

Leadership Style and Performance in Higher Education: Is There a Correlation?

Friday Symposium

Friday, February 25, 2005

Jeremy Dutschke, Ph.D.

Dallas Baptist University

Abstract

The paper I present to you today is one developed out of my dissertation research in which Chief Enrollment Manager leadership style, as documented by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, is examined for correlation with institutional enrollment performance at Council for Christian College and University-member institutions. I will cover the rationale for such a study. Then provide you with an abridged history and overview of the topic of leadership, moving toward the specific area of leadership addressed in my research study. Next I will briefly review the outcomes of my research study including a few limitations to the study and recommendations for future research. Then I will wrap it up with a few concluding thoughts and open the floor for Questions and Answers.

Part I: Introduction

Private institutions of higher education are particularly dependent upon three primary areas of revenue for solvency and persistence – enrollment, development funds, and endowment investment returns. During the first quarter of 2001, financial analysts pointed to signs of a national recession and suggested a “significant downturn would be hardest on those private institutions below the [Carnegie] top tier, those with large sticker prices, but less-than-mammoth endowments” (Brownstein, 2001, p. A14). A primary reason for this concern was based on research showing for every revenue dollar, “tuition supplies 55 cents at private research universities, 76 cents at liberal-arts colleges, and 85 cents at private universities that are less research-intensive” (McPherson and Schapiro, 2001, p. B24). Since tuition revenue is directly linked to enrollment levels (Hossler and Bean, 1990), such a predicted “economic slowdown [would] reduce the number of full-pay students, whether by leading them to less-expensive institutions, bypass[ing] higher education altogether, or be[ing] eligible for more institutional financial aid as a result of their lower incomes” (McPherson and Schapiro, 2001, p. B24), adversely affecting the tuition revenue at private colleges and universities.

Unfortunately, Tuesday, September 11, 2002, was never forecasted by financial analysts, causing the American economy to be turned upside down, which resulted in a full-fledge recession in the third and fourth quarters of fiscal year 2001. Well into the 2002 fiscal year,

Evidence is growing across the country that the recession is hurting private colleges, in large and small ways. While there are signs that the nation as a whole may be coming out of the recession, it is only now beginning to set in on college campuses, and its effects may be prolonged. (Van Der Werf, 2002, p. A26)

Therefore, American higher education continues to face rising tuition rates and fees, heightened funding issues, lowering endowments, fluctuating enrollments, increasing employee health-care costs, and organizational restructuring issues due to an economically volatile environment resulting from a declining stock market, reduced consumer confidence due to declining personal wealth and security of potential matriculants and donors, and increasing institutional overhead costs (Breneman, 2002; Lively, 2001; Rivard, 2002; Van Der Werf, 2002, Van Der Werf, Blumenstyk, and June, 2002).

It is important to note that “small, relatively poor campuses make up the vast majority of private, four-year colleges” (Van Der Werf, 2002, p. A26) with an average “endowment of \$12-million, according to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities” (p. A26). This means much of American higher education “depend[s] substantially on tuition for revenue, [has] little cushion against unexpected revenue shortfalls” (p. A26), and is extremely dependent on semester and annual enrollment rates directly impacting tuition revenue levels (Hossler and Bean, 1990). Subsequently, “at smaller, less-wealthy institutions, ...if enrollment falters at some of these institutions, the financial consequences could be serious” (Allen, 2001, p. A10). In fact, predictions of massive independent college closures, mergers, layoffs, or restructuring of missions based on such volatility appear to be coming true (Angelo, 2002; Drucker, 1992; Dunn, 2000; Jarvis, 2003; Jerousek, 2003; Perry, 2002; Pulley, 2003; Van Der Werf, 2002; 2003; Zhao, 2002).

With this in mind, during the last two decades of the twentieth century, the concept and practice of enrollment management in private higher education has become extremely “critical to the survival of many institutions and crucial to the maintenance and growth of all” (Swanson and Weese, 1997, p. 3) colleges and universities. According to Hossler and Bean (1990, p. 5), “enrollment management is an organizational concept and a systematic set of activities designed to enable educational institutions to exert more influence over their student enrollments.” Thus, enrollment management “brings together often disparate functions, having to do with recruiting, funding, tracking, retaining, and replacing students as they move toward, within, and away from an institution of higher education” (Maguire, 1986, pg. 645). Effective enrollment management is dependent upon strategic planning and institutional research “concern[ing] student college choice, transition to college, student attrition and retention, and student outcomes” (Hossler and Bean, 1990, p. 5).

Since enrollment management involves the recruitment, admissions, registration, and retention processes of the college or university, several departments fall under the enrollment management umbrella including Admissions, Financial Aid, Academic Advising, Learning Assistance Centers, Campus Activities, Residence Life, Career Planning and Placement, Institutional Research, Faculty Development, and Registrar. (Maguire, 1986; Swanson and Weese, 1997). Due to the various departments encompassed by enrollment management, there is no one template all colleges and universities implement to organize their enrollment management functions. Some institutions centralize their enrollment management services through a committee or a single enrollment division, while others decentralize their enrollment management operations through departmental matrices involving parts of various divisions (Hossler, 1990). Regardless of the approach, however, typically a single individual at the vice presidential or dean-level within the organization is charged with the overall responsibility of collaborating, supervising and influencing the enrollment services of the college or university (Maguire, 1986; Swanson and Weese, 1997). This single individual is the institution’s Chief Enrollment Manager (CEM).

