FATHER'S EDUCATION BY GROUP

Father's Education	Nominated	Representative	Total
Less than High School	1	10	11
Some High School	3	7	10
High School Diploma	1	6	7
College Courses	0	2	2
Bachelors Degree	1	1	2
Masters Degree	0	2	2
Doctoral Degree	0	3	3
Total	6	31	37

The educational level of the fathers of the nominated respondents did not go beyond the level of a Bachelors degree. Two-thirds or 66% of the nominated respondents indicated the father's education as less than a high school diploma. The representative respondents indicated a higher level of educational attainment for the father. Two representative respondents or 6% indicated the educational level of the father to be a Masters Degree and three representative respondents or 10% indicated the educational level of the father to be a Doctoral Degree. Ten representative respondents or 32% listed the educational level of the father as less than high school.

In contrast to the educational level of the fathers, no mother's education

went beyond Post-Bachelors study. There were no Masters Degrees nor Doctoral Degrees attained by the mothers.

Table 14

CROSSTABULATION OF MOTHER'S EDUCATION BY GROUP

Mother's Education	Nominated	Representative	Total
Less than High School	1	11	12
Some High School	0	7	7
High School Diploma	3	7	10
College Courses	1	2	3
Bachelors Degree	1	3	4
Post-Bachelor	0	1	1
Total	6	31	37

On the lower end of the educational scale the educational level of the father and mother was fairly consistent. Eleven or 30% of the fathers had less than a high school education and twelve or 32% of the mothers had less than a high school education. None of the mothers had degrees beyond the Bachelors Degree while five or 14% had fathers with degrees beyond the Bachelors Degree.

For the nominated respondents the educational level of the mother was slightly higher than the educational level of the father. Five of the mothers of the nominated respondents or 83% had a high school diploma or more while two or

33% of the fathers of the nominated respondents had a high school diploma or more.

The number of siblings of the respondents were studied. The number of younger brothers, younger sisters, older brothers and older sisters were crosstabulated. These results are found in Tables 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Table 15

CROSSTABULATION OF YOUNGER BROTHERS BY GROUP

Number of Younger Brothers	Nominated	Representative	Total
0	3	12	15
1	3	10	13
2	0	6	6
3	0	2	2
7	0	1	1
Total	6	31	37

Fifteen of the total respondents or 41% had no younger brothers. Fifty per cent of the nominated respondents had no younger brothers and the other 50% of the nominated respondents had one younger brother. The range for the number of younger brothers for the representative respondents was from zero to seven. Twelve representative respondents or 39% had no younger brothers while one representative respondent had seven younger brothers.

The numbers for younger sisters are fairly consistent with those for younger brothers. The number of younger sisters is in Table 16.

Table 16

CROSSTABULATION OF YOUNGER SISTERS BY GROUP

Number of Younger Sisters	Nominated	Representative	Total
0	4	13	17
1	2	12	14
2	0	3	3
3	0	2	2
5	0	1	1
Total	6	31	37

Forty-six per cent of the total respondents had no younger sisters. Thirty-one or 84% of the total respondents had one or no younger sisters. One representative respondent had five younger sisters.

Table 17

CROSSTABULATION OF OLDER BROTHERS BY GROUP

Number of Older Brothers	Nominated	Representative	Total
0	3	22	25
1	3	7	10
3	0	1	1
6	0	1	1
Total	6	31	37

Twenty-five respondents or 68% had no older brothers. The nominated respondents were evenly divided with 50% having one older brother and 50% having no older brothers. One representative respondent had six older brothers.

There were fewer older sisters than older brothers. While 68% of the total respondents had no older brothers, 73% had no older sisters. The results are in Table 18.

Table 18

CROSSTABULATION OF OLDER SISTERS BY GROUP

Number of Older Sisters	Nominated	Representative	Total
0	5	22	27
1	1	4	5
2	0	4	4
4	0	1	1
Total	6	31	37

One nominated respondent had one older sister while the remainder or 83% of the nominated respondents had no older sisters. The highest number of older sisters was four, with one representative respondent having four older sisters.

Professional Background

The educational background and work related experiences were studied to determine whether there were differences in the experiences of effective and representative presidents. Several questions regarding these two areas were asked. The university presidents were asked to provide information regarding

their professional backgrounds to develop profiles of both the nominated and representative groups.

The respondents were asked about the types of degrees earned. First, they were asked if they had a doctorate degree and this question was followed by type of degree. This information is crosstabulated in Table 19.

Table 19

CROSSTABULATION OF DOCTORAL DEGREE BY GROUP

Doctorate	Nominated	Representative	Total
yes	5	27	32
no	1	4	5
Total	6	31	37

Thirty-two respondents or 86% of the total respondents held doctoral degrees. Eighty-three per cent of the nominated respondents held doctoral degrees while 73% of the representative respondents did. The thirty-two respondents who indicated that they held a doctorate degree were asked to indicate the type of degree. The research indicated that no presidents held EdDs and there were very few university presidents with professional degrees in areas such as law, medicine, and theology. The results of the type of doctoral degree are in Table 20.

Table 20

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF DOCTORATE BY GROUP

Type of Doctorate	Nominated	Representative	Total
Ph.D.	4	24	28
JD	0	2	2
MD	0	1	1
Other	1	0	1
Total	5	27	32

Most nominated respondents indicated that they hold the PhD. Representative respondents also follow this general pattern. The respondents were asked to indicate whether their doctoral degree granting institution was a public or a private institution. The results are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION FOR DOCTORAL DEGREE BY GROUP

Type of Institution	Nominated	Representative	Total
Public	5	17	22
Private	0	10	10
Total	5	27	32

All of the nominated respondents received their doctoral degrees from public institutions. The representative respondents were much more evenly

divided with seventeen respondents or 63% receiving their doctoral degree from public institutions and 37% receiving their doctoral degree from private institutions.

The respondents were asked to identify their major area of study for the doctoral degree. This question was asked to determine if there were any differences between nominated and representative presidents in their choice of major areas of study. The results of this question are shown in Table 22.

Table 22

CROSSTABULATION OF MAJOR AREA OF STUDY BY GROUP

Major Area of Study	Nominated	Representative	Total
Social Science	2	0	2
Business	0	2	2
Law	0	2	2
Medicine	1	1	2
Engineering	0	4	4
Liberal Arts	1	6	7
Science	0	6	6
Education	0	5	5
No Major Given	2	5	7
Total	6	31	37

More presidents held doctorates in liberal arts than any other major. This was followed closely by science in second place with education in the third highest

position. Engineering was the fourth most frequent choice. Social Science was the most frequent choice for the nominated respondents and liberal arts and science were chosen equally by the representative respondents. Other major areas of study included business, law, and medicine.

Degrees preceding the doctoral degree were looked at to determine a more complete educational picture of the persons holding the position of university president. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had a Master's degree and if so, the type of degree. These results are in Tables 23 and 24.

Table 23

CROSSTABULATION OF MASTER'S DEGREE BY GROUP

Master's Degree	Nominated	Representative	Total
Yes	6	27	33
No	0	3	3
Total	6	30	36

Missing = 1

All of the nominated respondents had received a Master's degree. Ninety per cent of the representative respondents had received a Master's degree. One representative respondent had by-passed the Master's degree and gone directly into doctoral work. The type of degree obtained is shown in Table 24.

Table 24

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF MASTER'S DEGREE BY GROUP

Type of Master's Degree	Nominated	Representative	Total
MA	4	8	12
MBA	0	1	1
MS	2	15	17
MEd	0	2	2
MFA	0	2	2
Total	6	28	34

Missing = 2

Seventeen of the total respondents or 50% had MS degrees. The nominated respondents had MA and MS degrees with 66% having MAs and 33% having the MS. Other degrees held by the respondents included the MBA, MEd, and MFA. The type of institution from which these Master's degrees were obtained is crosstabulated in Table 25.

Table 25

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION FOR MASTER'S DEGREE BY GROUP

Type of Institution	Nominated	Representative	Total
Public	5	19	24
Private	1	8	9
Total	6	27	33

Missing = 3

The majority of the respondents had received their Master's degree from a public institution. This is typical of the pattern expressed at the doctoral level. The respondents were asked to identify the major area of study at the Master's level. These results are in Table 26.

