SELF-PERCEIVED LEADER BEHAVIOR AND CHARACTERISTICS

OF BLACK AND WHITE CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS

OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the

College of Human Resources and Education

of

West Virginia University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for

The Degree of Doctor of Education

by

Gregory D. Epps

1995

Dedication

Dedicated to the Epps and Coleman families; my brother Kevin Epps, my father Donald Epps, and my mother Lola Epps.

Acknowledgements

There are several people who have in some way assisted me as I have traveled the road of this academic journey. I thank all my peers and fellow classmates who have walked this path with me. I especially thank Dr. Andy Corrigan who has been a big help and a good friend.

I can never express the gratitude I have for Mrs. Gayla Doughty for the help and assistance she has provided me. I don't know what I would have done without her. I also wish to thank Dr. James Ranson, Dr. John B. Hayes, Dr. Paul Leary, Dr. Jack Yeager, Danny Cantrell, Helen Stafford, and Debra Wood for their assistance and encouragement.

I wish to acknowledge the significant contributions and my appreciation to the members of my committee: Dr. John Andes, Dr. Richard Meckley, Dr. Stephen Cupps, Dr Charles Ledbetter, Dr. Edwin Smith, my good friend Dr. R. Charles Byers, and my committee chair Dr. Powell Toth. Dr. Toth has provided me with strength, confidence and guidance that has been immeasurable.

I also thank my brothers of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. for all their support and encouragement in helping me to hold true to the cardinal principles of Christian manhood, scholarship, perserverance, and uplift.

My family has been such a big help to me that it is difficult to express all of my love and appreciation to them. They have been encouraging and understanding through the most trying of times.

In particular, I thank my brother Kevin Epps; he has been a good friend and a close companion.

I thank my father Don Epps for all that he has done for me dating back to my childhood. Because of him I learned self-discipline and how to strive to be the best that I can be. Through him I learned what it means to be a real man and I love him for that.

I also thank Lola Epps, my mother and my friend, who I love dearly for everything. She has been with me through all my trials and tribulations. She has always been there for me. She showed me what it means to love unconditionally, and to give of myself without expecting anything in return.

Finally, I give all praises to the Lord my God for all his blessings. He has guided my path and I will continue to follow him throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study examined and compared self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities. For the purpose of this study, chief administrators are identified as presidents, provosts, and chancellors of higher education institutions. This chapter discusses black leadership in higher education and leadership theory through relevant literature. It also suggests a rationale for the study. The following sections present a formal problem statement and related questions. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the significance of the study and limitations.

Background

In recent years, literature relative to various leadership behaviors and contexts in higher education has become abundant. Much of this literature focuses primarily on non-minority leadership (National Commission on Excellence in Education Administration, 1987).

The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) stated that black leadership is an area of study that remains largely unexplored. Torres and Kapes (1990) further suggested that national and state studies relative to minorities in higher education are needed to learn more about the

characteristics of black leaders. Guyden (1992) stated
that most of the research existing in this area dated
back to the 1970's and 1980's, and that since that
time, significant changes have occurred in higher
education.

The absence of discussion of blacks in the
literature helps foster race role stereotypes,
occupational role typing, discrimination, and "negative
biases toward black college presidential leadership"
(Hicks, 1985 p. 123). Research relative to leadership
behavior demonstrates these biases, with little
information relating to blacks. The lack of research
in this area leaves a void where empirical data should
provide an important service of information and support
for black chief administrators.

Hicks (1985) stated that there is a lack of
empirical data relative to the leadership behavior of
college presidents in general, and is particularly
pronounced for black college presidents. Hicks noted
that the information that is available concerning chief
administrators is mostly historical or biographical,
and contributes very little to the understanding or
enhancement of leadership. Hicks further stated that
it is imperative that the leadership behavior of black
college chief administrators be studied and compared
with those of white college chief administrators. Hill

2

(1975) noted that there was a paucity of literature concerning this subject, which suggested that this area needs additional exploration and research. Amodeo, and Emslie (1985) suggest that research relative to leadership behavior is biased and that the lack of "inside" (p.2) information creates an environment that is programmed for the failure of minorities.

Beck and Murphy (1992) stated that the dominant culture of the school administrator is that of the white male, and that when a person with an ethnic minority background seeks entry, cultural conflict ensues. They suggested that administrative culture could be aided by future study. Williams, Fortune, and Pantilli (1991) stated that there are recurring leadership characteristics present in black leaders and that further study of these characteristics is needed.

Russell and Wright (1990) suggested that there may be differences in the leader behavior among different races and that little comparative work has been done concerning the differences relative to white males and racial minorities. They further suggested that there is a need for more documentation of these differences relative to visible blacks. However, they failed to compare leader behavior and to discuss specific black leader characteristics. Hill (1975) also suggested that further research and information is

needed relative to possible differences in leadership
characteristics of Blacks.

Williams, Fortune, and Pantilli (1991) stateed
that research relative to black leaders' personal
characteristics is necessary and that it appears that
some differing traits exist and are identifiable and
measurable. They also noted that more information is
needed to properly evaluate black leadership and that
more research must be done for further clarification of
this concept before drawing strong conclusions from
studies. Torres and Kapes (1990) agreed, noting that
black administrative leadership was clearly a subject
worthy of additional research.

Harvard (1986) suggests that future investigations
relative to black leader behavior could provide better
insight for other blacks who seek high level
administrative roles and foster a better understanding
of the issues which confront blacks who have already
obtained administrative positions. Harvard also noted
that by sharing these successful performances and
practices, "other minorities will learn to emulate and
applaud their success while avoiding their
predecessors' failures and pitfalls" (p. 17).

Though some comparative studies have been done,
the lack of studies concerning the comparison of black
and white leadership characteristics is evidenced by

4

the paucity of literature identified from a computerized search in ERIC and other bibliographic data bases. In a review of the literature from 1982 through 1993, no articles could be found in the database that primarily focused on this issue. Furthermore, to date, only three dissertations could be found (through a search of the literature that included the ERIC database and Dissertation Abstracts International) that in some way focused on the issue.

Hicks (1985) compared the leadership behavior of presidents of historically black colleges with the leadership behavior of presidents of predominately white colleges. However, Hicks' study does not include black presidents from non-historically black colleges. Hicks (1985) recommended that further research and scholarly writings are needed to mold new images and create new models of leadership for blacks. He also recommends that due to the severe challenges facing black presidents, and the void of research data, studies comparing black and white presidents were needed.

Guyden (1992) studied leader behavior of presidents at historically black colleges and universities. While stereotypical and other leader behaviors such as decision-making and authoritarian versus democratic behavior were addressed, an in-depth

comparison to white leaders was not presented.
Finally, Stevenson (1991) compared data about black and
white college and university administrators and
provided a profile of their background, socialization,
recruitment, academic experiences, and educational
characteristics. However, the study focused on
representative bureaucracy and personnel management
procedures relating to higher education administration
and the chief administrative officers' selection and
appointment process (Stevenson, 1991) and does not
present a thorough comparison of leader behavior and
characteristics. Stevenson (1991) recommended that
such comparative studies are needed to compare
characteristics with the perceptions of leaders.

Theory

Hoy and Miskell (1991), stated that a theoretical
framework is needed to give facts meaning. They
further stated that a theoretical framework uses
interrelated concepts, assumptions and generalizations
to systematically describe and explain behavior.

According to Gable and Kavich (1981), America
has move from administrative leadership theories of
Classical Theory [1900-1930] to Human Relations Theory
[1930-1950] to Behavioral Theory [1950-1970]. Hoy and
Miskel (1991) indicated that the primary leadership
theories from 1970 to 1990 are Fiedler's (1967)

6

contingency theory of leadership, Houses' (1971) path-
goal theory, and Fieldler's (1987) cognitive resource
theory of leadership. A more recent theory on
leadership is Yukl's (1981) theory of traits and
leadership effectiveness of administrators.

The Classical Theory of leadership focused on the
goal specificity and formal structure of organizations
(Taylor, 1947; Weber, 1947). The theoretical concept
is known as "scientific management," and is
characterized by the belief that people can be
programmed to be efficient machines (Taylor, 1947).

The Human Relations Theory (Follet, 1941;
Mayo,1945) and the Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger
and Dickson, 1939) indicated that the fundamental
problem in all organizations is developing and
maintaining dynamic and harmonious relationships
(Follett, 1941). This approach de-emphasized the
earlier concentration on organizational structure and
emphasized employee motivation and satisfaction and
group morale.

The Behavioral Science approach was supported by
the studies of Barnard (1938), Halpin (1958), and Simon
(1947). The Behavioral Science approach took into
consideration the impact of social relations and formal
structure, and used both perspectives, while adding
propositions drawn from political science, economics,

7

psychology and sociology (Simon, 1968). The Behavioral Science approach recognized both formal and informal organizations, but concentrated more on what leaders actually did.

Current theories of leadership include those known as Contingency approaches. Contingency approaches postulate that to have effective leadership, the leader must be matched with the situation. The approach more specifically supports the idea that certain types of people will be most effective in certain types of settings, and requires that some important characteristics of the leader and some important characteristics of the setting be assessed (Scott, Mitchell and Birnbaum, 1981). Three examples of the Contingency theory are the Contingency Model by Fiedler (1967), the Path-Goal Theory by House (1971), and Fiedler's (1987) Cognitive Resource Theory.

Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Model suggests that an effective leader must match his or her style with the demands of the situation. Fieldler uses group effectiveness as the criterion for his model; if the group does well, the leader is effective. The theory represents the leader as seeking to satisfy personal needs and accomplishing organizational goals (Fiedler, 1967); the Path-Goal Theory presented by House (1971) discusses how the leader's behavior is satisfying or

8

motivating, because of the impact on their subordinates' perceptions of work goals, personal goals and the paths to goal attainment. Fiedler's (1987) Cognitive Resource Theory attempts to merge the ideas of directive behavior, stress, task motivation, and cognitive resources of the leader with the ideas of situational control.

Numerous literature has been generated relative to the topic of leadership, but the most influential research conducted in this century has been the Ohio State Leadership Studies, stated Dipboye (1978). This research has as one of its major objectives the development of an objective measure of leader behaviors and as a second objective the determination of relationship between leader behavior and criteria such as job satisfaction and performance. The Ohio studies resulted in the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and eventually the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S). The LBDQ-S is a "widely used" (Dipboye, 1978, p. 1174) measure of leader behavior. The LBDQ was originally developed at The Ohio State University by Hemphill and Coons (1950), and was later refined by Halpin and Winer (1952). Two basic dimensions of leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration, are measured by LBDQ.

9

Several researchers and theorists have used the LBDQ in education studies to assess leadership performance (Grill, 1978; Gable & Kavich, 1981; Morton, 1983; Hicks, 1985; Binning & Fernandez, 1986; Kean, 1989; Guyden, 1992; Kean, Leary & Toth, 1993). Entries listed in Dissertation Abstracts International show that from 1987 to 1994 the LBDQ was used in 115 different studies. This study utilized the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S) to evaluate self-perceived leadership behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities.

Statement of the Problem/Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare self-perceived leadership behavior and characteristics of black chief administrators with the self-perceived leadership behavior and characteristics of white chief administrators. This study examined these behaviors and characteristics using administrators of higher education institutions in the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. Leadership behavior and characteristics of black administrators of colleges and universities have been described in the literature as stereotypical (Guyden, 1992) rather than empirical. Guyden (1992) stated that a clear description of black leadership behavior and

10

characteristics is needed along with a comparative relationship to white chief administrators in order to make founded conclusions relative to leadership.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Is there a difference in leadership behavior between black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities as assessed by the LBDQ-S?

2. What are the differences and similarities in demographic characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities?

Definitions

Major terms used in this study are defined in the following section.

1. Chief Administrators were defined as the president, provost or chancellor of a college or university.

2. Black Chief Administrators were defined as those who considered themselves to be of the black race or of African-American decent. (As they indicated on the survey).

3. White Chief Administrators were defined as those who considered themselves to be of the white race or of Caucasian heritage. (As they indicated on the survey).

11

4. The <u>Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)</u> was comprised of member institutions in 15 states that include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia.

5. <u>Self-Perceived Leadership Behavior</u> was assessed by scores on the LBDQ-S.

6. <u>Demographic Characteristics</u> included gender, race, age, years in present position, highest level of education completed, and college major.

Significance

This study provides findings that should be useful for, but not limited to, those in higher education who train, recruit, and select chief administrators of colleges and universities. These findings also provide useful information to researchers and others interested in increasing their body of knowledge relative to black leadership. Information provided by this study should prove useful for future planning, not only to those at historically black colleges and universities, but to those at predominately white institutions as well, as black administrators' roles become more crucial in the years ahead as demographics and technology continue to change (Cunningham, 1992).

Results of this study should provide useful

12

information to potential leaders as they assess and
analyze perceived strengths and weaknesses of current
leaders, as they identify problems and practices that
inhibit or enhance effectiveness. The lack of black
subjects in higher education leadership research has
led to an inability to generalize findings in relation
to black and white leader behavior. Except for chief
administrators of traditionally white colleges and
universities, there is little precedent for
measurements, comparisons, and conclusions for black
chief administrators (Hicks, 1985). Most studies have
dealt exclusively with extremely small samples of black
chief administrators and have been limited to the
reporting of demographic characteristics, personality
factors, and career paths, and are largely speeches,
essays, biographical, and historical works with no
mention of leader similarities and differences between
races (Hicks, 1985). This study used larger samples
and addressed demographic similarities and differences
between races.

Many researchers who have examined black leaders
based their findings upon subordinate perceptions or on
values and attitudes of upper-management white males;
this study differs in that self perceptions are used
instead. Another shortcoming of research relating to
blacks is that most studies compare administrators

13

without respect to equivalent experience and rank
(Mark, 1981). This study took into consideration rank
by using the chief administrator as the variable.

Due to the limitations of previous research, it
appears that alleged race differences have been based
on stereotypes rather than empirical studies of black
chief administrators. Further research is needed to
fill the existing void in both the depth and breadth of
self-perceived leader behaviors and attitudes (Larwood
& Powell, 1981). In order to develop a more complete
knowledge base, research relating to the nature of
academic leadership must determine if and how blacks
and whites differ in leader behavior and the extent to
which black administrators fit the current models of
leadership and strategies for success. In summary,
this study, in addition to the aforementioned reasons,
is significant because of the following reasons:

1.   It addressed black stereotypical behavior
     described in some existing literature.
2.   Results of the study addressed assertions in the
     literature which claim that black and white chief
     administrators' leadership is fundamentally
     different.
3.   This study addressed characterizations of black
     administrators as authoritative and paternalistic
     leaders who are ill-equipped to deal with complex

contemporary leadership problems in higher education.

Limitations

This study and its findings are presented with the following limitations:

1. This study was limited to data collected from chief administrators in selected institutions in Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states, which may limit generalizability of findings.

2. This study was limited by the personal biases of the survey respondents.

3. Data was collected through survey techniques. Limitations exist based upon response rate, as well as the reliability and validity of the instrument (Kerlinger, 1986).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of the literature related to self-perceived leadership behaviors and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of institutions of higher education. The first section includes a brief overview of leadership in higher education. The second section discusses leadership research concerning Blacks. The next section provides a conceptual framework of leadership theory and research with an expanded discourse on the LBDQ-S. The chapter concludes with a summary of the literature review.

Leadership in Higher Education

Hicks (1985), in an in-depth study of leadership, stated that leaders have historically played key roles in society. The Bible discusses Moses' use of delegation, span of control, and management by exception. Roman and Egyptian civilizations can credit much of their success to leadership accomplishments, and Plato espoused virtues which his philosopher-rulers should possess to govern the ideal states (Hicks, 1985). Syrett and Hogg (1992) stated that the progress, as well as the defense of achievements already made, are dependent on leadership. Effective leadership is important in all areas of society,

16

including business, military, politics, social affairs, and education (Syrett and Hogg, 1992). They concluded that leadership skills have become important because the more fragmented and diversified an organization becomes, the more the organization needs changing. Effective leaders create and articulate vision and make those changes a reality.

The role of leadership in America continues to be a major topic of discourse within the higher education community. Thomas (1988) found that leadership is a key concept in understanding and improving organizations such as schools. He argued that earlier studies (Pfeiffer, 1967; Lieberson and O'Conner, 1972) that were in conflict with his views were flawed by the lack of value put on leadership. Thomas (1988) concluded that his studies "present compelling evidence" (p. 251) that individual leaders do make a difference in the effectiveness of organizations.

Bennis (1989) agreed with the findings of Thomas (1988), and concluded that educational leadership does have substantial impact on school organizations. Further, Bennis (1989) gave three basic reasons why leaders are important to higher education. First, leaders are responsible for the effectiveness of organizations. The success of all organizations, rests on the perceived quality of leaders. Second,

17

change and upheaval make it essential for institutions of higher education to have anchors and guiding purposes. Leaders fill that need. Thirdly, Bennis stated that there are pervasive national concerns about institutions of higher education. Educational leaders have a key role in alleviating the public's concern (Bennis, 1989).

Chief Administrators in Higher Education

Leadership in higher education, as well as in education in general, has once again drawn much attention as higher education enters an era of diminished resources (Zhang and Strange, 1992). The role of chief administrative leadership is now more important than ever in guiding institutions through troubled times. Zhang and Strange (1992) conducted a qualitative study of the leadership of presidents from nine small midwestern colleges. Their findings revealed that the prospects of changing enrollment patterns, decreasing state and federal funding, and increasing consumer demands for greater flexibility, accountability, and higher quality all help to create an atmosphere of uncertainty for institutional leaders as entrepreneurs.

Zhang and Strange (1992) concluded that the success of risk taking leadership may be a function of fit between presidential style and an institutions'

18

need, within the context of institutional health. Other results of their study revealed that institutional vitality largely rests on the clarity of its mission, the articulation of that mission to all concerned, and the institution's willingness and capacity for change. They (1992) concluded that the more intuitive style of problem solving apparently gives the "kind of jolt an institution needs to get going", (p.27) and that, in some cases, the enthusiasm and sense of hope ingrained by the chief administrator is capable of instilling new life into an institutional framework that had all but expired. They recommended further study to find whether the same results would be found at other institutions.

In their book relating to academic chief administrators, Kerr and Gade (1986) stated that approximately 5,000 people served as college and university chief administrators during the 1980s. They predicted that another 5,000 will serve in the 1990s; equaling as many as 10,000 in total by the end of the century. Kerr and Gade (1986) implied that the fortunes of institutions in America will be influenced more by the vision and actions and leadership abilities of these 10,000 chief administrators than by any other group of similar size within the academic community, and that to study these chief administrators and what

19

these chief administrators do and how they do it is of central importance. As the role of these chief administrators continue to change, they will need to "develop or sharpen skills in handling multiple roles, multiple constituencies, and multiple perspectives," (Kerr and Gade 1986, p.42).

