STARS

University of Central Florida

STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2005

Transformational Leadership Qualities Of Florida Community College Student Government Advisors

Thomas Rath
University of Central Florida

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd

University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP QUALITIES OF FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ADVISORS

by

THOMAS KENNARD RATH
B.A. Binghamton University, 1988
M.S. College Misericordia, 1999

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

Fall Term
2005

Major Professor: Jess House

ABSTRACT

College student government organizations (SGOs) have the important responsibility for achievement of purposes that serve students and the college community. They are also the student voice in higher education governance. Effective student leadership is vital to the effective fulfillment of these purposes, as is the role of the student government advisor in ensuring the success of student leadership and leadership development. Transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) is seen as a way of reaching higher levels of leadership effectiveness and organizational performance, and it has been advanced for use in SGOs.

This study examined the extent to which community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student governments. Several research questions were formulated to guide this examination. Surveys which included an instrument to measure the effectiveness of reaching organizational outcomes and the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research* (MLQ 5X) (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000) were given to Florida community college student government executive board members and their respective student government advisors. Anticipated findings included increased levels of organizational outcomes in those community college SGOs in which advisors exhibit greater levels of transformational leadership qualities.

Analysis of the data yielded advisor and student government member demographics, and a strong level of fulfillment of organizational outcomes. Statistically significant positive correlations were found between student reported transformational leadership qualities of advisors and student ratings of achievement and importance of organizational outcomes. A statistically significant correlation was also found between student ratings of importance of organizational outcomes and student ratings of the achievement of organizational outcomes. This indicates the existence of a relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of Florida community college student government advisors and the perceived importance and achievement of student government organizational outcomes. Secondary results were also given.

Results of this study suggest that Florida community college student government advisors who exhibited higher levels of transformational leadership qualities engendered higher levels of organizational outcomes in Florida community college student governments. Implications were discussed for the study findings, and recommendations for future research were made.

Dedicated to the memory and ongoing presence of my beloved friend, Freud.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

<u>Introduction</u>

Student government is essential to the success of a college community (Golden &

Schwartz, 1994) and reinforces characteristics necessary for citizenship skills (Morse,

1989). Student participation in college and university governance is a stated goal of most

higher education institutions, and an involvement in student government "implies student

participation in a wide variety of leadership activities" (Kuh & Lund, 1994, p.6). An

inquiry into the leadership characteristics of community college student government

advisors, particularly in reference to transformational leadership, becomes especially

relevant to the investigation of college student government leadership (Boatman, 1998;

Chavez, 1996; Fortune, 1999; Francis, 1997; Lord, 1978).

The institutional formalization of student participation largely takes the form of

student government organizations, whose role and influence have gradually increased

throughout the history of American higher education (Horowitz, 1987). With this

increase in student government role and influence comes related interest in student

leadership studies in student government, particularly in the application of Bass's (1985)

and Bass and Avolio's (1993) principles of transformational leadership (Gold &

Quatroche, 1994). This leadership model serves the need of student affairs officers to

advance student government goals and purposes (Gold & Quatroche, 1994). The

community college student government advisor is a nexus for study of transformational leadership and effective student government.

Problem Statement

The role of the student government advisor directly influences the potential success of student government leadership (Gold & Quatroche, 1994). Transformational leadership may be either formally or informally implemented to promote constitutional and other purposes of student government leadership (Fasci, 1993). This study examined the extent to which community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student government. The following research questions were formulated to guide this examination:

1. To what degree are community college student government advisors (CCSGAs) educated, formally or informally, in the concepts of transformational leadership?

2. What are the demographic characteristics of CCSGAs and the leaders of community college student government organizations (CCSGOs)?

3. What are the perceptions of the leaders of CCSGOs of the transformational leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

4. What are the self-reported transformational leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

5. To what degree are the organizational outcomes of CCSGOs fulfilled, as measured by achievement of those outcomes by CCSGO leaders and advisors?

6. What is the relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of community college student government advisors and community college student government organizational outcomes?

Limitations and Delimitations

1. The data were delimited to responses from Florida community college student government leaders and advisors.

2. The population of student government leaders was delimited to student government executive board members at Florida community colleges.

3. Persons identified as student government advisors were delimited to those recognized by the Florida Junior and Community College Student Government Association (FJCCSGA) as having primary responsibility for Florida community college student government advising.

4. Consideration of leadership development was delimited to those defined as leadership activities found in community college student governments, as opposed to the general category of student activities as found within Florida community college organizations and offices, particularly campus activity boards.

5. The transformational leadership qualities of CCSGO advisors, perceived effective transformational leadership of advisors, and the level of effectiveness in reaching organizational outcomes could be accounted for by factors other than the process of transformational leadership.

<u>Definition of Terms</u>

The following terms were used in this study:

1. <u>Constitutional and Other Purposes</u> – Student government purposes are formalized in SGO constitutions. They were typically included within the three categories of student government as (a) responsibility for governance as acceded by higher education institutions, (b) providing leadership experiences to those involved in student government, and (c) providing "valuable co-curricular services for the student body" (Cuyjet, 1994, p. 77).

2. <u>Executive Board</u> – In this study, the term executive board referred to, in most cases, four respondents on each campus who held the positions of President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, or the equivalents.

3. <u>Florida Community College or Community College</u> – For the purposes of this study, Florida community colleges were defined as public educational institutions "operated by a community college district board of trustees under statutory authority and rules of the State Board of Education" as defined in Florida Statutes Section 1004.65 ("West's Florida Statutes Annotated," 2005, p. 517). They are authorized to provide comprehensive adult education

services including lower level undergraduate instruction and associate
degrees, career and technical education, student development services,
economic and workforce development programs, dual enrollment instruction,
and other services as prescribed by law. One private junior college, a member
of FJCCSGA, was also included in the study, and shall be included in the
definition of *Community College*.

4. Student Government Advisor (SGA) – This individual was any full-time or
   part-time staff or faculty member officially recognized by their community or
   junior college as having advising responsibilities for a particular campus
   student government. Also referred to in this study simply as *advisor(s).*

5. Student Government Organizations (SGOs) – This term was used to denote
   any student organization officially recognized by a college that fulfills student
   government constitutional purposes and functions.

6. Student Government Leaders and Leadership – Student government leaders
   and leadership were students who met the minimal qualifications for
   membership in community college SGOs. Also referred to in this study simply
   as *student(s).*

<div align="center">Assumptions</div>

It was assumed that the respondents to the surveys answered honestly and
candidly. It was also assumed that the surveys provided validly measured the
respondents' replies, that information provided by agencies involved in the study was

accurate, and that the perceptions of the respondents were relevant. It was further

assumed that institutional differences, such as in campus size and location, did not affect

the outcomes of the study.

<center>Significance of the Study</center>

This study and its research questions should assist college student government

leaders, their advisors, and other college officials, particularly in Florida, to better

achieve student government organizational outcomes and purposes. Greater

understanding of the viability of transformational leadership in the understudied

population of college student leaders was achieved. Furthermore, this study may add to

the consideration of the importance of student government in community colleges and

higher education, particularly in the areas of campus life, student activities, student

development, and student retention.

<center>Conceptual Framework</center>

<center>College Student Governments</center>

College student governments have significantly evolved from their antecedents in

late 18th century student activism (Chambers & Phelps, 1994). Latter 19th and early 20th

century students were concerned with the issues of in loco parentis and the removal of

unpopular college officials or services. Student governments were established or

<center>6</center>

reformed in earnest between 1900 and 1920 largely as a means of administrative control over students (Horowitz, 1987). The limited activity and activism from this time to the 1960s largely centered on the issues of access to higher education for immigrants and the poor and pacifism movements (Chambers & Phelps, 1994). The free speech movement, political activism, and expansion of student rights were among the issues concerning SGOs in the 1960s. Political activity lessened in student governments in the early 1970s, with the subject of student entitlement being predominant (Chambers & Phelps, 1994). The 1980s and 1990s saw a rise in concern among students and student governments about professional career preparation (Schlesinger & Baldridge, 1982; Chambers & Phelps, 1994).

Today's student governments reflect an interest in governance, policy making, accountability, and institutional financial responsibility (Chambers & Phelps, 1994). Cuyjet (1994) stated that the three main purposes of modern student governments are (1) responsibility for governance as acceded by higher education institutions, (2) providing leadership experiences to those involved in student government, and (3) providing "valuable cocurricular services for the student body" (p. 76-77). Organizational outcomes and student government involvement in these outcomes, can then be viewed as the relative ability to effectively reach these purposes.

Researchers have demonstrated that college students have a need to be involved in institutional decision-making and governance (Lord, 1978; Francis, 1979). However, as detailed in Lord's study (1978), a majority of respondents had no knowledge of current student governance or, if aware of such representation, wanted to be involved in such

governance. Francis (1979) found that while 84% of students realized the importance of participation in student governance, only 2% were actually involved in student governance. An understanding of leadership theory and application, effective leadership, and successful demonstrated organizational outcomes as practiced by student government leaders and developed by their advisors, is a possible redress to the disparity of student-realized need for participation and their actual motivation to be involved.

Leadership Theory

A review of leadership theory can be organized into several distinct categories: trait theory, behavior theory, situation and contingency theory, exchange and path goal theory, charismatic and transformational theory, and the emergent categories of constitutive or constructive theories, leadership within learning organizations, and post charismatic or post-transformational theory (Storey, 2004). Behavior theory, situation and contingency theory, and charismatic and transformational theory are of particular influence in the field of student leadership.

Trait theory is concerned with native qualities that are possessed by effective leaders. Behavior theory is primarily concerned with determining those behavioral styles that are effective and universally applicable and is largely associated with the discussion of the dichotomy of task and relationship orientation. Although varied in detail, situation and contingency theory is concerned with the relationship of situations with leadership styles. Situational leadership, defined as the interplay between leaders, followers, and situations, has been applied in at least one college student government development

program (Chavez, 1985). Dichotomous models of leadership found in behavior and process theory also influence student leadership theory (Woodland, 1994).

Charismatic theory owes much to the work of the sociologist Max Weber. Weber believed that charisma was a quality of personality of extraordinary and unique nature on which leadership is often based and conferred (Weber, 1968). Some others who have contributed to this field include House (1977), Conger and Kanungo (1988), and Bass (1985). Constitutive and constructivist theory is concerned with the *meaning making* of leaders and followers (Storey, 2004). Leadership "dependent on time and place" (p. 16) is subject to evaluation over various lengths of time and must be internally and externally validated. Post-charismatic and post-transformational leadership theory has as its focus the consideration of alternative models of leadership to charismatic leadership, such as suggested by Fullan (2001), which involves embedded learning and learning as a result of conflict, devolved team based leadership, and tolerance for experimentation and false starts.

Transformational Leadership

Bass's (1985) concept of transformational leadership served as the theoretical focus of this study. Transformational leadership theory is best understood in contrast with transactional leadership. According to Burns (1978), leadership can be moral or amoral in nature. Only moral leaders can be transactional or transformational. Transactional leaders act with exchange in mind. Transformational leaders act to satisfy higher needs of followers and engage the whole person. There has been a growth in student leadership

9

studies in this area, especially in the application of Bass's (1985) principles of leadership (Gold & Quatroche, 1994). This model serves the need of student affairs officers to advance student government goals (p. 42).

Bass (1985) posited that the study of leadership in the half-century before 1985 was mainly concerned with the dichotomies of autocratic and democratic leadership, directive and participative locus of decision-making, task and relationship focus, and initiation and consideration behavior. Bass (1985) viewed these approaches as inadequate in dealing with the study of leadership given the need for higher-order change in effort and performance, the shortcomings of cost-benefit exchange theories, and the emergence of new approaches to the subject of motivation. Bass expanded Burns' (1978) definition of transforming leadership to that of transformational leadership, and transactional leadership from that of quid pro quo exchange to contingent reinforcement.

Bass's (1985) definition of transactional leadership includes recognition of what workers want from work and, if warranted, facilitating wants. It also recognizes an exchange of rewards and promises of reward for worker effort. Finally, transactional leadership "is responsive to our [the worker's] immediate self-interests if they can be met by getting our work done" (Bass, 1985, p.11).

The process of contingent reinforcement is the main force in transactional leadership (Bass, 1998). Contingent reinforcement includes the components of contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership, with contingent reward the most effective transactional approach. Active and passive management-by-exception

is considered to be the next most effective. Laissez-faire leadership, the lack of

leadership, is considered the least effective of these components (Bass, 1998).

Refining Burn's (1978, p. 22) construct of transforming leadership, Bass (1985)

added the construct of expanding a portfolio of needs and wants and the concept of

detrimental *pseudotransformational leadership* (Bass, 1998). Bass (1985) differed from

Burns by including transactional leadership as part of overall leadership behavior, not in a

continuum of behavior as proposed by Burns.

Bass (1998) asserted that the transformational leader exhibits, to some relative

degree, all aspects of transactional and transformational leadership. The distribution of

transactional leadership and transformational leadership components is particularly

important. The more effective transformational leader exhibits greater evidence of

components associated with transformational leadership. According to Bass' view of

transformational leadership (1985, 1998), it is the presence and augmentation of

transformational leadership components on transactional components that accounts for

results greater than those accounted for by transactional leadership.

Transformational leadership components include the interacting and interrelated

constructs of idealized influence (attributed and behavioral), inspirational motivation,

intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985/1998; Bass and

Avolio, 1993). These constructs were determined and refined (Bass, 1998) through factor

studies as completed by Bass (1985), Howell and Avolio (1993), Bycio, Hackett, and

Allen (1995), and Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1997).

Charismatic leadership or idealized influence describes the process in which leaders are viewed by followers as role models. Followers imbue them with exceptional personal qualities and high levels of moral and ethical conduct (Bass, 1998). Inspirational motivation is the process in which transformational leaders behave "in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers' work" (Bass, 1998, p. 11). Intellectual stimulation is the process whereby leaders encourage followers' innovation and creativity. Individualized consideration is the coaching or mentoring process in which leaders foster individual followers' unique "needs for achievement and growth" in a holistic fashion (Bass, 1998, p. 11).

Effective transformational leadership and the interrelated dynamics of its constructs may have implications in field of student government advising. Dickerson (1999) posited that student government leaders face more limits, time constraints, and concentrated leadership training than in the past. Chavez (1985) also viewed the role of advisors as being particularly demanding and complex with many formal and personal functions.

Given this need for concentrated advisor leadership, Bass's definition (1985) of an effective transformational leader is particularly salient. The student government advisor has an important role in the success of SGOs (McKaig & Policello, 1987) and in the leadership development of student government members, particularly as evidenced in the quality of their extracurricular learning (Kuh, Schuh, & Witt, 1991; McKaig & Policello, 1987). In this context, the study of transformational leadership as a leadership paradigm practiced in student leadership development is merited.

Methodology

As of February 2005, there were 28 community colleges in the State of Florida, which included 52 campuses and 172 sites in the State of Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2005). For the purposes of this study all campuses and sites with active student governments (72) were investigated, as was one private junior college. Each campus or site had one student government association or representative with at least one student government advisor. All Florida community college student governments were members of the Florida Junior and Community College Student Government Association (FJCCSGA). The following sections detail the research type, population and samples, instrumentation data collection and analysis, and anticipated findings of the study.

Research Type

The study consisted of a survey of two versions, one designed for advisors and the other designed for student leaders. Each version consisted of two sections. The first section included items meant to gather demographic information about community college SGAs and community college SGO leaders. Community college SGAs and student leaders were also asked the degree to which they have or their advisors have achieved student government outcomes. The second part of the survey included the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research* (MLQ 5X) (Bass & Avolio, 1995/2000), which measured transformational leadership behaviors, types of leadership, and transformational leadership outcomes as self-perceived by community college

13

student government advisors and as perceived by community college student government members.

Bass' theory of transformational leadership (1995, 1998) was used as the conceptual model in this study. This research type yielded quantitative data that were analyzed for statistical significance. The survey as designed was expected to effectively measure and represent transformational leadership as found in community college student government advising.

Population and Sample

The population was all Florida community college and junior college student government advisors and all executive board members of Florida community college and junior college student governments, numbering approximately 360. The purposive sample included all respondents who were members of the Florida Junior and Community College Student Government Association for the 2004-2005 academic year, who completed the survey, and who were advisors or student executive board members. Human subjects study approval from University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board was obtained before implementation.

Instrumentation and Other Sources of Data

Two instruments were used to collect data for this investigation. A self-constructed instrument was developed to gather demographic information about

respondents, the degree to which constitutional and other student government processes were achieved, and the levels of organizational outcomes met in those community college SGOs. Organizational outcome items were developed from a review of literature, particularly Cuyjet's (1994) research of relevant services provided by student government. The *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research* (MLQ 5X) (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000) measured the presence of transformational leadership characteristics in respondents and the leadership outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness. Data from both instruments were used to address the last research question, "What is the relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of community college student government advisors and community college student government organizational outcomes?"

Research Questions

Data for research questions 1, 2, and 5 were collected in a self-constructed section of the survey. The question, "To what degree are community college student government advisors educated, formally or informally, in the concepts on transformational leadership?" was addressed in items 28 though 31 of the advisor survey. The question, "What are the demographic characteristics of community college student government advisors and student government organization leaders?" was addressed in items 25, 26, 27, 32, and 38 of the advisors survey. Items 25 to 30, and 33 to 34, were used to measure demographic characteristics for students. The last question measured in this survey, "To what degree have community college student government organizations achieved their

15

organizational outcomes, both as perceived by SGO leaders and by their advisors?" was addressed in items 1 through 24 of both versions of the survey.

Data for research questions 3 and 4, that of student government organization leaders' perceptions of community college student government advisors' transformational leadership qualities and student government advisors' self- perceptions of their transformational leadership qualities, were collected in the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research* (MLQ 5X) (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000). The transformational leadership qualities of idealized influence (attributed and behavior) were measured in items 6, 10, 14, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, and 34; inspirational motivation in items 9, 13, 26, and 36; intellectual stimulation in items 2, 8, 30, and 32; and individualized consideration in items 15, 19, 29, and 31. The transactional leadership qualities of contingent rewards were measured in items 1, 11, 16, and 35; management-by-exception (active and passive) in items 3, 4, 12, 17, 20, 22, 24, and 27; and laissez-faire leadership in items 5, 7, 28, and 33. Two short answer qualitative questions were asked of both advisors and students, and these were found in item 31 of both versions of the survey.

Data Collection

All data for the study were obtained from surveys administered and returned from the dates of February 10 to April 30, 2005. Surveys were initially administered at the FJCCSGA State Conference from February 10-12, 2005. Respondents who did not take or return surveys were contacted and sent surveys in the mail in March and April 2005.