Although private colleges and universities need effective leadership at all levels of the institution’s administration in order to navigate and survive the rough waters present during the first quarter of the 21st century, one specific area in which strong, effective leadership is needed

in college and university administration rests with the Chief Enrollment Manager (CEM). Since enrollment management is so critical to the viability of institutions of higher education and Chief Enrollment Managers (CEMs) are most responsible for and influential in creating a private institution's enrollment management philosophy, strategy, and annual performance (Hossler and Bean, 1990; Maguire, 1986), CEMs need to be studied to identify and explore any correlation existing between their leadership style and enrollment performance. In addition, it is important to document the their direct subordinate's rating of the CEM's leadership style. This will allow the exploration of the difference between the CEM's perception of his or her own leadership style and the subsequent direct subordinate's perception of the CEM's leadership style; thus, documenting how realistic the CEM's perception of his or her own leadership style.

In response to the need for college and university leadership during such turbulent economic times, this study explored any relationship existing between Chief Enrollment Managers (CEMs) transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership and effective or ineffective annual institutional enrollment performance. But before we go any further, we need to set the context for what leadership is and why it is important to consider in such scenario.

Part II: Literature Review

Bass and Stogdill (1990) note leadership is defined in a variety of ways depending on the philosophical and sociological position of the definer or theorist. Since leaders are found at all levels of groups, organizations, and society, it seems almost everyone intuitively has a concept or opinion of what leadership is or should be, and those concepts throughout history are as diverse as the theoretical definitions present in the literature. Thus, it is not surprising that leadership has been conceptualized, studied, and theorized in very different ways.

History of Leadership

The earliest theoretical concepts of leadership identify the primary factors influencing effective leadership as the leader's lineage or personal traits. Effective leadership was first assumed to be based on the heredity of so called "Great Men." Therefore, according to this concept, a leader, whether a monarch, statesman, priest, etc., is simply born, not made, and only varied by the situations in which he was divinely placed (Dowd, 1936; Galton, 1870; Jennings, 1960; Wiggam, 1931; Woods, 1913). Carlyle (1847, p. 46) summarized this notion of leadership well when he wrote,

For at the bottom the Great Man, as he comes from the hand of Nature, is ever the same kind of thing...I hope to make it appear that these are all originally of one stuff; that only by the world's reception of them, and the shape they assume, are they so immeasurably diverse.

Since "Great Men" could be identified, it was logical to attempt to identify the specific traits or characteristics that differentiated a leader from his followers. Therefore, during the nineteenth century and the early parts of the twentieth century, the leadership ideology moved to an emphasis on exploring and identifying certain leadership characteristics or traits to explain leader effectiveness. Trait theorists sought to explain effective leadership by attempting to

identify specific qualities or characteristics of leaders differentiating them from their followers. Stogdill (1948) and Mann (1959) note that several researchers attempted to identify specific traits, such as age, height, weight, physical appearance, articulation, intelligence, integrity, self-confidence, emotional control, or popularity, that differentiate leaders from followers (Bernard, 1926; Bingham, 1927; Kilbourne, 1935; Tead, 1929). Still today, hints of this theory remain as Gardner (1989) suggests that effective leaders possess such qualities as physical vitality and stamina, intelligence and action-oriented judgement, eagerness to accept responsibility, task competence, understanding of followers and their needs, skill in dealing with people, need for achievement, capacity to motivate people, courage and resolution, trustworthiness, decisiveness, self-confidence, assertiveness, and adaptability/flexibility. However, attempts to isolate and verify specific individual traits with minimal substantiated results led to the general conclusion that no single characteristic distinguishes leaders from followers or guarantees leader effectiveness.

In the mid-twentieth century, the theoretical ideology shifted again, focusing on leader behavior and its relation to effectiveness. In fact, it was Mann (1965) who made the observation that leadership effectiveness was being measured by the wrong measures – leader traits – and should be measured by what leaders actually do – leader behavior. Behavioral Leadership theorists' primary contribution to the field of leadership involves the notion that leadership behavior can be classified into two categories – task-oriented or person-oriented behaviors. Task-oriented behavior deals with the leader's emphasis on the relationship between their followers and the quality and quantity of work they are to perform, while person-oriented behavior deals with the relationship between the leader and the follower and a concern for how they feel toward one another. For instance, McGregor (1960) proposed that traditional organizations assume certain facts about human behavior and devised Theory X and Theory Y of leadership. Theory "X" assumes that followers cannot achieve their own goals and must be controlled and directed through the exercise of authority. On the other hand, Theory "Y" assumes that followers can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise. Ideally, a manager can use parts of each theory and shift back and forth from one to another depending on the situation and the follower(s) involved. Later, Likert (1961, 1967) proposed the Four Management Systems Model of leadership behavior. System 1 is similar to Theory "X," in which management has no trust or confidence in followers and uses authority to control follower behavior. In System 2, managers condescendingly place confidence and trust in their employees (similar to master and slave). In System 3, managers have substantial, but not complete, trust and confidence in their employees. System 4 is similar to Theory "Y," in which management has complete trust and confidence in their followers to perform their tasks. Finally, Blake and Mouton (1964) introduced the Managerial Grid, which is a two-dimensional grid analysis of leadership practices based on the Initiating Structure, or the leader's behavior and task orientation relating to the needs of the organization, versus Consideration, or the leader's behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and their staff members. Based on combinations between these two dimensions, five basic styles of leadership can be devised as follows: Impoverished, which views the purpose as unobtainable and people as lazy and indifferent; Task, which views followers as a commodity such as machines; Middle of the Road, which views purpose as coming first, but morale must not be ignored; Country Club, which views purpose as incidental to lack of conflict and good fellowship; and Team, which works to integrate task and human requirements for the best of both

worlds. Despite these theoretical approaches and various research studies, still no specific leadership behavior or set of behaviors was determined to ensure leadership effectiveness.