The study of leadership has traditionally held an important place in preparation programs of educational administrators. This emphasis has increased during the past two decades. In their study of the changing roles of chief administrators, Lane, Corwin and Monahan (1969) suggested that the chief administrator is no longer merely the caretaker of an educational enterprise. The pressures and problems of the chief administrator demand that increased attention be given to the role of an executive leader and less be given to the role of an expediter. Lane, Corwin and Monahan (1969) theorized that to be a successful leader, the chief administrator must be able to predict human behavior in varying situations. This prediction of human behavior may necessitate the determination of ones' cultural background, social class and ethnic group. Also to be determined is the nature of the present situation, as well as past history, motivation, and biological status. In effect, those who aspire to leadership status require understanding of sociological

20

and anthropological data, political and economic data, and particularly, knowledge of the psychology of interpersonal relations state Lane, Corwin and Monahan (1969). They concluded that the chief administrator must be adept in analyzing the structure of organizations and the nature and function of group processes in the organization.

Black Leadership Studies

The subject of black leadership is a topic that remains largely unexplored (Torres and Kapes, 1990). Torres and Kapes conducted a study to investigate the work values and degree of job satisfaction of potential minority leaders in higher education. They stated that during the late 1960s, leadership development programs were established in an effort to bring more blacks into the mainstream of American society and its educational institutions. State and national studies relative to the degree of black participation in higher education have revealed that leadership programs focus on the development of management skills, instead of learning about the characteristics of black leaders (Torres and Kapes, 1990).

Torres and Kapes (1990) found that leadership development programs could train potential black administrators, but that research needs to be conducted relative to leadership development programs that

21

identify the characteristics of potential leaders.
They concluded that this type of assessment could
provide useful information about why potential minority
leaders choose a certain work environment. This
information could be used also to encourage minorities
to enter or advance into leadership positions (Torres &
Kapes, 1990).

McPhail (1989) studied the changing job of the
president, focusing on the multiple roles of a black
chief administrator. He used LeMoyn-Owen College as an
example, noting the importance of a varied style of
leadership. McPhail indicated that the power of the
presidency at this institution has not diminished and
is unique in institutions that are in crisis and that
need to undergo major transformation of their mission,
structure, and curricula. McPhail (1989) indicated
that his "power retention" (p.1) concept is in direct
conflict with the thinking of Kerr and Gade (1986) who
stated that the college presidency has lost power, is
constrained by external and internal forces, and
requires developed skill in handling multiple roles,
multiple perspectives, and multiple constituencies.
McPhail (1989) stated that while the abilities
mentioned by Kerr and Gade are important, it is the
presidents' "vision" for LeMoyne-Owen College that
primarily has "sustained him the challenge." (p. 1)

22

McPhail concluded that blacks today are more inclined
to run their institutions like businesses, "placing
corporate brass on their boards and going head to head
with top white schools for the most promising black
youths" (p. 12).

Marshall (1992) presented research aimed at
discovering administrators' values. Marshall stated
that the dominant culture of the school administration
is the white male and that when a person with a
minority background seeks entry, cultural conflict
ensues. She stated that blacks are "placed in staff
positions, distant from the mainstream, administering
special projects and supervising their own group" (p.
370-71). Further, Marshall (1992) stated that blacks
experience role conflict because the administrative
culture expects them to handle minority problems, while
the minority culture looks to them to articulate and
lobby for their particular needs: "They are cultural
leaders, cultural breakers and takers" (p.371). These
perspectives demonstrate that exploring the language,
the professional culture, and the influence of cultural
background on education administrators' values may
reveal values of the professional culture (Marshall,
1992).

Marshall (1992) concluded that her research
indicates new reasons for supporting blacks in their

administrative careers. She stated that the value "these atypical leaders" (p. 383) bring with them to use in developing an administrative style are laudable, and with their values guiding the flow of action, schools could be more human, fair, and equitable places.

Hill (1975) sought to gain reality-based opinions about some of the administrative problems and administrative needs of black chief administrators. Hill stated that "the vast majority of earlier black college presidents resembled their autocratic white counterparts at the more prestigious institutions of higher education during the nineteenth century." (p. 53). This did not occur with black chief administrators who have remained in full control of their institutions. Hill (1975) further stated that authoritarian presidential behavior was exemplified by many black presidents in order to help their institutions survive. It does not follow that their authoritarian tendencies would disappear when the environment became less threatening, he further stated. Autocracy is the dominant characteristic of many black chief administrators, according to Hill (1975).

Hill (1975) concluded that there is a growing need for black administrators of higher education to write more "to acquaint students of higher education and the

24

general society with the administrative problems and
issues black administrators encounter and must solve"
(p. 62). She also stated that there was a paucity of
literature concerning this subject, which suggests that
this area needs additional exploration and research
(Hill, 1975).

Additional research has stressed the necessity of
leadership development for black chief administrators
(Cunningham, 1992). The role of the black chief
administrator in higher education has been important
historically in predominately black colleges and
universities as well as predominately white
institutions, and this role will become even more
important in the future as demographics and technology
continue to change stated Cunningham (1992). He also
noted that blacks have been "given responsibility but
not the corresponding power at predominately white
institutions" (p. 5) and that "too many people expect
too many things from these administrators on these
campuses." (p. 6). In agreement with Marshall, (1992),
Cunningham (1992) maintained that the black
administrator must act as a trouble-shooter with the
black students and the black community. Smith (1980)
discussed this situation by saying:

Because black administrators were hired to pacify
the black community and/or to demonstrate that the

25

hiring institution is an "equal opportunity
employer," neither of which is legitimate, the
leadership which they could provide based on their
knowledge of given issues is neither accepted nor
respected by those who must be influenced (p.
327).

Cunningham (1992) concluded that the future and
success of historically black colleges and universities
will depend solely on their leadership. In addition,
Cunningham (1992) indicated that changing demographics
in higher education make it important that, "more time,
money, and effort be spent in developing and utilizing
the black administrator" (p. 10), to benefit the
predominately white, as well as the predominately black
institution.

Comparative Studies

The literature that focused primarily on
comparisons of black and white chief administrators has
been sparse and has produced little meaningful or
definitive data. Hicks (1985) stated that the most
significant outcome of these studies has been the
confirmation of negative biases of whites about black
colleges and black presidential leadership. A search
of the literature identified few studies that have
attempted to broaden the base of knowledge concerning
black leadership as it relates to the leadership of

white administrators   (Jones, 1984; Stevenson, 1991).

Jones (1984) stated in his study that the most common model of governance used at institutions of higher learning, whether predominately black or white is the managerial model in which chief administrators and administrative staff are responsible for the management of their institutions. He characterized the differences between strong administrative leadership and authoritarian leadership. Jones noted that in authoritarian leadership, chief administrators retain authority and power. The management skills of the strong administrator include the ability to select competent administrative personnel, effectively communicate mission and goals, and delegate the authority to supportive administrators to get tasks completed.

Jones (1984) noted that as black colleges and their administrators have moved closer to the main currents of American higher education, they have experimented with various governance models. He further suggested that this statement supports findings by the Carnegie Commission (1973) which reports that institutional type affects internal practices of governance. According to the Carnegie Commission, authority is normally diffused to the faculty at major research institutions and prestigious liberal arts

27

colleges (predominately white institutions).

Jones (1984) stated that "faculty authority" (p. 276), is often subordinate to administrative authority at practically all other institutions of higher education, which would include most predominately black colleges or colleges with black chief administrators.

Stevenson (1991) stated that literature about higher education "abounds" (p.1) with numerous references of the limited number of blacks that hold the position of chief administrator. She stated that with the exception of the historically black institutions, blacks as chief administrators of American colleges and universities is an uncommon occurrence. Stevensons' (1991) study was descriptive and comparative in nature and focused on the comparison of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities. She provided a profile of their background, socialization, recruitment, academic experiences, and educational characteristics.

Stevenson (1991) conducted research which examined the concerns of black and white administrators, such as, similarities and differences of the employment search process between black chief administrators at institutions of higher education and their white counterparts. She also sought to discover similarities

and differences among black and white administrators
with regard to their personal attributes, educational
backgrounds, job experiences, and critical differences
overall. Stevensons' (1991) researches main
contribution was its focus on representative
bureaucracy and personnel management procedures
relating to higher education administration and the
chief administrative officer selection and appointment
process. The study, however, did not provide detailed
data relative to a comparison of leader behavior and
characteristics of black and white chief administrators
of institutions of higher education. Stevenson (1991)
recommended that studies were needed to research the
unexplained underrepresentation of minorities as chief
administrators of institutions in higher education and
to compare, over time, characteristics and perceptions
of black with white chief administrators.

Leadership Theory

Classical Theory. The Classical Theory of
leadership focused on the goal specificity and formal
structure of organizations (Sutermeister 1969).
Sutermeister (1969) stated that included in the
assumptions of the Classical Theory of leadership is
that (a) each position on the organizational chart is
occupied by a person who has a known and unchanging
task, that (b) formal authority is the central

29

indispensable means of leader control, that there (c) should be unity of command, that (d) tasks should be separated into specialized units, that (e) line and staff functions should be divided, that (f) the span of control should be fairly small, and that (g) responsibility and authority are equated. The Classical Theory viewed workers as a direct instrument to perform assigned tasks and a "given rather than a variable" (p. 24).

Three theorists that made major contributions to the Classical Theory were Taylor, Weber and Fayol. Taylor (1911) is known as the founder of the Scientific Management Theory. Scientific Management was developed primarily as a system for increasing productivity in industry. The Scientific Management Theory principles have been applied to several large-scale enterprises, which include operations within departments and agencies of the federal government.