Table 26

CROSSTABULATION OF MASTER'S DEGREE MAJOR AREA OF STUDY BY GROUP

Major Area of Study	Nominated	Representative	Total
Social Science	2	0	2
Business	0	2	2
Law	1	3	4
Engineering	0	4	4
Liberal Arts	1	9	10
Science	1	5	6
Education	0	4	4
Other	0	1	1
Total	5	28	33

Missing = 3

As at the doctoral level, more respondents held Master's degrees in liberal arts. The pattern continued with science being second choice. Education, engineering, and law were the third most frequent choices. Also following the pattern at the doctoral level, social science was the most frequent choice of the nominated respondents.

The undergraduate educational experience of the respondents was studied. The type of bachelor's degree obtained are indicated in Table 27.

Table 27

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY GROUP

Type of Bachelor's Degree	Nominated	Representative	Total
BS	3	17	20
BFA	3	3	6
BA	0	5	5
Other	0	2	2
Total	6	27	33

Missing = 4

The most frequently reported type of undergraduate degree was the BS degree with 61% of the total respondents having this degree. The nominated respondents were equally divided between the BS degree and the BFA degree. The type of institution which granted these degrees is reported in Table 28.

Table 28

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION FOR BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY GROUP

Type of Institution	Nominated	Representative	Total
Public	3	19	22
Private	3	7	10
Total	6	26	32

Missing = 5

The pattern for type of institution attended to obtain degrees remains fairly constant for the representative respondents with a majority attending public institutions at all three levels. At the Bachelor's degree level the nominated respondents were evenly divided between public and private institutions. The pattern changes for the advanced degrees where the nominated respondents predominantly attended public institutions. The major area of study at the Bachelor's degree level is crosstabulated in Table 29.

Table 29

CROSSTABULATION OF MAJOR AREA OF STUDY AT THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE LEVEL BY GROUP

Major Area of Study	Nominated	Representative	Total
Social Science	0	1	1
Business	0	1	1
Engineering	0	4	4
Liberal Arts	2	12	14
Science	2	8	10
Education	1	0	1
Total	5	26	31

Missing = 6

Liberal Arts is listed most frequently as the chosen major at the undergraduate level for all the respondents, with science being the second most frequent choice. This is consistent with the pattern at the Master's and Doctoral level.

The personal and professional profile of the nominated effective Canadian university president obtained from this data indicated a male Caucasian between the ages of 46 and 60 years of age. The person was more likely to be Protestant in choice of religion. The respondent was presently married, with one marriage, a professional spouse, and had two to three children. The nominated effective president had one or no younger brothers, younger sisters, older brothers, and older sisters.

The nominated effective respondent gave no political affiliation. The educational level of the father was some high school and for the mother the level was a high school diploma. The respondent had obtained a doctoral degree which was a PhD and the degree was most likely to be from a public institution with a major from the social sciences.

Career Path

An examination of information relating to previous experiences of those occupying the office of president was done. Respondents were asked to identify their academic positions, the years they had spent in these positions, the offices held in those positions, and the types of institutions employing them. Most of the respondents entered the academic world as fulltime faculty, with 83% of the nominated respondents and 81% of the representative respondents indicating this entry point. One nominated respondent entered as a dean. The representative respondents who did not enter as fulltime faculty entered as a dean, a director, and in one instance as a president.

The career ladder to the presidency was typically through the ranks at the university including fulltime faculty, dean, vice-president and president. The

university presidents were asked to provide additional information about their professional backgrounds to further develop the profiles of both the nominated and representative groups. They were asked how many years they had been in higher education. The results of this analysis are shown on Table 30.

Table 30

YEARS IN HIGHER EDUCATION BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	6	18.33	5.16
Representative	31	18.23	6.04
Total	37	18.24	5.83

The table presents the average length of time in higher education for both the nominated and representative groups. The six nominated presidents who had responded to the study had a mean length of time in higher education of 18.33 years with a standard deviation of 5.16. The nominated presidents indicated that their experience in higher education administration ranged from ten to twenty-five years. The representative presidents indicated they had been in higher education administration an average of 18.23 years with a standard deviation of 6.04. One representative president indicated he had no prior experience in higher education before becoming president and the rest indicated they had been working in this area from ten to twenty-six years. All of the participating presidents responded to this question. The nominated respondents had a longer average length of time in higher education than did the representative group.

The respondents were asked to indicate their total years of experience

outside higher education. This information is shown in Table 31.

Table 31

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OUTSIDE HIGHER EDUCATION BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	3	4.33	4.93
Representative	17	5.75	8.44
Total	20	5.61	8.12

The average length of time outside higher education for both the nominated and representative groups is shown in the table. The three nominated presidents who had experience outside higher education had a mean length of time of 4.33 years with a standard deviation of 4.93. The nominated respondents indicated that their experience outside higher education ranged from one to ten years. The representative respondents indicated they had experience outside higher education an average of 5.75 years with a standard deviation of 8.44. Eleven representative respondents indicated they had no professional experience outside higher education. The range of time spent outside higher education by representative respondents was from one to thirty-two years. The representative respondents had, on an average, spent more time outside higher education than had the nominated respondents.

The respondents were asked to indicate the total number of years in a presidential position. This question was asked to determine if there was a difference between the length of time spent in a presidential position of the

nominated and representative presidents. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 32.

Table 32

TOTAL YEARS IN A PRESIDENTIAL POSITION BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	6	8.50	4.04
Representative	31	7.84	9.91
Total	37	7.95	9.17

The nominated respondents had a mean length of time of 8.50 years spent in a presidential position with a standard deviation of 4.04. The range of years for this group was from one to twelve years. The representative respondents had a mean length of time of 7.84 years spent in a presidential position with a standard deviation of 7.84. The range of years for this group was from one to twenty-three years.

Respondents were asked to give their age when they assumed their first presidency. This question was to determine at what age presidents typically assume the office and if there was a difference in age upon assumption of the presidency by the nominated and representative respondents. The results are shown in Table 33.

Table 33

AGE UPON ASSUMPTION OF FIRST PRESIDENCY BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	6	44.83	6.91
Representative	31	48.58	6.21
Total	37	47.97	6.38

The nominated respondents had a mean age of 44.83 years upon assumption of first presidency with a standard deviation of 6.91. The range of ages for the nominated respondents was thirty-seven to fifty-five years. The representative respondents had a mean age of 48.58 years upon assumption of first presidency with a standard deviation of 6.21. The range of ages for the representative respondents was thirty-four to sixty years.

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of years spent in their current presidency. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 34.

Table 34

YEARS IN CURRENT PRESIDENCY BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	6	7.17	4.71
Representative	31	5.16	4.83
Total	37	5.47	4.81

The mean for the number of years the nominated respondents had been in their current presidency was 7.17 years with a standard deviation of 4.71. The

range of years for the nominated respondents was one to twelve. The mean for the number of years the representative respondents had been in their current presidency was 5.16 years with a standard deviation of 4.83. The range of years for the representative respondents was one to twenty-three.

The scholarly activity of the respondents was assessed. The first measure of scholarly activity to be tabulated was the number of books published. The information regarding the published books is in Table 35.

Table 35

NUMBER OF BOOKS PUBLISHED BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	5	2.20	1.79
Representative	30	1.70	3.02
Total	35	1.77	2.86

Four of the five nominated respondents who answered this question had published at least one book. The mean number of books published by the nominated respondents was 2.20 with a standard deviation of 1.79. The range for the number of books published by this group was one to four. Thirteen of the representative respondents had published at least one book. The mean number of books published by the representative respondents was 1.70 with a standard deviation of 3.02. The range for the number of books published by this group was one to thirteen.

A second question asked about scholarly activity was related to the number of articles published. Each president was asked to indicate the approximate

number of articles they had published in refereed journals. The results of this question are in Table 36.

Table 36

NUMBER OF ARTICLES IN REFEREED JOURNALS BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	6	47.67	53.34
Representative	30	39.03	47.67
Total	36	40.47	47.96

All of the nominated respondents had published articles in refereed journals. The mean number of articles published for the nominated respondents was 47.67 with a standard deviation of 53.34. The range of number of articles for this group was seven to one hundred and fifty-one. Three of the representative respondents indicated they had no articles published in refereed journals. The mean number of articles published in refereed journals by the representative respondents was 39.03 with a standard deviation of 47.67. One representative respondent reported having two hundred and fifty articles published in refereed journals. With the exception of this respondent, the range of number of articles published in refereed journals for the representative respondents was five to one hundred.