At this juncture, researchers began to explore the characteristics of situations and their relationship to leadership effectiveness by suggesting that leaders arise out of or adjust to situations, rather than simply possessing specific traits or set of behaviors making them different from their followers. In particular, Situational Leadership theorists investigated the idea that situations determine the leadership abilities required for effectiveness. Such theorists proposed that effective leadership originated from a combination of leader characteristics and situational circumstances. Essentially, Situational Leadership, like the preceding Behavioral Leadership theories, is based on two dynamics: task versus relationship. However, Situational Leadership theories move one step further to suggest that the setting in which the leader finds himself impacts the leader's behavior, causing him to adjust his behavior depending on the personal and professional maturity of the follower and the specific situational variables presented. Thus, depending on the combination of the follower's maturity level and the various situational variables, the leader's behavior will either be "Telling" (high task, low relationship), "Selling" (high task, high relationship), "Participating" (low task, high relationship), or "Delegating" (low task, low relationship) (Hersey, 1984; Hersey, and Blanchard, 1977).

Similar to Situational Leadership, Contingency Leadership theory posits that the appropriate style of leadership is contingent on the requirements of the particular situation. However, Contingency Leadership is a synthesis of the trait approach and the situationalist view as it seeks to determine situational variables mediating the interaction between leadership behavior and situations resulting in effectiveness or "situational favorableness." Therefore, leader behavior is contingent on the situation. Only the leader possessing particular qualities will arise due to the specific situational circumstances requiring specific leadership abilities. Fiedler (1964, 1967, 1971) championed this leadership theory as he implemented a model to assess particular leadership "traits" by measuring the "least preferred coworker" (LPC). The higher the leader rated the group member whom he or she liked least, the higher would be the leader's LPC score. A high LPC score was equivalent to a more socially oriented leader while a low LPC score was equivalent to a more task oriented leader. Another Contingency Leadership model is the Path-Goal Theory, which suggests that a leader can affect the performance, satisfaction, and motivation of a follower or group of followers by offering rewards for achieving performance goals and clarifying paths towards these goals. This can be done by espousing one of three leadership styles – directive leadership, supportive leadership, or participative leadership – depending on the particular situation (House, 1971; House and Mitchell, 1974). The Normative Decision-Making Model is also a Contingency Leadership model in which the leader can either choose to be autocratic, consultative, or group-oriented when making decisions. Autocratic decision-making involves unilateral decision-making by the leader with little to no follower information. Consultative decision-making involves the leader interacting with individual followers or groups of followers to obtain information to make a decision. Group-oriented decision-making involves the leader interacting with individual followers or groups of followers in such a way that the group considers the information and makes a decision, when making decisions depending on the specific situation presented (Vroom and Yetton, 1973 and Vroom and Jago, 1988). Unfortunately, inconsistent empirical data, theoretical criticism and dissipation

in the Contingency Leadership theoretical movement brought about no specific situational characteristics or leadership abilities definitively related to leader effectiveness.

In the 1970's and 1980s, the Neocharismatic Leadership theorists, including House's (1977), Burns (1978), Bass (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Conger and Kanungo (1987), Kouzes and Posner (1987), and Sashkin (1988), refocused attention to leadership traits again and their relationship to leader effectiveness. Collectively, these theorists purported that effective leadership involves charisma characteristics such as being visionary, energetic, innovative, unconventional, empowering, and exemplary that inspires followers to greater levels of effectiveness. More importantly, this trend in leadership research ultimately led to the development of transactional and transformational leadership theories (Burns, 1978 and Bass, 1985).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership theory views the leader-subordinate relationship as a series of transactions or exchanges through the leader's use of Contingent Rewards by exchanging punishment and rewards for follower compliance and effort in order to achieve overall organizational performance (Burns, 1978). Bass (1985, Bass and Avolio, 1995) extended Burn's definition of transactional leadership to describe the supervisory-subordinate relationship through the use of Contingent Rewards, Management-by-Exception, or laissez-faire leadership.

Foundationally, transactional leadership is a theory grounded in exchange theory in which leaders use Contingent Rewards by leveraging punishments or rewards for follower compliance and effort in order to achieve overall organizational performance. Thus, transactional leadership may be best understood in light of a particular type of Exchange Theory – the Path Goal Theory of Leadership. According to House and Mitchell (1974, p. 81), the path-goal approach is concerned primarily with “how the leader influences the subordinates' perceptions of their work goals, personal goals, and the paths to goal attainment” which influences subordinate motivation and satisfaction. Thus, this leadership approach “suggests that a leader's behavior is motivating or satisfying to the degree that the behavior increases subordinate goal attainment and clarifies the paths to these goals” (p. 81). It also “occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (Burns, 1978, p. 19).

Later, Bass (1985) extended Burn's definition of transactional leadership to describe the supervisory-subordinate relationship. The transactional leader, according to Bass, “recognizes what it is we want to get from our work and tries to see that we get what we want if our performance warrants it,” “exchanges rewards and promises of reward for our effort,” and “is responsible to our immediate self-interests if they can be met by our getting the work done” (p. 11). Therefore, the transactional leader identifies the need desired for a follower to fulfill. Thomas Wren (1995, p. 98) notes transactional and exchange theories of leadership show “the relationship between leaders and followers is a dynamic one extending longitudinally in time. Roles are defined, negotiated, and redefined. People move toward or away from one another with effects on motivation, satisfaction, and individual and group performance.” In addition, transactional leadership “serv[es] structure and readiness that is already in place” (Bass, 1996, p.