As the chief engineer at the Midvale Steel Company, Taylor conducted experiments to determine the best way of performing each operation and the amount of time it required. He analyzed the materials, tools, and work sequence, establishing a clear division of labor between leaders and workers. Taylor believed that individuals could be programmed to be efficient machines, and that workers, motivated by economics and

limited by physiology, need constant direction.

Hicks (1985) stated that scientific management had a powerful impact on American education. During the rise of scientific management, much of the public thought that schools were inefficient, resulting in educators and laymen demanding changes. In 1913, wholesale changes, and dismissals occurred in education. Through these changes new teaching methods, standardized tests, and revised objectives were introduced. Among the educational innovations was the Gary Plan or platoon system and change of the superintendents' role from educator to leader (Hicks, 1985).

As detailed by Campbell (1987), developments in educational administration leadership theory parallel those in the broad field of leadership theory. Similar to Taylor's scientific managers, Bobbit (1913) looked at organizational behavior from the vantage point of job analysis. He observed administrative leaders at work, specifying the component tasks to be performed, determining ways to perform each task, and suggesting an organization to maximize efficiency.

Human Relations Approach. The human relations theory of leadership was a movement developed in reaction to the formal tradition of the classic models of administration. This theory replaced the

concentration on the structure of the organization with an emphasis on employees' motivation and satisfaction. Studies by Follet (1941), and Roethlisberger and Mayo (1933) were instrumental in the movement. Follet (1941), who wrote a series of papers dealing with the human side of administration, believed that the fundamental problem in all organizations was developing and maintaining dynamic and harmonious relationships. Follet (1924) also implied that conflict was "not necessarily a wasteful outbreak of incompatibilities, but a normal process by which socially valuable differences register themselves for enrichment of all concerned." (p. 300). Despite the work of Follet, the development of the human relations approach is normally associated with the studies, done in the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company in Chicago. These studies are basic to the literature that describes informal groups, and the study of informal groups is basic to the analysis of schools (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

Studies conducted at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company led to "perhaps the greatest management changes of the interwar decades" (Buchell, 1977, p. 10). These studies, known as the Hawthorne studies, contrasted dramatically with the mechanistic treatment of people in organizations established by

32

Taylor (1911). The Hawthorne studies which began in
the mid 1920s and lasted until the mid 1930s, led to
many new insights basic to modern leadership theory.
The studies conducted at the Hawthorne
plant began as a routine study of the effect of
different types and amounts of lighting on
productivity, but it was expanded to far more basic
aspects of human beings at work. As the lighting
experiments proceeded, it was noted that production of
the control and experimental groups were responding to
some factor other than the changes in physical
conditions. Social scientists, notably Roethlisberger
and Mayo (1933), were brought in to seek an explanation
of these results (Hoy and Miskel 1991). Mayo (1933)
determined that a number of nonphysical factors were
indeed affecting productivity. In summarizing
conclusions, Mayo (1933) determined that, (a) economics
was not the only significant motivator, (b) workers
respond to leaders as members of an informal group, not
as individuals, (c) production levels are limited more
by the social norms of the informal organizations than
by physiological capacities, (d) specialization does
not necessarily create the most efficient manner of
work, (e) workers use the informal organization to
protect themselves against arbitrary management
decisions, (f) a narrow span of control is not a

33

prerequisite to effective supervision, (g) informal leaders are often as important as formal leaders and (h) individuals are active human beings, "not passive cogs in a machine" (p.15).

By 1940, the results of the Hawthorne studies were evident in writings concerning education administration (Campbell, 1971). Campbell noted that this emphasis on human relations and democratic practices has resulted in a series of prescriptions as to what conditions should be and what proper behavior in an organization ought to be. Buchele (1977) indicated that the human relations approach added additional insight necessary to leader behavior. Buchele also stated that the approach has rendered more information on informal leadership, pointed out the importance of listening and encouraging employees to express themselves, and produced evidence linking consultative, or participative patterns of leadership.

Behavioral Science Approach. Because the classical and human relations approaches ignored the impact of social relations and formal structure, the Behavioral Science Approach used both perspectives and adds propositions drawn from psychology, sociology, political science and economics (Griffith, 1979). The behavioral practitioners sought to redirect leadership theory and participative management practices away from

34

manipulation and towards true joint effort, where goals serve the needs of subordinates as well as the needs of the leader and the organization as an entity (Buchele, 1977). Two behavioral practitioners who contributed heavily to the study of leadership are Barnard (1938) and Simon (1947).

Barnard (1938) originated much of the behavioral science leadership theory with his book <u>Function of the Executive</u>, in which he analyzed organizational life. The book provides a comprehensive theory of cooperative behavior in formal organizations. Barnard (1938) provided the original definitions of formal and informal organizations and cogently demonstrated the inevitable interaction between the two. Barnard (1940) summarized the contributions of his work in terms of structural and dynamic concepts. The structural concepts that he considered important are the individual, cooperative system, formal organization, complex formal organization, and the informal organization. Dynamic concepts Barnard mentions are free will, cooperation, communication, authority, the decision process, and dynamic equilibrium. Barnard's focus relative to leader decision making as a key managerial process and his explanation of the noneconomic factors that influence decisions laid the basis for later work by Simon (1947) and others.

35

Simon (1947), basing his early work on Barnard's (1940) descriptions of the realities of the leaders decision-making process, contended that leaders make decisions by using a simplified model of the real situation, and that a leader's psychological makeup results in a subjective rather than an objective one. Simon also theorized that a leaders' search for alternative courses of action was rarely complete; instead, leaders accept satisfying alternatives rather than insisting on optimum solutions.

The behavioral theory of leadership became popular in higher education in the 1950s, and by the 1960s a full scale theory movement had emerged to guide the study and teaching of educational administration (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). Higher education began to replace democratic prescription with analysis and a field orientation, and raw observation with theoretical research (Buchele, 1977). The work of the behavioral theorists contributed to many aspects of leadership and continues to establish new insights relative to leadership.

Contingency Approach. The behavioral theories developed at Ohio State University (1940s), the University of Michigan (1940s), and Harvard University (1947), all added greatly to the theory of leadership. Some theorists, however, felt a need for alternative,

36

more contemporary theories of leadership. The
contemporary theories of leadership are often referred
to as contingency approaches (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).
Contingency theories maintain that leadership
effectiveness depends upon the fit between personality
characteristics and behavior of the leader and
situational variables such as task structure, position
power, and subordinate skills and attitudes (Fleisham,
1973). Contingency approaches attempt to predict which
types of leaders will be effective in different types
of situations (Fleisham, 1973). Presently, three
contingency theories receive considerable attention
from scholars. Those three theories are Fiedler's
(1967) contingency model, House's (1971) path-goal
theory, and Fiedler's (1987) cognitive resource theory.

Fiedler's (1967) contingency model was the first
major theory to propose specific contingency
relationships in the study of leadership. The basic
postulates of Fiedler's theory are: (a) leadership
style is determined by the motivational system of the
leader (b) situational control is determined by group
atmosphere, task structure and position
power, and (c) group effectiveness is contingent on the
leader's style and control of the situation (Fiedler,
1967, p. 1).

House's (1971) path-goal theory is a contingency

37

approach to leadership that was developed and refined in the early and mid 1970s. This approach integrates the concepts of leader behavior and situation favorableness with a definition of effectiveness. The theory is called path-goal because it explains how leaders influence their subordinates' perceptions of work goals, personal goals, and path goal attainment. Tests of the path-goal theory typically use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to measure leader behavior.

Fiedler's (1987) cognitive resource theory maintains that in the best possible situation, the leaders' intellectual abilities or cognitive resources are the major source of the plans, decisions, and strategies that guide the group's actions. These plans, decisions, and strategies are communicated to the group through directive behavior, and acted upon if the group supports the leader's and the organization's goals (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987). The cognitive resource theory attempts to merge the ideas of directive behavior, stress, task motivation, and cognitive resources of the leader with the ideas of situational control.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S)

To bridge the relationship between leadership theory and leadership performance, the Leader Behavior

38

Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed at Ohio State University in the 1940s. In studying leader behavior, the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University initiated the "best known leadership studies to identify various dimensions of leader behavior" (Hoy & Miskel, 1991 p. 262). The staff narrowed the description of leader behavior to two dimensions, initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the leaders' behavior in delineating the relationship between the members of the group and himself, and in endeavoring to establish channels of communication, well-defined patterns of organization, and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior that indicates mutual trust, respect, friendship, and warmth in relationships between the leader and other members of the group (Halpin, 1957).

The LBDQ can be used by the subordinates, supervisors, or the leader to describe leader behavior. When the LBDQ is used by the leaders themselves to describe self-perceived leader behavior, the LBDQ-Self(S) is utilized. The LBDQ-S items request that the respondent indicate the frequency at which they perceive themselves to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs on a five point scale: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never (Halpin,

1957). The LBDQ-S is comprised of a 40 item
questionnaire consisting of two subscales that
correspond with the dimensions, initiating structures
and consideration. Only 30 of the 40 items are scored,
15 for each of the two dimensions.

Use in Higher Education. The use of the LBDQ-S to
investigate perceptions of leader behavior in higher
education is supported by the literature (Lucas, 1993).
Gable and Kavich (1981) sought to determine if changing
leadership theories in education reflect existing
leadership performance subscale for describing
educational administration. They applied selected
questions in the LBDQ-S to the current leadership
models of an educational leader. Gable and Kavich
(1981) found that high scores on both initiation of
structure and consideration mean positive ethical
perspectives for leadership potential. They concluded
that leadership should represent the positive
relationship of the leader to the follower, and that by
using the LBDQ-S, one could determine who is best
qualified for leadership roles.