A third set of questions to identify scholarly activity and professional involvement was related to professional organizations. Respondents were asked to indicate the approximate number of professional organizations in which they held membership and to identify two professional organizations in which they

frequently participated. The number of professional organizations are indicated in Table 37.

Table 37

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS BY GROUP

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Nominated	6	8.33	8.45
Representative	30	5.83	5.23
Total	36	6.25	5.81

All six of the nominated respondents indicated they belonged to at least three professional organizations. The mean number of professional organizations belonged to by the nominated respondents was 8.33 with a standard deviation of 8.45. One nominated respondent indicated membership in twenty-five professional organizations. With the exception of this respondent, the range of professional organization memberships for the nominated respondents was three to nine organizations. Twenty-nine of the representative respondents who answered the question indicated they belonged to professional organizations. The mean number of professional organizations belonged to by the representative respondents was 5.83 with a standard deviation of 5.23. One representative respondent indicated membership in thirty professional organizations. With the exception of this respondent, the range of professional organization memberships for the representative respondents was one to ten.

The list of organizations in which the Canadian university presidents hold

memberships reflects both the nature of the office and the specific educational backgrounds of the person holding the office. The organization most frequently mentioned was the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). Other associations mentioned included the Royal Society of Canada, Canadian Education Association, Institute of Public Administration of Canada, Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and the Canadian Society for the Study of Education.

The nominated effective Canadian university president had been in higher education longer than the representative president, had less years outside higher education, had been in the presidential position longer, and was younger in age upon assumption of the first presidency. The nominated effective president had published more books, more refereed journal articles, and belonged to more professional organizations than the representative group.

Testing of the Hypotheses

The research questions contrasted five groups on leadership styles and personal preferences. These five groups were nominated Canadian presidents with effective U.S. presidents, representative Canadian presidents with representative U.S. presidents, representative Canadian presidents with effective U.S. presidents, nominated Canadian presidents with representative Canadian presidents, and the total Canadian presidents with the total U.S. presidents. The professional credentials and scholarly activities were compared for the nominated Canadian presidents with the effective U.S. presidents and the nominated Canadian presidents with the representative Canadian presidents.

Research question one, "Is there a difference between effective U.S.

presidents and effective Canadian presidents?" was answered by testing hypothesis 1. H_1 stated in the null is: "There is no statistically significant difference between the responses of university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents nominated as effective regarding Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social Reference and the Image of the president." The hypothesis was tested by a one sample t-test using the Canadian effective presidents scores as one variable and the mean scores of the U.S. university presidents as the comparison mean. The results of each of the subscales are shown on Table 38.

Table 38

t-TESTS FOR ONE SAMPLE - EFFECTIVE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS COMPARED TO EFFECTIVE U.S. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

Scale	Canadian Presidents Mean	SD	United States Presidents Mean	df	t value	Prob of t
Management Style	31.60	2.61	33.35	4	-1.50	
Human Relations	27.20	4.09	20.94	4	3.43	*
Image	11.67	2.66	10.04	5	1.50	
Social Reference	20.60	1.14	14.39	4	12.18	*
Confidence	9.75	0.96	6.92	3	5.91	*

*$p \leq .05$

The t-tests for one sample yielded three significant results. The t-value for Human Relations of 3.43 was statistically significant at an alpha level f .05 with 4 degrees of freedom. The subscale for Social Reference was also statistically significant with a t-value of 12.18 at an alpha level of .05 with 4 degrees of freedom. The confidence subscale produced a t-value of 5.91 which was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 3 degrees of freedom. These results indicated the Canadian university presidents differed on these three subscales from the U.S. university presidents. The means for the effective Canadian university presidents were higher for each of the subscales than the means of the effective U.S. university presidents with the exception of the subscale for Management Style. As a result of the mixed finding on this statistical analysis, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a statistically significant difference between the effective Canadian university presidents and the mean scores of the effective U.S. university presidents as measured on the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory. Care should be taken when interpreting this result due to the small number of responses in the category of effective Canadian presidents. Six presidents responded to the survey who had been nominated as effective and while this represents 66.7% of the surveys for this group returned, the absolute number of responses are sensitive to individual differences.

The second research question was "Is there a statistically significant difference between the responses of the representative Canadian university presidents and responses of university presidents identified by the Fisher Tack Effective Leadership Inventory as representative in the U.S. regarding Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social Reference, and the

Image of the president?" This question was answered by using a one sample t-test using the representative Canadian university presidents scores as one variable and the mean scores of the representative U.S. university presidents as the comparison mean. The results of each of the subscales are shown on Table 39.

Table 39

t-TESTS FOR ONE SAMPLE - REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS COMPARED TO REPRESENTATIVE U.S. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

Scale	Canadian Presidents Mean	SD	United States Presidents Mean	df	t value	Prob of t
Management Style	35.14	4.76	35.54	28	- .46	
Human Relations	25.46	3.41	20.56	27	7.60	*
Image	10.61	2.18	9.95	27	1.59	
Social Reference	20.54	2.37	14.42	27	13.69	*
Confidence	9.43	1.64	6.66	27	8.92	*

*p ≤ .05

The t-tests for one sample yielded three significant results. The t-value for Human Relations of 7.60 was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 27 degrees of freedom. The subscale for Social Reference was also statistically significant with a t-value of 13.69 at an alpha level of .05 with 27 degrees of freedom. The confidence subscale produced a t-value of 8.92 which was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 27 degrees of freedom. These results indicate the Canadian representative university president differed on

these three subscales from the U.S. representative university presidents. The means for the Canadian university presidents were higher for each of the subscales than the means of the U.S. university presidents with the exception of the subscale for Management Style. There is a statistically significant difference between the representative Canadian university presidents and the mean scores of the representative U.S. university presidents as measured on the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory.

The third research question was answered by testing hypothesis 2, "There is a statistically significant difference between the responses of university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian university presidents identified as representative regarding Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social references, and the Image of the president." The hypothesis was tested using a one sample t-test using the representative Canadian presidents scores as one variable and the mean scores of the effective U.S. university presidents as the comparison mean. The results of each of the subscales are shown on Table 40.

Table 40

t-TESTS FOR ONE SAMPLE - REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS COMPARED TO EFFECTIVE U.S. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

Scale	Canadian Presidents Mean	SD	United States Presidents Mean	df	t value	Prob of t
Management Style	35.14	4.76	33.35	28	2.02	
Human Relations	25.46	3.42	20.94	27	7.01	*
Image	10.61	2.18	10.04	27	1.37	
Social Reference	20.54	2.37	14.39	27	13.75	*
Confidence	9.43	1.64	6.92	27	8.08	*

*$p \leq .05$

The t-tests for one sample yielded three significant results. The t-value for Human Relations of 7.01 was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 27 degrees of freedom. The subscale for Social Reference was also statistically significant with a t-value of 13.75 at an alpha level of .05 with 27 degrees of freedom. The Confidence subscale produced a t-value of 8.08 which was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 27 degrees of freedom. These results indicate the representative Canadian university presidents differed on these three subscales from the effective U.S. university presidents. The means for the Canadian university presidents were higher for each of the subscales than the means of the U.S. university presidents. As a result of the finding on this statistical analysis, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a statistically significant

difference between the representative Canadian university presidents and the mean scores of the effective U.S. university presidents as measured on the Fisher Tack Effective Leadership Inventory.

The fourth research question asked if there was a statistically significant difference between the responses of those nominated as effective Canadian university presidents and the responses of representative Canadian university presidents regarding Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social Reference, and Image of the president as indicated by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory. The question was tested using a one sample t-test using the effective Canadian university presidents scores as one variable and the representative Canadian university presidents as the comparison mean. The results of each of the subscales are shown on Table 41.

Table 41

t-TESTS FOR TWO INDEPENDENT SAMPLES - EFFECTIVE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS COMPARED TO REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

Scale	Effective Canadian Presidents Mean	SD	Representative Canadian Presidents Mean	SD	df	t value	Prob of t
Management Style	31.60	2.60	35.14	4.76	32	-1.61	
Human Relations	27.20	4.09	25.46	3.42	31	1.02	
Image	11.67	2.69	10.61	2.18	32	1.04	
Social Reference	20.60	1.14	20.54	2.37	31	.06	
Confidence	9.75	.96	9.43	1.64	30	.38	

*$p \leq .05$

The t-tests yielded no significant results. The t-value for Management Style of -1.61 with 32 degrees of freedom was not statistically significant. The subscale for Human Relations with a t-value of 1.02 and 31 degrees of freedom was not statistically significant. The Image Index with a t-value of 1.04 with 32 degrees of freedom was not statistically significant. The Social Reference Index with a t-value of .06 and 31 degrees of freedom was not statistically significant. The confidence index with a t-value of .38 and 30 degrees of freedom was not statistically significant. The means for the effective Canadian university presidents were higher for each of the subscales than the means of the representative Canadian university presidents with the exception of the subscale for Management

Style. There is no statistically significant difference between the effective Canadian university presidents and the representative Canadian university presidents as measured on the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory.