To encourage a high return rate from respondents, elements of Dillman's (2000) Tailored

Design elements were utilized. These elements included using respondent friendly

questionnaires, multiple contacts, providing return envelopes with first class stamps, and

personalized correspondence to respondents (Dillman, 2000).

Anticipated Findings

From an examination of the literature, this researcher anticipated the result of

increased levels of organizational outcomes in community college SGOs whose advisors

exhibit greater levels of transformational leadership qualities. It was further anticipated

that these exhibited greater levels of transformational leadership qualities would be

demonstrated as self-reported by advisors and as rated by students. Secondary anticipated

findings include certain demographic characteristics of advisors and student leaders, the

ways in which advisors received education and training in transformational leadership,

and the reasons why student government executive board members joined student

government.

Justification for the Research

There was a paucity of research that specifically examined transformational

leadership in student government advising. Given the essential role of the student

government advisor in the success of student governments, the potential reliance on

transformational leadership as a theoretical base for college student leadership training,

and the purpose of community colleges in providing educational opportunities to students, research into this particular area was justified.

Summary

This study investigated the potential influence of community college student government advisors who exhibit transformational leadership on the organizational outcomes of community college student governments.

Chapter 1 presents an introduction to the study, the problem to be studied and related study questions. A conceptual framework, methodology, sample and population, an explanation of research questions and research type, limitations and delimitations, definition of terms, assumptions, significance of the study, data collection, anticipated findings, and justification for the research were presented in this chapter.

Chapter 2 presents a review of literature on and related to transformational leadership and community college student government. This review included the history of college student governments and their modern role and function in higher education; the role of the college student advising, particularly student government advising; and an examination of the theory of transformational leadership and research concerning the transformational leadership characteristics and qualities of those who are in student advising positions or related positions. Literature on the organizational outcomes in college student governments and related groups was reviewed, as was research and literature on the characteristics of community college and other college student government advisors and student government leaders.

Chapter 3 explains the framework for the study and methodology used for data collection and analysis. Detailed information on the sampled population was provided. A description of the surveys instruments used was given, including information on the reliability and validity of both the Survey of Community College Advisors and Leaders and the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*.

Chapter 4 presents the results of data analysis. Relationships between the research and data collected were established, as was a description of qualitative data.

Chapter 5 includes a review of the conceptual framework used for the study, a discussion of results, implications, recommendations for further research. A complete list of appendixes and references follow Chapter 5.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Research and literature is reviewed in this chapter to give context to the overall research question concerning the relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of Florida community college student government advisors and community college student government organizational outcomes. The purposes and, therefore, outcomes of college student government have changed significantly over the 200 year history of American college student government. These changes have evolved from the early issues of challenging the disciplinary control of colleges and their administrations (Chambers & Phelps, 1994; Dunkel & Schuh, 1998; Horowitz, 1987) to their modern role as the official representatives of students in college governance (Cuyjet, 1985), attendant to a wide range of campus community concerns and services (Cuyjet, 1994).

There are several categories of college groups and organizations outside of student government that usually require a non-student advisor (Dunkel & Schuh, 1998), including Greek letter, honors and recognition, residence hall, military, sports, departmental, and special interest associations. Although advisors of all types of college student organizations share similar functions and roles, it has been stated that given the unique institutional charge of college student governments, a highly effective college student government advisor must possess several unique qualities, especially in his or her interactions with institutional authority (Boatman, 1988).

The application of transformational leadership principles to student government

development and training has been proposed to engender more effective performance and

change in student government leadership. As stated by Gold & Quatroche (1994):

> A student leadership curriculum along with specific learning goals and teaching
> strategies should consist of transformational leadership principles as a means to
> create a collegial governance that is inclusive, energizing, and ethically superior.

The role of the student government advisor is essential in that he or she serves as a

recognized source for student leadership training and development (Dunkel & Schuh,

1998: Gold & Quatroche, 1994) and as a source of the application of transformational

leadership by example or intent.

College Student Governments

Modern college student governments range in complexity from simple college

campus representative bodies to multifaceted entities providing a "wide variety of

purposes, interests, and services" (Dunkel & Schuh, 1998, p. 20). Often seen in their

historical genesis as being *austere* in their purposes, they now are responsible for dealing

with many important student concerns, including but not limited to student apathy,

organizational funding, and student programming and activities (Keppler & Robinson,

1993).

The history of college student government parallels the overall history and

development of student organizations, student activism, and student activities.

Throughout this history, the role of student government has vacillated "from complete

autonomy in the operation of various components of the educational institution to virtual inactivity in the face of an autocratic administration" (Cuyjet, 1994, p. 75).

Medieval equivalents of student government, such as found in the University of Bologna in the 11th to 14th centuries, were comprised of student *nations,* bands of students based on nationality, which had complete authority and control over universities (Falvey, 1952). While the first recognized, but short lived, student government organization, the House of Students, was established in the United States in 1828 at Amherst College (Keppler & Robinson, 1993), student activism and organizations had been present in America since the colonial period (Dunkel & Schuh, 1998).

Organizations that developed during this period included literary organizations, debating societies, and athletic organizations (Saddlemire, 1988). With the burgeoning growth of student activities, including the formation of Greek letter, honors, and student government organizations, came a recognized need for *professional* advisement of student organizations (Saddlemire, 1988) and for institutional control over student populations (Horowitz, 1987).

Starting with the first recorded American college protest at Harvard University in 1766, early college student activism was largely concerned with non-ideological issues such as lack of quality services and activities and compulsory attendance at religious services (Brax, 1981). After a period of sometimes violent student protest in the early 19th century, student activism concerns shifted to issues of *in loco parentis* (institutional authorities acting in the role of parents) and the removal of unpopular college presidents

and served as an impetus for the formal establishment of student organizations, including student government (Ellsworth & Burns, 1970).

At the turn of the 20th century, the first officially sanctioned and lasting student governments were established (Golden & Schwartz, 1994). The Carnegie Institute of Technology formed a student activities board in 1906 and a student council in 1917. In 1923, these entities were fused to form one of first recognized college student governments to last through the 20th century (Tarbell in Golden & Schwartz, 1994). The duties of this student government included student activities and programming, responsibilities found in modern student governments.

The autonomy and responsibilities of student governments shifted in the 1920s and 1930s with an increase in student radicalism and criticism of higher education authority (Brax, 1981; Horowitz, 1987) and a change to more ideologically driven concerns (Chambers & Phelps, 1994). Students were concerned with the relevance of college and university curriculum to social concerns of the time, including the economic disaster of the Depression and growing anxiety over the growing threat of war. Brax (1981) noted that during this time, there was an unprecedented level of student activism not to be seen again until the 1960s.

During World War II and throughout the 1950s, student activism and student influence on college campuses significantly decreased (Brax, 1981). This era in college student government has been termed one of student conformity and detachment from student issues (Baxter-Magolda & Magolda, 1988). Four major themes of student activity and involvement were prevalent in the 1960s: civil rights, civil liberties, the peace

23

movement, and student life (Baxter-Magolda & Magolda, 1988). From this period of

heightened student activism emerged an expansion of student rights, including greater

involvement in institutional governance (Astin, Astin, Bayer & Bisconti, 1975; Chambers

and Phelps, 1994). With the subsidence of student activism in the 1970s, student

governments and organizations sought greater formal influence in governance (Horowitz,

1986; Long, 1970, Vellela, 1988). The 1980s were marked with an increase in interest by

members of student governments and organizations in career and professional preparation

and a shift in perspective to consumerism (Chambers & Phelps, 1994; Horowitz, 1987)

Student governments in the 1990s reflected an interest in governance, policy

making, accountability, and institutional financial responsibility (Chambers & Phelps,

1994). Cuyjet (1994) stated that the three main purposes of modern student governments

are (1) responsibility for governance as acceded by higher education institutions, (2)

providing leadership experiences to those involved in student government, and (3)

providing "valuable cocurricular services for the student body" (p. 76-77). Their major

function is to serve as the official representatives of students to the institutional

administration at large and a provider of certain student services (Cuyjet, 1994, p. 74).

Student Government Advising

Dickerson (1999) posited that student government leaders face more limits, time

constraints, and concentrated leadership training than in the past. Given this need for

concentrated advisor leadership Bass' definition (1995, 1998) of an effective

transformational leader as being "one who motivates us to do more than we would normally do" becomes particularly salient (1985, p. 20).

Chavez (1985, p. 17-19) delineated several responsibilities of student government advisors. They may need to teach a student leadership class, serve as consultant, attend mandatory meetings and functions, and supervise clubs and organizations. Chavez viewed the role of advisors as being particularly demanding and complex with many formal and personal functions. They must help students monitor correspondence, assure quality work and correspondences, serve as an informational resource, assist in budgeting, facilitate ongoing functions of student governments, and arbitrate differences between campus constituencies.

Boatman (1988), in interviews of student government advisors identified several key issues in effective student government advising. They include sharing and making available information, access to resources, encouraging mutual respect among college community members, and ability to make institutional impact. Covington (1986) reported statistically significant differences between student government leaders and advisors in perceptions of the educational value and the role of student government. Miles and Miller (1997) reported that the perceived needs of student government leaders included administrators' and advisors' respect of student government decisions and the need to create a facilitative student government structure.

In a study of California community college student government leaders and advisors, Fortune (1999) found several perceptual differences between the two populations. They included differences in the understanding of institutional

administrative codes and the job classification of advisors. Consensus, however, was found in the need for leadership activities, the importance of having an advisor, and how both affected the perceived role of the advisor. Based on those findings Fortune (1999) made several recommendations, including placing faculty in all advising positions and the development of leadership classes that would be included within the general curriculum.

Organizational Outcomes in College Student Government

Bass and Avolio (1995) included the organizational outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction with leaders, and leadership effectiveness in the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research* (MLQ 5X). Although these outcomes add to understanding the overall dynamics of transformational leadership in organizations, they may not yield data specifically related to the particular organizational outcomes of student governments.

Student government organizational outcomes may be best considered by the prevalent issues faced by and services provided by student government organizations (Cuyjet, 1994). The ten most prevalent issues and services of respondents in student government, as reported in Cuyget's (1994) study, were the following:

1. Representation on campus-wide committees.

2. Activities programming.

3. Allocation of student activities fees.

4. Recognition of registration of student organizations.

5. Participation in college or university governance.

6. Multicultural awareness and diversity.

7. Representation on college or university council or senate.

8. Safety on campus.

9. Recycling and environmental issues.

10. General student apathy.

In this study, Cuyjet (1994) also found that non-student government members were concerned with the effectiveness of student government in addressing the above listed issues. In a discussion of successful outcomes in student government use and development of University planning documents, Bambenek and Sifton (2003) identified six principles, of project design, for involving student government leaders (p. 67):

1. Student leaders must give articulate, responsible and constructive input.

2. Student leaders should inclusively express their needs.

3. Encourage global thinking and consideration of resources in student leadership.

4. Create unified, concrete, well-articulated sets of ideas and proposals.

5. Commit sufficient time and resources.

6. Student leaders must demonstrate credibility of representing the student body.

Cuyjet (1994) stated that the three main purposes of modern student governments are (1) responsibility for governance as acceded by higher education institutions, (2) providing leadership experiences to those involved in student government, and (3) providing "valuable co-curricular services for the student body" (p. 76-77). The concerns

of students as found by Cuyjet (1994) and the principles which student leaders must employ for productive effort (project design) can be found in student government purposes. Organizational outcomes and student government involvement in these outcomes, combined with avowed constitutional purposes, may then be viewed as the relative ability to effectively reach these purposes.

Transformational Leadership

Several authors have used the term *transformational leadership* to denote a construct of a particular type of leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Tichy & Devana, 1986). The conceptual model of leadership used for this study, however, is based in the transformational leader concept as posited by Bass (1985, 1996) and Bass and Avolio (1998).

It is from Bass' early studies in group dynamics and leadership and his later expansion on Burns' (1978) definition of transforming leadership that the latter comprehensive theory of Full Range Leadership Model (Bass & Avolio, 1991, 1998) found its genesis. Bass (1954) demonstrated that when a leaderless group is established, competition begins for leadership and control of the group, and an organization is formed that includes leaders, followers, and non-participants. Bass (1997) viewed transformational leadership as more focused on one leader or a small number of leaders and their influence on a group, in contrast to more egalitarian theories of leadership (Rost, 1991).

Bass (1997) differentiated between authoritarian leadership and directive leadership. The authoritarian leader is marked by rigidity, obsequiousness to other authority, low risk preference, high need for structure, and conventional thinking. The directive leader is marked with transformational or transactional behavior, including consultation with followers, peers, and superiors (p. 16).

As previously noted, Bass (1985) determined that the study of leadership in the half-century before 1985 was mainly concerned with the dichotomies of autocratic and democratic leadership, directive and participative locus of decision-making, task and relationship focus, and initiation and consideration behavior. Bass viewed these approaches as inadequate in dealing with the study of leadership given the need for higher-order change in effort and performance, the shortcomings of cost-benefit exchange theories, and the emergence of new approaches to the subject of motivation.

Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership

According to Bass, transformational leadership consists of five interacting and interrelated components (Bass, 1985, 1988, 1996; Bass & Avolio, 1997; Bass & Steidlmeir, 1998).

Idealized Influence (Attributed and Behavioral)

The first component is that of charismatic leadership or idealized influence, distinguished by attributed and behavioral factors. This component references the

behaviors of leaders that engender positive emulation, admiration, respect and trust, and those characteristics attributed to them by their followers, including exceptional personal qualities and high levels of moral and ethical conduct (Bass, 1998). These behaviors include (Bass, 1996) consideration of follower needs over personal needs, consistency, shared risk-taking, demonstration of high moral and ethical standards, and avoidance of the pursuit of power for personal gain. This is also characterized as followers as having "complete faith" in their leader (Bass, 1990, p. 218).

Inspirational Motivation

This component references those behaviors in a leader which facilitate motivation and inspiration by "providing meaning and challenge to their follower's work" (Bass, 1996, p.5). Inspirational motivation behaviors expressed by transformational leaders include enthusiasm, optimism, envisioning future states, clearly communicated expectations, commitment to goals, and shared vision. Bass (1990, p. 218) refers to this as communicating "high performance expectations."

Intellectual Stimulation

The third component is intellectual stimulation. The intellectually stimulating transformational leader arouses "their follower's efforts to be innovative and creative" without public criticism (Bass, 1996, p.7). These leaders question assumptions, reframe problems, and approach old situations in novel ways.

Individualized Consideration

This component refers to the ways that transformational leaders act in the role of coach or mentor, paying attention to the individual's need for achievement and growth (Bass, 1996, p.7). Followers engage in a dialectic process of achievement of higher performance as guided by transformational leaders. To do this, transformational leaders create new learning opportunities in a supportive environment, recognize and support variation in follower needs and wants, and engage in effective two-way communication and management by walking around. Furthermore, interactions with followers are personalized, and tasks are delegated with leaders giving positive feedback and support without excessive scrutiny.

Although other theorists (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993) contend that all of these components are included in the operational definition of charismatic leadership, these constructs were determined, confirmed, and refined (Bass, 1998) through factor studies such as completed by Bass (1985, 1988), Howell and Avolio (1993), Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995), and Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1997).

Bass's (1985, 1996) definition of transactional leadership is that of rewarding or disciplining a worker "depending on the adequacy of the follower's performance" (Bass, 1996, p.7). It is "responsive to our [the worker's] immediate self-interests if they can be met by getting our work done" (Bass, 1985, p.11). Transactional leadership consists of the four components of contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire leadership. The process of

31

contingent reinforcement is the main force in the first three components of transactional leadership (Bass, 1996, 1998).

Contingent Reward

Contingent reward is seen to be the most effective of the transactional leadership components and refers to the process by which the leader contracts with followers to achieve tasks or goals and promises or provides rewards for their satisfactory completion.

Management-by-Exception (Active)

After contingent reward, management-by-exception (active) is considered the next more effective form of transactional leadership. In this construct, the leader actively monitors "deviances form standards" (Bass, 1996, p.7), mistakes, and errors and actively corrects them.

Management-by-Exception (Passive)

In management-by-exception (passive), the next most effective component, the leader passively waits for errors to happen and only then corrects them.

Laissez-faire leadership, the lack of leadership, is considered the least effective of these components (Bass, 1996, 1998). Bass (1996) stated that "laissez-faire represents a nontransaction" (p. 7) or the lack of leadership.

The transformational leader, according to Bass (1985) is one who motivates followers to reach a higher level of performance than normally is expected. Bass stated that this was done through three interrelated ways (p. 20):

1. Elevating levels of awareness and consciousness of designated outcomes and determining ways to achieve them.

2. Transcending self-interest for that of the group or organization.

3. By altering motivational need level or "expanding our portfolio of needs and wants" (p. 20).

Refining Burn's (1978) concept of transforming leadership, Bass (1985) added the construct of expanding a portfolio of needs and wants and the concept of detrimental *pseudotransformational leadership* (Bass, 1998). Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1997) also augmented Burns' definition of transactional leadership by considering it as a part of a full range of leadership behavior, rather than a position in a continuum of behavior.

In their Full Range of Leadership Model, Bass and Avolio (1991, 1998) and Avolio (1999) asserted that the transformational leader exhibits some relative degree of all aspects of transactional and transformational leadership. It is the distribution of transactional leadership and transformational leadership components that is important,

with more effective transformational leaders exhibiting greater evidence of components associated with transformational leadership. According to Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1998), it is the presence and augmentation of transformational leadership components on transactional leadership that accounts for the statistical variance results above those accounted for by transactional leadership alone.

<div align="center">Research on Transformational Leadership</div>

The components of Bass's transformational leadership have been supported in various studies over the past twenty years (Bass & Avolio, 1998). The assertions as found in this theory are supported in studies of industrial managers and military officers (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1988) and in descriptions of superiors by part-time MBA students (Seltzer & Bass, 1990).

In a meta-analysis of leadership styles and work performance of over 2,000 respondents in public and private sector agencies, Lowe, Kroech, and Sivasubramnian (1996) substantiated the hierarchy of effectiveness of transformational leadership. In public and private agency respondents, they respectively found mean correlated corrections of .74 and .69 for charismatic-inspirational leadership, .65 and .56 for intellectual stimulation, .63 and .62 for individualized consideration, .41 and .41 for contingent reward, and .10 and -.02 for management by exception, as measured by the MLQ (1995). Other researches reported similar substantiations of the hierarchy in a partial square analysis (Howell & Avolio, 1993) and a separate factor analysis (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995).

Gasper (1992), in a meta-analysis of twenty studies, found correlations of transformational and transactional leadership respectively of .76 and .71 with effectiveness, .71 and .22 with satisfaction, and .88 and .32 with extra effort. Also, in review of the two above listed studies, Patterson, Fuller, Kester, and Stringer (1995) confirmed the positive effects of transformational leadership on selected follower outcomes and compliances.