Using the LBDQ-S and the specially designed
Decision Behavior Questionnaire, Guyden (1992)
attempted to present a clear description of how senior
administrators perceive leader behavior and their own
decision-making behaviors. Guyden (1992) compared

40

senior administrators' perceptions of the leader behavior of their presidents and their own decision-making behaviors. Guyden (1992) stated that the leadership of blacks is described in the literature as authoritarian. He also stated that stereotypical leader behaviors could be related to administrator decision-making behaviors.

Guyden (1992) found that senior administrators perceived their presidents as balanced in their leader behaviors. She also noted that self-reported decision-making behaviors did not cluster around a particular style, but spread among the behavior styles of the Vroom and Yetton (1943) model. Guyden concluded that the perception of leader behavior by senior administrators differs from the stereotypical behavior described in the literature, indicating a possible shift toward leader behavior that is democratic.

Guyden (1992) recommended that an updated study be conducted focusing on black presidents. She noted that differences between leaders behavior described in the literature and the findings of her study indicate a shift in leader behavior from autocratic to democratic, and that this shift is a result of a new group of blacks in administration. It is also recommended by Guyden (1992) that research focusing on chief

administrators self perceptions of their leader
behavior would be useful.

Hicks' (1985) study focused on a comparison of
leader behavior of presidents of historically black
colleges and universities (HBCUs) and presidents of
predominately white colleges. To date, this research
may be considered to be one of the most comprehensive
relating to leadership behaviors of black chief
administrators. Hicks' research compared and evaluated
the perceived leader behavior of black presidents from
HBCUs with presidents of predominately white colleges.

Using the LBDQ-S, Hicks (1985) found that his
study contradicted assertions found in the literature
which make allegations that black and white college
presidential leadership is fundamentally different, and
characterize black presidents as authoritative and
paternalistic leaders who are ill equipped to deal with
complex contemporary leadership problems in higher
education (p.2). Hicks (1985) concluded that
perceptions of black presidential leadership behavior
can probably be attributed to negative biases, dated
information, misinformation, or a combination of any of
these.

Hicks (1985) recommended that further research and
scholarly writings were needed to mold new images and
create new models of leadership. He also recommended

42

that a replication of his study be done, in order to validate his findings (P. 127).

<u>Summary</u>

Several leadership studies contributed significantly to the body of leadership knowledge generally, and leader behavior and characteristics specifically. The Ohio State Leadership Studies resulted in a leadership model to bridge leadership theory and performance through the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

The paucity of literature relating to black chief administrators was noted by several writers. Black presidents are often viewed as authoritarian, paternalistic, and conservative leaders (Hicks, 1985). Historically, black leaders have always been compared with white college leaders in terms of accomplishments and appropriateness (Hicks, 1985). Hicks (1985) stated that assertions characterizing and stereotyping black leadership can be assessed only by a direct comparison with the leadership behaviors and characteristics of white college chief administrators.

This study sought to substantially add to the general body of leadership knowledge, and specifically to the body of knowledge relative to leadership behavior and characteristics of black chief administrators of colleges and universities. The

43

perceived leadership behavior areas of consideration

and initiating of structure, along with demographic

characteristics will be examined through a comparison

of black and white chief administrators of SREB

colleges and universities.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study examined and compared self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities. Chief administrators were selected from higher education institutions within the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. This chapter identifies the population surveyed, the instrumentation utilized, the procedures used to apply the survey instruments, and the methods used to score the data.

Population/Sample

The population for this study included chief administrators of the 538 four year colleges and universities, both public and private, within the 15 SREB states. A randomly selected sample of black (n=18) (Appendix A) and white, (n=132) (Appendix B) chief administrators of colleges and universities were utilized for this study. The sample of 150 chief administrators (Appendix C) was chosen because it controlled for statistical errors at maximum rate. To compare leader behavior among the two groups, the white chief administrators were considered the control group, and black chief administrators were considered to be the experimental group. Each sample group was considered discrete.

45

The institutions represented in the sample were identified from three sources. For the control group, a list of all institutions of higher education within the SREB states was furnished through Peterson's Register of Higher Education (1994). The official membership list of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) (1993) and the publication "Black Issues in Higher Education" (1993) were used to identify potential experimental group respondents.

Design

The study used a static group comparison research design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) to examine and compare self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators. Data was collected by utilizing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S) (Stogdill, 1974) and an additional demographic questionnaire in a survey form.

Surveys have been, and continue to be, the prevailing quantitative method used in studying educational administration (Boyan, 1988). The survey technique's most important contributions may be its rigorous sampling procedures, the overall design and the implementation of the design of studies, the unambiguous definition and specification of the

46

research problem, and the analysis and interpretation of data (Kerlinger, 1986). Babbie (1973) stated that:

> Surveys are frequently conducted for the purpose of making descriptive assertions about some population: discovering the distribution of certain traits or attributes. The distribution of traits among a carefully selected sample of respondents from among the larger population can be measured, and the comparable description of the larger population can be measured, and the comparable description of the larger population is inferred from the sample (p. 57-58).

Similarly, this study sought to collect data from a representative sample that would allow comparison of data to a larger number of subjects.

The potential sample respondents were assured in cover letters included with the survey that they would receive their individual LBDQ-S results if they so desired. This was done to increase the likelihood of responses to the survey (Babbie, 1973). The sample respondents were also assured that only aggregate data would be reported and that their institution would not be identified by name in the presentation of the study's findings. A minimum response rate of 50 percent plus one (Kerlinger, 1986) was sought to ensure the accuracy of the survey.

47

Instrumentation

The LBDQ-S and additional demographic questions (See Appendix D) were utilized in the form of a survey questionnaire to collect data addressing the research questions. As described in Chapter I, the survey instrument allowed for the comparison of perceived leader behavior and selected demographic characteristics of black and white chief administrators.

LBDQ-S. The LBDQ was developed at Ohio State University and later revised by Halpin (1957). The LBDQ-S contains items that each describe a specific way in which a leader may behave. In filling out the questionnaire, the respondent indicates the frequency they perceive themselves to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never. These responses are scored in relation to two (consideration and initiating structure) dimensions of leader behavior. The scores are then averaged to yield an index of the leaders' behavior in respect to that dimension (Halpin, 1957).

The LBDQ-S is comprised of a 40-item questionnaire consisting of two subscales that correspond with the dimensions initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the leaders' behavior in delineating the relationship between the members of the

group and himself/herself, and in endeavoring to establish channels of communication, well-defined patterns of organization, and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior that indicates mutual trust, respect, friendship, and warmth in relationship between the leader and other members of the group (Halpin, 1957). Buros (1978) stated that the LBDQ "provides a stellar example of how a leadership scale or any psychological instrument should be developed" (p. 1174).

Validity. In at least two respects, the LBDQ-S shows evidence of validity as a measure of leadership behavior (Buros,1978). In terms of face validity, the items are straightforward and appear to match common sense descriptions of leader behavior in settings that vary. Also, the validity of the LBDQ-S as a measure of job satisfaction and work group performance appear fairly good in that most studies indicate significant correlations between the scales of the LBDQ-S and both performance and satisfaction (Buros, 1978). Widespread validity is recognized concerning the LBDQ-S due to the multiple times the instrument has been used.

Reliability. In evaluating the reliability of the LBDQ-S, Buros (1978) states that both the initiating structure and the consideration style factors have been found to have high coefficients of internal

49

consistency. The estimated reliability by the split half method for the initiating structure score is .83, and for the consideration score is .92, when corrected for attenuation (Halpin, 1957). Also, inter-rater agreement appears to be sufficiently high to justify procedures stated in the LBDQ manual (Buros, 1978).

Procedures

The procedure for data collection using the survey questionnaire included the following. Each selected chief administrator/institution, identified from the Peterson's Register of Higher Education (1994), the membership list from NAFEO (1993), and the Black Issues in Higher Education (1993) publication, was mailed a survey envelope. Each envelope contained a questionnaire (Appendix D), a cover letter (Appendix E) explaining the nature and intent of the research and assured anonymity, and the intent of the survey. Postage-paid return envelopes were included in the packet to facilitate participation.

The first mailing of surveys took place on July 1, 1994. The potential respondents were asked to return their questionnaires by July 29, 1994. All potential respondents received a follow-up postcard, as a reminder, on July 18, 1994. A second survey envelope was sent on September 1, 1994 to those chief administrators not responding. This mailing included

50

another copy of the LBDQ-S, a new cover letter
(Appendix F), and another postage-paid return envelope.
The second mailing had an extended deadline of
September 23, 1994. Additional mailings took place
until the 50 percent plus one requirement as described
by Kerlinger (1986) were met.

Data Scoring

The LBDQ-S with additional demographic questions
was used to collect data regarding self-perceived
leader behavior and characteristics. In administrating
the LBDQ-S, the respondents were instructed to describe
the approximate frequency in which they engage in each
of the behaviors specified in the questionnaire items.
Only 30 of the 40 items are scored 15 each for the two
dimensions initiating structure and consideration. The
10 unscored items are retained in the questionnaire in
order to keep the conditions of administration
comparable to those used in standardizing the
questionnaire. The scored items for each of the two
dimension keys are listed on Appendix (D).