The fifth research question asked if there was a statistically significant difference between the response of the total Canadian university presidents and the responses of the total average U.S. university presidents regarding Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social Reference, and Image of the president as indicated by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory. The question was tested with a one sample t-test using the total Canadian university presidents scores as one variable and the mean scores of the total U.S. university presidents as the comparison mean. The results of each of the subscales a are shown on Table 42.

Table 42

t-TESTS FOR ONE SAMPLE - TOTAL CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS COMPARED TO TOTAL AVERAGE U.S. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

Scale	Canadian Presidents Mean	SD	United States Presidents Mean	df	t value	Prob of t
Management Style	34.62	4.65	34.45	33	.22	
Human Relations	25.74	3.51	20.75	32	8.14	*
Image	10.79	2.27	10.00	33	2.06	*
Social Reference	20.55	2.21	14.41	32	15.97	*
Confidence	9.47	1.57	6.79	31	9.68	*

*$p \leq .05$

The t-tests for one sample yielded four significant results. The t-value for Human Relations of 8.14 was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 32 degrees of freedom. The subscale for Image was statistically significant with a t-value of 2.06 at an alpha level of .05 with 33 degrees of freedom. The subscale for Social Reference was statistically significant with a t-value of 15.97 at an alpha level of .05 with 32 degrees of freedom. The t-value for Confidence of 9.68 was statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 31 degrees of freedom. These results indicated the Canadian university presidents differed on these four subscales from the U.S. university presidents. The means for the Canadian university presidents were higher for each of the subscales than the means of the U.S. university presidents. There is a statistically significant difference between

the Canadian university presidents and the mean scores of the U.S. university presidents as measured on the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory.

The third hypothesis stated in the null was there was no statistically significant difference between university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian university presidents nominated as effective regarding professional credentials and experiences and scholarly activities. The professional credentials are shown in Table 43.

Table 43

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS OF EFFECTIVE U.S. PRESIDENTS AND NOMINATED CANADIAN PRESIDENTS

Professional Credentials	U.S. Presidents x	Canadian x	s	t	Prob of t
Yrs in Higher Education	19.19	18.33	5.16	.41	
Yrs. Outside Higher Education	9.26	4.33	4.93	1.73	
Yrs. in Current Presidency	8.01	7.17	4.71	.44	
Total Yrs. in Presidential Position	6.37	8.50	4.04	-1.29	
Age at first Presidency	42.50	53.33	4.63	-5.73	*

*p<.05

The mean number of years spent in higher education by the effective U.S. presidents was 19.19 and the mean number of years for the nominated Canadian presidents was 18.33. The t value was .41 and was not statistically significant at

the .05 level. The mean number of years spent outside higher education was 9.26 for the effective U.S. presidents and 4.33 for the nominated Canadian president. The t value was 1.73 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of years spent in the current presidency was 8.01 for the effective U.S. presidents and was 7.17 for the nominated Canadian presidents. The t value was .44 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of years spent in a presidential position was 6.37 for the effective U.S. presidents and 8.50 for the nominated Canadian presidents. The t value was -1.29 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean age on assumption of first presidency for the effective U.S. presidents was 42.50 and for the nominated Canadian presidents the mean age was 53.33. The t value was -5.73 and was statistically significant at the .05 level. The age on assumption of first presidency was the only statistically significant difference in the professional credentials of the effective U.S. presidents and the nominated Canadian presidents.

Various scholarly activities were measured to determine if there was a difference in scholarly activities. These activities included the number of articles published, the number of books published and the number of memberships in professional organizations. These are compared in Table 44.

Table 44

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES OF EFFECTIVE U.S. PRESIDENTS AND NOMINATED CANADIAN PRESIDENTS

Scholarly Activities	U.S. Presidents x	Canadian x	s	t	Prob of t
No. of Articles Published	8.53	47.67	53.34	-1.80	
No. of Books Published	1.12	2.20	1.79	-1.35	
No. of Professional Organizations	6.17	8.33	8.45	-.63	

*p<.05

The mean number of articles published for the effective U.S. presidents was 8.53 and for the nominated Canadian presidents the mean was 47.67. The t value of -1.80 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of books published by the effective U.S. presidents was 1.12 and for the nominated Canadian presidents the mean number was 2.20. The t value of -1.35 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of memberships in professional organizations was 6.17 for the effective U.S. presidents and 8.33 for the nominated Canadian presidents. The t value of -.63 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. There was no statistically significant difference in any of the criteria used to measure scholarly activity between the effective U.S. presidents and the nominated Canadian presidents.

The fourth hypothesis assessed the same criteria for professional and scholarly differences between the effective U.S. presidents and the representative

Canadian presidents. The results of the professional credentials are in Table 45.

Table 45

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS OF EFFECTIVE U.S. PRESIDENTS AND REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN PRESIDENTS

Professional Credentials	Effective U.S. x	Representative Canadian x	s	t	Prob of t
Yrs in Higher Education	19.19	18.23	6.04	.89	
Yrs. Outside Higher Education	9.26	5.75	8.44	2.20	*
Yrs. in Current Presidency	8.01	5.16	4.83	3.28	*
Total Yrs. in Presidential Position	6.37	7.84	9.91	-.83	
Age at first Presidency	42.50	54.71	5.98	-11.37	*

*p<.05

The mean number of years spent in higher education by the effective U.S. presidents was 19.19 and the mean number of years for the representative Canadian presidents was 18.23. The t value was .89 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of years spent outside higher education was 9.26 for the effective U.S. presidents and 5.75 for the representative Canadian president. The t value was 2.20 and was statistically significant at the 0.5 level. The mean number of years spent in the current presidency was 8.01 for the effective U.S. presidents and 5.16 for the representative Canadian presidents. The t value was 3.28 and was statistically significant at the 0.5 level. The mean

number of years spent in a presidential position was 6.37 for the effective U.S. presidents and 7.84 for the representative Canadian presidents. The t value was -.83 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean age on assumption of first presidency for the effective U.S. presidents was 42.50 and for the representative Canadian presidents the mean age was 54.71. The t value was -11.37 and was statistically significant at the .05 level. The years outside higher education, the years in current presidency, and the age at first presidency were statistically significant differences with the effective U.S. presidents having a higher mean number of years outside higher education and years in current presidency.

The same scholarly activities were compared for effective U.S. presidents and representative Canadian presidents. These are compared in Table 46.

Table 46

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES OF EFFECTIVE U.S. PRESIDENTS AND REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN PRESIDENTS

Scholarly Activities	Effective U.S. x	Representative Canadian x	s	t	Prob of t
No. of Articles Published	8.53	39.03	47.67	-3.50	*
No. of Books Published	1.12	1.70	3.02	-1.05	
No. of Professional Organizations	6.17	5.83	5.23	.35	

*p<.05

The mean number of articles published for the effective U.S. presidents was 8.53 and for the representative Canadian presidents the mean was 39.03. The

t value of -3.50 was statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of books published by the effective U.S. presidents was 1.12 and for the representative Canadian presidents the mean number was 1.70. The t value of -1.05 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of memberships in professional organization was 6.17 for the effective U.S. presidents and 5.83 for the representative Canadian presidents. The t value of .35 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. There was a statistically significant difference in one criteria used to measure scholarly activity, the number of articles published. The representative Canadian presidents had a higher mean number of articles published.

In addition to the comparisons addressed by the hypotheses comparisons were made between Canadian nominated and representative groups. The professional credentials are compared in Table 47.