44). Thus, a transactional leader's "major purpose...is to organize and direct activities aimed at goal achievement for the group...including maintaining the operation, obtaining and using resources, and reducing impediments to effective performance" (Hollander, 1978, p. 38).

Bass (1991) characterizes transactional leadership as the use of Contingent Rewards, Passive Management-by-Exception, and Active Management-by-Exception. Contingent Rewards involves "leaders [who] engage in a constructive path-goal transaction of reward for performance. They clarify expectations, exchange promises and resources, arrange mutually satisfactory agreements, negotiate for resources, exchange assistance for effort, and provide commendations for successful follower performance" (Bass and Avolio, 1995, p. 3). Active Management-by-Exception involves "leaders [who] monitor followers' performance and take corrective action if deviations from standards occur. They enforce rules to avoid mistakes" (p. 3). Passive Management-by-Exception involves "leaders [who] fail to intervene until problems become serious. They wait to take action until mistakes are brought to their attention" (p. 3). Through one or a combination of each of these attributes, the transactional leader uses power to impose a "cost-benefit, economic exchange to meet subordinates' current material and psychic needs in return for 'contracted' services rendered by the subordinate" (Bass, 1991, p. 14). The use of Contingent Rewards is the ability of the transactional leader to use coercive power to "assign or get agreement on what needs to be done and promise rewards or actually reward others in exchange for satisfactorily carrying the assignment" (p. 7) to completion. Although this component of transactional leadership may achieve some success, it is typically not long-term and is considered to be substandard to the effects of transformational leadership. Both Passive and Active Management-by-Exception are also coercive power transactions between a leader and a follower in which "the leader arranges to Actively monitor any deviance from standards, mistakes, and errors in the follower's assignments and to take corrective action as necessary" (p. 7). This transactional approach to leadership is even less effective than the use of Contingent Rewards.

Based on this literature regarding transactional leadership, it is reasonable to hypothesize that scaled, self-rated Chief Enrollment Manager (CEM) transactional leadership will be negatively related to institutional enrollment performance in higher education.

Transformational Leadership

In contrast to transactional leadership, Burns (1978) first introduced transforming leadership theory, which he conceived to be the complete opposite of transactional leadership. Transforming leadership "occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). According to Burns, transforming leadership is moral as it transforms both the leader and the follower by raising their "level of conduct and ethical aspirations" (p. 20). In essence, it is "a micro-level influence process between individuals and a macro-level process of mobilizing power to change social systems and reform institutions" (Yukl, 1989, p. 271). Burns (1978) goes on to describe transforming leadership as intellectual, reforming, revolutionary, heroic, and ideological. This is consistent with the more contemporary transformational leader model proposed by Bass (1993; Avolio et al., 1991).

Bass (1985) later added to Burn's concept and renamed it transformational leadership. According to Bass, transformational leadership provides vision, charisma, and empowerment to followers through the use of Idealized Influence (Attributed/Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration to elevate the followers, and the leader, to higher levels of performance and achievement. Idealized Influence involves "leaders [who] display conviction; emphasize trust; take stands on difficult issues; present their most important values; and emphasize the importance of purpose, commitment, and the ethical consequences of decisions. Such leaders are admired as role models; they generate pride, loyalty, confidence, and alignment around a shared purpose" (Bass and Avolio, 1995, p. 3). Individualized Consideration involves "leaders [who] deal with others as individuals; consider their individual needs, abilities and aspirations; listen attentively; further their development; advise; teach; and coach" (p. 3). Inspirational Motivation involves "leaders articulat[ing] an appealing vision of the future, challenge followers with high standards, talk optimistically and with enthusiasm, and provide encouragement and meaning for what needs to be done" (p. 3). Intellectual Stimulation involves "leaders [who] question old assumptions, traditions, and beliefs; stimulate in others new perspectives and ways of doing things; and encourage the expression of ideas and reasons" (p. 3). Unlike Burns, Bass did not view transactional and transformational processes as mutually exclusive. Bass believed a leader may interchangeably or simultaneously be transactional and transformational depending on different circumstances and situations, which has been confirmed by various research studies (Dixon, 1998; Seltzer and Bass, 1990). Therefore, this leadership ideology can be thought of as a continuum with various leaders possessing leadership styles ranging from transactional leadership on one extreme end of the continuum to transformational leadership on the other extreme end.

According to Bass (1985, p. 17), a transformational leader has the ability to "arouse or alter the strength of needs which may have lain dormant." "Transformational leadership involves the influence by a leader of subordinates...to empower subordinates to participate in the process of transforming the organization" (Yukl, 1989, p. 269). Empowering leadership, which is an outcome of the transformational characteristic of Individualized Concern, "provide[s] autonomy to one's followers so that, as much as possible, they can envisage, enable, direct and control themselves in carrying out their responsibilities in alignment with the goals of their leader and the larger organization" (Bass, 1996, p. 157). Thus, it is the transformational leader who empowers his or her followers by monitoring follower cohesiveness to the leader and each other and "display[s] Inspirational Motivation" (p. 165) in the form of highlighting followers' positive qualities and complementing their strengths.