The score for each dimension is the sum of the
scores assigned to responses to each of the 15 items in
the dimension. The possible range of scores on each
dimension is 0 to 60. When each LBDQ-S answer sheet
has been scored on each of the two dimensions, and the
scores secured from the respondents have been averaged

51

separately by dimension, the two scores may be designated as the leaders initiating structure and consideration index scores. Those that score high in both consideration and initiating structure are condisered to be effective leaders. A score of greater than 45 indicates a high degree of consideration and a score of greater than 38 indicates a high degree of initiating structure (Haldin, 1957). Each index score is rounded to the nearest whole number.

In order to provide a basis for interpretation of the LBDQ-S scores, data was secured from three independent samples of leaders (Halpin, 1957). As described by Halpin, sample I consisted of 251-B-2a and B-50 Aircraft Commanders, Sample II consisted of 144 RB-47 Aircraft Commanders, and Sample III was comprised of Educational Administrators. Findings and conclusions in this study come from a comparison of data collected from the control and experimental groups. Data analysis included frequency distributions, measurements of central tendencies, measures of associations, or analysis of variance. Post hoc analyses using ancillary data were performed when appropriate.

52

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities. This chapter presents the data collected for this study as well as the statistical analysis of the data. The chapter is divided into the following sections: (a) description of the sample, (b) descriptive data, (c) statistical analysis of data, (d) major findings, (e) ancillary findings, and (f) a summary of the chapter.

Description of the Sample

The population for this study consisted of chief administrators of the 538 four year colleges and universities, both public and private, within the 15 Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. The sample used 150 randomly selected black (n=18) and white (n=132) chief administrators of colleges and universities. The data used for this study were collected from the 80 chief administrations who returned useable responses to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S) survey, along with additional demographic questions, for a final return rate of 54.1 percent. The total included 11 black respondents, a return rate of 61.1 percent and 69

white respondents for a return rate of 53.1 percent.
Two other responses were received but were unusable
because in each case their race was not identified as
black or white. This revelation also caused the white
n to equal 130 instead of 132, and the random sample to
equal 148, not 150.

The institutions represented by respondents are in
14 states within the four geographic regions of south,
southeast, southwest, and northeast (Table 1). The
south region (black n=5, white n=18) includes the
states of Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi).
The southeast region (black n=3 and white n=22)
includes the states of North Carolina, South Carolina,
Kentucky, and Tennessee. The southwest region (black
n=2 and white n=18) includes Arkansas, Oklahoma,
Louisiana, and Texas. The northeast region (black n=1
and white n=11) includes Maryland, Virginia and West
Virginia. West Virginia is the only SREB state not
represented by survey responses, which was due to
random sampling procedures. Respondent returns
reflected the geographical frequency distribution of
the total population.

The responding chief administrators represented
institutions stratified by public and private funding
(Table 2). Response ratio by type of funding were
consistent with sample population rates for both

54

groups. Public institutions comprised 45.5 percent of the responding blacks, while 54.5 percent were from private institutions. The white respondents included 36.2 percent from public institutions, and 63.8 percent from private institutions.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by
Geographic Regions

| Geographic | Frequency | | Percent | |
Region	Black	White	Black	White
South	5	18	45.5	26.1
Southeast	3	22	27.2	31.9
Southwest	2	18	18.2	26.1
Northeast	1	11	9.1	15.9

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by
Type of Institutional Funding (Public or Private)

| Control | Frequency | | Percent | |
	Black	White	Black	White
Public	5	25	45.5	36.2
Private	6	44	54.5	63.8

Descriptive Data

Demographic data included the following items:
(a) gender; (b) race; (c) age; (d) years in present position; (e) present salary; (f) highest level of education completed; and (g) college majors.

Race. In examining demographic items on the survey related to the respondent's race, Table 3 reveals that there were 11 black (13.8%) and 69 white (86.2%) chief administrators who responded. The 11 black respondents represent a slightly higher percentage than the black chief administrators (12.8%) in the total sample population percentage. The 69 white respondents represent a slightly lower percentage than white chief administrators (87.2%) in the total sample population percentage.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by
Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
Black	11	13.8
White	69	86.2

Gender. Demographic items on the survey related to gender are represented in Table 4. Of the black chief administrators that responded, one (9.1%) was female. The respondent was the only black female in

the population. The white respondents' frequency distribution was consistent with population norms and was almost exactly the same as the black respondents with regard to gender.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Female	1	7	9.1	10.1
Male	10	62	90.9	89.9

Age. Table 5 represents data pertaining to the age of each respondent. Black and white chief administrators' age distribution were basically consistent with each other. Both groups had over 80 percent of the respondents 50 years or older. Both groups had 36 percent of their respondents between the years of 50 and 54, and there was nearly an exact match with the respondents between the ages of 55 and 59. There were 10 percent more black than white chief administrators at the 60-or-over age, slightly supporting the findings of Hicks (1985) that black chief administrators were generally older than their white counterparts.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by
Age

Age	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
39 - 44 years	1	5	9.1	7.2
45 - 49 years	0	9	0.0	13.0
50 - 54 years	4	25	36.4	36.2
55 - 59 years	2	12	18.2	17.4
60 or over	4	18	36.4	26.1

Years In Position. Demographic items examined on
the survey pertaining to the total number of years that
the respondents have been in their present position are
shown on Table 6. Data revealed that the general
pattern of tenure in the chief administrator position
is similar for both groups. While the black chief
administrators have a greater percentage (18.2%) of
respondents who were in their position 11 to 15 years
and over 15 years (18.2%), the white chief
administrators were closely matched with 14.7 percent
in their position 11 to 15 years and 17.6 percent for
respondents in their position over 15 years.

58

Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by
Total Years in Present Position

Years	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Under 1 year	0	7	0.0	10.3
1 - 3 years	3	15	27.3	22.1
4 - 5 years	1	6	9.1	8.8
6 - 10 years	3	18	27.3	26.5
11 - 15 years	2	10	18.2	14.7
Over 15 years	2	12	18.2	17.6

Present Salary. Demographic information as it
related to the present annual salary of the respondents
is shown in Table 7. The data revealed that over 75
percent of both groups had annual salaries in excess
of $80,000 (black= 81.8% and white= 77.3%). While the
white respondents' salaries had a wider range of
distribution, the black respondents had only two chief
administrators that did not make $80,000. Also of note
is that one white respondent made under $20,000. The
respondent indicated that the position was "an
independent consultant basis with less than one year in
business."

59

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by
Present Annual Salary

Salary	Frequency*		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Under - 20,000	0	1	0.0	1.5
20,000 - 24,999	0	0	0.0	0.0
30,000 - 34,999	0	0	0.0	0.0
35,000 - 39,999	1	0	9.1	0.0
40,000 - 44,999	0	3	0.0	4.5
45,000 - 49,999	0	0	0.0	0.0
50,000 - 59,999	0	2	0.0	3.0
60,000 - 69,999	1	5	9.1	7.6
70,000 - 79,999	0	4	0.0	6.1
80,000 and above	9	51	81.8	77.3

*Frequency missing = 3

Highest Degree Earned. Demographic information as
it is related to the highest level of education
completed by the respondents is shown on Table 8.
While all but one (99%) of the black respondents had
doctoral degrees, the white respondents had more
variety. Data of white respondents reveal that 55
(79.7%) have doctorate degrees while two have bachelor
degrees. Also, one (2.9%) white respondent had no
earned degree but did acknowledge the usefulness of a
doctorate for a position such as chief administrator.

60

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Highest Level of Education Completed

Degree	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Bachelor	0	2	0.0	2.9
Masters	1	8	9.1	11.6
Specialist	0	1	0.0	1.4
Doctoral	10	55	90.9	79.7
Professional	0	2	0.0	2.9
No Degree	0	1	0.0	1.4

College Majors. The final demographic item examined on the survey related to the respondents' college majors. The respondents were asked to indicate on the survey if their major was undergraduate or graduate, but since that information was not represented on a regular basis, major degree data are combined. Data in Table 9 reveals that black chief administrators had high frequency representation in humanities, education and higher education, with almost half of the respondents having a major in education (45.5%). White respondents were fairly high in those three categories, although they did not have nearly as great of a percentage (11.65%) in education as black respondents. White respondents also were high in the physical sciences (13.0%) and theology/religious majors

61

(11.6%), but their highest number of responses were in the social sciences, (32.4%) while the black respondents only had 9.1 percent that majored in that category.

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by
Graduate and Undergraduate College Majors

Majors	Frequency		Percentage	
	Black	White	Black	White
Social Sciences	1	22	9.1	32.4
Biological Sciences	1	3	9.1	4.3
Physical Sciences	1	9	9.1	13.0
Business	1	3	9.1	4.3
Administration/ Management	2	4	18.2	5.8
Humanities	3	18	27.3	26.1
Education	5	8	45.5	11.6
Higher Education	3	16	27.3	23.2
Fine Arts	0	3	0.0	4.3
Mathematics	0	3	0.0	4.3
Vocational Education	0	0	0.0	0.0
Theology/Religion	0	8	0.0	11.6
Engineering	0	4	0.0	5.8
Other	2	6	18.2	8.7

Statistical Analysis

Two survey instruments were utilized to collect
statistical data relative to the comparison of self-
perceived leader behavior of chief administrators of
colleges and universities. The first survey
instrument, used to answer the first question, was the
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S)
(Halpin, 1957). The LBDQ-S is a forty item
questionnaire consisting of two sub-scales,
consideration (person oriented) and initiating
structure (task oriented), that measures those two
different dimensions of leader behavior. Subjects
responded to each item on a five point Likert scale
according to their self-perceptions of their leadership
behavior. The five points on the Likert scale were as
follows: A = always, B = often, C = occasionally, D =
seldom, and E = never. The LBDQ-S items were scored
according to the responses at values of A = 5, B = 4,
C = 3, D = 2, E = 1, except three items which were
scored in reverse order.