Table 47

PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS OF NOMINATED CANADIAN PRESIDENTS AND REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN PRESIDENTS

Professional Credentials	Nominated Canadian x	s	Representative Canadian x	s	t	Prob of t
Years in Higher Education	18.33	5.16	18.24	6.04	.04	
Yrs Outside Higher Education	4.33	4.93	5.75	8.44	-.28	
Years in Current Presidency	7.17	4.71	5.16	4.83	.93	
Total Yrs. Presidential Position	8.50	4.04	7.84	9.91	.16	
Age at First Presidency	53.33	4.63	54.71	5.98	-.53	

*p<.05-

The mean number of years spent in higher education by the nominated Canadian president was 18.33 and the mean number of years for the representative Canadian president was 18.24. The t value was .04 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of years spent outside higher education was 4.33 for the nominated Canadian president and 5.75 for the representative Canadian president. The t value was -.28 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of years spent in the current presidency was 7.17 for the nominated Canadian president and 5.16 for the representative Canadian president. The t value was .93 and was not statistically

significant at the .05 level. The mean number of years spent in a presidential position was 8.50 for the nominated Canadian presidents and 7.84 for the representative. The t value was .16 and was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean age on assumption of first presidency for the nominated Canadian presidents was 53.33 and for the representative Canadian presidents the mean age was 54.71. The t value was -.53 and was not statistically significant at the 0.5 level. There were no statistically significant differences between the nominated Canadian presidents and the representative Canadian presidents on the criteria used to measure the professional credentials.

Certain scholarly activities were compared to determine if there was a difference in the scholarly activities of the nominated and the representative Canadian university presidents. These results are in Table 48.

Table 48

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES OF NOMINATED CANADIAN PRESIDENTS AND REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN PRESIDENTS

Scholarly Activities	Nominated Canadian		Representatives Canadian			
	x	s	x	s	t	Prob of t
No. of Articles Published	47.67	53.34	39.03	47.67	.40	
No. of Books Published	2.20	1.79	1.70	3.02	.36	
No. of Professional Organizations	8.33	8.45	5.83	5.23	.96	

* p<.05

The mean number of articles published for the nominated Canadian

presidents was 47.67 and for the representative Canadian presidents the mean was 39.03. The t value of .40 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of books published by the nominated Canadian presidents was 2.20 and for the representative Canadian presidents the mean number was 1.70. The t value of .36 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. The mean number of memberships in professional organization was 8.33 for the nominated Canadian president and 5.83 for the representative Canadian presidents. The t value of .96 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. There was no statistically significant difference in any of the criteria used to measure scholarly activity between the two groups of Canadian presidents.

Summary

In this chapter the analysis of the data was presented. The chapter was divided into two sections. The first section included the descriptive statistical results of the sample. The second section included the results of the statistical tests to answer the research hypotheses.

The interpretations and conclusions generated by the data presented in this Chapter are presented in Chapter V of this dissertation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study are presented. The study design, methodology, survey instrument, and findings are reviewed.

The Study Design

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there was a difference between Canadian university presidents nominated as effective and the effective U.S. presidents on leadership characteristics, personal profiles, and professional and scholarly activity as measured by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory. Additional comparisons were made comparing representative Canadian presidents with representative U.S. presidents, representative Canadian presidents with effective U.S. presidents, effective Canadian presidents with representative Canadian presidents, and the total Canadian presidents with the total U.S. presidents.

Instrument and Methodology

The Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory was chosen because items were included to assess characteristics of effectiveness of the university president. Demographic differences between the effective and representative presidents were addressed by questions about the individual's personal background. The focal point of the instrument was the section on leadership attitudes and behaviors with 40 items related to attitudes and styles of leadership. The professional data information collected included degrees earned, previous experience, current position, and scholarly activity. The personal information included age, sex, race,

religious preference, marital status, number of marriages, spouse's occupation, number and ages of children, province or foreign country of birth, political affiliation, province of current residence, father's and mother's education, and number of siblings.

Each university president in Canada was asked to nominate the five most effective presidents in office at that time. No definition of effectiveness was given. Each respondent made their own decision regarding characteristics of effectiveness. Following the nomination process all presidents were asked to respond to the leadership effectiveness questionnaire. Comparisons were made between groups nominated as effective, the U.S. effective president, and the remainder of the population labelled as representative.

The demographic questions were subjected to a series of crosstabulations. These crosstabulations provided frequencies and percentages for each category. For this study all demographic variables were broken down by the type of respondent. Professional and scholarly activity was assessed by mean scores. The hypotheses were tested using a one sample t-test. In addition to the four hypotheses of interest some additional comparisons were performed.

During the collection of the data it was brought to the attention of the researcher that the methodology might not accommodate the bi-lingual nature of Canada. Even though all respondents could respond in English it was questioned whether French persons had an equal chance at being nominated as effective.

A recommended change in the design of the study would be the wording of the hypotheses. As currently stated the hypotheses focus on a comparison of the nominated effective Canadian president with the effective U.S. president and the

representative Canadian president with the U.S. effective president. It would have been more inclusive to have had hypotheses which called for comparisons of more groups.

Findings: Personal Data

An overview of the personal data of the respondents gave a profile of the Canadian university presidents involved in the study. The majority were in the age group of 51-55 years of age. The sex of the group was predominantly male and the race was Caucasian. The religious preference most frequently noted was protestant. Most respondents were presently married with one marriage being the norm. The occupation of the spouse was as likely to be professional as homemaker with the responses almost evenly divided between the two. The most frequently occurring number of children was three.

The province or area of birth and the province of current residence indicated no particular pattern for either group of presidents. The political affiliation indicated by the respondents was none or refused to answer by all the nominated effective and for most of the representative presidents.

The education attainment level of the father was less for the nominated effective group than for the representative group. The same pattern was identified in the mother's education. In looking at other family characteristics, both groups were likely to have one or no younger brothers, one or no younger sisters, one or no older brothers, and one or no older sisters.

Findings: Professional Data

Responses to questions about the educational background indicated that a slightly higher percentage of nominated respondents held doctoral degrees than

did the representative. Most nominated effective presidents indicated they hold the PhD while no presidents held EdDs. All nominated effective respondents received their doctoral degrees from public institutions while representative respondents were much more evenly divided between public and private institutions. More presidents held doctorates in liberal arts than any other major. This pattern is consistent at the Master's and Bachelor's degree level with liberal arts being the most frequently chosen major.

Typically the career ladder to the presidency was through the ranks of the university including fulltime faculty, dean, vice-president and president. One representative respondent entered as president. The mean length of time in higher education was slightly longer for the nominated effective respondents. The representative respondents had spent more time outside higher education than had the nominated respondents.

The respondents nominated as effective had been in the presidential position for a longer period of time. These nominated effective respondents also reached the presidency at an earlier age than the representative respondents. Additionally, the mean number of years was greater for the nominated effective respondents. Time spent in the office of the presidency may be a factor in the perception of effectiveness by the peer group.

Findings: Scholarly Data

The number of books published, the number of articles in refereed journals, and the number of professional organization memberships were used as indicators of scholarly activities. In all three areas the nominated effective presidents had a higher mean score. The nominated effective presidents had

written more books, published more journal articles, and belonged to more professional organizations.

Findings: Testing of the Hypotheses

The Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory included a series of questions on management styles. These questions were divided into five subscales: Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social Reference and Image. Each of the subscales were analyzed and reported on independently along with the total score. The first two hypotheses addressed differences between the effective Canadian University president and effective U.S. University presidents, representative Canadian University president and effective U.S. University presidents. The third and fourth hypotheses addressed the same two groupings but compared professional and scholarly background characteristics.

The following hypotheses were tested in the null at the .05 significance level. They were tested using two-sample t-tests. The t-test was used because the actual numbers were small and the comparisons were between two groups.

Management Behaviors

H_1 There is no statistically significant difference between the responses of university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents nominated as effective regarding Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social Reference, and the Image of the president. There was a significant difference between the two groups of effective presidents, Canadian and United States on Human Relations, Social Reference and

Confidence. The mean scores for the Effective Canadian presidents were higher. The null hypothesis is rejected.

H_2 There is no statistically significant difference between the responses of university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents identified as representative regarding Management Style, Human Relations, Confidence, Social Reference, and the Image of the president. The comparison of the effective U.S. president with the representative Canadian president yielded statistically significant results for the Canadian presidents for the subscales of Human Relations, Social Reference, and Confidence. The means for the representative Canadian university presidents were higher on these subscales than those determined for the effective U.S. university president. As a result of this finding, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Professional and Scholarly Activities

H_3 There is no statistically significant difference between university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents nominated as effective regarding professional credentials and experiences and scholarly activities. No significant difference was found between the effective U.S. and effective Canadian presidents when the professional credentials including years in higher education, years outside higher education, years in

current presidency and total years in presidential position and scholarly activities consisting of number of articles published, number of books published, and number of professional organizations were compared. The null hypothesis was accepted.