Transformational leaders possess the power to raise those around them "to a greater awareness about the issues of consequence" (Bass, 1985, p. 17). Likewise, Schuster (1994, p. L39) notes that "transformational leadership...appeals to people's higher levels of motivation to contribute and add to the quality of life." In concert with Schuster, Bass (1985, p. 15) notes that transformational leaders motivate those they lead "to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group, organization, or country." Transformational leadership "instills a sense of purpose in those who are lead, and of encouraging emotional identity with the organization and its goals for their own sake" (Brown, 1994, pp. 1-2).

Ultimately, transformational leaders motivate their followers to go above and beyond their highest expectations. According to Bass (1985, p. 20), transformational leaders motivate their subordinates to achieve higher goals by “raising [their] level of awareness [and] consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes, and ways of reaching them.” They also do this by motivating their followers “to transcend [their] own self-interest for the sake of the team, organization, or larger polity” (p. 20). Bass also notes a relationship between Maslow’s (1954) Hierarchy of Needs and transformational leadership as he contends that transformational leaders alter or raise their follower’s level of need toward self-actualization in order to achieve greater personal and organizational goals.

Bass (1996, p. 15) goes on to note that “truly transformational leaders transcend their own self-interests for one of two reasons: utilitarian or moral principles.” Utilitarian principles are for “the benefit of the organization...or to meet the challenges of the task or mission (p. 15). On the other hand, moral principles are about “do[ing] the right thing, to do what fits principles of morality, responsibility, sense of discipline, and respect for authority, customs, rules and traditions” (pp. 15-16).

Based on the transformational leadership literature, it is also reasonable to hypothesize that CEM transformational leadership will be positively related to institutional enrollment performance in higher education.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership Research

Research indicates that the type of leadership approach used affects several factors in organizations including organizational performance, employee satisfaction, and employee performance. Particularly, Burns' and Bass' concepts of transactional and transformational leadership is relevant to this discussion as these concepts have been shown to affect such organizational characteristics as employee behavior, employee satisfaction, employee performance, and organizational performance.

Much of the research related to transactional and transformational leadership is behavioral in nature, seeking to understand the causal relationship between the leader’s style and the subsequent effects on their subordinates and unit performance. Several studies (Tichy and Devanna, 1986; Smith, Carson, and Alexander, 1984) argue that attributes of executive leadership significantly affects organizations. Further, several studies have shown a positive correlation between transformational leadership and group or organizational performance and effectiveness. Specifically, research studies (Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein, 1988; Barling, Weber, and Kelloway, 1996; Howell and Avolio, 1993; Jung and Avolio, 2000; Keller, 1992; Keller, 1995; Koh, Steers, and Terborg, 1995; Russ, McNeilly, and Comer, 1996; Sosik, 1997; Spangler and Braiotta, 1990; Waldman, Bass, and Einstein, 1987; Walman and Yammarino, 1999; Yammarino and Bass, 1990) have shown transformational leadership attributes to be significantly correlated with follower, group, unit-level, and/or organizational effectiveness/performance. Similarly, other research studies (Deluga, 1988; Hater and Bass, 1988; Medley and Laroche, 1995; Seltzer and Bass, 1990; Tracey and Hinkin, 1994) have revealed transformational leadership attributes to be significantly correlated to leader effectiveness and employee satisfaction.

A macro-review of dissertations reveals that over 100 dissertations have studied transactional and transformational leadership style and their relationship to various aspects of college and university effectiveness. Specifically, several dissertations have explored transformational and transactional leadership and their relationship to college and university employee, departmental and/or organizational performance. For instance, two dissertations studied student or faculty academic leadership and its relationship to effective organizational change in higher education (Nischan, 1997; Temple, 2001). Three dissertations studied leadership behavior/style and its relationship to university athletic programs (Davis, 2001; London, 1996; Zwiren, 1995). Numerous studies have explored the leadership styles of college and university presidents and their relationship to various aspects of organizational performance (Eldredge, 1999; Epps, 1999; Harris, 1996; Harrison, 2000; Jackson, 1999; Levine, 2000; Mason, 1998; Murray, 1988; Niles, 1997; Tucker, 1990). In addition, two dissertations studied Student Affairs executive leadership style and its relationship to various aspects of organizational satisfaction and performance (Anderson, 1998; Greenlee, 1992). Finally, two dissertation studies explored leadership styles of college and university library leadership and their relationship to library effectiveness (Albritton, 1993; Suwannarat, 1994).

Surprisingly, there was an absence of literature seeking to uncover any relationship between Chief Enrollment Manager's (CEMs') leadership style and enrollment performance in colleges and universities. Based on the importance of Chief Enrollment Management to institutions of higher education (Hossler, 1990; Hossler and Bean, 1990; Maguire, 1986; Swanson and Weese, 1997) and the lack of research in this area, CEM leadership needs to be investigated to explore and document any relationship between CEM transactional or transformational leadership style and enrollment performance.

Thus, based on these various dissertation studies from higher education, and the various research studies from the leadership literature, it seemed safe to deduce that transformational leadership attributes are positively correlated with follower and organizational effectiveness/performance at colleges and universities, while transactional leadership attributes are negatively correlated with follower and institutional performance measures. It also seemed safe to hypothesize that transformational leadership exhibited by Chief Enrollment Managers (CEMs) would be positively correlated with institutional enrollment performance at CCCU institutions, while transactional leadership exhibited by CEMs would be negatively correlated with institutional enrollment performance. Further, due to the surprising absence of literature exploring any relationship between CEM's leadership style and enrollment performance in colleges and universities and the emphasis placed on Chief Enrollment Management at institutions of higher education (Hossler, 1990; Hossler and Bean, 1990; Maguire, 1986; Swanson and Weese, 1997), CEM leadership needed to be investigated to explore and document any relationship between CEM transactional or transformational leadership style and subsequent institutional enrollment performance at CCCU institutions.