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) computer
program was used to analyze the data. The probability
criterion level for rejecting the null hypothesis was
0.05. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) using the
general linear models (GLM) procedure was the analytic-
technique used to determine if there were instances in

63

which data collected from the LBDQ-S revealed any statistically significant differences between black and white respondents in regard to self-perceived leader behavior in the areas of consideration and initiating structure. The GLM procedure does not require equal **n's** or proportional **n's** for analysis. Since no differences were hypothesized, a two-tailed test with a probability level of 0.05 (0.25 on each side of the distribution equals 0.05) on the analysis was required. At the 0.05 alpha level, one could be 95 percent assured that there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores (Sprinthall, 1990).

The second statistical analysis examined differences and similarities in demographic characteristics of respondents. The SAS program using ANOVA was the analytic procedure utilized. A two tailed T-Test with a probability level of 0.05 was used to test for significance. Frequency distributions for the two leadership behaviors (consideration and initiating structure) as they relate to the respondents and their demographic information was compiled to analyze the second question of this study. Differences in demographical variables were observed through the comparison of percentiles and by using the ANOVA general linear models (GLM) procedure to test for statistical significance.

64

Major Findings

Major findings are presented in this section in relation to the research questions which guided the study.

Question 1: Is there a difference in leadership behavior between Blacks and Whites as assessed by the LBDQ-S? To assess this research question, the LBDQ-S asked black and white chief administrators to answer questions that would result in their self-perceived consideration and initiating structure scores as measured by the LBDQ-S. Survey questions pertaining to consideration included 1, 3, 6 , 8, 12, 13, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 28, 31, 34, and 38. Survey questions pertaining to initiating structure include 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, 27, 29, 32, 35, and 39 (See Appendix D).

When the ANOVA was applied using race as the independent variable and consideration as the dependent variable, the analysis indicated there was no statistical difference in respondents' consideration scores. An F value of 1.53 yielded a probability value (Pr>F) of 0.2198. The resulting Pr>F value of 0.2198 with 1 and 79 degrees of freedom was not statistically significant at the criterion 0.05 alpha level. Table 10 presents a summary of the analysis.

The difference in mean scores indicated that white

65

chief administrators tended to engage in consideration leadership behavior more than black chief administrators. The mean consideration score for black respondents was 47.3636364, and for white respondents, it was 49.0579710. The difference in means was 1.6943346 for the two groups. The standard deviation for black respondents was 7.29757120 compared with 3.54750972 for white respondents. The data in Table 10 presents an analysis of these scores.

Table 10

Analysis of Variance: Consideration (LBDQ-S)

Source	DF	Sum/ Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr >F
Race	1	27.2364295	27.2364295	1.53	0.2198
Error	78	1388.3135705	17.7988919		
Total	79	1415.5500000			

Mean Score for Consideration (LBDQ-S)

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	11	47.3636364	7.29757120
White	69	49.0579710	3.54750972

When the ANOVA was applied using race as the independent variable and initiating structure as the dependent variable, the analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the

66

respondent's initiating structure scores.   An F value
of 11.97 yielded a probability value (Pr>F) of 0.0009.
The resulting Pr>F value of 0.0009 with 1 and 79
degrees of freedom was statistically significant at
the criterion 0.05 alpha level.   Table 11 presents a
summary of the analysis.

The difference in mean scores indicated that black
chief administrators tended to engage in initiating
structure leader behavior more than white chief
administrators.   The mean initiating structure scores
for black respondents was 47.5454545 and for white
respondents was 42.1449275.   The difference in mean
scores for the two groups was 5.400527.   The standard
deviation was 3.53167485 for black respondents and
4.96835682 for white respondents.

Table 11

Analysis of Variance: Initiating Structure (LBDQ-S)

Source	DF	Sum/ Square	Mean Square	F Value	Pr >F
Race	1	276.709503	276.709503	11.97	0.0009
Error	78	1803.277997	23.118949		
Total	79	2079.987500			

Mean Score for Initiating Structure (LBDQ-S)

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	11	47.5454545	3.53167485
White	69	42.1449275	4.96835682

Question 2 : What are the differences and
similarities in demographic characteristics of black
and white chief administrators? To assess the
similarities and differences in demographics of black
and white respondents, three methods were used. First,
demographic and racial information was juxtaposed for
those respondents by both "high" consideration and
"high" initiating structure. The demographic data used
included race, gender, age, years in present position,
highest level of education completed, present salary,
and graduate and undergraduate college majors.
Observations were made through the comparison of
percentiles. Secondly, a two-tailed T-Test with a

68

probability level of 0.05 was utilized to test for
statistical difference in relation to demographics and
leader behavior consideration and initiating structure
scores.   A two-tailed T-Test with a probability level
of 0.05 was utilized to test for statistical difference
in relation to demographics and leader behavior
consideration and initiating structure scores.   An
ANOVA using the GLM procedure was used to analyze data.
For each demographic characteristic, the ANOVA is only
tabularly presented when results reveal statistical
differences.   The third method used was to compare data
collected from the demographic questionnaire by the
observation of percentiles.

Respondents Scoring High In Consideration

The criterion for dichotomizing the measures on
consideration was the average score of all measures on
consideration (48.83%).   All respondents who scored
above the average score were categorized as "high."
Using this dichotomy, there were 7 blacks and 60 whites
who were in the high category for consideration.
Tables in reference to the ANOVA are only presented in
the areas of race and college majors, which revealed
statistically significant differences.

Race.   The data in Table 12 represents comparisons
black and white chief administrators who scored high in
consideration.   Seven blacks (12.96%) and 47 whites

69

(87.04%) scored high in this area. The difference in percent values (4.48%) indicated that white college chief administrators tended to engage in the consideration leadership behavior, as measured by the LBDQ-S, more frequently than black college chief administrators.

Table 12

Table of High Consideration by Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
Black	7	12.96
White	47	87.04

Gender. The data in Table 13 represents a comparison of the two respondent groups who scored high in consideration by gender. The percentage values for both groups were almost exactly the same. The data indicate that 85.71 percent black and 85.11 percent white were male respondents. All but one of the total eight female respondents rated high in consideration. Of the eight females who were high in consideration, one was black (14.29%), and seven were white (14.89%).

Table 13

Table of High Consideration by Gender

Gender	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Female	1	7	14.29	14.89
Male	6	40	85.71	85.11

Age.   The data in Table 14 represents a comparison of the two respondent groups who scored high in consideration by age. Black college chief administrators were generally older than white respondents who scored high in consideration. There were 28.57 percent of the black respondents who were between the ages of 55 and 59, and there were also 28.57 percent who were 60 or over, totaling 57.14 percent black chief respondents who are over 55 years of age. The white chief administrators between 55 and 59 totaled 12.77 percent, and those who were over 60 totaled 23.40 percent. There were 36.17 percent of the white respondents who were over 55 years old.

Table 14

Table of High Consideration by
Age

Age	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
20-29	0	0	0.00	0.00
30-34	0	0	0.00	0.00
35-39	0	0	0.00	0.00
40-44	1	4	14.29	8.51
45-49	0	6	0.00	12.77
50-54	2	20	28.57	42.55
55-59	2	6	28.57	12.77
60 or over	2	13	28.57	23.40

A statistically significant difference in mean scores of respondents was revealed when the ANOVA was applied using the age group 55-59 as the independent variable and all consideration scores as the dependent variable. Black respondents in the age group of between 55 and 59 tended to use consideration leader behavior more than white respondents in that same age group.

An F value for the difference between means was 2.87, which resulted in a statistically significant probability value of 0.0422. This level exceeded the 0.05 alpha level of significance. These data are presented in Table 15, which represents Pr>F values for race, age, and race and age collectively, as well as

72

mean scores for consideration scores of ages 55-59.

Table 15

Analysis of Variance: Consideration by Age and Race

Source	DF	Sum/ Square	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Race	1	1.70395	1.703951	0.10	0.7542
Age	4	108.242256	27.060564	1.51	0.1919
Race and Age	3	148.625047	49.541682	2.87	0.0422
Error	71	1224.262222	17.243130		
Corrected Total	79	1415.550000			

Mean Score for Consideration and Ages 55 to 59

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	2	53.0000000	1.4142136
White	12	48.9166667	3.2879486

Years In Present Position. The data in Table 16 represents comparisons of the years spent in the present position of the chief administrators who were high in Consideration. The general pattern of tenure for the respondents years in their present position was similar for both groups. Analysis of the data reveals that white respondents were highest in the one to three years (26.09%), the six to ten years (19.57%), and the over 15 years (19.57%) categories. The black

73

respondents were highest in the one to three years, six
to ten years, and the 11 to 15 year categories. The
percentage values for all three were 28.57 percent.

Table 16

Table of High Consideration by
Total Years in Present Position

Years	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Under 1 year	0	6	0.00	8.70
1 - 3 years	2	12	28.57	26.09
4 - 5 years	0	4	0.00	8.70
6 -10 years	2	9	28.57	19.57
11-15 years	2	8	28.57	17.39
Over 15 years	1	9	14.29	19.57

Present Salary. The data in Table 17 compares
black and white respondents who were high in
consideration as it relates to the present salary from
their position. Data reveals that for both the black
(71.43%) and the white (75.55%) respondents, the
highest response concentration is for those at the
$80,000 and above salary level. Data also reveal that
all respondents but one made at least $40,000.