H_4 There is no statistically significant relationship between university presidents identified by the Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory for university presidents as effective and Canadian University presidents identified as representative regarding professional credentials and experiences and scholarly activities. Statistically significant differences were found for professional credentials including years outside of higher education and years in current presidency. The means of the effective U.S. president were higher for these two variables than those achieved by the representative Canadian president. Scholarly activities of journal articles published showed a statistically significant difference with representative Canadian presidents publishing a greater number of articles than the effective U.S. presidents. Books published and organization memberships were not statistically significant between the two groups and the means were similar. The null hypothesis is accepted.

The original hypotheses were set up to compare the two Canadian groups with the U.S. effective but further research questions were answered by comparing the two Canadian groups with each other. No statistically significant differences were found between the two Canadian groups. The effective Canadian presidents

had higher scores on the management subscales but the differences were not statistically significant.

Others findings compared the two Canadian Groups on professional credentials and scholarly activities. T tests for two independent variables were used to test these comparisons. The results indicate no statistically significant differences between the two groups in either area. The effective university presidents appear to have more experience in their roles, but not enough to establish statistical significance. The same rationale is true for the scholarly activities.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been reached based on the findings from the statistical analysis and review of literature.

1. All Canadian presidents had higher mean scores for the Human Relations, Social Reference, and Confidence subscales than the effective U.S. presidents. These subscales reflect behaviors that are directed outwardly.
2. There was not a significant difference between groups on the Management Style Index and the Image Index. These two indexes represent inward directed behaviors which are qualitatively different from the other indexes. These findings appear to indicate that Canadian university presidents use a more people-oriented approach in their administrative positions. This seems as true of the representative Canadian president as of those nominated effective. Some of the reasons the Canadian presidents may score higher on

human relations aspects than the U.S. effective presidents may lie in cultural differences between the two countries. Canada has a much smaller population base than the U.S. There are far fewer institutions of higher education in Canada and these institutions on the whole have a much smaller student and faculty population. The constituency of the Canadian president is generally smaller than the U.S. counterpart. This could account for the differences between the presidents on human relations and confidence factors, with the Canadian president in a position to be more approachable and able to develop a more collegial style. A smaller number of faculty, students, and other constituents would be more conducive to a collegial approach.

The political climate in Canada is different from that in the U.S. The government is involved with more socialist programs in all areas. Student access to universities in Canada is considered to be a right for all citizens and the university is not perceived to be a restricted place for the elitist. This focus on students may help facilitate a campus climate of approachability which extends to the presidency. The religious schools may contribute to an increased human relations style.

The types and sizes of institutions, the organizational structure and the political climate could be factors that cause the Canadian university presidents to be different from those in the U.S. All results of this study should be interpreted with care because of the small population involved.

Recommendations for Future Research

As a result of the major findings and conclusions associated with this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The study should be replicated to verify the results.
2. The U.S. presidents should be re-surveyed and compared directly to the Canadian presidents comparing today's presidents with today's presidents.
3. A closer analysis of the subscales should be done to increase validity.
4. The demographic sector of the study needs revision in order to gather only pertinent information and facilitate data analysis.
5. Use an additional management style inventory with the Fisher/Tack to determine criterion validity.

Summary

This chapter has presented major findings, conclusions and recommendations which resulted from the research. The problem approached has been to determine differences between effective university presidents in Canada and those that are representative and to compare the Canadian presidents with the U.S. presidents.

Strong, effective leadership at the presidential level is essential to a positive future for higher education. Those concerned about the future of higher education can benefit from the knowledge obtained through studying the personal characteristics, professional attitudes, and leadership behaviors of effective presidents.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS

252 Dillon Hall
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4

(, 1990)

J. R. C. Perkin, President
Acadia University
Wolfville, Nova Scotia B0P 1X0

Dear Dr. Perkin:

Strong, effective leadership at the presidential level is essential to ensure a positive future for higher education in Canada. Given the imperative to increase our knowledge about effective leadership, my doctoral research is directed toward the information void on effective leadership characteristics. The intent of the research is to implement a nationwide study to identify the characteristics of effective university presidents.

In order for the research to be possible and in relation to your commitment to effectiveness at your university and your knowledge of the presidency, I would like to have your input on two occasions. In phase I I would like to establish the identity of presidents who, in the eyes of their peers are effective presidents. In Phase II I would be collecting pertinent professional and demographic data from those nominated as effective and from the remainder of all university presidents in Canada.

To assure the anonymity of your responses, the following safeguards are being used. A code number is included on the response envelope for follow-up purposes. The names and codes will be kept in a secured place and will be destroyed when the survey process is complete. Your name and the name of your institution will not be associated with your responses.

Nominations are being requested from presidents of universities listed in the 1989 Commonwealth Universities Yearbook which will provide a nationwide group of nominators. This list is attached for your reference. You are being requested to indicate with a check mark the five people you consider to be the most effective university presidents in the country. No preconceived definition of the term "effective" is being offered in order not to place restrictions or personal biases. The goal of the research is to focus on defining the characteristics and styles associated with effectiveness. It is not necessary to rank

order your five nominations. Please indicate your five choices with a check mark beside the names on the enclosed list and return it in the enclosed envelope by (, 1990).

If you have any questions, please contact me at 519-966-5684 or 519-253-4232, extension 2474. I thank you for your participation and cooperation in this effort to expand the knowledge base on characteristics of effective leaders.

Sincerely,

Linda M. McKay
Associate Professor
University of Windsor

LMM:va
Encl.

CC: Dr. Larry W. Hillman, Adviser
Administrative and Organizational Studies
Wayne State University

252 Dillon Hall
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4

Dear President:

In my research on the leadership characteristics of university presidents the second phase involves collecting information on attitudes and leadership style and professional and demographic data. To date I have not received your completed questionnaire. While I am aware that you have an incredibly busy schedule, it would increase the importance of this research effort if your input could be obtained. Clearly we share the feelings of support for research within the academic community and I appreciate any support you can provide. Your continued support in responding to the enclosed questionnaire will make the study much more complete.

Upon completing your responses to the Attached survey instrument could you please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. Safeguards are being used to assure the anonymity of your responses. The code number assigned to your envelope is for follow-up.purposes. The code and names are kept in a secured place and will be destroyed when the survey process is complete. Neither your name nor the name of your university will be associated with your responses.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 519-966-5684 or 519-253-4232, extension 2472. I thank you for your participation and cooperation in this effort to expand the knowledge base on leadership characteristics.

Sincerely,

Linda M. McKay
Associate Professor
University of Windsor

LMM:va

cc: Dr. Larry W. Hillman, Adviser
Administrative and Organizational Studies
Wayne State University

APPENDIX B

FISHER/TACK EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP INVENTORY

APPENDIX C

PERSONAL ATTITUDES AND LEADERSHIP STYLE FACTORS

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITIES IN CANADA

Universities in Canada*

Acadia University

University of Alberta

Athabasca University

Bishop's University

Brandon University

University of British Columbia

Brock University

University of Calgary

Camrose Lutheran College

University College of Cape Breton

Carleton University

Concordia University

Dalhousie University

College Dominicain de Philosophie et de Theologie

University of Guelph

University of King's College

Lakehead University

Laurentian University of Sudbury

Universite Laval

University of Lethbridge

McGill University

McMaster University

University of Manitoba

Memorial University of Newfoundland

College Militaire Royal de Saint-Jean

Universite de Moncton

Universite de Montreal

Mount Allison University

Mount Saint Vincent University

University of New Brunswick

Nova Scotia Agricultural College

Nova Scotia College of Art and Design

University of Ottawa

University of Prince Edward Island

Universite du Quebec

Queen's University at Kingston

Redeemer Reformed Christian College

University of Regina

Royal Military College of Canada

Royal Roads Military College

Ryerson Polytechnical Institute

Universite Sainte-Anne

St. Francis Xavier University

Saint Mary's University

University of Saskatchewan

Universite de Sherbrooke

Simon Fraser University

Technical University of Nova Scotia

University of Toronto

Trent University

Trinity Western University

University of Victoria

University of Waterloo

University of Western Ontario

Wilfrid Laurier University

University of Windsor

University of Winnipeg

York University

*Commonwealth Universities Yearbook 1989

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE TO PERSONAL ATTITUDES AND LEADERSHIP STYLE ITEMS

APPENDIX E

Frequency and Percentage of Response to Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style Items