Other empirical research also supports the viability of Bass' transformational leadership theory. In a study of 28 organizations, Howell and Higgens (1990) found that project champions exhibited more transformational leadership behaviors than non-project champions. Similar results have been found among naval officers (Salter, 1989) and with other naval personnel who evidence better fitness reports and recommendations for promotion (Yamarino & Bass, 1990), ministers with high church attendance and membership growth (Onnen, 1987), effective MBA managers (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988), and successful middle business managers (Howell & Avolio, 1993).

Among non-student higher education populations, Green (1994) confirmed support for transformational leadership and the MLQ with business faculty, and Jackson (2000) found significant levels of effective transformational leadership in college administration, which resulted in higher levels of follower extra effort and satisfaction. Baldygo (2003) supported the concept of cascading effects of transformational leadership, in this case as found in management levels of American community colleges, with a particular noted effect in the outcomes of extra effort, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leadership.

Although transformational leadership is used as a model for leadership study and development (Gold & Quatroche, 1994), research of this model's application with student government advisors and student government leaders is limited. However, similar populations may be used for comparison.

In a study of transactional and transformational leadership factors in residence hall directors and resident assistants, Komives (1991) discovered that hall director leadership behavior accounted for two-thirds of variance in resident assistant motivation. Furthermore, those resident directors who demonstrated greater levels of transformational leadership qualities were perceived by resident assistants as being more effective leaders. Kieffer (2003) noted a clear and strong correlation between the increasing levels of transformational leadership in college resident assistants and higher levels of satisfaction among residents. Kieffer (2003) also noted that lower levels of student satisfaction were correlated with more passive-avoidant leadership and transactional leadership as expressed by resident assistants.

Loyd (1996) found that success in involvement by students in church activities was attributable to pastor or church student union transformational leadership styles. Nischan (1997) reported increased student outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction attributable to community college faculty members who exhibit transformational leadership characteristics. Furthermore, Gibson and Pason (2003) found that, in a particular university student leadership development program implementing transformational leadership concepts, student leaders exhibited a more profound

understanding of leadership, a greater awareness of the intricate concerns of leadership, and a higher level of commitment to service.

<u>Leadership and Student Development</u>

Along with the establishment of student governments and their organizational outcomes has emerged an investigation of college student development and its positive influence on student experiences outside of the classroom (Astin, 1977, 1992; Chickering, 1969; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Light, 1992; Pace, 1990, Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Some developmental categories include cognitive complexity, knowledge acquisition, humanitarianism, interpersonal and intrapersonal competence, and practical competence (Kuh, Douglass, Lund & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994). A researcher in one study claimed that more than 70% of learning in college occurred outside of the classroom (Wilson, 1966), and researchers in another study (Moffatt in Kuh & Lund, 1994) found that 40% of students stated learning outside the classroom to be their most significant educational experience.

Kuh and Lund (1994) stated, "Little is known about what students gain from student government positions" (p. 6). The limited research that exists related to student government and student development is contained in two categories: (1) student government leadership as one of many learning and personal development experiences, (2) studies concerned nearly exclusively with student government leadership experience (Kuh & Lund, 1994). Results of studies in the first category have shown that involvement in student governance has positive direct and indirect effects on various student

37

characteristics. Smart (1986) and Ethington, Smart, and Pascarella (1988) found a direct positive relationship between involvement in student government and various populations' occupational status. Positive direct effects were shown on most populations' humanitarian values, and a positive indirect effect was found on the likelihood of students choosing a social service occupation (Ethington, Smart & Pascarella, 1988), and in the intensity of participation in community activities among community college student government leaders (Eklund-Leen & Young, 1997). Student leaders also perceived an increase in perceived leadership confidence (Astin, 1992) and in job satisfaction and well-being (Downey, 1984).

Student government leadership activities, as an element of an overall cocurricular experience, may have a positive impact on leadership and student development (White, 1998). Astin (1997) stated that involvement in student government correlates with higher than average levels of political liberalism, hedonism, artistic interests, status needs and satisfactions with peer relationships. Floerchinger (1988) stated that student involvement in co-curricular activities engendered several benefits including: increased retention; improved interpersonal, communication, and group organizational skills; positive development of leadership skills; greater satisfaction with college experiences; and establishment of ongoing altruism. Astin (1997) posited that involvement in student government increases intensity of peer interaction which leads to augmented changes resulting from the college experience.

There is a paucity of research and found in the second category. In a study of student government members experiencing a campus controversy, Schwartz (1991) found

short-term effects of increased stress levels, heightened consideration of ethical issues, increased use of coping strategies, and enhanced moral awareness and personal responsibility. Results of research indicating long-term effects are more ambiguous. Such effects may include an influence on the development of relationships outside of the family and involvement in civic organizations (Schuh & Laverty, 1983) and a higher level of vocational satisfaction (Downey, Bosco, & Silver, 1984).

As a part of the College Experience Study (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991), outcomes and benefits of involvement in student government were measured. In a final taxonomy of outcomes, the only statistically significant result came in a gain in practical competence. In presenting the study, Kuh and Lund (1994) determined that although reflective thought as an outcome did not show any notable statistically significant gain "if dialogue between student government advisers and student leaders requires self-reflection, gains in these areas will accrue" (p. 13).

Out of nine institutional conditions identified by the authors as enriching student development outside the classroom, six are particularly applicable. They were: (1) institutional polices congruent with student needs and characteristics, (2) high and clear expectations of student performance, (3) use of effective teaching approaches, systematic assessment of student performance, (4) ample opportunity for student involvement outside of the classroom, (5) human scale settings characterized by ethics of membership and care, (6) and a pervading ethos of learning.

Some of the conditions listed by Kun and Lund (1994) have similarities in transformational leadership processes (Bass, 1985). The student government advisor is

39

often the contact for student government members' relations with other campus constituencies (Chavez, 1985). As an agent for enhancing student development, the advisor has leadership capacity that would enable him or her to do what Kuh et al. (1994) suggest, that is, to break down institutional unit barriers and create situations of applied learning between classroom and non-classroom experiences. To do so, the student government advisor needs to have a formal or informal understanding of and approach to student government leader behaviors, characteristics, and perceptions of leadership factors.

Research on Student Leaders

Butler (1982) found that real differences existed between leadership behaviors as expected and as found in selected leadership groups at a university, including student government. Of particular significance in differences found were goal attainment in academic development, intellectual orientation, individual personality development, traditional religiousness, advanced training, meeting local needs, democratic governance, community, intellectual and aesthetic environment, and innovation. Similar results were found in a study conducted by Bosco (1982) at selected universities in Nebraska and Oklahoma.

There is evidence that among student government populations that an attitude such as optimism contributes to their greater achievement (Davis, 1992). Furthermore, there are some indications that college student government leaders de-emphasize ideology as motivation for action and largely emphasize moderation, competence,

40

flexibility, and political reciprocity (Sessa, 1990). Interesting results can be found in research related to perceptual differences found in student government leaders. Holloway (1998) found significant differences in the self-perceptions of leadership factors between those elected and selected for student government and Greek life positions, particularly in relation to selected individual, family, and demographic characteristics.

According to Kraack (1985), involvement in college student government and other student organizations led to greater developed maturity than those students not involved in such organizations. This difference in maturity was persistent throughout the course of the study, but was predominant during the period of college entry. A significant positive correlation was found between democratic governance scales and the scales of relationships with the same and opposite sex, integration, allocentrism, and autonomy.

Summary

Although the roles and functions of college student governments have evolved from their Medieval beginnings of total institutional control by students (Falvey, 1952), today's student governments are imbued with responsibilities of providing voice and representation in institutional governance, engendering opportunities for leadership for peers, and providing "valuable cocurricular services for the student body" (Cuyjet, 1994, p. 74-76). The student government advisor, usually professional staff or faculty, fulfills an essential role in the development of student government leadership and their organizational outcomes.

A review of research concerning student government advisors, confirmed that student government advisors are key in the management and leadership of college student governments (Boatman, 1988; Chavez 1985; Dunkel & Schuh, 1998). However, the recognition of the important role of student government advisors was concomitant with perceptual differences between advisors and student leaders in the educational role and value of student government, in the understanding of institutional administrative codes, the job classification of advisors, the respect given to student leader decision making, and the need to create a facilitative student government structure (Covington, 1986; Fortune; 1999; Miles & Miller, 1997). These perceptual differences are mitigated by the findings of Fortune (1999), which were that consensus between advisors and student leaders was found in the need for leadership activities and in the importance of having an advisor.

Student government leadership and advisors are charged with accomplishing their constitutional responsibilities and addressing the prevalent issues faced by and services provided by student government organizations and the students they represent (Bambenek & Sifton, 2003; Cuyjet, 1994). These issues and services and the methods by which student government redresses them can be found in student government purposes. Organizational outcomes and student government involvement in these outcomes, combined with avowed constitutional purposes, may then be viewed as the relative ability to effectively reach these purposes.

Transformational leadership, largely as found in the research of Bernard Bass (1985, 1998), has been forwarded as a model for student leadership study and development (Gold & Quatroche, 1994). As a part of leadership development, it may be

42

viewed as a paradigm under which organizational outcomes are better achieved. The

constructs and components of transformational leadership have been supported, largely in

various studies of populations outside of higher education over the past twenty years

(Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988; Bass & Avolio, 1998; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen,

1995; Gasper, 1992; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Howell & Higgens, 1990; Lowe, Kroech, &

Sivasubramnian 1996; Onnen, 1987; Patterson, Fuller, Kester, & Stringer, 1995; Salter,

1989; Seltzer & Bass, 1990; Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1988; Yamarino & Bass,

1990).

There is a moderate amount of research supporting the dynamics of

transformational leadership at work in populations in higher education outside of student

government (Baldygo, 2003; Green, 1994; Jackson, 2000; Nischan, 1997), but there is a

paucity of research of this model's application with student government advisors and

student government leaders. Other similar populations may be used for comparison, such

as residence hall directors and resident assistants (Kieffer, 2003; Komives, 1991), church

student union transformational pastors (Loyd, 1996), and student leadership development

programs implementing transformational leadership concepts (Gibson & Pason, 2003).

As early as the mid-1970s (Bass & Cowgill, 1975), researchers observed a

disparity between the recognition by students of the need to make a difference in college

governance and the actual participation of students in this process. More recently, Chang

(2002) reported that over 80% of community college students almost never participated

in a college student event, activity, organization, or student government group. This

disconnect is contrasted with the findings that effective transformational leaders engender

feelings of identity, excitement, and expectations among their followers and with the *falling domino*, the leadership augmentation of a immediate subordinate as influence by his or her leader, effect of transformational leadership (Bass, Waldman, Avolio & Bebb, 1987). In this process, behavior of transformational leaders is particularly evidenced in the next level of leadership. In the case of community college student government, the next level of leadership from advisors may be seen as representative student government leadership.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

College student governments have been in existence in the United States since the Colonial era (Dunkel & Schuh, 1998). Officially sanctioned and lasting student governments were established at the turn of the 20th century (Golden & Schwartz, 1994). With the institutional formalization of student participation and importance of student government role and influence comes related interest in student leadership studies in student government, particularly in the application of Bass's (1985) and Bass and Avolio's (1993) principles of transformational leadership (Gold & Quatroche, 1994).

This leadership model is forwarded to advance student government goals and purposes (Gold & Quatroche, 1994). However, contrasted to abundant research demonstrating the presence and influence of transformational leadership in other populations, there is a paucity of research relating to college student government members or related populations. The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student government.

The purpose of Chapter 3 is to describe and detail the methodology implemented to examine the extent to which community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student governments. This chapter consists of seven parts. They include the statement of the problem, population and sample, instrumentation used, instrument reliability and validity, data collection, data analysis, and a summary.

Statement of the Problem

The role of the student government advisor directly influences the potential

success of student government leadership (Gold & Quatroche, 1994). Transformational

leadership may be either formally or informally implemented to promote constitutional

and other purposes of student government leadership. This study examined the extent to

which community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational

leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community

college student government. The following six questions were formulated for the

purposes of this examination:

1. To what degree are community college student government advisors
   (CCSGAs) educated, formally or informally, in the concepts of
   transformational leadership?

2. What are the demographic characteristics of CCSGAs and the leaders of
   community college student government organizations (CCSGOs)?

3. What are the perceptions of the leaders of CCSGOs of the transformational
   leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

4. What are the self-reported transformational leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

5. To what degree are the organizational outcomes of CCSGOs fulfilled, as
   measured by achievement of those outcomes by CCSGO leaders and
   advisors?

6.   What is the relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of community college student government advisors and community college student government organizational outcomes?

<u>Population and Sample</u>

The population of this study was all Florida community college and junior college student government advisors and all executive board members of Florida community college and junior college student governments, numbering approximately 360. The purposive sample included all respondents who were members of the Florida Junior and Community College Student Government Association (FJCCSGA) for the 2004-2005 academic year and who were student government advisors or executive board members.

Advisors and student government executive board members were identified by their associated colleges and campuses as found in the 2004-2005 FJCCSGA Advisor's Directory (2004). Permission was acquired from the State Advisor of FJCCSGA (M. Vasquez, personal communication, November 17, 2004) to contact advisors and executive board members and to administer the survey at the FJCCSGA State Conference (February 10-13) and afterwards by mail for those who did not complete the survey at the conference.

In all, members of 72 community college campuses or sites, including one private junior college campus, with active student governments were identified to receive the survey. It was also determined that each active campus or site had one student government association executive board member or representative with at least one

student government advisor. One campus was identified as inactive and did not receive the survey.

The survey was initially administered at the FJCCSGA State Conference from February 10-12, 2005. Respondents who did not take or return surveys were contacted and sent surveys in the mail in March and April 2005. Several contacts were made during this time to facilitate respondent return rate. At least one student or advisor response was received from 74% of campuses or sites. Additionally, 68% of advisors and 46% of students returned surveys.

Instrumentation

This study employed the research design of a non-experimental cross-sectional survey. Data was collected for this study by the implementation of a survey consisting of two sections. Other types of research design were not used because of the limited longitudinal availability of student and advisor cohorts. It was assumed that institutional differences, such as campus or site size and location, between campuses did not affect the constructs studied. It was further assumed that the respondents to the survey responded truthfully and accurately.

Data were gathered for this study by implementation of a two-part survey of two versions, one for Florida community college student government advisors and the other for Florida community college student government executive board members. In both versions, items 1 through 24 items were meant to address Research Question 5.

Organizational outcome items were developed from a review of literature, particularly Cuyjet's (1994) research of relevant services provided by student government.

Items 1 through 12 in the self-constructed section attempted to measure respondent's opinion of the importance of certain organizational outcomes. Items 13 through 24 attempted to measure respondent's opinion as to how well their student government achieved certain organizational outcomes. A Likert scale was used for these items to measure agreement. Items 1 to 12 utilized a range of "Very Important" coded as a value of 4 to "Not Important" as a value of 1. Items 13 to 24 utilized a range of "Very Well" coded as a value of 4 to "Not Well at All" as a value of 1.

In the advisor version of the survey, items 25 through 33 utilized eight demographic questions to answer Research Questions 1 and 2 and one limited short answer qualitative question to answer Research Question 1. These questions identified advisor demographic characteristics, which included: (a) time commitment to advising, (b) months in current position, (c) job classification, (d) age, and (e) gender. To answer Research Question 1, two demographic questions were utilized to determine the level of advisor familiarity of and education and training in transformational leadership. Furthermore, one limited short answer qualitative question was utilized to establish the way in which transformational leadership was received.

In the student version of the survey, items 25 through 34 utilized nine demographic and one limited short answer qualitative question to answer Research Question 2. These questions identified student demographic characteristics, which included: (a) hours per week committed to student government, (b) months in current

position, (c) job classification of advisor, (d) attendance status in college (full-time or part-time), (e) academic goal, (f) position held, (g) age, (h) gender, and (i) intention to seek future leadership positions. One limited short answer qualitative question was utilized to elicit one reason as to why they joined student government.

A field test was administered to an outgoing (2003-2004 academic year) group of local Florida community college student government executive board members and advisors. Three advisor versions and nine student versions of the survey were returned. Minor modifications to the survey were made, particularly in the directions given to respondents and in the paper size of the survey. A reliability analysis of the items found in the survey yielded satisfactory results (see Instrument Reliability and Validity). The final version of the survey was administered as previously stated (see Population and Sample).

The second section of the survey, the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research* (MLQ 5X) (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000), measured the presence of transformational and transactional leadership characteristics in respondents and the leadership outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness. The MLQ 5X is consisted of 45 questions directed to the leader (community college student government advisor) and to the rater of the leader (community college executive student government executive board member).

In the advisor version of the survey, the leader answered questions for self-assessment of leadership characteristics, results of which were applied to answer Research Question 4. In the student version of the survey, parallel questions are presented

to the rater to assess their perception of their leader's characteristics, which were applied

to answer Research Question 3.

Items were scored using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all" (0) to

"frequently, if not always" (4). Four items each measured the constructs of idealized

influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual

stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception

(active), management-by-exception (passive), laissez-faire leadership, and effectiveness.

Three items measured extra effort, and two items measured satisfaction.

Data from both instruments were used to address the last research question,

"What is the relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of community

college student government advisors and community college student government

organizational outcomes?"

Instrument Reliability and Validity

The *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research* (MLQ 5X) has been

determined to be valid as measured against external criteria (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000,

p. 1-8). Leadership factor scales were "generally high, exceeding standard cut-offs for

internal consistency recommended in the literature" (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000, p. 12).

Construct analysis of the MLQ 5X (Pile in Bass, 1996) detailed support for an

effective rate-rerate consistency. Bass and Avolio (1990) also found generally high scale

test-retest reliabilities in their studies of military personnel. Leslie and Fleenor (1999), in

a review of many studies using the survey, stated that the MLQ had acceptable levels of internal and inter-rater consistency.

In his analysis of supportive research (1996), Bass stated that the constructs of charisma, individualized consideration, and management-by-exceptions are "most predictable." Also, using confirmatory structural equation modeling techniques in a review of 18 studies, with 6,525 total samples, Antonakis (2001) confirmed the validity of Bass and Avolio's single-order factors (1995/2000) as measured by the MLQ (5X). Overall, support for the structural validity of the factors in MLQ was confirmed by Tepper and Percy (1994) through implementation of two studies by the authors, though some concern was raised over the separation of management-by-exception into active and passive elements and of the separation of charismatic leadership and inspirational leadership into individual constructs (p. 743).

A reliability study was conducted on the self-constructed section of the survey after completion of a test administration of its items. Responses were obtained from 12 surveys returned from an outgoing (2003-2004 academic year) group of local Florida community college student government executive board members and advisors. A reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's Alpha of .81 for the advisor version of the survey and of .85 for the student version of the survey. All statistical procedures were performed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Science: Graduate Pack 11.0 for Windows* (SPSS, 2001) software.