Part III: Results and Conclusions

Interestingly, my research findings were not as anticipated.

Transactional Chief Enrollment Manager Leadership

Based on the results from the data analysis, only one positive, statistically significant correlation was found between CEM transactional leadership and institutional enrollment performance. All other leadership attributes revealed no statistically significant, positive or negative correlation CEM transactional leadership and institutional enrollment performance. This is generally inconsistent with previous research on the effects of transactional leadership and organizational effectiveness. Thus, based on the results from this data analysis, it could not be concluded that a negative correlation exists between CEM transactional leadership and institutional enrollment performance.

Transformational Chief Enrollment Manager Leadership

Similarly, no statistically significant correlation was revealed between CEM transformational leadership and institutional enrollment performance. It could not be concluded that a positive correlation existed between CEM transformational leadership and institutional enrollment performance, which is also inconsistent with previous research on the effects of transformational leadership.

Laissez-Faire Chief Enrollment Manager Leadership

Further, no statistically significant correlation was revealed between CEM laissez-faire leadership and the institutional enrollment performance. In fact, all of the correlation coefficients for CEM laissez-faire leadership and institutional enrollment performance were positive in nature. This was also inconsistent with previous research on the effects of laissez-faire leadership and organizational effectiveness. Thus, it could not be conclude that a negative correlation exists between CEM laissez-faire leadership and institutional enrollment performance.

Implications

Since the results from the data analysis of this research project did not indicate a statistically significant, positive or negative correlation between CEM transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership and institutional enrollment performance, the implications of this research study are null. The larger body of leadership research pointing to the influence of leadership style and organizational effectiveness was neither supported or refuted due to the inconsequential nature of the results from this research study. Therefore, the greatest implication of this study was the need for further research designed to overcome the limitations of this research study while further exploring and isolating the relationship between Chief Enrollment Manager leadership and institutional enrollment performance.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research study could be expanded to provide further information to students and practitioners of higher education administration through further research into the effects of Chief Enrollment Manager leadership style and institutional enrollment performance.

Since one of the limitations of this study was the limited focus of the designated study sample, expanding the survey group further to larger consortiums or classifications of higher education institutions could strengthen the findings of a future study. In fact, a study designed to include all the institutions in the global population would provide the greatest amount of applicable information for the entire higher education community.

Another suggestion for future research would include a research design allowing for an extended period of time for data collection at the same pool of institutions. This would enable the study of the way CEM leadership style potentially fluctuates over time, and how perceived changes in CEM leadership style correlates to changes in enrollment performance over time.

In addition, due to the insignificant statistical results derived from the data collection and analysis process of this study that are contrary to the majority of the hypotheses proposed by this research study and documented in the leadership literature at large, additional research incorporating the use of a multiple regression research design may be better to further explore and statistically analyze the importance of CEM leadership and its influence on institutional enrollment performance.

Further, a study exploring the affects of Enrollment division mid-level management leadership style on institutional enrollment performance may be valuable as the CEM may be too far removed from the day-to-day operations of the enrollment division, minimizing the effects of their leadership on enrollment performance as evidenced by this study's results. A study exploring the affects of Enrollment division entry-level employees may also be prudent to identify their leadership style and its potential effect on institutional enrollment performance, as this is where the day-to-day enrollment operations are truly executed. These suggestions may help explain the insignificant statistical results derived from the data collection and analysis process of this study and provide a better understanding of the level at which enrollment management leadership style possibly affects institutional enrollment performance.

Ultimately, there is need for continuing and expanding the scope of the present research to gather more information and a better understanding of the importance and relationship of Chief Enrollment Manager leadership style and institutional enrollment performance.

Conclusions

So in conclusion, private colleges and universities need effective leadership at all levels of the institution's administration in order to navigate and survive the rough waters present during the first quarter of the 21st century. Although my study did not definitively concluded that enrollment management divisions led by Chief Enrollment Managers (CEMs) exhibiting a specific leadership style correlated to higher or lower levels of institutional enrollment

performance, this does not negate the larger body of leadership literature. In fact, based on the leadership literature at large and specific dissertations targeting various areas of higher education, there is substantial evidence of a correlation between Leadership Style and Performance in Higher Education. Therefore, additional research further exploring the relationship between Chief Enrollment Manager leadership and institutional enrollment performance is warranted and strongly encouraged.

References

- Albritton, R. L. (1993). Transformational vs. transactional leadership in university libraries: A test of the model and its relationship to perceived library organizational effectiveness. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Allen, D. (2001). Colleges brace the economic downturn. *Chronicle of higher education*, 47(April 20), A10.
- Anderson, G. S. (1998). Enhancing executive selection in student affairs: A profile of effective chief student affairs officers at selected liberal arts colleges. Kent State University.
- Angelo, J. M. (2002). Small-school shakeout: Statistics are grim, but some survive. *University business*, June 2002, 17.
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., and Einstein, W. O. (1988). Transformational leadership in a management game simulation: Impacting the bottom line. *Group and organization studies*, 13(1), 59-80.
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., and Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four i's of transformational leadership. *Journal of european industrial training*, 15(4), 9-16.
- Barling, J., Weber, T., and Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of applied psychology*, 81(6), 827-832.
- Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational dynamics*, 13(3), 26-40.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership*. Alexandria VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public administration quarterly*, 17(1), 112-121.

- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B.J. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Sampler set. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., and Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of transformational leadership at the world-class level. *Journal of management*, 13(1), 7-19.
- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Bernard, L. L. (1926). *An introduction to social psychology*. New York: Holt.
- Bingham, W. V. (1927). Leadership. In H. C. Metcalf. *The psychological foundations of management*. New York: Shaw.
- Blake, R. R and Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf.
- Breneman, D. W. (2002). For colleges, this is not just another recession. *The chronicle of higher education*, 48(40), B7-B9.
- Brown, A. D. (1994). Transformational leadership in tackling technical change. *Journal of general management*, 19(4), 1-12.
- Brownstein, A. (2001). Enrollment shifts and last minute aid requests signal the onset of an economic downturn. *Chronicle of higher education*, 47(April 20), A14.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Burns, J. M. (1995). Transactional and transforming leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.). *The leader's companion*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Carlyle, T. (1841). On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History. In H. Murch (Ed.). *Carlyle's Heroes and Hero Worship*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., Publishers, 1913.
- Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. A. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- Davis, D. J. (2001). An analysis of the perceived leadership styles and levels of satisfaction of selected junior college athletic directors and head coaches. United States Sports Academy.
- Deluga, R. J. (1988). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with employee influencing strategies. *Group and organization studies*, 13(4) 456-467.
- Dixon, D. L. (1998). The balanced CEM: A transformational leader and a capable manager. *Healthcare forum journal*, 41(2), 26-29.

- Dowd, J. (1936). *Control in human societies*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century.
- Drucker, P. F. (1992). *Managing for the future: The 1990s and beyond*. New York, NY: Truman Talley Books/Dutton.
- Dunn, S. L. (2000, March-April). The virtualizing of education. *The futurist*, 32(2), 1-7.
- Eldredge, R. G. (1999). The advancement president in higher education. Johnson and Wales University.
- Epps, B. P. (1999). Effective private college leadership: A case study of strong charismatic presidents of small private colleges. The Union Institute.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Advance in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press, 1964.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1971). Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. *Psychological bulletin*, 76, 128-148.
- Fiedler, F. E. and Garcia, J. E. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership: cognitive resources and organizational performance*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Galton, F. (1870). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. New York: Appleton.
- Gardner, J. (1989). *On Leadership*, New York: Free Press
- Greenlee, K. E. (1992). An analysis of leadership styles and job satisfaction in student affairs. Oklahoma State University.
- Harris, J. P. (1996). A study of transformational leadership and decision-making processes in the coalition for christian colleges and universities. Kent State University.
- Harrison, D. T. (2000). Transformational leadership and community college effectiveness. The Ohio State University.
- Hater, J. H. and Bass, B M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 73(4), 695-702.
- Hersey, P. (1984). *The situational leader*. New York, NY: Warner.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Hollander, E. P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Hossler, D. (1990). Chapter 3: Organizational approaches. In Hossler, D., Bean, J. P., and Associates. *The strategic management of college enrollments*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hossler, D. and Bean, J. P. (1990). Chapter 1: Principles and objectives. In Hossler, D., Bean, J. P., and Associates. *The strategic management of college enrollments*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, 16, 321-338.
- House, R. J. (1977). A theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior, Vol. 10*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J. and Aditya, R. N. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of management*, 23(3), 409-474.
- House, R. J. and Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of contemporary business*, 3, 81-97.
- Howell, J. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(6), 891-902.
- Jackson, R.L., Sr. (1999). Transformational and transactional leadership in division administration at three institutions of higher education: An application of the bass and avolio multifactor leadership questionnaire. University of Cincinnati.
- Jarvis, M. (2003). Marshall university president warns of possible furloughs. *Charleston Daily Mail*.
- Jennings, E. E. (1960). *An anatomy of leadership: Princes, heroes, and supermen*. New York: Harper.
- Jerousek, M. (2003). Falling endowments strain college budgets. *The Des Moines Register*.
- Jung, D. J. and Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 21, 949-964.
- Kahn, R. L. and Katz, D. (1953). *Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale*. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.). *Group Dynamics*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

- Keller, R. T. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of management*, 18(3), 489-501.
- Keller, R. T. (1995). "Transformational" leaders make a difference. *Research-technology management*, 38(3), 41-44.
- Kilbourne, C. E. (1935). The elements of leadership. *Journal of coast artillery*, 78, 437-439.
- Koh, W. L., Steers R. M., and Terborg J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in singapore. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 16, 319-333.
- Kouzes, J. M. and Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, M. F. (2000). The importance of leadership: An investigation of presidential style at fifty national universities. University of North Texas.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1967). An emerging theory of organizations, leadership, and management. In L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass. *Leadership and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt.
- Lively, K. (2001). For private colleges without large endowments, bearish markets bring anxiety and caution. *Chronicle of higher education*, 47(April 20), A15.
- London, C. L. (1996). Transformational, transactional leadership and organizational effectiveness of canadian university athletic programs. MHK University of Windsor.
- Maguire, J. (1986). Enrollment management: Goals, methods, and issues. In A. W. Rowland (Ed.). *Handbook of institutional advancement* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mann, R. D. (1959) A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 66(4), 241-70.
- Mann, F. C. (1965). *Toward an understanding of the leadership role in formal organization*. In R. Dublin (Ed.). *Leadership and productivity*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler.
- Mark, R. (1996). *Research made simple: A handbook for social workers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Mason, A. M. (1998). Perceptions of presidential leadership by chief academic officers and their relationships to job satisfaction, motivation toward extra effort, and perceived

effectiveness in american community colleges: A composite model of transformational and transactional leadership. North Carolina State University.

- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McPherson, M. S. and Schaprio, M. O. (2001). Preparing for hard times shows wisdom, not pessimism. *Chronicle of higher education*, 47(April 20), B24.
- Medley, F. and Larochele, D. R. (1995). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Nursing management*, 26(9), 64JJ-64NN.
- Murray, M. F. (1988). A study of transformational leadership, organizational effectiveness, and demographics in selected small college settings. Kent State University.
- NCSS – Statistical Analysis and Data Analysis Software. (2002). *Product information: NCSS stat system*. Retrieved March 3, 2003, from <http://www.ncss.com>
- Niles, G. P. (1997). A comparative study of leadership behaviors in university settings. The University of Rochester.
- Nischan, T. P. (1997). Transformational leadership as a predictor of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction in a community college classroom environment. Nova Southeastern University.
- Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Perry, J. L. (2002). Stanford and duke consider job cuts. *Chronicle of higher education*, XLIX(12), A33.
- Pulley, J. L. (2003). Another downer of a year for college endowments. *Chronicle of higher education*, XLIX(20), A23-A27.
- Rivard, N. (2002). Economy continues to batter higher ed: Schools modify investments, slash budgets – and seize opportunities. *University Business*, 5(10), 7-8.
- Russ, F. A., McNeilly, K. M., and Comer, J. M. (1996). Leadership, decision making and performance of sales managers: A multi-level approach. *Journal of personal selling and management*, 16(3), 1-15.
- Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo (Eds.). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuster, J. P. (1994, January). Transforming your leadership style. Association management, 46(1), L39-L42.

- Seltzer, J. and Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of management*, 16(4), 693-703.
- Shannon E. (1995). The relationships between transformational leadership and care/justice aspects of psychosocial development and selected characteristics of women university students: Implications for educating leaders. University of Alabama at Birmingham.
- Smith, J. E., Carson, K. P. and Alexander R. A. (1984). Leadership: It can make a difference. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(4), 765-776.
- Sosik, J. J. (1997). Effect of transformational leadership and anonymity on idea generation in computer-mediated groups. *Group and organization management*, 22(4), 460-487.
- Spangler, W. D. and Braiotta, L. (1990). Leadership and corporate audit committee effectiveness. *Group and organization studies*, 15(2), 134-157.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Stogdill, R. M. and Coons, A. E. (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press for Bureau of Business Research.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Suwannarat, P. (1994). Library leadership in research university libraries. Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University.
- Swanson, R. M. and Weese, F. A. (Eds.). (1997). *Becoming a leader in enrollment services: A development guide for the higher education professional*. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).
- Tead, O. (1929). *Human nature and management: The application of psychology to executive leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Temple, J. A. (2001). Leadership style of technical-vocational deans in American community colleges: A predictive study. Texas Tech University.
- Tichy, N. M, and Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Tichy, N. M. and Devanna, M. A. (1986b). The transformational leader. *Training and development journal*, 40(7), 27-32.
- Tracey, J. B. and Hinkin, T. R. (1994). Transformational leadership in the hospitality industry *Cornell hotel and restaurant administration quarterly*, 35(2), 18-24.

- Trowbridge, K. S. (2002). The state of christian higher education: Thriving. Council for Christian Colleges and Universities.
- Tucker, M. L. (1990). Higher education leadership: Transformational leadership as a predictor of satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. University of New Orleans.
- Van Der Werf, M. (2002). Mount senario's final act. *The chronicle of higher education*, 48(40), A24-A27.
- Van Der Werf, M. (2002). Recession and reality set in at private colleges. *Chronicle of higher education*, 48(March 1), A26.
- Van Der Werf, M. (2002). Junk-bond colleges: Declining fiscal ratings reflect the struggles many small colleges face. *Chronicle of higher education*, 49(22), pp. A21-A24.
- Van Der Werf, M. (2003). Colleges issue record volume of bonds. *Chronicle of higher education*, 49(26), p. A32.
- Van Der Werf, M., Blumenstyk, Goldie, and June, Audrey W. (2002). Fallout from wall street hits colleges hard. *The chronicle of higher education*, 48(48), A27-A28.
- Vroom, V. H. and Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organization*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vroom, V. H. and Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., and Einstein, W. O. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal processes. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 60(3), 177-186.
- Waldman, D. A. and Yammarino, F. J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: Levels-of-management and levels-of-analysis effects. *Academy of management review*, 24(2), 266-285.
- Wiggam, A. E. (1931). The biology of leadership. In H. C. Metcalf. *Business Leadership*. New York: Pitman.
- Woods, F. A. (1913). *The influence of monarchs: Steps in a new science of history*. New York: MacMillan.
- Wren, J. T. (Ed.). (1995). *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Yammarino, F. J. and Bass, B. M., (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In E. C. Clark and B. C.

Clark (Eds.). *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America, Inc. (151-169).

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of management*, 15(2), 251-289.

Zhao, Yilu, (2002). More small colleges dropping out. *The new york times*, May 7, 2002, A20.

Zwiren, M. L. (1995). Leadership behavior of athletic directors in jesuit colleges/universities and its relationship to supported student athlete graduation rates. Fordham University.