	Effective N = 6					Representative N = 31				
Item	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1. Am sometimes viewed as hardnosed.	1 16.7%	5 83.3%				1 3.2%	18 58.1%	4 12.9%	6 19.4%	2 6.5%
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential.	5 83.3%	1 16.7%				23 74.2%	8 25.8%			
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks.	4 66.7%	1 16.7%	1 16.7%			14 45.2%	17 54.8%			
*4. Am primarily concerned about being liked.	3 50.0%	3 50.0%				4 12.9%	24 77.4%	1 3.2%	2 6.5%	
5. Try to achieve consensus.	4 66.7%	1 16.7%	1 16.7%			5 16.1%	23 74.2%	2 6.5%	1 3.2%	
6. Believe in organizational structure.	1 16.7%	3 50.0%	2 33.3%			7 22.6%	20 64.5%	2 6.5%	2 6.5%	
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident.	3 50.0%	3 50.0%				10 31.3%	21 67.7%			
8. Believe in close collegial relationships.				3 50.0%	3 50.0%			4 12.9%	17 54.8%	10 32.3%
*9. Believe that a leader serves the people.				3 50.0%	3 50.0%			3 10.0%	15 50.0%	12 40.0%
10. Believe in merit pay.	4 66.7%	2 33.35				10 33.3%	13 43.3%	5 16.7%	1 3.3%	1 3.3%
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive.	1 16.7%	5 83.3%				4 12.9%	21 67.7%	4 12.9%	2 6.5%	
*12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo.		1 20.0%	3 60.0%	1 20.0%			13 41.9%	6 19.4%	10 32.3%	2 6.5%
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates.	4 66.7%	2 33.3%				9 29.0%	17 54.8%	4 12.9%	1 3.2%	
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings.	2 33.3%	4 66.7%				10 32.3%	20 64.5%	1 3.2%		

	Effective N = 6					Representative N = 31				
Item	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
15. Maintain a measure of mystique.		1 20.0%	1 20.0%	1 20.0%	2 40.0%	1 3.2%	6 19.4%	10 32.3%	9 29.0%	5 16.1%
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution.	1 16.7%	3 50.0%	1 16.7%	1 16.7%		7 23.3%	9 30.0%	8 26.7%	6 20.0%	
*17. Choose another CEA as confident.		1 16.7%	2 33.3%	3 50.0%		4 12.9%	12 38.7%	7 22.6%	5 16.1%	3 9.7%
18. Believe in community involvement.	3 50.0%	3 50.0%				13 41.9%	16 51.6%	2 6.5%		
19. Always appear energetic.	4 66.7%	2 33.3%				8 25.8%	16 51.6%	6 19.4%	1 3.2%	
20. Am often viewed as a loner.		1 16.7%	1 16.7%	2 33.3%	2 33.3%	2 6.5%	10 32.3%	7 22.6%	9 29.0%	3 9.7%
*21. Count committee meetings as mistakes.		5 83.3%	1 16.7%			9 29.0%	21 67.7%		1 3.2%	
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague.		2 33.3%		3 50.0%	1 16.7%	1 3.3%	7 23.3%	11 36.7%	10 33.3%	1 3.3%
23. Accept loses gracefully.	1 16.7%	3 50.0%		2 33.3%		2 6.5%	18 58.1%	5 16.1%	6 19.4%	
24. Tend to work long hours.	4 80.0%	1 20.0%				15 48.4%	13 41.9%	3 9.75		
*25. Often like people who are different.				4 66.7%	2 33.3%			5 16.7%	19 63.3%	6 20.0%
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously.			2	4 33.3%	1 66.7%	3 3.2%	9.7%	18	9 58.1%	29.0%
27. Am warm and affable.	2 33.3%	4 66.7%				4 12.9%	18 58.1%	8 25.8%	1 3.2%	
*28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired.		4 80.0%	1 20.0%				11 37.9%	7 24.1%	11 37.9%	
29. Dress well.	2 33.3%	1 16.7%	2 33.3%	1 16.7%		3 9.7%	21 67.7%	7 22.6%		
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual.	4 66.7%	2 33.3%				12 40.0%	16 53.3%	2 6.7%		

	Effective N = 6					Representative N = 31				
Item	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
31. Believe in the institution at all costs.		2 40.0%	1 20.0%	1 20.0%	1 20.0%	4 13.8%	10 34.5%	6 20.7%	7 24.1%	2 6.9%
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement.	3 50.0%	3 50.0%				8 25.8%	21 67.7%	2 6.5%		
*33. Appear to make decisions easily.				6 100%			5 16.7%	4 13.3%	19 63.3%	2 6.7%
34. Appear confident even when in doubt.		2 33.3%	3 50.0%	1 16.7%		2 6.5%	15 48.4%	13 41.9%	1 3.2%	
35. View myself and the institution as one.		2 33.3%		2 33.3%	2 33.3%	3 10.3%	4 13.8%	7 24.1%	13 44.8%	2 6.9%
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof.		2 33.3%	1 16.7%	2 33.3%	1 16.7%		8 25.8%	5 16.1%	11 35.5%	7 22.6%
37. Enjoy stirring things up.		1 16.7%	2 33.35	2 33.3%	1 16.7%	1 3.2%	8 25.8%	7 22.6%	13 41.9%	2 6.5%
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant.		5 83.3%	1 16.75			2 6.5%	18 58.1%	5 16.1%	6 19.4%	
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office.		2 33.3%		4 66.75		2 6.5%	9 29.0%	12 38.7%	8 25.8%	
40. Smile a lot.	1 16.7%	5 83.3%				6 20.7%	13 44.8%	7 24.1%	3 10.3%	

* Reversed item.

APPENDIX F

POSITIONS HELD IN HIGHER EDUCATION

POSITIONS HELD IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			9.6111	7.5034	36
PC1	1	fulltime faculty	10.0345	7.6133	29
GROUP	1	nominated	11.7500	9.3586	4
GROUP	2	control	9.7600	7.4904	25
PC1	4	director	5.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	5.0000	.0000	1
PC1	5	dean	6.5000	2.1213	2
GROUP	1	nominated	5.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	8.0000	.0000	1
PC1	8	president	11.3333	11.0604	3
GROUP	2	control	11.3333	11.0604	3
PC1	10	assistant	3.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	3.0000	.0000	1

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 1 OR 2.7 PCT.

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			7.0882	4.8390	34
PC2	1	fulltime faculty	13.6667	10.0167	3
GROUP	1	nominated	24.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	8.5000	6.3640	2
PC2	2	department	5.6429	4.2717	14
GROUP	1	nominated	7.7500	5.3151	4
GROUP	2	control	4.8000	3.7653	10
PC2	3	coordinator	6.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	6.0000	.0000	1
PC2	4	director	6.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	6.0000	.0000	1
PC2	5	dean	6.7273	2.4121	11
GROUP	2	control	6.7273	2.4121	11
PC2	7	vice president	9.0000	9.8995	2
GROUP	2	control	9.0000	9.8995	2
PC2	8	president	8.5000	2.1213	2
GROUP	1	nominated	10.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	7.0000	.0000	1

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 3 OR 8.1 PCT.

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			5.8710	2.7658	31
PC3	1	fulltime faculty	8.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	8.0000	.0000	1
PC3	2	department chair	4.3333	3.2146	3
GROUP	2	control	4.3333	3.2146	3
PC3	4	director	4.0000	1.4142	2
GROUP	2	control	4.0000	1.4142	2
PC3	5	dean	6.5833	2.7784	12
GROUP	1	nominated	6.6667	1.5275	3
GROUP	2	control	6.5556	3.1667	9
PC3	7	vice president	6.3333	3.2146	3
GROUP	2	control	6.3333	3.2146	3
PC3	8	president	6.0000	3.0237	8
GROUP	1	nominated	12.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	5.1429	1.9518	7
PC3	11	other	4.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	4.0000	.0000	1
PC3	12		3.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	1	nominated	3.0000	.0000	1

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 6 OR 16.2 PCT.

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			4.6087	2.6584	23
PC4	4	director	4.5000	2.1213	2
GROUP	2	control	4.5000	2.1213	2
PC4	5	dean	6.0000	1.4142	2
GROUP	2	control	6.0000	1.4142	2
PC4	6	assistant to the	2.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	2.0000	.0000	1
PC4	7	vice president	3.5000	2.2583	6
GROUP	1	nominated	4.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	3.4000	2.5100	5
PC4	8	president	5.5000	3.2404	10
GROUP	1	nominated	7.3333	5.5076	3
GROUP	2	control	4.7143	1.7995	7
PC4	11	other	3.5000	.7071	2
GROUP	2	control	3.5000	.7071	2

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 14 OR 37.8 PCT.