Data Collection

All data for the study were obtained from surveys administered and returned from the dates of February 10 to April 30, 2005. Surveys were initially administered at the FJCCSGA State Conference from February 10-12, 2005. Respondents who did not take or return surveys were contacted and sent surveys in the mail in March and April 2005. Several contacts were made during this time to facilitate respondent return rate. Response rates included 74% of campuses or sites, 68% of advisors, and 46% of students investigated.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to describe and measure (a) the respondent's opinion of the importance of certain organizational outcomes, (b) the respondent's opinion as to how well their student government achieved certain organizational outcomes (c) demographic characteristics of respondents, (d) the self or other reported presence of transformational and transactional leadership characteristics of community college student government advisors. Descriptive statistics were also used to measure the outcomes of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness.

As the data from these items related to this were ordinal, Spearman rank order correlation studies were utilized to examine the relationship between organizational outcomes of Florida community college student governments and the perceived transformational leadership qualities of Florida community college student government

advisors. Statistical analyses were done at the .05 level. Organizational outcomes as measured included importance and achievement of organizational outcomes as rated by advisors and student, and the components of advisor transformational and transactional leadership as self-reported by advisors and as reported by students.

All quantitative data were entered into a research database and analyzed utilizing the *Statistical Package for the Social Science: Graduate Pack 11.0 for Windows* (SPSS, 2001). Each case was entered into the database with accompanying codes for each participant and community college campus or site. Significance for all statistical measures was set at the 0.05 level.

Qualitative data were obtained from a single survey question asked in the student executive board member and advisors surveys. Student government executive board members were asked, "In one sentence, please describe your reason for joining student government." Results of this question are presented in Appendix C. Advisors were asked, "In one sentence, please describe in what way you received this [transformational leadership] training." Results of this question are presented in Appendix D.

Summary

The methodological approach to the study has been detailed in Chapter 3. The study employed a research design of a non-experimental cross-sectional survey. Chapter 3 has described the research type and design and the population studied. Research questions were explained to demonstrate the scope of the study. The population and

sample studies were detailed. The instrumentation utilized for the study was described

and demonstrated to exhibit reliability and validity.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which community college

student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an

influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student government. An

analysis for the data gathered in this investigation is presented in this chapter organized

under the following sections: (1) population and sample, (2) research questions, (3)

qualitative data, (4) secondary findings, and (5) summary of findings. Research data were

analyzed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Science: Graduate Pack 11.0 for*

Windows (SPSS, 2001).

Population and Sample

All Florida community college and junior college student government advisors

and all executive board members of Florida community college and junior college student

governments, numbering approximately 360, were identified as the population of study

and were selected for purposive sampling. Survey participants were identified as being

members of one of 72 Florida community college campuses or sites, including one

private junior college campus, with active student governments. One campus was

identified as inactive and did not receive the survey. Executive board members and

student government advisors for each campus and site were given the survey.

The survey was initially administered at the FJCCSGA State Conference from

February 10-12, 2005. Respondents who did not take or return surveys were contacted

and sent surveys in the mail in March and April 2005. Several contacts were made during this time to facilitate respondent return rate. They included a contact and reminder through a FJCCSGA email listserve two weeks after the initial mailing of the survey, a letter to campus student government and advisor campus offices after four weeks, another email after six weeks, and a final letter to student government and advisor offices after eight weeks. No contacts were made by phone, as no personal contact information was available for students, nor were there readily available phone listings for student government offices.

At least one student or advisor response was received from 74% of campuses or sites. Additionally, 68% of advisors and 46% of students returned surveys. Advisor only replies were received from 8% of campuses or sites, and student only replies were also received from 8% of campuses of sites. Data were collected for all respondents who completed a survey and who were members of the Florida Junior and Community College Student Government Association (FJCCSGA) for the 2004-2005 academic year and who were student government advisors or executive board members.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student governments. To this end, six research questions were posed.

57

Research Question 1

To what degree are community college student government advisors (CCSGAs) educated, formally or informally, in the concepts of transformational leadership?

Four items that were related to this question were included in the advisor version of the survey. In response to the item, "How familiar are you with transformational leadership concepts and practices," 16.6% of advisors were very familiar, 25% moderately familiar, 37.5% were slightly familiar, and the remaining 18.8% were not familiar at all ($n = 48$, $M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.00$). In response to the item, "Have you received education and training in transformational leadership concepts and practices," a majority of advisors (58.3%) had not received education and training in transformational leadership concepts and practices ($n = 48$, $M = 1.58$, $SD = .50$).

In response to the item, "What best describes the level of training you have received," none who responded to the question reported having received a great amount of education or training in transformational leadership concepts and practices, with the 68.4% stating that they had received a small amount of education or training in transformational leadership concepts and practices ($n = 48$, $M = 2.21$, $SD = .54$).

In a content analysis of short answer qualitative replies to the item, "In one sentence, please describe in what way you received this education or training," two categories of education or training emerged. Of the 19 receiving training in transformational leadership concepts and practices (58.8%) did so through formal studies or curriculum in higher education at the undergraduate or graduate level. The remaining

respondents (41.2%) received training through conferences, workshops, and seminars. Results of the analyses for this research question can be found in Table 1. Qualitative responses can be found in Appendix D.

Table 1

Frequency Counts for Advisor Knowledge about Transformational Leadership (N = 181)

Knowledge about Transformational Leadership	Number	Percentage
Familiarity with concepts and practices in TFL[*]	48	
Very familiar	8	16.6%
Moderately familiar	12	25.0%
Somewhat familiar	19	37.5%
Not familiar at all	9	18.8%
Received education and training in TFL	48	
Yes	20	41.7%
No	28	58.3%
Level of education in TFL	19	
A great amount	0	0.0%
A moderate amount	6	31.6%
A small amount	13	68.4%
None at all	0	0%

Research Question 2

What are the demographic characteristics of CCSGAs and the leaders of

community college student government organizations (CCSGOs)?

Advisors

Of the respondents who completed the survey, 27.1% were Florida community

college student government advisors (n = 49). Advisor's ages ranged from 23 to 60 years,

with a mean advisor age of 41.5 years (n = 47, SD = 10.22). Advisors had been in their

current positions ranging from two months to 330 months (27.5) years, with a mean

tenure of 70.6 months (5.9 years) (n = 49, SD = 80.20). These results are presented in

Table 2.

Table 2

Advisor Sample by Age and Months in Position (N = 181)

Age and Months in Position	Number	M	SD	Low	High
Age (in years)	47	41.5	10.22	23	60
Months in position	47	70.6	80.20	2	330

An analysis of the data yielded that 60.4% of advisors reported a full-time commitment to student government, and 39.6% of advisors reported a part-time commitment to student government (*n* = 48, *M* = 1.65, *SD* = .53). These results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Advisor Sample by Time Commitment to Position (N = 181)

Time Commitment to Position	Number	Percentage
Full-Time	29	60.4%
Part-Time	19	39.6%

A majority of advisors (56.3%) reported themselves as *Professional Staff*, while 12.5% reported themselves as *Faculty Member*, 20.8% reported themselves as *Administrator*, and 10.4% as *Support Staff* (*n* = 48, *M* = 2.65, *SD* = .84). These results are found in Table 4.

Table 4

Advisor Sample by Self-Report of Position Title (N = 181)

Position Title	Number	Percentage
Faculty Member	6	12.5%
Administrator	10	20.8%
Professional Staff	27	56.3%
Support Staff	5	10.4%

A majority of advisors were female (58.3%) and 41.7% were male (*n = 48, M =* 1.58, *SD* = .498). These results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Advisor Sample by Gender (N = 181)

Gender	Number	Percentage
Female	28	58.3%
Male	20	41.7%

Of the 181 respondents who completed the survey, 132 (72.9%) were Florida community college student government executive board members. Student ages ranged from 17 years to 51, with a mean age of 22.4 years ($n = 130$, $SD = 5.97$). Students had been in their current positions ranging from one to 28 months, with a mean tenure of 7.64 months ($n = 130$, $SD = 5.04$). These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Student Sample by Age and Months in Position (N = 181)

Age and Months in Position	Number	M	SD	Low	High
Age (in years)	130	22.4	6.00	17	51
Months in position	130	7.64	5.04	1	28

Students committed an average of 14 hours per week to student government activities ($n = 128$, $SD = 10.9$). Responses of time committed to student government activities ranged from one hour to 50 hours. These results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Student Sample by Time Commitment to Student Government (N = 181)

	Number	M	SD	Low	High
Time Commitment	128	14.0	10.9	1	50

Students reported 37.0% advisors as a *Faculty Member*, 11.8% as Administrator, 33.1% as *Professional Staff*, 12.6 % as *Support Staff*, and 5.5% as *Not Applicable* (*M* = 2.39, *SD* = 1.29). These results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Student Sample by Report of Advisor Position Title (N = 181)

Report of Advisor Position	Number	Percentage
Faculty Member	47	37.0%
Administrator	15	11.8%
Professional Staff	42	33.1%
Support Staff	16	12.6%
Not Applicable	7	5.5%

A majority of students (84.8%) considered themselves as full-time, defined in the questionnaire as taking 12 credit hours or more of classes in a semester. The remaining 15.2% of students considered themselves as part-time, defined in the questionnaire as taking less than 12 credit hours of classes in a semester ($n = 132, M = 1.15, SD = .36$). These results are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

Student Sample in College by Semester (N = 181)

Attendance in College by Semester	Number	Percentage
Full-Time	112	84.8%
Part-Time	20	15.2%

A majority (86.9%) were pursing a general transfer degree to a four-year college or university, 10.8 were pursuing a workforce degree, and 2.3% a pursuing a certificate ($n = 130, M = 1.15, SD = .42$). These results are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Student Sample by Student Academic Goal (N = 181)

Academic Goal	Number	Percentage
Associate in Arts[1]	113	86.9%
Associate in Science[2]	14	10.8%
Certificate	3	2.3%

[1]Also described as "general transfer degree"
[2]Also described as "workforce degree"

A majority (94.5%) held a position with a title commonly associated with membership in an executive board as *president*, *vice-president*, *secretary*, or *treasurer* (n = 130, M = 2.89, SD = 1.50), while the remainder of respondents (5.5%) reported themselves as *other* (n = 130, M = 2.89, SD = 1.50). A majority of respondents were female (63.6%), and the remainder of respondents reported themselves as male (36.4%) (n = 132, M = 1.64, SD = .48). These results are reported in Tables 11 and 12, respectively.

Table 11

Student Sample by Student Position (N = 181)

Position	Number	Percentage
President	47	37.0%
Vice-President	15	11.8%
Secretary	42	33.1%
Treasurer	16	12.6%
Other	7	5.5%

Table 12

Student Sample by Gender (N = 181)

Position	Number	Percentage
Male	48	36.4
Female	84	63.6

Of the 132 students who replied to the item, 76.5% planned on seeking future formal leadership positions, and 23.5% did not plan on seeking future leadership positions ($n = 132$, $M = 1.39$, $SD = .75$). Theses results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Students Seeking Future Leadership Position (N = 181)

Seeking Future Leadership Position	Number	Percentage
Yes	101	76.5%
No	31	23.5%

Qualitative Data

A content analysis of advisor qualitative data is found on page 57. An analysis of student themes was implemented to examine the qualitative question, "In one sentence, please describe your reason for joining student government." Student replies were categorized into one or more of eight major themes including (a) socialization with other students, (b) facilitation of relations between campus members, (c) representing student interests, (d) involvement in meaningful activities, (e) development of leadership skills, (f) team membership, (g) developing programs and activities, and (h) developing self-esteem.

Research Question 3

What are the perceptions of the leaders of CCSGOs of the transformational leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

Items related to Research Question 3 were found in the second section of the student version of the survey, the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) Rater Form (5x-Short) (1995/2000). Advisor transformational and transactional leadership qualities, as well as the advisor group outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, were measured in 45 items. Items were scored using a five point Likert scale including "not at all" (0), "once in a while" (1), "sometimes" (2), "fairly often" (3), and "frequently, if not always" (4). Four items each measured the constructs of idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), laissez-faire leadership, and effectiveness. Three items measured extra effort, and two items measured satisfaction.

All results for this question are reported as average scores of items related to the nine components of leadership and the three *organizational outcomes*. For this study, the organizational outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, are reported as group outcomes because these outcomes are distinctly different than the organizational outcomes as measured and studied by this researcher (see Instrumentation). Results of frequency analysis follow, and are presented by transformational and transactional leadership construct and by group outcome.

Construct 1: Idealized Influence (Attributed)

Students reported an idealized influence (attributed) mean advisor score of 3.25 and a median score of 3.5, with a range of scores from .25 to 4 ($n = 130$, $SD = .84$). The mean reported score of 3.25, between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 2: Idealized Influence (Behavioral)

Students reported an idealized influence (behavioral) mean advisor score 2.92 and a median score of 3, with a range of scores from 0 to 4 ($n = 130$, $SD = .76$). The mean reported score of 2.92 fell was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 2: Inspirational Motivation

Students reported an inspirational motivation mean advisor score of 3.29 and a median score of 3.5, with a range of scores from 1.25 to 4 ($n = 130$, $SD = .71$). The mean reported score of 3.29 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 4: Intellectual Stimulation

Students reported an intellectual stimulation mean advisor score of 3.07 and a median score of 3.25, with a range of scores from .25 to 4 ($n = 130$, $SD = .76$). The mean reported score of 3.07 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 5: Individualized Consideration

   Students reported an individualized mean advisor score of 2.96 and a median score of 3.0, with a range of scores from .00 to 4 ($n = 130$, $SD = .92$). The mean reported score of 2.96 was between *sometimes* and *fairly often.*

Construct 6: Contingent Reward

   Students reported contingent reward mean advisor score of 3.22 and a median score of 3.5, with a range of scores from 1 to 4 ($n = 130$, $SD = .76$). The mean reported score of 3.22 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 7: Management-by-Exception Active

   Students reported a management-by-exception (active) mean advisor score of 1.93 and a median score of 2.0, with a range of scores from 0 to 4 ($n = 130$, $SD = 1.01$). The mean reported score of 1.92 was between *once in a while* and *sometimes*.

Construct 8: Management-by-Exception Passive

   Students reported a management-by-exception (passive) mean advisor score of 1.18 and a median score of 1, with a range of scores from 0 to 3 ($n = 130$, $SD = .85$). The mean reported score of 1.18 was between *once in a while* and *sometimes*.

Construct 9: Laissez-Faire Leadership

Students reported an advisor laissez-faire leadership mean score of .71 and a

median score of .33, with a range of scores from 0 to 4 (n = 130, SD = .79). The mean

reported score of .71 was between *not at all* and *once in a while*.

Extra Effort

For the purposes of this study, this construct is considered the ability of the

advisor to facilitate extra effort from his or her student government, as self-reported by

the advisor or rated by the student. Students reported an extra effort mean score of 3.18

and a median score of 3.42, with a range of scores from 0 to 4 (n = 129, SD = .93). The

mean reported score of 3.18 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Effectiveness

For the purposes of this study, this construct is considered the ability of the

advisor to facilitate effectiveness from his or her student government, as self-reported by

the advisor or rated by the student. Students reported an extra effort mean score of 3.37

and a median score of 3.67, with a range of scores from .5 to 4 (n = 130, SD = .75). The

mean reported score of 3.37 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

<u>Satisfaction</u>

For the purposes of this study, this construct is considered the ability of the advisor to facilitate satisfaction from his or her student government, as self-reported by the advisor or rated by the student. Students reported an extra effort mean score of 3.38 and a median score of 4, with a range of scores from 0 to 4 ($n = 129$, $SD = .88$). The mean reported score of 3.38 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

All results for this question are reported as average scores of items related to the nine components of leadership and the three advisor group outcomes. For this study, the organizational outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, are reported as group outcomes because these outcomes are distinctly different than the organizational outcomes as measured and studied by this researcher (see Instrumentation). Results of frequency analysis follow and are presented by transformational and transactional leadership construct and by group outcome. These results are presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Transformational Leadership Qualities of Advisors as Reported by Students (N = 181)

	Number	M	SD
Idealized Influence -- Attributed	130	3.25	.84
Idealized Influence -- Behavioral	130	2.92	.76
Inspirational Motivation	130	3.29	.71
Intellectual Stimulation	130	3.07	.76
Individualized Consideration	130	2.96	.92
Contingent Reward	130	3.22	.76
Management-by-Exception (Active)	130	1.93	1.01
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	130	1.18	.85
Laissez-Faire	130	.71	.79
Extra Effort	129	3.18	.93
Effectiveness	130	3.67	.75
Satisfaction	129	3.38	.88

Research Question 4

What are the self-reported transformational leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

Items related to Research Question 4 were found in the second section of the advisor version of the survey, the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) Leader Form (5x-Short) (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 2000). Advisor transformational and transactional leadership qualities, as well as the group outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction were measured in 45 items. Items were scored using a five point Likert scale including "not at all" (0), "once in a while" (1), "sometimes" (2), "fairly often" (3), and "frequently, if not always" (4). Four items each measured the constructs of idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management-by exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), laissez-faire leadership, and effectiveness. Three items measured extra effort, and two items measured satisfaction.

Construct 1: Idealized Influence (Attributed)

Advisors reported an idealized influence (attributed) mean score of 3.22 and a median score of 3.25, with a range of scores from 2 to 4 ($n = 49$, $SD = .51$). The mean reported score of 3.22 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 2: Idealized Influence (Behavioral)

Advisors reported an idealized influence (behavioral) mean score of 3.14 and a median score of 3, with a range of scores from 2 to 4 ($n = 49$, $SD = .53$). The mean reported score of 3.14 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 3: Inspirational Motivation

Advisors reported an inspirational motivation mean score of 3.26 and a median score of 3.25, with a range of scores from 1.75 to 4 ($n = 49$, $SD = .56$). The mean reported score of 3.26 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 4: Intellectual Stimulation

Advisors reported an intellectual stimulation mean score of 3.04 and a median score of 3, with a range of scores from 1.75 to 4 ($n = 49$, $SD = .59$). The mean reported score of 3.04 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 5: Individualized Consideration

Advisors reported an individualized consideration mean score of 3.43 and a median score of 3.5, with a range of scores from 2.5 to 4 ($n = 49$, $SD = .44$). The mean reported score of 3.43 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always.*

Construct 6: Contingent Reward

Advisors reported contingent reward mean score of 3.13 and a median score of 3, with a range of scores from 2 to 4 ($n = 49$, $SD = .55$). The mean reported score of 3.13 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Construct 7: Management-by-Exception Active

Advisors reported a management-by-exception (active) mean score of 1.54 and a median score of 1.5, with a range of scores from .25 to 3.25 ($n = 49$, $SD = .69$). The mean reported score of 1.54 was between *once in a while* and *sometimes*.

Construct 8: Management-by-Exception Passive

Advisors reported a management-by-exception (passive) mean score of 1.19 and a median score of 1.0, with a range of scores from 0 to 2.75 ($n = 49$, $SD = .63$). The mean reported score of 1.19 was between *once in a while* and *sometimes*.

Construct 9: Laissez-Faire Leadership

Advisors reported a laissez-faire leadership mean score of .72 and a median score of .67, with a range of scores from 0 to 2.5 ($n = 49$, $SD = .56$). The mean reported score of .72 was between *not at all* and *once in a while*.

Extra Effort

Advisors reported an extra effort mean score of 3.12 and a median score of 3, with a range of scores from 2 to 4 ($n = 47$, $SD = .57$). The mean reported score of 3.12 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Effectiveness

Advisors reported an effectiveness mean score of 3.27 and a median score of 3.25, with a range of scores from 2 to 4 ($n = 48$, $SD = .48$). The mean reported score of 3.27 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

Satisfaction

Advisors reported a satisfaction mean score of 3.41 and a median score of 3.5, with a range of scores from 2 to 4 ($n = 48$, $SD = .57$). The mean reported score of 3.41 was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*.

All results for this question are reported as average scores of items related to the nine components of leadership and the three group outcomes. For this study, the organizational outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, are reported as group outcomes because these outcomes are distinctly different than the organizational outcomes as measured and studied by this researcher (see Instrumentation). Results of frequency analysis follow and are presented by transformational and transactional leadership construct and by group outcome. They are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Transformational Leadership Qualities as Self-Reported by Advisors (N = 181)

	Number	M	SD
Idealized Influence -- Attributed	49	3.22	.51
Idealized Influence -- Behavioral	49	3.14	.53
Inspirational Motivation	49	3.26	.56
Intellectual Stimulation	49	3.04	.59
Individualized Consideration	49	3.43	.44
Contingent Reward	49	3.13	.55
Management-by-Exception (Active)	49	1.54	.69
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	49	1.19	.63
Laissez-Faire	49	.72	.56
Extra Effort	47	3.12	.57
Effectiveness	48	3.27	.48
Satisfaction	48	3.41	.57

Research Question 5

To what degree are the organizational outcomes of CCSGOs fulfilled, as measured by achievement of those outcomes by CCSGO leaders and advisors?

Items related to the inquiry of Research Question 5 were found in the first section of the advisor and student version of the survey, as constructed by this researcher. Items 1 through 12 in the self-constructed section measured respondents' opinions of the importance of certain organizational outcomes. Items 13 through 24 measured respondents' opinions as to how well their student government achieved certain organizational outcomes. A Likert scale was used for these items to measure agreement. Items 1 to 12 utilized scores of "not important" (1) "slightly important," (2) "moderately important," (3) and "very important" (4). Items 13 to 24 utilized a range of "not well at all," (1) "slightly well," (2) "moderately well," (3) and "very well" (4).

Items considered by advisors and students for importance and achievement of outcomes included:

1. Allocation of student fees and funds.

2. Setting an intellectual environment.

3. Coordinating and promoting student activities.

4. Organizing students.

5. Formal training in leadership concepts and practices.

6. Multicultural awareness and diversity.

7. Securing student rights.

8. Establishment of leadership positions and opportunities.

9. Involving students in campus life.

10. Providing a voice for the students.

11. Establishing student government as a services organization.

12. Acting as a liaison between the college and students.

For the purposes of this research question, all results were analyzed as average scores of items related to the importance and achievement of organizational outcomes as reported by advisors and students.

Importance of Organizational Outcomes

Advisors reported an importance of organizational outcomes mean score of 3.64 and a median score of 3.75, with a range of scores from 2.83 to 4 ($n = 48$, $SD = .27$). The mean reported score of 3.64 was between *moderately important* and *very important*. Students reported an importance of organizational outcomes mean score of 3.67 and a median score of 3.75, with a range of scores from 2.83 to 4 ($n = 133$, $SD = .29$). The mean reported score of 3.67 also was between *moderately important* and *very important*.

Achievement of Organizational Outcomes

Advisors reported an achievement of organizational outcomes mean score of 3.11 and a median score of 3.25, with a range of scores from 1.83 to 3.92 ($n = 49$, $SD = .50$). The mean reported score of 3.11 was between *moderately important* and *very important*. Students reported an achievement of organizational outcomes mean score of 3.33 and a

median score of 3.33, with a range of scores from 2.18 to 4 ($n = 132$, $SD = .46$). The

mean reported score of 3.33 also was between *moderately important* and *very important*.

Results for student and advisor rating of achievements of organizational outcomes are

presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Organizational Outcomes as Rated By Advisors and Students:

Importance and Achievement (N = 181)

	Number	M	SD
Advisor Rating*	49		
Importance	48	3.75	.27
Achievement	49	3.11	.50
Student Rating*	133		
Importance	133	3.67	.29
Achievement	132	3.33	.46

*Rating based on the following scale:
1 = Not at All, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Moderately Important, 4 = Very Important

Research Question 6

What is the relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of community college student government advisors and community college student government organizational outcomes?

For this research question, correlation analyses, using two-tailed Spearman rank order correlation coefficients at the .05 level of statistical significance, was utilized to examine the relationship between the importance and achievement of organizational outcomes of Florida community college student governments and the self-reported and perceived transformational leadership qualities of Florida community college student government advisors.

Statistically significant correlations were found between student perceived overall transformational leadership qualities of advisors and the student perceived achievement of organizational outcomes ($n = 128$, $r_s = .32$, $p = .000$) and student perceived importance of organizational outcomes ($n = 129$, $r_s = .22$, $p = .013$). These results are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

Statistically Significant Correlations between Overall Student Perceptions of

Transformational Leadership Qualities of Advisors and of the Student Perceptions of the

Importance and Achievement of Organizational Outcomes (N = 181)

Student Perceptions of the Transformational Leadership Qualities of Student Government Advisors	n	r_s	p
Student Perceptions of the Achievement of Organizational Outcomes	129	.32	.000
Student Perceptions of the Importance of Organizational Outcomes	129	.22	.013

A statistically significant relationship was also found between student perceived

achievement of organizational outcomes and the student perceived importance of

organizational outcomes ($n = 131$, $r_s = .31$, $p = .000$). These results are presented in Table

18.

Table 18

Statistically Significant Correlations between Student Perceptions of the Importance and Achievement of Organizational Outcomes (N = 181)

Student Perceptions of the Importance of Organizational Outcomes	n	r_s	p
Student Perceptions of the Achievement of Organizational Outcomes	129	.31	.000

Statistically significant relationships were also found between student perceived achievement of organizational outcomes and many student perceived transformational leadership qualities of advisors, including idealized influence (attributed) ($n = 129$, $r_s = .23$, $p = .010$) and behavioral ($n = 129$, $r_s = .28$, $p = .001$), inspirational motivation ($n = 129$, $r_s = .29$, $p = .001$), intellectual stimulation ($n = 129$, $r_s = .25$, $p = .004$), individualized consideration ($n = 129$, $r_s = .27$, $p = .002$) and contingent reward ($n = 129$, $r_s = .20$, $p = .022$). Results of this analysis can be seen in Table 19.

Table 19

Statistically Significant Relationships between Student Perceptions of the Achievement of Organizational Outcomes and Student Perceived Advisor Transformational Leadership Constructs (N = 181)

Student Perceived Transformational Leadership Constructs	n	r_s	p
Idealized Influence -- Attributed	129	.23	.010
Idealized Influence -- Behavioral	129	.28	.001
Inspirational Motivation	129	.29	.001
Intellectual Stimulation	129	.25	.004
Individualized Consideration	129	.27	.002
Contingent Reward	129	.20	.022

<u>Secondary Findings</u>

Statistically significant relationships were found between student perceived achievement of organizational outcomes and student-rated group outcomes that were by advisors, including extra effort ($n = 129$, $r_s = .35$, $p = .000$), effectiveness ($n = 129$, $r_s = .36$, $p = .000$), and satisfaction ($n = 129$, $r_s = .30$, $p = .000$). Results of this analysis can be found in Table 20.

Table 20

Statistically Significant Relationships between Student Rated Perceptions of the Achievement of Organizational Outcomes and Student Rated Advisor Group Outcomes (N = 181)

Student Perceived Advisor Outcomes	n	r_s	p
Extra Effort	129	.35	.000
Effectiveness	129	.36	.000
Satisfaction	129	.30	.000

Statistically significant relationships were found between advisor perceived achievement of organizational outcomes and advisor self rating of group extra effort ($n = 47$, $r_s = .42$, $p = .004$), effectiveness ($n = 129$, $r_s = .39$, $p = .006$), and self-reported advisor contingent reward behavior ($n = 128$, $r_s = .33$, $p = .020$). These results are demonstrated in Table 21.

Table 21

Statistically Significant Relationships between Advisor Perceptions of the Achievement of Organizational Outcomes and Advisor Group Outcomes and of Contingent Reward (N = 181)

Advisor Self Rated Group Outcomes and Contingent Reward	n	r_s	p
Extra Effort	47	.42	.006
Effectiveness	47	.39	.004
Contingent Reward	47	.33	.020

Statistically significant results were found between student perceived advisor transformational leadership qualities and advisor self-rated extra effort ($n = 128$, $r_s = .73$, $p = .004$), effectiveness ($n = 129$, $r_s = .78$, $p = .021$), and satisfaction ($n = 129$, $r_s = .70$, $p = .020$). Results for this analysis are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Statistically Significant Relationships between Student Perceptions of Advisor Transformational Leadership Qualities and Advisor Self Rated Group Outcomes (N = 181)

Advisor Self Rated Group Outcomes	n	r_s	p
Extra Effort	128	.73	.004
Effectiveness	129	.78	.021
Satisfaction	129	.70	.020

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of advisor extra effort and student perceptions of advisor idealized influence (attributed) (n = 127, r_s = .72, p = .000), idealized influence (behavioral) (n = 128, r_s = .52, p = .000), (n = 128, r_s = .69, p = .000), intellectual stimulation (n = 128, r_s = .60, p = .000), individualized consideration (n = 128, r_s = .56, p = .000), contingent reward (n = 128, r_s = .67, p = .000), and laissez fair leadership (n = 128, r_s = .-23, p = .000). Results for this analysis are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Statistically Significant Relationships between Student Rated Advisor Extra Effort and

Student Perceptions of Advisor Transformational Leadership Constructs (N = 181)

Student Rated TFL[*] Constructs	n	r_s	p
Idealized Influence -- Attributed	127	.72	.000
Idealized Influence -- Behavioral	128	.52	.000
Inspirational Motivation	128	.60	.000
Intellectual Stimulation	128	.56	.000
Individualized Consideration	128	.67	.000
Laissez-Faire Leadership	128	-.23	.000

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of

advisor effectiveness and student perceived advisor idealized influence (attributed) (n =

129, r_s = .71, p = .000), idealized influence (behavioral) (n = 129, r_s = .62, p = .000),

inspirational motivation (n = 128, r_s = .69, p = .000), intellectual stimulation (n = 129, r_s

= .68, p = .000), individualized consideration (n = 129, r_s = .68, p = .000), contingent

reward (n = 129, r_s = .65, p = .000), and management by exception (passive) (n = 129, r_s

= .-21, p = .016). Results for this analysis are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Statistically Significant Relationships between Student Rated Advisor Effectiveness and Student Perceptions of Advisor Transformational Leadership Constructs (N = 181)

Student Perceptions of Transformational Leadership Constructs	n	r_s	p
Idealized Influence -- Attributed	129	.71	.000
Idealized Influence -- Behavioral	129	.62	.000
Inspirational Motivation	128	.69	.000
Intellectual Stimulation	129	.68	.000
Individualized Consideration	129	.68	.000
Contingent Reward	129	.65	.000
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	129	-.21	.016

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of advisor satisfaction and student perceptions of advisor idealized influence (attributed) ($n = 128$, $r_s = .72$, $p = .000$), idealized influence (behavioral) ($n = 128$, $r_s = .50$, $p = .000$), inspirational motivation ($n = 128$, $r_s = .67$, $p = .000$), intellectual stimulation ($n = 128$, r_s

= .60, p = .000), individualized consideration (n = 128, r_s = .56, p = .000), contingent

reward (n = 128, r_s = .67, p = .000), and laissez fair leadership (n = 128, r_s = .-45, p =

.000). These results are presented in Table 25 (see next page).

Other secondary findings include relationships were between the student rating of

advisor extra effort and advisor level of education and training in transformational

leadership concepts and practices (n = 128, r_s = .62, p = .006), between student rating of

advisor effectiveness and extra effort (n = 128, r_s = .70, p = .009), between student rating

of advisor satisfaction and effectiveness (n = 128, r_s = .79, p = .000), and between student

rating of advisor satisfaction and extra effort (n = 128, r_s = .68, p = .000).

<u>Qualitative Data</u>

A content analysis of advisor qualitative data is found on p. 57. An analysis of

student themes was implemented to examine the qualitative question, "In one sentence,

please describe your reason for joining student government." Student replies were

categorized into one or more of eight major themes including (a) socialization with other

students, (b) facilitation of relations between campus members, (c) representing student

interests, (d) involvement in meaningful activities, (e) development of leadership skills,

(f) team membership, (g) developing programs and activities, (h) Developing self-esteem.

Table 25

Statistically Significant Relationships between Student Rated Advisor Satisfaction and

Student Perception of Advisor Transformational Leadership Constructs (N = 181)

Student Rated Transformational Leadership Constructs	n	r_s	p
Idealized Influence -- Attributed	128	.72	.000
Idealized Influence -- Behavioral	128	.50	.000
Inspirational Motivation	128	.67	.000
Intellectual Stimulation	128	.60	.000
Individualized Consideration	128	.56	.000
Contingent Reward	128	.67	.000
Laissez-Faire Leadership	128	-.45	.000

<u>Summary</u>

Analysis of the data yielded that fewer than half of Florida community college

student government advisors were educated, formally or informally, in the concepts of

transformational leadership. Demographic characteristics were presented for Florida

community college advisors and student government members. Student government

members reported generally strong ratings of advisor transformational leadership

qualities, and advisors self-reported similarly strong transformational leadership qualities.

Student government organizational outcomes were largely fulfilled, as measured by

achievement of those outcomes by CCSGO leaders and advisors.

A statistically significant positive correlation was found between student

perceived transformational leadership qualities of advisors and student ratings of

achievement of organizational outcomes. Statistically significant correlations were also

found between student perceived transformational leadership qualities of advisors and

student ratings of the importance organizational outcomes. Furthermore, a statistically

significant relationship was found between student perceived achievement of

organizational outcomes and student perceived importance of organizational outcomes.

These positive correlations indicate the existence of a relationship between the

transformational leadership qualities of Florida community college student government

advisors as perceived by students and the student perceived achievement and importance

of student government organizational outcomes.

Statistically significant relationships were also found between student perceived

achievement of organizational outcomes and many student perceived transformational

leadership qualities of advisors, including idealized influence (attributed and behavioral),

inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and

contingent reward. Results of this analysis indicate the existence of a relationship between all individual transformational leadership constructs as found in advisors as perceived by students. Results also indicate the existence of a relationship between the strongest of the transactional leadership constructs, contingent reward, and student perceived achievement of organizational outcomes.

Statistically significant relationships were also found between student perceived achievement of organizational outcomes and student-rated group outcomes of advisors, including extra effort and satisfaction. Statistically significant relationships were found between advisor perceived achievement of organizational outcomes and advisor self-ratings of group extra effort. Statistically significant relationships were also found between advisor perceived achievement of organizational outcomes and self-reported advisor contingent reward behavior.

Statistically significant correlations were found in the relationships between student perceived advisor transformational leadership qualities and advisor self-rated group outcomes of effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of advisor group outcomes of extra effort and student perceived advisor idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavioral), intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, and laissez-faire leadership.

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student perceived advisor effectiveness and student perceived advisor idealized influence (attributed),

idealized influence (behavioral), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, and management by exception (passive).

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of the advisor group outcome of satisfaction and student perceived advisor idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavioral), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, and laissez-faire leadership.

Other secondary findings include relationships between the student rating of the advisor group outcome of extra effort and advisor level of education and training in transformational leadership concepts and practices, between student rating of the advisor group outcomes of effectiveness and extra effort, between student rating of the advisor group outcomes of satisfaction and effectiveness, and between student rating of the advisor group outcomes of satisfaction and extra effort.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which Florida community college student government advisors who exhibited transformational leadership qualities had an influence on the organizational outcomes of community college student governments. The researcher also investigated the demographic characteristics of Florida community college student government members and their advisors.

Furthermore, the researcher also gathered qualitative data as to why student government leaders joined student government and the type of transformational leadership education received by student government advisors. The researcher endeavored to determine the utility of the conceptual model of transformational leadership, particularly as found in the application of Bass's (1985) and Bass and Avolio's (1993) concept of transformational leadership, as it has been advocated for use in college student government populations (Gold & Quatroche, 1994).

In a review of literature and related research, the long history of college student government, up to and including the late 20th century, was presented. Research and literature concerning student government advising, organizational outcomes in college student government, transformational leadership, leadership and student development, and student leadership was reviewed. The use of transformational leadership and the legitimacy of transformational leadership as a conceptual model for study in non-student

and related student populations was demonstrated. The use of transformational leadership

in community college student government populations, as found in the influence of

Florida community college student advisors on student government organizational

outcomes, was the major question that guided the study.

Six research questions were posed and investigated. The following is a review of

the conceptual framework of the study and a discussion of the results that may be drawn

from the data. Implications of the research as related to the fields of student leadership,

college student government advising, and college student governments are discussed.

Also, recommendations for further study are presented.

Conceptual Framework

College Student Governments

College student governments have significantly evolved from their antecedents in

late 18th century student activism (Chambers & Phelps, 1994), latter 19th and early 20th

century students concerns with issues of *in loco parentis* and the removal of unpopular

college officials or services. This evolution continued in their use between 1900 and 1920

largely as a means of administrative control (Horowitz, 1987), 1960s activism and early

1970s entitlement issues (Chambers & Phelps, 1994), and the rise in the 1980s and 1990s

of concern about career preparation (Chambers & Phelps, 1994; Schlesinger & Baldridge,

1982). Recent student governments reflect an interest in governance, policy making,

accountability, and institutional financial responsibility (Chambers & Phelps, 1994).

Cuyjet (1994) stated that the three main purposes of modern student governments are: (1) responsibility for governance as acceded by higher education institutions, (2) providing leadership experiences to those involved in student government, and (3) providing "valuable cocurricular services for the student body" (pp. 76-77). Organizational outcomes, and student government involvement in these outcomes, can be viewed as the relative ability to effectively reach these purposes.