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			5.3846	3.5009	13
PC5	4	director	2.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	2.0000	.0000	1
PC5	7	vice president	6.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	6.0000	.0000	1
PC5	8	president	5.9000	3.7550	10
GROUP	1	nominated	7.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	5.7778	3.9616	9
PC5	11	other	3.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	3.0000	.0000	1

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 24 OR 64.9 PCT.

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			3.3333	1.1547	3
PC6	8	president	3.3333	1.1547	3
GROUP	2	control	3.3333	1.1547	3

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 34 OR 91.9 PCT.

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			3.0000	.0000	1
PC7	7	vice president	3.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	3.0000	.0000	1

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 36 OR 97.3 PCT.

Variable	Value	Label	Mean	Std Dev	Cases
For Entire Population			2.0000	.0000	1
PC8	8	president	2.0000	.0000	1
GROUP	2	control	2.0000	.0000	1

Total Cases = 37
Missing Cases = 36 OR 97.3 PCT.

REFERENCES

Alton, B. T. "Presidential Search: Bringing Closure." Association of Governing Boards Report Vol. 30, No. 4 (1988):32-34.

_____."Presidential Search: Identifying Candidates." Association of Governing Boards Report Vol. 30, No. 1 (1988):24-27.

Arnold, D. B. "The Inside President, The Outside Chairman." Association of Governing Boards Report Vol. 30, No. 1 (1988):31-33.

Ashworth, K. H. "Searching, Searching, Gone: Will Public Disclosure Drive Candidates Away?" Change Vol. 14, No. 4 (1982):20-23.

Baldridge, J. V. (1971). Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bennis, W. B. and Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Bloom, A. (1987). Closing of the American Mind. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G.(1974). Leadership and Ambiquity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Corson, J. H. (1974). The Governance of Colleges and Universities: Modernizing Structure and Processes. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cross, G. L. (1983). Letters to Bill on University Administration. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Dodds, H. W. (1968). The Academic President - Educator or Caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill.

Drucker, P. F. (1967). The Effective Executive. New York: Harper and Row.

Ferrari, M. R. (1970). Profiles of American College Presidents. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University.

Fisher, C. F. (ed.) (1978). Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc..

_____. "How Presidents Can Wield Power." Association of Governing Boards Report Vol. 30, No. 5 (1988):20-24.

_____. (1984). Power of the Presidency. New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Fisher, J. L., Tack, M. W., and Wheeler, K. J. "Profiles of Effective College Presidents." Association of Governing Boards Report Vol. 30, No. 1, (1988): 28-30.

Ginsburg, S. G. "The Motivating Factor: How Leaders Inspire Administrators." Educational Record 68 (1987):42-44.

Gross, E. and Grambsch, P. V. (1974). Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Harris, H. J. "The College Administrator as Activist." Liberal Education Vol. 69, No. 4 (1983):335-338.

Hilpert, J. M. and Alfred, R. L. "Improving Enrollment Success: Presidents Hold the Key." Educational Record 68 (1987):30-35.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (1968). The American Revolution. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Jones, T. E., Standord, E. V., and White, G. C. (1964). Letters to College Presidents. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Kauffman, J. F. "The College Presidency - Yesterday and Today." Change Vol. 14, No. 4 (1982):12-19.

Kerr, C. "Liberal Learning: A Record of Presidential Neglect." Change Vol. 16, No. 6 (1984): 32-36.

_____. (Director) (1984). Presidents Make A Difference. A Report of the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leader-ship. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing boards of Universities and Colleges.

Kerr, C. and Gade, M. L. (1986). The Many Lives of Academic Presidents, Time, Place and Character. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Knode, J.C. "Presidents of State Universities." Scientific Monthly 58 (March, 1944):218-20.

Kolman, E. and Hassler, D. "The Influence of Institutional Culture on Presidential Selection." The Review of Higher Education Vol. 10, No. 4 (1987):319-332.

Levine, A. "Diary of a New College President." Change 16 (1984):10-17.

Maccoby, M. (1981) The Leader. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Moore, K. M., Salimbene A. M., Marlier, J. D., and Bragg, S. M. "The Structure of Presidents' and Deans' Careers." Journal of Higher Education Vol. 54 No. 5 (1983):500-515.

Ostar, A. W. "Leadership: How Trustees Fit In." Association of Governing Boards Report Vol. 30, No. 1 (1988): 47-48.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). Organizational Design. Arlington Heights, Ill.: AHM Pub.

Quehl, G. H., and Fisher, J. L. "Presidential Assessment: Obstacle to Leadership." Change Vol. 16, No. 4 (1984): 5-7.

Riesman, D. (1980). On Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Saunders, R. T. "The Role of the Community College President: Views of Faculty and Presidents." Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1978.

Stogdill, R. M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership." Journal of Psychology Vol. 25, (1948): 35-71.

Stoke, H. W. (1959) The American College President. New York:Harper and Brothers.

Thwing, C. F. (1926). The College President. New York: Macmillan.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vroom, V. H. and Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wood, M. M. "Crosscurrents and Undercurrents in the Trustee-President Relationship." Educational Record 65 (1984):38-42.

Young, C. A. "Presidential Search: Interviewing Candidates." Association of Governing Boards Report Vol. 30, No. 3 (1988):24-28.

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EFFECTIVE U.S. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS AND EFFECTIVE AND REPRESENTATIVE CANADIAN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

by

LINDA MATTHEWS MCKAY
May, 1992

Advisor: Dr. Larry W. Hillman
Major: Higher Education
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

The review of the literature indicated that very few studies have been done that address the effectiveness of university presidents. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the management styles of Canadian university presidents, both effective and representative, differed from the management styles of the effective U.S. presidents.

Canadian university presidents were identified as effective by a peer nomination process. The Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory was administered by the researcher to those presidents in office at the time of the study. Leadership characteristics, personal profiles, and professional and scholarly activities were measured and compared. The nominated effective and representative Canadian groups were compared to the U.S. effective presidents. The fifty-eight universities listed in the Commonwealth Universities Yearbook comprised the population from which this study derived.

Four hypotheses were drawn in conjunction with the results of the

Fisher/Tack study. The hypotheses were tested using a t-test for two independent samples. The available data made various other comparisons possible in addition to those in the original hypotheses.

The following findings were from the analysis of the data:

1) All Canadian presidents, both effective and representative had higher mean scores on Management Style, Human Relations, Image, Social Reference and Confidence Indexes than did the effective U.S. presidents.

2) There was no statistically significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups of Canadian presidents on professional credentials, scholarly activities, and management style behaviors.

It appears that Canadian university presidents use a more people-oriented approach in their administrative positions. This may be due, in part, to cultural differences between the two countries.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Name: Linda Matthews McKay

Education:

Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., Ph.D., 1992; University of Maryland, College Park, Md., M.S., 1968; University of North Carolina, Greensboro, N.C., B.S., 1962.

Positions:

Professor, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, 1968-present.
Head, Department of Home Economics, University of Windsor, 1982-1988.

Memberships:

Phi Delta Kappa, American Home Economics Association, Omicron Nu, Canadian Association of Researchers in Home Economics, Canadian Home Economics Association (National President, 1990-92), Apparel Studies Association of Canada (National President, 1976-78), International Federation of Home Economics, International Sociological Association, American Education Research Association.

Publications:

Clothing Aid For The Handicapped (1983), University of Windsor Printshop.

"Clothing As A Social Indicator: 1760-1960." Toronto Separate School Board Curriculum and Canadian Home Economics Journal, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 99-102. 1989.

"Curriculum Issues: A Global Perspective." Office of Teaching and Learning Newsletter. March, 1985, Vol. VII, No. 2, p.4

"The Design of a National Metrology System: Canada's Standard Clothing Size Program." Testing Technology Delegation Journal, August, 1985. (Presented paper in Beiging and Shanghai, China).

"Strategic Planning for the 1990s", Canadian Home Economics Journal, 41(1), Winter, 1991, pp. 5-8.

Awards:

Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture Library Service Award
Canadian Home Economics Association Mary A. Clarke Honor Award
Canadian Home Economics Association Fiftieth Anniversary Award