Researchers have demonstrated that college students have a need to be involved in institutional decision-making and governance (Francis, 1979; Lord, 1978), but the students often are not aware of or involved in student government (Francis, 1979; Lord, 1978). An understanding of leadership theory and application, effective leadership, and successful demonstrated organizational outcomes as practiced by student government leaders and developed by their advisors, is a possible redress to the disparity of student-realized need for participation and their actual motivation to be involved.

Transformational leadership

Bass's (1985, 1998) concept of transformational leadership served as the theoretical focus of this study. Transformational leadership theory is best understood in contrast with transactional leadership. According to Burns (1978), leadership can be moral or amoral in nature. Only moral leaders can be transactional or transformational. Transactional leaders act with exchange in mind. Transformational leaders act to satisfy higher needs of followers and engage the whole person. There has been a growth in

student leadership studies in this area, especially in the application of Bass's (1985) principles of leadership (Gold & Quatroche, 1994). This model serves the need of student affairs officers to advance student government goals (p. 42).

Bass (1985) posited that the study of leadership in the half-century before 1985 was mainly concerned with the dichotomies of autocratic and democratic leadership, directive and participative locus of decision-making, task and relationship focus, and initiation and consideration behavior. Bass viewed these approaches as inadequate in dealing with the study of leadership given the need for higher-order change in effort and performance, the shortcomings of cost-benefit exchange theories, and the emergence of new approaches to the subject of motivation. Bass expanded Burns' (1978) definition of transforming leadership to that of transformational leadership, and transactional leadership from that of quid pro quo exchange to contingent reinforcement.

Bass's (1985) definition of transactional leadership includes recognition of what workers want from work and, if warranted, facilitating wants. It also recognizes an exchange of rewards and promises of reward for worker effort. Finally, transactional leadership "is responsive to our [the worker's] immediate self-interests if they can be met by getting our work done" (Bass, 1985, p. 11).

The process of contingent reinforcement is the main force in transactional leadership (Bass, 1998). Contingent reinforcement includes the components of contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership, with contingent reward the most effective transactional approach. Active and passive management-by-exception is considered to be the next most effective. Laissez-faire leadership, the lack of

leadership, is considered the least effective of these components (Bass, 1998). Bass

(1985) differed from Burns by including transactional leadership as part of overall

leadership behavior, not in a continuum of behavior as proposed by Burns.

Bass (1998) asserted that the transformational leader exhibits, to some relative

degree, all aspects of transactional and transformational leadership. The distribution of

transactional leadership and transformational leadership components is particularly

important. The more effective transformational leader exhibits greater evidence of

components associated with transformational leadership. According to Bass' view of

transformational leadership (1985, 1998), it is the presence and augmentation of

transformational leadership components on transactional components that accounts for

results greater than those accounted for by transactional leadership.

Transformational leadership components include the interacting and interrelated

constructs of idealized influence (attributed and behavioral), inspirational motivation,

intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985,1998; Bass &

Avolio, 1993). Charismatic leadership or idealized influence describes the process in

which leaders are viewed by followers as role models. Followers imbue them with

exceptional personal qualities and high levels of moral and ethical conduct (Bass, 1998).

Inspirational motivation is the process in which transformational leaders behave "in ways

that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their

followers' work" (Bass, 1998, p. 11). Intellectual stimulation is the process whereby

leaders encourage followers' innovation and creativity. Individualized consideration is

the coaching or mentoring process in which leaders foster individual followers' unique

"needs for achievement and growth" in a holistic fashion (Bass, 1998, p. 11).

Effective transformational leadership, and the interrelated dynamics of its

constructs, may have implications in the field of student government advising. Dickerson

(1999) posited that student government leaders face more limits, time constraints, and

concentrated leadership training than in the past. Chavez (1985) also viewed the role of

advisors as being particularly demanding and complex with many formal and personal

functions.

Given this need for concentrated advisor leadership, Bass's definition (1985) of

an effective transformational leader is particularly salient. The student government

advisor has an important role in the success of SGOs (McKaig & Policello, 1987) and in

the leadership development of student government members, particularly as evidenced in

the quality of their extracurricular learning (Kuh, Schuh, & Witt, 1991; McKaig &

Policello, 1987). In this context, the study of transformational leadership as a leadership

paradigm practiced in student leadership development is merited.

Summary of Results

Research Question 1

To what degree are community college student government advisors (CCSGAs)

educated, formally or informally, in the concepts of transformational leadership?

An interpretation of the results for this research question yielded a low level of education of transformational leadership concepts among Florida CCSGAs, particularly as measured by familiarity of education and training received and level of training in transformational leadership. Furthermore, those who have received training in transformational leadership have done so largely through workshops or classroom curricula and not through any means that could be surmised from the data as being lasting or ongoing. It could be inferred that transformational leadership as a concept is not commonly or overtly referenced in formal leadership education activities among students and advisors. Results of the analyses for this research question can be found in Table 1. Qualitative responses can be found in Appendix D.

<center>Research Question 2</center>

What are the demographic characteristics of CCSGAs and the leaders of community college student government organizations (CCSGOs)?

<u>Advisors</u>

Of the respondents who completed the survey, 27.1% were Florida community college student government advisors ($n = 49$). Advisor ages ranged from 23 to 60 years, with a mean advisor age of 41.5 years ($n = 47$, $SD = 10.22$). Advisors had been in their current positions ranging from two months to 330 months (27.5) years, with a mean tenure of 70.6 months (5.9 years) ($n = 49$, $SD = 80.20$). These results are presented in

<center>103</center>

Table 2. The majority of advisors have been in their positions for more than five years, and so it could also be assumed that are more experienced in their duties and may have an understanding of student dynamics that would lend itself to student leadership training and development.

An analysis of the data yielded that 60.4% of advisors reported a full-time commitment to student government, and 39.6% of advisors reported a part-time commitment to student government ($n = 48$, $M = 1.65$, $SD = .53$). These results are presented in Table 3. From this it could be posited that the majority of advisors potentially have the time to engage in student leadership training and development.

A majority of advisors (56.3%) reported themselves as *Professional Staff*, while 12.5% reported themselves as *Faculty Members,* 20.8% reported themselves as *Administrator*, 56.3% as *Professional Staff*, and 10.4% as *Support Staff* ($n = 48$, $M = 2.65$, $SD = .84$). These results are found in Table 4.

A majority of advisors were female (58.3%) and 41.7% were male ($n = 48$, $M = 1.58$, $SD = .498$). These results are presented in Table 5.

Students

Of the 181 respondents who completed the survey, 132 (72.9%) were Florida community college student government executive board members. Student ages ranged from 17 years to 51, with a mean age of 22.4 years ($n = 130$, $SD = 5.97$). Students had been in their current positions ranging from one to 28 months, with a mean tenure of 7.64 months ($n = 130$, $SD = 5.04$). These results are presented in Table 6.

Students committed an average of 14 hours per week to student government activities ($n = 128, SD = 10.9$). Responses of time committed to student government activities ranged from one hour to 50 hours. These results are presented in Table 7.

Students reported 37.0% of advisors as a *Faculty Member*, 11.8% as *Administrator*, 33.1% as *Professional Staff*, 12.6 % as *Support Staff*, and 5.5% as *Not Applicable* ($M = 2.39, SD = 1.29$). These results are presented in Table 8.

A majority of students (84.8%) considered themselves as full-time, defined in the questionnaire as taking 12 credit hours or more of classes in a semester. The remaining 15.2% of students considered themselves as part-time, defined in the questionnaire as taking less than 12 credit hours of classes in a semester ($n = 132, M = 1.15, SD = .36$). These results are reported in Table 9.

A majority (86.9%) were pursing a general transfer degree to a four-year college or university, 10.8% were pursuing a workforce degree, and 2.3% were pursuing a certificate ($n = 130, M = 1.15, SD = .42$). These results are reported in Table 10.

A majority (94.5%) held a position with a title commonly associated with membership in an executive board as *president*, *vice-president*, *secretary*, or *treasurer* ($n = 130, M = 2.89, SD = 1.50$), while the remainder of respondents (5.5%) reported themselves as *other* ($n = 130, M = 2.89, SD = 1.50$). A majority of respondents were female (63.6%), and the remainder of respondents reported themselves as male (36.4%) ($n = 132, M = 1.64, SD = .48$). These results are reported in Tables 12 and 13, respectively.

Of the 132 students who replied to the item, 76.5% planned on seeking future

formal leadership positions, and 23.5% did not plan on seeking future leadership

positions ($n = 132$, $M = 1.39$, $SD = .75$). Theses results are presented in Table 13.

From an analysis of student demographic characteristics it was determined that

student government members commit weekly hours to their student governments

equivalent to that of a part-time job ($M = 13.99$, $SD = 1.05$). A majority of students plan

on transferring to a college and university, and a majority of students plan on seeking

future leadership positions. The combination of the presence of student time commitment

and intent to seek future leadership positions, possibly at colleges and universities,

presents an opportunity for the more thorough introduction of transformational leadership

to this population, as has been recommended by student development practitioners (Fasci,

1993; Gold & Quatroche, 1994).

Research Question 3

What are the perceptions of the leaders of CCSGOs of the transformational

leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

Constructs 1 and 2: Idealized Influence (Attributed and Behavioral)

Students reported an attributed mean advisor score that was between *fairly often*

and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 130$, $M = 3.25$, $SD = .84$). Students also reported a

behavioral mean advisor score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always*

($n = 130$, $M = 2.92$, $SD = .76$). This would indicate that student leaders felt that advisors

frequently exhibited behaviors that engendered positive emulation, admiration, respect and trust, and that they attributed characteristics of exceptional personal qualities and high levels of moral and ethical conduct (Bass, 1998) to advisors. As stated previously in the review of literature, these behaviors include consideration of follower needs over personal needs, consistency, shared risk-taking, demonstration of high moral and ethical standards, and avoidance of the pursuit of power for personal gain (Bass, 1996).

Construct 3: Inspirational Motivation

Students reported an inspirational motivation mean advisor score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* (n = 130, M = 3.29, SD = .71). This would indicate that student leaders felt that advisors frequently exhibited those behaviors that facilitated motivation and inspiration by "providing meaning and challenge to their follower's work" (Bass, 1996). These behaviors expressed by advisors included enthusiasm, optimism, envisioning future states, clearly communicated expectations, commitment to goals, and shared vision.

Construct 4: Intellectual Stimulation

Students reported an intellectual stimulation mean advisor score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* (n = 130, M = 3.07, SD = .76). This would indicate that students felt that advisors regularly aroused student "efforts to be innovative and creative" without public criticism (Bass, 1996) and students felt that advisors question assumptions, reframe problems, and approach old situations in novel ways.

Construct 5: Individualized Consideration

      Students reported an individualized consideration mean advisor score that was

between *sometimes* and *fairly often* ($n = 130$, $M = 2.96$, $SD = .92$). This would indicate

that students felt advisors to a moderate degree acted in the role of coach or mentor,

paying attention to the individual's need for achievement and growth (Bass, 1996, p. 7).

Construct 6: Contingent Reward

      Students reported a contingent reward mean advisor score that was between *fairly*

often and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 130$, $M = 3.22$, $SD = .76$). This would indicate

that students felt that advisors were strongly engaging in the process by which they

contracted with students to achieve tasks or goals and promises or provided rewards for

their satisfactory completion (Bass, 1996, 1998). This mean score is close in value to the

mean of the scores self-reported by advisors ($n = 49$, $M = 3.13$, $SD = .55$).

Construct 7: Management-by-Exception Active

      Students reported a management-by-exception (active) mean advisor score that

was between *once in a while* and *sometimes* ($n = 130$, $M = 1.93$, $SD = 1.01$). After

contingent reward, management-by-exception (active) is considered the next more

effective form of transactional leadership. To a lesser degree students indicated that

advisors actively monitored and corrected "deviances from standards" (Bass, 1996, p.7),

mistakes, and errors.

Construct 8: Management-by-Exception Passive

Students reported a management-by-exception (passive) mean advisor score that was between *once in a while* and *sometimes* ($n = 130$, $M = 1.18$, $SD = .85$). Students indicated that advisors to a lesser degree passively waited for errors to happen and only then corrected them.

Construct 9: Laissez-Faire Leadership

Students reported an advisor laissez-faire leadership mean score that was between *not at all* and *once in a while* ($n = 130$, $M = .71$, $SD = .79$). Students indicated that advisors rarely exhibited a lack of leadership.

Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction

Students reported an extra effort mean score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* for extra effort ($n = 129$, $M = 3.18$, $SD = .93$), in a higher placement for effectiveness ($n = 130$, $M = 3.67$, $SD = .75$), and a lower placement for satisfaction ($n = 129$, $M = 3.38$, $SD = .88$). From this, it could be inferred that students were largely satisfied with advisor behavior related to these group outcomes. Results for all constructs are found in Table 15.

Research Question 4

What are the self-reported transformational leadership qualities of CCSGAs?

Constructs 1 and 2: Idealized Influence (Attributed and Behavioral)

Advisors reported an idealized influence (attributed) mean score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 49$, $M = 3.22$, $SD = .51$) and an idealized influence (behavioral) mean score was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 49$, $M = 3.14$, $SD = .53$). This would indicate that advisors largely felt they exhibited behaviors which engendered positive emulation, admiration, respect and trust, and that they were attributed characteristics of exceptional personal qualities and high levels of moral and ethical conduct (Bass, 1998) to advisors. As stated previously in the review of literature, these behaviors include consideration of follower needs over personal needs, consistency, shared risk-taking, demonstration of high moral and ethical standards, and avoidance of the pursuit of power for personal gain (Bass, 1996).

Construct 3: Inspirational Motivation

Advisors reported an inspirational motivation mean score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 49$, $M = 3.26$, $SD = .56$). This would indicate that advisors largely felt they exhibited those behaviors which facilitated motivation and inspiration by "providing meaning and challenge to their follower's work" (Bass, 1996, p.5). These behaviors expressed by advisors included enthusiasm, optimism, envisioning future states, clearly communicated expectations, commitment to goals, and shared vision.

Construct 4: Intellectual Stimulation

Advisors reported an intellectual stimulation mean score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 49$, $M = 3.04$, $SD = .59$). This would indicate that advisors felt they regularly aroused student "efforts to be innovative and creative" without public criticism (Bass, 1996, p.7), and they felt that they question assumptions, reframe problems, and approach old situations in novel ways.

Construct 5: Individualized Consideration

Advisors reported an individualized consideration mean score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 49$, $M = 3.43$, $SD = .44$). This would indicate that advisors to a large degree felt they acted in the role of coach or mentor, paying attention to the individual's need for achievement and growth (Bass, 1996, p. 7).

Construct 6: Contingent Reward

Advisors reported a contingent reward mean score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* ($n = 49$, $M = 3.13$, $SD = .55$). This would indicate that they were strongly engaging in the process by which they contracted with students to achieve tasks or goals and promises or provided rewards for their satisfactory completion (Bass, 1996, 1998)

Construct 7: Management-by-Exception Active

Advisors reported a management-by-exception (active) mean score that was between *once in a while* and *sometimes* ($n = 49$, $M = 1.54$, $SD = .69$). To a lesser degree advisors indicated they actively monitored "deviances from standards" (Bass, 1996, p.7), mistakes, and errors and actively corrected them.

Construct 8: Management-by-Exception Passive

Advisors reported a management-by-exception (passive) mean score that was between *once in a while* and *sometimes* ($n = 49$, $M = 1.19$, $SD = .63$). Advisors to a lesser degree passively waited for errors to happen and only then corrected them.

Construct 9: Laissez-Faire Leadership

Advisors reported a laissez-faire leadership mean score of .72 that was between *not at all* and *once in a while* ($n = 49$, $M = .72$, $SD = .56$). Advisors indicated that they rarely exhibited a lack of leadership.

Extra Effort, Effectiveness, Satisfaction

Advisors reported an extra effort mean score that was between *fairly often* and *frequently, if not always* for extra effort ($n = 47$, $M = 3.12$, $SD = .57$), effectiveness ($n = 48$, $M = 3.27$, $SD = .48$), and satisfaction ($n = 48$, $M = 3.41$, $SD = .57$). From this, it could be inferred that advisors felt they efficaciously engaged in behaviors that related to these group outcomes. Results for all constructs are presented in Table 15

Research Question 5

To what degree are the organizational outcomes of CCSGOs fulfilled, as measured by achievement of those outcomes by CCSGO leaders and advisors?

To a large degree advisors fulfilled the student government organizational outcomes as measured by agreement with their importance ($n = 48$, $M = 3.64$, $SD = .27$) and by achievement of those outcomes ($n = 49$, $M = 3.11$, $SD = .50$). Students reported similar levels of fulfillment of these outcomes, also as measured by agreement of importance of organizational outcomes ($n = 133$, $M = 3.67$, $SD = .29$) and by achievement of student government organizational outcomes ($n = 132$, $M = 3.33$, $SD = .46$). Advisors and students were in close agreement on the importance of student government organizational outcomes and that those outcomes had been successfully achieved. Results for this research question are presented in Table 16.

Research Question 6

What is the relationship between the transformational leadership qualities of community college student government advisors and community college student government organizational outcomes?

For this research question, correlation analyses, using two-tailed Spearman rank order correlation coefficients at the .05 level of statistical significance, were utilized to

examine the relationship between the importance and achievement of organizational

outcomes of Florida community college student governments and the self-reported and

perceived transformational leadership qualities of Florida community college student

government advisors.

Statistically significant correlations were found between student perceived overall

transformational leadership qualities of advisors and the student perceived achievement

of organizational outcomes ($n = 128$, $r_s = .32$, $p = .000$) and student perceived importance

of organizational outcomes ($n = 129$, $r_s = .22$, $p = .013$). These results are presented in

Table 17.

A statistically significant relationship was also found between student perceived

achieved organizational outcomes and the student perceived importance of organizational

outcomes ($n = 131$, $r_s = .31$, $p = .000$). This result is presented in Table 18.

Statistically significant relationships were also found between student perceived

achievement of organizational outcomes and many student perceived transformational

leadership qualities of advisors, including idealized influence (attributed) ($n = 129$, $r_s =$

$.23$, $p = .010$) and behavioral ($n = 129$, $r_s = .28$, $p = .001$), inspirational motivation ($n =$

129, $r_s = .29$, $p = .001$), intellectual stimulation ($n = 129$, $r_s = .25$, $p = .004$),

individualized consideration ($n = 129$, $r_s = .27$, $p = .002$) and contingent reward ($n = 129$,

$r_s = .20$, $p = .022$). Results of this analysis can be seen in Table 19.

These results would indicate that student perception of advisor transformational

leadership qualities may be more accurate than advisor self-ratings of transformational

leadership behavior, and the possibility of a dynamic at work among advisors that produces a disconnect between their self-ratings and those of students. These results may also indicate that the dynamic of transformational leadership, as conceptually envisioned by Bernard Bass (1985, 1996) and Bass and Avolio (1993), may be at work among the population of Florida community college student government advisors and student government members. Both individual transformational leadership constructs and overall transformational leadership qualities seem to be present. Its use among college student governments, as recommended by Gold and Quatroche (1994), may be bolstered by the finding of these positive relationships.

<u>Secondary Findings</u>

Statistically significant relationships were found between student perceived organizational outcomes and student-rated advisor group outcomes, including extra effort ($n = 129$, $r_s = .35$, $p = .000$), effectiveness ($n = 129$, $r_s = .36$, $p = .000$), and satisfaction ($n = 129$, $r_s = .30$, $p = .001$). Results of this analysis can be found in Table 20. This indicates that student perceived government organizational outcomes were fulfilled at greater levels in those student governments in which there are greater levels of the student rated group outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

Statistically significant relationships were found between advisor perceived organizational outcomes and advisor self rating of group extra effort ($n = 47$, $r_s = .42$, $p = .004$), effectiveness ($n = 129$, $r_s = .39$, $p = .006$), and self- perceived advisor contingent reward behavior ($n = 128$, $r_s = .33$, $p = .020$). These results are demonstrated in Table 21.

These results indicate that advisor perceived government organizational outcomes were fulfilled at greater levels when advisors engage in the group outcome of extra effort, and when advisors engage in contingent reward behavior, as perceived by students.

Statistically significant results were found between student perceived advisor transformational leadership qualities and advisor self-rated group outcomes of extra effort ($n = 128$, $r_s = .73$, $p = .004$), effectiveness ($n = 129$, $r_s = .78$, $p = .021$), and satisfaction ($n = 129$, $r_s = .70$, $p = .020$). Results for this analysis are presented in Table 22. This result indicates that advisors who exhibited greater levels of transformational leadership qualities as perceived by students facilitated greater levels all three group outcomes, as self-rated by advisors.

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of advisor extra effort and student perceived advisor idealized influence (attributed) ($n = 127$, $r_s = .72$, $p = .000$), idealized influence (behavioral) ($n = 128$, $r_s = .52$, $p = .000$), ($n = 128$, $r_s = .69$, $p = .000$), intellectual stimulation ($n = 128$, $r_s = .60$, $p = .000$), individualized consideration ($n = 128$, $r_s = .56$, $p = .000$), contingent reward ($n = 128$, $r_s = .67$, $p = .000$), and laissez fair leadership ($n = 128$, $r_s = .-23$, $p = .009$). Results for this analysis are presented in Table 23.

This result indicates that advisors, as rated by students, who engaged in greater levels of the group outcome of extra effort, facilitate greater levels of student perceived advisor transformational leadership qualities as perceived by students. Furthermore, this result indicates that advisors, as perceived by students who engaged in greater levels of the group outcome of extra effort, also facilitated greater levels of the transactional

116

leadership construct of contingent reward and lesser levels of the transactional leadership

quality of laissez-faire leadership.

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of

advisor effectiveness and student perceived advisor idealized influence (attributed) ($n =$

129, $r_s = .71$, $p = .000$), idealized influence (behavioral) ($n = 129$, $r_s = .62$, $p = .000$),

inspirational motivation ($n = 128$, $r_s = .69$, $p = .000$), intellectual stimulation ($n = 129$, r_s

$= .68$, $p = .000$), individualized consideration ($n = 129$, $r_s = .68$, $p = .000$), contingent

reward ($n = 129$, $r_s = .65$, $p = .000$), and management by exception (passive) ($n = 129$, r_s

$= .-21$, $p = .016$). Results for this analysis are presented in Table 24.

This result indicates that advisors, as rated by students, who engaged in greater

levels of the group outcome of effectiveness, facilitated greater levels of student

perceived advisor transformational leadership qualities. Furthermore, this result indicates

that advisors, as rated by students, who engaged in greater levels of the group outcome of

effectiveness, also facilitated greater levels of the transactional leadership construct of

contingent reward, and lesser levels of the transactional leadership quality of

management-by-exception (passive).

Statistically significant relationships were found between the student rating of

advisor satisfaction and student perceived advisor idealized influence (attributed) ($n =$

128, $r_s = .72$, $p = .000$), idealized influence (behavioral) ($n = 128$, $r_s = .50$, $p = .000$),

inspirational motivation ($n = 128$, $r_s = .67$, $p = .000$), intellectual stimulation ($n = 128$, r_s

$= .60$, $p = .000$), individualized consideration ($n = 128$, $r_s = .56$, $p = .000$), contingent

reward ($n = 128$, $r_s = .67$, $p = .000$), and laissez fair leadership ($n = 128$, $r_s = .-45$, $p =$ .000). These results are presented in Table 25.

This result indicates that advisors, as rated by students, who engaged in greater levels of the group outcome of satisfaction, facilitated greater levels of student perceived advisor transformational leadership qualities. Furthermore, this result indicates that advisors, as rated by students, who engaged in greater levels of the group outcome of satisfaction, also facilitated greater levels of the transactional leadership construct of contingent reward, and lesser levels of the transactional leadership quality of laissez-faire leadership.

Other secondary findings include relationships between the student rating of advisor extra effort and advisor level of education and training in transformational leadership concepts and practices ($n = 128$, $r_s = .62$, $p = .006$). This result indicates that advisors who engaged in greater self-perceived levels of the group outcome of satisfaction facilitated greater levels of self-perceived advisor transformational leadership concepts and practices.

Results also indicated that there are statistically significant relationships between student rating of advisor effectiveness and extra effort ($n = 128$, $r_s = .70$, $p = .009$), between student rating of advisor satisfaction and effectiveness ($n = 128$, $r_s = .79$, $p = .000$), and between student rating of advisor satisfaction and extra effort ($n = 128$, $r_s = .68$, $p = .000$). This indicates that there is a general positive relationship between student-perceived advisor group outcomes.

Lastly, it is worth to note that although the majority of advisors reported having little or formal training or education in transformational leadership concepts and practices, advisors exhibited strong levels of transformational leadership qualities, both as self-perceived and perceived by students. This may indicate that factors other than formal education and training may contribute these strong levels. These factors, among others, could include criteria for selection to their positions, commitment to the development of student leadership, and recognition of the need of community college student leaders for directive leadership.

Implications

In 2000, 11.6 million students in American higher education attended community colleges (American Association of Community Colleges, 2005). In the fall of 2004, 374,743 students attended Florida community colleges (Florida Department of Higher Education, 2005); while at the same time 278,492 attended a university in the state of Florida (State of Florida Board of Governors, 2005). An argument could be made that support for student leadership development is equally important, if not more so, at community colleges, particularly in Florida, where the establishment of student governments and their involvement in institutional governance has been legislatively mandated in State of Florida Statutes 1004.26 & 1001.65, 2005. (West's Florida Statutes Annotated, 2005.

Furthermore, students who are involved in extracurricular activities and interaction with fellow students outside of the classroom, compared with contemporaries

with lower levels of involvement, exhibit greater levels of critical thinking, better degree planning, increased locus of control for academic success, and more preference for higher-order cognitive tasks (Pascarella, Pierson, & Wolniak, 2004). Pascarella et al. (2004) also state that involvement in extracurricular and peer activities benefits these students in their academic success and cognitive development. This is contrasted with the lower overall level of involvement of these students in such activities, compared to all incoming students.

Student government can be a very meaningful activity for the initial and ongoing development of student development, providing benefits to both the individual student government member and the student population as a whole. The use of transformational leadership as a model for the development of student leadership and the ability to engender increased student government organizational outcomes could be viewed as an important element in the betterment of the student educational experience.

Armed with the knowledge that the presence and development of transformational leadership qualities may lead to greater student group outcomes, the student government advisor would benefit by engaging in self-examination to develop areas of leadership shortcomings and take advantage leadership strengths. Potentially, a student government advisor could self-assess and compare his or her mean scores to those rated by student government members and fellows. Transformational leadership concepts and practices should be considered for training advisors. Student government group outcomes and organizational outcomes may benefit, and, therefore, college student populations may

benefit. In this effort, the transformational leadership could develop those qualities, advising and leading student government to success.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several recommendations can be suggested based on the results of this study:

1. It is recommended that student government members and their advisors in community colleges in other states be studied for relationships between transformational leadership qualities of student government advisors and organizational outcomes.

2. It is recommended that in and out of state, four-year college and university student governments, and in and out of state graduate student associations, be studied further for this purpose.

3. It is recommended that transformational leadership qualities of student government presidents be examined, given the cascading effect of transformational leadership.

4. It is recommended that the concept of substitutes for leadership (Bass, 1996) be studied in relation to this population, particularly as such substitutes could potentially influence transformational leadership qualities and the fulfillment of organizational outcomes.

5. It is recommended that other leadership models be investigated to examine the relationship between such models and student government organizational outcomes.

6. It is recommended there be an investigation of highly effective student and advisor leadership training programs to determine the explicit or implicit leadership models they employ.

7. It is recommended that longitudinal studies be implemented to determine the lasting effect of advisor and other transformational leadership qualities on student government populations.

APPENDIX A: ADVISOR SURVEY

Survey of Florida Community College Student Government Advisors:

The Effectiveness of Community College Student Government Advisors in

Reaching Student Government Outcomes

Survey Form A – Student Government Advisors

Constructed by Tom Rath

(Form A)

Directions: Please complete sections I, II and III on the following pages

I. CONSENT FORM

February 10-13, 2005

Dear Community College Student Government Advisor:

I am asking your help in a study I am conducting in support of my doctoral studies at the University of Central Florida. My study concerns the transformational leadership qualities of community college student government advisors and the organizational outcomes of Florida community student government associations.

I understand that you serve as student government advisor for your community college campus. I am contacting you to answer a questionnaire for this study.

Results of my survey will be used to provide valuable information for all who are involved and concerned with student government leadership development. This research will help community college student governments better serve their students and institutions by gaining insight into how their advisors help student leaders reach organizational outcomes.

There are no known risks to completing this survey. Your answers are completely confidential and will be reported only as summaries in which individual responses cannot be identified. When you return your complete questionnaires, your name will be removed from contact lists and never connected to your answers in any way. The survey is voluntary. However, my research will be greatly enhanced if you take a few minutes to let me know what you think about this topic. If you prefer not to respond, please let me know by returning a blank questionnaire.

If you have any questions about this research, please contact me at (941) 637-5653 or my faculty supervisor, Dr. House at (239) 590-7810. Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the UCFIRB Office, University of Central Florida Office of Research, Orlando Tech Center, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 207, Orlando, FL 32826. The phone number is (407) 823-2901.

Sincerely,
Thomas K. Rath
UCF Doctoral Student

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE REPONSES

_____I have read the procedure described above.
_____I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure.

_____I would like to receive a copy of the procedure described above.
_____I would not like to receive a copy of the procedure described above.

IF YOU AGREE TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE SIGN AND DATE

_____/_____

Participant   Date

PLEASE CONTINUE TO SECTION II ON NEXT PAGE ⟶

II. START QUESTIONNAIRE HERE

For questions 1-12, place an "X" by the category that best describes your answer.

Please consider each of the following student government outcomes and indicate if they are *Very Important, Moderately Important, Slightly Important, or Not Important*.

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
1. Allocation of Student Fees and Funds	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Setting an Intellectual Environment	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Coordinating and Promoting Student Activities	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Organizing Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Formal Training in Leadership Concepts and Practices	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Multicultural Awareness and Diversity	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Securing Student Rights	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Establishment of Leadership Positions and Opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Involving Students in Campus Life	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Providing a Voice for Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Establishing Student Government as a Service Organization	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Acting as a Liaison Between the College and Students	☐	☐	☐	☐

CONTINUE HERE

For questions 13-24, place an "X" by the category that best describes your answer.

Please again consider each of the following student government outcomes and indicate *if your student government has* achieved them *Very Well, Moderately Well, Slightly Well, or Not Well At All*.

	Very Well	Moderately Well	Slightly Well	Not Well At All
13. Allocation of Student Fees and Funds	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Setting an Intellectual Environment	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Coordinating and Promoting Student Activities	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Organizing Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Formal Training in Leadership Concepts and Practices	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Multicultural Awareness and Diversity	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Securing Student Rights	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Establishment of Leadership Positions and Opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Involving Students in Campus Life	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Providing a Voice for Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Establishing Student Government as a Service Organization	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Acting as a Liaison Between the College and Students	☐	☐	☐	☐

CONTINUE HERE

For questions 25-34 place an "X" by the category that best describes your answer or fill in the appropriate response.

25. What is your time commitment to your student government?

☐ Full Time Advisor (all of your time is committed to student government)
☐ Part Time Advisor (half or less time committed to student government)
☐ Not Applicable

26. How many months have you held your present position? _____

27. Which title *best* describes your classification at your college?

☐ Faculty Member
☐ Administrator
☐ Professional Staff
☐ Support Staff
☐ Not Applicable

28. How familiar with transformational leadership concepts and practices?

☐ Very Familiar
☐ Moderately Familiar
☐ Slightly Familiar
☐ Not Familiar at All

29. Have you received education and training in transformational leadership concepts and practices?

☐ Yes (Go to Question 30)
☐ No (Go to Question 32)

30. Which best describes the level of education or training you have received in transformational leadership concepts and practices?

☐ A Great Amount
☐ A Moderate Amount
☐ A Small Amount
☐ None at All

31. In one sentence, please describe in what way you received this training?
_____

32. What is your Age? _____

33. What is your gender?

☐ Male
☐ Female

CONTINUE HERE

The following questions are from the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) Leader Form (5x-Short). This questionnaire is to describe your leadership as you perceive it. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are not sure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

[Note: Due to copyright restrictions only five questions from the MLQ can be included as examples of survey items. The following questions are not necessarily in the order as presented]

Use the following scale:

Not at all	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Frequently, if not always
	1			
0		2	3	4

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts……………………………...	0 1 2 3 4
2. I re-examine critical assumptions…………………………………………………………….	0 1 2 3 4
3. I fail to get to interfere until problems become serious	0 1 2 3 4
4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards…..	0 1 2 3 4
5. I lead a group that is effective……………………………………………………………..	0 1 2 3 4

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for completing this survey!

Please return the surveys to the collection box located at the FJCCSGA Registration area at the St. Petersburg Hilton.

This research will help community college student governments better serve their students and institutions by gaining insight into how community college student government advisors help student leaders reach organizational outcomes.

If you have any suggestions or comments about this survey, please include them in the below provided space:

APPENDIX B: STUDENT SURVEY

Survey of Florida Community College Student

Government Executive Leaders:

The Effectiveness of Community College Student Government Advisors in

Reaching Student Government Outcomes

Survey Form B – Student Government Executive Board Members

Constructed by Tom Rath

(Form B)

Directions: Please complete sections I, II and III on the following pages

I. CONSENT FORM

February 10-13, 2005

Dear Community College Student Executive Board Member:

I am asking your help in a study I am conducting in support of my doctoral studies at the University of Central Florida. My study concerns the transformational leadership qualities of community college student government advisors and the organizational outcomes of Florida community student government associations.

I understand that you serve as student government executive board member for your community college campus. I am contacting you to answer a questionnaire for this study.

Results of my survey will be used to provide valuable information for all who are involved and concerned with student government leadership development. This research will help community college student governments better serve their students and institutions by gaining insight into how their advisors help student leaders reach organizational outcomes.

There are no known risks to completing this survey. Your answers are completely confidential and will be reported only as summaries in which individual responses cannot be identified. When you return your complete questionnaires, your name will be removed from contact lists and never connected to your answers in any way. The survey is voluntary. However, my research will be greatly enhanced if you take a few minutes to let me know what you think about this topic. If you prefer not to respond, please let me know by returning a blank questionnaire.

If you have any questions about this research, please contact me at (941) 637-5653 or my faculty supervisor, Dr. House at (239) 590-7810. Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the UCFIRB Office, University of Central Florida Office of Research, Orlando Tech Center, 12443 Research Parkway, Suite 207, Orlando, FL 32826. The phone number is (407) 823-2901.

Sincerely,
Thomas K. Rath
UCF Doctoral Student

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE REPONSES

_____I have read the procedure described above.
_____I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure.

_____I would like to receive a copy of the procedure described above.
_____I would not like to receive a copy of the procedure described above.

IF YOU AGREE TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE SIGN AND DATE

_____/_____

Participant   Date

PLEASE CONTINUE TO SECTION II ON NEXT PAGE ➤

II. START QUESTIONNAIRE HERE

For questions 1-12, place an "X" by the category that best describes your answer.

Please consider each of the following student government outcomes and indicate if they are *Very Important, Moderately Important, Slightly Important, or Not Important*.

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
1. Allocation of Student Fees and Funds	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Setting an Intellectual Environment	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Coordinating and Promoting Student Activities	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Organizing Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Formal Training in Leadership Concepts and Practices	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Multicultural Awareness and Diversity	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Securing Student Rights	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Establishment of Leadership Positions and Opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Involving Students in Campus Life	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Providing a Voice for Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Establishing Student Government as a Service Organization	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Acting as a Liaison Between the College and Students	☐	☐	☐	☐

CONTINUE HERE

For questions 13-24, place an "X" by the category that best describes your answer.

Please again consider each of the following student government outcomes and indicate *if your student government has* achieved them *Very Well, Moderately Well, Slightly Well, or Not Well At All*.

	Very Well	Moderately Well	Slightly Well	Not Well At All
13. Allocation of Student Fees and Funds	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Setting an Intellectual Environment	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Coordinating and Promoting Student Activities	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Organizing Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Formal Training in Leadership Concepts and Practices	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Multicultural Awareness and Diversity	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Securing Student Rights	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Establishment of Leadership Positions and Opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Involving Students in Campus Life	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Providing a Voice for Students	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Establishing Student Government as a Service Organization	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Acting as a Liaison Between the College and Students	☐	☐	☐	☐

CONTINUE HERE

For questions 25-34 place an "X" by the category that best describes your answer or fill in the appropriate response.

25. **How many hours per week d you commit to student government? _____**

26. **How many months have you held your present position? _____**

27. **Which title *best* describes your advisor's classification at your college?**

☐ Faculty Member
☐ Administrator
☐ Professional Staff
☐ Support Staff
☐ Not Applicable

28. **What best describes your attendance at college?**

☐ Full-time (12 credit hours or more)
☐ Part-time (Less than 12 credit hours)

29. **What category best describes your academic goal?**

☐ Associates in Arts Degree (transfer degree)
☐ Associated in Science Degree (workforce degree)
☐ Certificate
☐ Not Applicable

30. **What is your position in student government?**

☐ President
☐ Vice President
☐ Secretary
☐ Treasurer
☐ Other (please descibe) _____

31. **In one sentence, please describe your reason for joining student government:**

_____

32. **What is your Age? _____**

33. **What is your gender?**

☐ Male
☐ Female

34. **Do you plan on seeking a formal leadership position in the future?**

☐ Yes
☐ No

III. CONTINUE HERE

The following questions are from the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) Rater Form (5x-Short). This questionnaire is to **describe the leadership style of your advisor(s)** as you perceive it. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are not sure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. If you have two advisors, another form will be provided.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

[Note: Due to copyright restrictions only five questions from the MLQ can be included as examples of survey items. The following questions are not necessarily in the order as presented]

Use the following scale:

Not at all	Once in a While	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

1.	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts………………………………..	0 1 2 3 4
2.	Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate………….....	0 1 2 3 4
3.	Fails to interfere until problems become serious………………………………….……..	0 1 2 3 4
4.	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards…	0 1 2 3 4
5.	Leads a group that is effective……………………………………………………….…..	0 1 2 3 4

THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for completing this survey!

Please return the surveys to the collection box located at the FJCCSGA Registration area at the St. Petersburg Hilton.

This research will help community college student governments better serve their students and institutions by gaining insight into how community college student government advisors help student leaders reach organizational outcomes.

If you have any suggestions or comments about this survey, please include them in the below provided space:

APPENDIX C: STUDENT QUALITATIVE DATA

QUALITATIVE DATA:

STUDENT RESPONSES AS TO WHY THEY JOINED STUDENT GOVERNMENT

(From Executive Board Member Survey Question #31)

I love school and wanted to become involved

I wanted to be involved.

Be involved in having an impact on campus

To become involved in the college.

To improve my leadership skills.

To experience something new and to be more involved in school.

To be part of a team.

To lead my fellow student in a positive way.

I want to be a voice for the student body.

I joined SGA to help better communication between faculty and the student body.

Getting involved in campus life.

The ability to make a change.

Wanting to be involved.

I want to gain the leadership and communication skills necessary for my career.

I joined SGA to become more involved and develop leadership skills.

Leadership and communication become the best reasons for success.

I joined student government in order to get involved with the students and college.

To improve leadership skills.

To be heard.

To get involved.

To support the organization, to acquire experience and build up my resume.

I was involved in a lot of clubs in high school and enjoyed leadership positions there so I decided to get involved with student leaders at college.

To meet people.

To help benefit me and my fellow students.

To help set the tone for the student body and develop leadership skills.

I believe in using your talents to the best of you ability; mine is leadership, and I to help the students become more involved.

I joined student government to refine leadership skills, serve my student body, and be involved with campus affairs.

To participate in the planning of student events.

I wanted to get involved and nobody else wanted it

I wanted to become active on campus.

I wanted to be a voice for the students, as well as a leader, role model – and to be active in my school activities.

In order to get an SGA started on my campus.

To help be a part of making a change.

To be active in something worthwhile.

Because I enjoy it.

My friend convinced me to join.

To get experience in the leadership field.

I wanted to make a difference.

To help the students further themselves.

Coming together and becoming a part of a group that makes a difference in college.

To gain recognition and to gain community service hours.

I wanted to be involved with an organization at the community college level.

To serve the students and become proactive.

To increase my participation in my school.

To help with issues of students and their rights.

To be involved with student rights and concerns.

Promote citizenship.

Bored.

To better understand the student population.

To develop better leadership skills and become more literate in government issues.

To gain more leadership and government skills.

I wanted to learn leadership skills and I am very concerned about student issues.

I want students to become more involved in activities.

To meet other people and I knew I would be valuable.

To make students more aware of SGA.

I wanted to get involved, make a difference, and express my opinion.

I wanted to become more involved in student activities.

To be involved in active legislation.

For leadership.

To become more involved with college.

To help my fellow students to the best of my ability.

I enjoy being involved and help in student affairs.

Volunteer.

I've been in organization since 9th grade.

To gain experience.

To empower students.

To help organize and become a more outspoken, responsible organization.

I wasn't playing volleyball anymore and needed something to do.

To acquire leadership skills and help the students make the school better.

To actively participate in an organization.

I joined SGA to be part of something.

To gain more understanding of college life.

Because I wanted to be involved in school.

Student government is an association that meets students at their needs and are the voice for students; my heart goes out to everyone who are in the association and student body.

Learn more about leadership while helping promote student success.

I joined student government because I wanted to give back to the student body.

To meet other students who share a common interest.

To be more involved in college life.

To serve as a bridge between students and staff while motivating others to make their voices heard.

I wanted the political experience.

To help effect change.

My reason for joining SGA is to make a difference.

To become involved in student activities.

To involve myself in PJC activities in preparation for a 4 year school.

To be able to give student a voice to the college.

For the leadership experience.

My wife is the President – Duh!

To get involved in campus life and meet people.

I joined the SGA to make a difference and help the voice of the students be heard.

I joined to become more involved with students and college life.

To discover and organize campus life for students.

To help the student body and have a voice in decisions which effect the student body.

To be involved in school and hold a leadership position.

To make a difference for clubs on campus.

So I could have a voice at my college.

Be part of what happens to the student body.

Meet people and make a difference.

To help improve the events that are provided to our students.

Love to be student voice and helping other students.

I wanted to learn and grow.

To get more involved in school.

I was convinced by a friend.

To make a difference and make friends.

To give a voice to working, non-traditional students.

To act as a liaison between the students and college administration and to gain leadership experience.

I wanted to make a difference for the students and my college.

I wish to make a difference.

To be a voice for the students.

Advancement and opportunity and to learn leadership skills.

To gain experience, to get involved, and provide help to students.

To get more involved with the school.

To get involved.

I wanted to be involved.

To boost personal confidence.

To enhance the student experience.

I wanted to make things better for the student body.

I wanted to get involved and had the time to do so.

I wanted to make a difference on campus.

I wanted to get involved with school.

To get involved and help fellow students.

I wanted to change things I did not like.

To be involved in student issues and establish leadership skills.

To help the students.

I like helping others.

I wanted to be more involved with the school.

Enhance leadership characteristics while acting as liaison for the students.

To get involved.

To improve myself and my campus.

Opportunity to learn and grow.

Truly felt I had something to offer to the organization.

I joined to be part of something larger, to help.

APPENDIX D: ADVISOR QUALITATIVE DATA

QUALITATIVE DATA:

ADVISOR REPONSES TO IN WHAT WAY THEY RECEIVED TRAINING IN

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

(From Advisor Survey Question #31)

a) Through doctoral classes.

b) Competitive edge and PTK president as a CC student; Covey leadership seminar, Honors
   Institute, comprehensive school of leadership and PTK Leadership.

c) Concept was covered in a master's level class on management leadership.

d) I received this training as part of my bachelor's degree program.

e) UF Educational Leadership program.

f) Pursuit of higher education PhD.

g) Conferences and workshops.

h) Workshops and Seminars.

i) Workshops.

j) Short Presentations.

k) I took a number of leadership courses in the process of getting my M.S. in Higher
   Education Administration.

l) In workshops and leadership class.

m) Masters degree program in managerial leadership – component of classes.

n) Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration and Management.

o) Leadership conference, as student and advisor.

p) Graduate work related to field.

q) Presentation at leadership conference.

APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL FORM

University of
**Central
Florida**

Office of Research & Commercialization

February 10, 2005

Thomas Rath
P.O. Box 510731
Punta Gorda, Fl 33951

Mr. Rath:

With reference to your protocol entitled, "Transformational Leadership Qualities of Florida Community College Student Government Advisors" I am enclosing for your records the approved, expedited document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office.

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

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

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

Cordially,

Barbara Ward

Barbara Ward, CIM
IRB Coordinator

Copies: IRB File

12443 Research Parkway • Suite 302 • Orlando, FL 32826-3252 • 407-823-3778 • Fax 407-823-3299
An Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Institution

150

THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

IRB Committee Approval Form

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S): Thomas Rath   **IRB #: 05-2369**

PROJECT TITLE: Transformational Leadership Qualities of Florida Community College Student Government Advisors

[ ] New project submission   [ ] Resubmission of lapsed project #_____
[ ] Continuing review of lapsed project #_____   [X] Continuing review of #1711
[X] Study expires **2/3/05**   [X] Initial submission was approved by expedited review
[ ] Initial submission was approved by full board review but continuing review can be expedited
[ ] Suspension of enrollment email sent to PI, entered on spreadsheet, administration notified _____

Chair   **IRB Co-Chairs:**
[X] Expedited Approval
    Dated: **28 Jan 2005**
        Cite how qualifies for   Signed: _____
        expedited review: Dr. Sophia Dziegielewski
        minimal risk and **# 7**

[ ] Exempt
    Dated: _____   Signed: _____
        Cite how qualifies for   Dr. Jacqueline Byers
        exempt status:
        minimal risk and _____

[ ] Expiration   [ ] Waiver of documentation of consent approved
    Date: _____   [ ] Waiver of consent approved

NOTES FROM IRB CHAIR (IF APPLICABLE): _____

151

APPENDIX F: COPYRIGHT PERMISSION LETTER

mind garden

Date: _____November 14, 2005_____

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for: _____Thomas Rath_____
to use the following copyright material;

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire   3rd Edition*

Author: *Bruce J. Avolio and Bernard M. Bass*

Copyright: *1995, 2000, 2004 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio*
for her/his thesis research.

In addition, five (5) sample items from the instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal or thesis.

The entire measure may not at any time be included or reproduced in other published material.

Sincerely,

Vickie Jaimez
Director of Operations

LIST OF REFERENCES

American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). *Fast facts.* Retrieved May 15, 2005 from American Associational of Community Colleges Website: http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/AboutCommunityColleges/Fast_Facts1/Fast_Facts.htm

Antonakis, J. (2001). The validity of the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership model as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X) (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62*(1).

Astin, A. W. (1997). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. In K. Arnold & I. C. King (Eds.). *College student development and academic life: Psychological, intellectual, social, and moral issues.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development: Basic and advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, Binghamton University.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1997). *Replicated confirmatory factor analysis of the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, Binghamton University.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Einstein, W. O. (1988). Transformational leadership in a management simulation: Impacting the bottom line. *Group and Organizational Studies, 13*, 59-80.

Astin, A. W., Astin, H. S., Bayer, A. E., & Bisconti, A. S. (1975). *The power of protest*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Baldygo, R. S. (2003). Cascading of transformational leadership in American community colleges (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(3).

Bambenek, J. J., & Sifton, S. (2003). Student government development and use of comprehensive university planning documents. *College Student Journal, 3*(1), 63-7.

Bass, B. M. (1954). The leaderless group discussion. *Psychological Bulletin, 52,* 254-262.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications.* New York: Free Press.

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. (1997). The ethics of transformational leadership. In *KLSP: Transformational Leadership Working Papers.* Retrieved January 24, 2003, from http://www.academy.umd.edu/publications/klspdocs/bbass_p1.htm

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and industrial impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chevers & R. Ayman (Eds.). *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*. New York: Free Press, 49-76.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995, 2000). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, second edition.* Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D.A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group and Organizational Study, 12*, 73-87.

Bass, D. G., & Cowgill, S. (1975). *A study of factors relating to student participation in community college governance.* Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova Southeastern University. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 104492).

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeir, P. (1998). *Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership*. Retrieved November 23, 2002, from Binghamton University, Center for Leadership Studies Website: http://cls.binghamton.edu/BassSteid.html

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper Business.

Baxter-Magdola, M. B, & Magdola, P. M. (1988). Student activism: A historical overview [Monograph]. In K. M. Miser (Ed.), *Student affairs and campus dissent: Reflection of the past and challenge for the future.* Washington, DC, National Association of College Personnel Administrators.

Boatman, S. (1988). Strong student governments and their advisement. *Campus Activity Programming, 20*(9), 58-63.

Brax, R. S. (1981). *The first student movement.* Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: HarperCollins.

Butler, J. E. (1982). Perceived and preferred institutional goals and leadership behavior among selected groups at East Tennessee State University (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 1982). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 43*(02A).

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 468-478.

Chambers, T., & Phelps, C. E. (1994). Student activism: Impacting personal, institutional, and community change. In M. C. Terrel and M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: Developing Student Government Leadership*, *66*, 45-58.

Chang, J. (2002). *Student involvement in the community college: A look at the diversity and value of student activities and programs.* (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 470 922).

Chavez, M. (1985). *A student government guide for Evergreen Community College*. San Jose, CA: Evergreen Community College. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 254 290).

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (Eds.). (1988). *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Covington, S. (1986). The perceptions of student government leaders and student government advisers toward selected aspects of student government programs in the community college and university system in Florida (roles and responsibilities, training, educational value, advising, funding) (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*(03A).

Cuyjet, M. J. (1994). Student government as a provider of student services. In M. C. Terrel and M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: Developing Student Government Leadership*, *66*, 73-89.

Dickerson, A. (1999). Student Councils. *Clearing House*, *72*(3), 133-135.

Dunkel, N. W., & Schuh, J. H. (1998). *Advising student groups and organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Downey, R. G. (1984). Long-term outcomes of participation in student government. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(3), 245-50.

Eklund-Leen, S. J., & Young, R. B. (1997). Attitudes of student organization members and nonmembers about campus and community involvement. *Community College Review, 24*, 71-81.

Ellsworth, F. L., & Burns, M. A. (1970). *Student activism in higher education*. Washington D.C.: American College Personnel Association.

Falvey, F. E. (1952). *Student participation in college administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fasci, S. D. (1993). A framework of transformational leadership concepts proposed for undergraduate college and university student development and student affairs leadership programs (developmental leadership, leadership training) (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 54(08).

Floerchinger, D. S. (1988). Student involvement can be stressful: implications and interventions. *Campus Activities Programming, 21*(6)*,* 60-63.

Florida Department of Education (2005, February). *Report for the Community College System: Fact Book.* Retrieved February 15, 2005 from http://www.firn.edu/doe/arm/cctcmis/pubs/factbook/fb2005/factbk05.pdf

Florida Junior and Community College Student Government Association. (n.d.). *FJCCSGA Advisor's Directory.* Retrieved November 1, 2004, from http://www.flccaa.org/pdf_files/SGA%20Advisor%20Directory.pdf

Fortune, M. F. (1999). Student government advisor in California community colleges: Differences in advisor role perceptions between student leaders and advisors (Doctoral Dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60.

Francis, R. M. (1979). *An analysis of student participation in governance at Herkimer Community College with recommendations for improvement*. Herkimer, NY: Herkimer Community College. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 196 465).

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gasper, J. M. (1992). Transformational leadership: An integrative review of the literature (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*(08).

Gibson, F. W., & Pason, A. (2003). Levels of leadership: Developing leadership through new models. *Journal of Education for Business, 79*(1), 23-27.

Gold, J. A., & Quaroche, T. J. (1994). Student government: a testing ground for transformational leadership theory. In M. C. Terrel and M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: Developing Student Government Leadership*, 66, 31-43.

Golden, D. C., and Schwartz, H. L. (1994). Building an ethical and effective relationship with student government leaders. In M. C. Terrel and M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: Developing Student Government Leadership*, *66*, 19-30.

Green, W. J. (1994). Transformational leadership as a predictor of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International 55*(08).

Horowitz, H. L. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

House, B. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 323-352.

Howell, J. M., & 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*, 891-902.

Howell, J. M. & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Champions of technological innovations. *Administrative Psychology, 35*, 317-341.

Jackson, R. A. (2000). Transformational and transactional leadership in division administration at three institutions of higher education: An application of the Bass and Avolio Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International 60*(07).

Keppler, K., & Robinson, J. (1993). Student governments: What are the issues of the day? *Campus Activities Programming*, *25*(9), 34-46.

Komives, S. R. (1991). The relationship of hall directors' transformational leadership to select resident assistant outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development*, *32*, 509-515.

Kuh, G. D., & Lund, G. P. (1994). What students gain from participating in student government. In M. C. Terrel and M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: Developing Student Government Leadership*, *66*, 5-17.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., & Witt, E. J. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leslie, J. B., & Fleenor, J. W. (1999). *Feedback to managers: A review and comparison of multi-rater instruments for management development*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Long, D. (1970). Black protest. In J. Foster and D. Long (Eds.), *Student activism in America*. New York: William Morrow.

Lord, J. A. (1978). *A survey of student opinion at Everett Community College regarding the student's role in college governance*. Everett, WA: Everett Community College. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 196 465).

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effective correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385-425.

McKaig, R., & Policello, S. (1987). Group advising: Defined, described, and examined. In J.H. Schuh (Ed.), *A Handbook for group advisors.* Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Miles, J. M., & Miller, M. T. (1997). *Increasing student involvement in self-governance activities: A delphi approach.* Albion, MI: Albion College. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 254 290).

Morse, S. W. (1989). *Renewing civic capacity: Preparing college students for service and citizenship.* Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.

Nischan, T. P. (1997). Transformational leadership as a predictor of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction in a community college classroom environment (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 1997). Dissertation Abstract International 58(6).

Onnen, M. K. (1987). The relationship of clergy leadership characteristics to growing or declining churches (Doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, 1987). *Dissertation Abstract International, 49*(5).

Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C.T., Wolniak, G.C. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(3), 249-284.

Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for 21ˢᵗ Century.* New York: Praeger.

Saddlemire, G. L. (1988). Student activities. In A. L. Rentz and G. H. Saddlemire (Eds.), *Student affairs functions in higher education.* Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Schlesinger, S., & Baldridge, J. V. (1982). Is student power dead in higher education? *College Student Journal, 16*(1), 9-17.

Salter, D. J. (1989). *Leadership styles in United States Marine Corps transport helicopter squadron.* Master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.

Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management, 16*(4), 693-703.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leaders: A self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science, 4,* 577-594.

SPSS, Inc. (2001). *SPSS graduate pack 11.0 for Windows* (11.0 ed.). Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.

State of Florida Board of Governors. (2005). *Total Headcount Enrollment by County of Residence at Time of Admission or Readmission, Preliminary*. Retrieved May 15, 2005 from http://www.fldcu.org/factbook/default.asp

Storey, J. (2004). Changing theories of leadership and leadership development. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Leadership in Organizations [electronic resource]: Current issues and Key Trends.* New York: Routledge.

Tepper, B. J., & Percy, P. M. (1994). Structural validity of the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*(3), 734-744.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: Wiley.

Vellela, T. (1988). New voices: Student activism in the eighties and nineties. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group and organizational studies, 15*, 381-394.

Weber, M. (1968). *On charisma and institution building: Selected papers*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

West's Florida Statutes Annotated. (2005). Florida Statutes, Title XLVII, § 1004.65. Volume 24c. *K-20 education code.* St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Woodland, D. B. (1994). Leadership challenges: 2002. In M. C. Terrel and M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *New Directions for Student Services: Developing Student Government Leadership, 66,* 91-99.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among Naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark and M. R. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership,* 151-169. West Orange, NY: Leadership Library of America.

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