Table 17

Table of High Consideration by
Present Annual Salary

Salary	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Under 20,000	0	0	0.0	2.22
20,000 - 34,999	0	0	0.0	0.0
35,000 - 39,999	0	0	0.0	0.0
40,000 - 44,999	1	0	14.29	0.0
50,000 - 59,000	0	1	0.0	2.22
60,000 - 69,000	0	3	0.0	6.67
70,000 - 79,000	1	3	14.29	6.67
80,000 and above	5	34	71.43	75.55

Highest Level of Education Completed. The black
and white respondents who were high in Consideration
are represented by their highest level of education in
Table 18. Data reveal that all black respondents had
either a masters (14.29%) or doctoral (85.71%) degree.
The white respondents degrees earned were more
stratified than the black respondents. The majority of
white respondents had either a masters (12.77%) or a
doctoral (74.47%) degree. The doctorate was the degree
that the majority of respondents of both groups
completed.

75

Table 18

Table of High Consideration by
Highest Level of Education Completed

Education	Frequency		Percent	
Completed	Black	White	Black	White
Bachelors Degree	0	2	0.00	4.26
Masters Degrees	1	6	14.29	12.77
Doctoral Degree	6	35	85.71	74.47
Specialist Certificate	0	1	0.00	2.13
Professional	0	2	0.00	4.26
No Degree	0	1	0.00	2.13

Graduate and Undergraduate College Majors. Data regarding the college majors of the respondents who were high in consideration is revealed by Data in Table 19. The most frequent majors for blacks were education (21.43%), higher education (21.43%), and administration/management (14.29%). Fewer white respondents were higher education majors (12.30%), education majors (4.62%), and administration/ management majors (4.62%). There were more white respondents with college majors in social sciences (16.92%) and humanities (21.53%).

Table 19

Table of High Consideration By
Graduate and Undergraduate College Majors

Majors	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Social Sciences	1	11	7.14	16.92
Biological Sciences	0	3	0.00	4.62
Physical Sciences	1	7	7.14	10.77
Business	1	1	7.14	1.54
Administration/ Management	2	3	14.29	4.62
Humanities	1	14	7.14	21.53
Education	3	3	21.43	4.62
Higher Education	3	8	21.43	12.30
Fine Arts	0	1	0.00	1.54
Mathematics	0	2	0.00	3.08
Vocational	0	0	0.00	0.00
Other	2	12	14.29	18.46

Data revealed that there were three college majors
which had statistical differences, when the ANOVA was
applied using college majors as the independent
variable and consideration as the dependent variable.
Those college majors were humanities, higher education,
and the major categorized as "other".

With regard to the college major humanities, the
difference in mean scores indicated that white
respondents with the college major of humanities

77

engaged in high consideration leader behavior more
frequency than black respondents. The F Value for the
difference between mean scores resulted in a
statistically significant probability value of 0.0497.
This level exceeded the 0.05 alpha level of
significance. Data in Table 20, represents Pr>F values
for race, humanities, and race and humanities
collectively, as well as mean scores for humanities and
race.

Table 20

Analysis of Variance: Humanities and Race

Source	DF	Sum/ Square	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Race	1	71.0726373	71.0726372	4.10	0.0464
Humanities	1	47.2135256	47.2135256	2.72	0.1030
Race and Humanities	1	68.938895	68.9388956	3.98	0.0497
Error	76	1317.6723856	17.33779	1.88	
Corrected Total	79	1415.55			

Mean Scores for Humanities and Race

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	3	43.3333333	10.5987421
White	18	49.4444444	2.9945484

With regard to the college major higher education,

the difference in means indicated that black
respondents had the college major of higher education
at a higher frequency than white respondents. The F
Value for the difference between mean scores was
2.8333333, which resulted in a statistically
significant probability value of 0.0466. This level
exceeded the 0.05 alpha level of significance. Data in
Table 21 represents data in relation to Pr>F scores for
race, higher education, and race and higher education
collectively. Mean scores for higher education and
race are also represented.

Table 21
Analysis of Variance: Higher Education and Race

Source	DF	Sub/ Square	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Race	1	0.4973283	0.4973283	0.03	0.8659
Higher Education	1	41.4878600	41.4878600	2.39	0.1259
Race and Higher Education	1	70.8747043	70.8746043	4.09	0.0466
Error	76	1316.8246855	17.3266406		
Corrected Total	79	1415.5500000			

Mean Scores for Higher Education and Race

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	3	51.3333333	1.15470054
White	16	48.5000000	3.44480285

In relation to the college major "other", the
difference in mean scores indicated that black chief
administrators whose college majors fell in the
category "other" used consideration leader behavior at
a higher frequency than white chief administrators.
The F Value for the difference between mean scores was
4.28, resulting in a statistically significant
probability value of 0.0419. This level exceeded the
0.05 alpha level of significance. Data in Table 22
represents data in relation to Pr>F scores for race,
"other", and race and "other" collectively. Mean
scores for race and "other" were also represented.

Table 22

Analysis of Variance: "Other" College Majors and Race

Source	DF	Sub/Square	Mean Square	F-Value	Pr>F
Race	1	1.7778400	1.7778400	0.10	0.7490
"Other"	1	64.6349829	64.6349829	3.75	0.0565
Race and "Other"	1	73.8201681	73.8201681	4.28	0.0419
Error	76	1309.960784	17.236326		
Corrected Total	79	1415.550000			

Means Scores for "Other" College Majors and Race

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	2	53.000000	1.41421356
White	18	48.8888889	3.28792602

Respondents Scoring High in Initiating Structure.

The criterion for dichotonizing the measures on initiating structure was the average score of all measures on initiating structure (42.48). All persons who scored above the average score were categorized as "high". Using this dichotomy, there were 10 blacks and 32 whites who were in the high category. Results of the ANOVA revealed that there were no statistically significant differences revealed in any demographic area. Therefore, no ANOVA tables were presented for initiating structure and the various demographic areas.

Race. Data in Table 23 reflects the frequency distribution of those respondents scoring high in Initiating Structure by race. Ten black (23.81%) and 32 (76.19%) white respondents scored high in this area. These data also reveal that all but one (90.90%) of the blacks from the total responding sample scored high in initiating structure.

Table 23

Table of High Initiating Structure by Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
Black	10	23.81
White	32	76.19

Gender. The comparison of gender for those respondents who were high in initiating structure (Table 24) shows that there are seven females (16.67%) and 35 males (83.33) in this area. Of the seven female respondents, one (10.29%) was black and six (85.71%) were white. All but one of the females in the total responding sample rated high in initiating structure. Of the male respondents, nine (90.00%) were black and 26 (81.25%) were white. There were no significant variations in data analysis results relative to gender.

Table 24

Table of High Initiating Structure by
Gender

Gender	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Female	1	6	10.00	18.75
Male	9	26	90.00	81.25

Age. Data regarding those respondents high in initiating structure relative to age comparisons of black and white chief administrators are revealed in Table 25. The data indicate that patterns for both groups are similar. However, two noteworthy variations were revealed. While 12.50 percent of the white respondents were between 45 and 49, there were no Blacks in this age group. This discrepancy was due to there being no black respondents in this age group in the sample. The other variation revealed is that the black respondents from 55 to 59 and 60 or over totaled 50 percent, while the white respondents only totaled 40.63 percent.

Table 25

Table of High Initiating Structure by
Age

Age	Frequency		Frequency	
	Black	White	Black	White
20-29	0	0	0.00	0.00
30-34	0	0	0.00	0.00
35-39	0	0	0.00	0.00
40-44	1	3	10.00	9.38
45-49	0	4	0.00	12.50
50-54	4	12	40.00	37.50
55-59	2	6	20.00	18.75
60 or over	3	7	30.00	21.88

Years in Present Position. Data revealing the comparison of black and white respondents high in initiating Structure relative to the years in their present position is found on Table 26. The highest tenure for black respondents was one to three years (30%) and six to ten years (30%). The highest tenure for white respondents was also one to three years (32.26%) and six to ten years (22.58%).

Table 26

Table of High Initiating Structure by Total Years in Present Position

Years	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Under 1 year	0	4	0.00	12.90
1 - 3 years	3	10	30.00	32.26
4 - 5 years	1	0	10.00	0.00
6 - 10 years	3	7	30.00	22.58
11 - 15 years	2	5	20.00	16.13
Over 15 years	1	5	10.00	16.13

Present Salary . Data regarding respondents who were high in initiating structure are compared by the present annual salary for their position in Table 27. As shown in Table 27, the majority of black (80.00%) and white (83.33%) respondents made $80,000 and above. One white (3.33%) respondent made less than $20,000. All other salaries but one were above $40,000.

85

Table 27
Table of High Initiating Structure by
Present Annual Salary From Position

Salary	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
1 - Under 20,000	0	1	0.00	3.33
20,000 - 34,999	0	0	0.00	0.00
35,000 - 39,999	0	0	0.00	0.00
40,000 - 44,999	1	0	10.00	0.00
45,000 - 44,999	0	1	0.00	3.33
50,000 - 59,999	0	1	0.00	3.33
60,000 - 69,999	0	1	0.00	3.33
70,000 - 79,999	1	1	10.00	3.33
80,000 and above	8	25	80.00	83.33

Highest Level of Education Completed.   Data
comparing those respondents who were high in initiating
structure by the highest level of education they
completed is represented in Table 28.   Black (90.00%)
and white (78.13%) respondents had more doctoral
degrees than any other.   There were four (12.50%) white
respondents and one (10%) black respondent who had
earned masters degrees.

Table 28

Table of High Initiating Structure by
Highest Level of Education Completed

Education	Frequency		Percent	
Completed	Black	White	Black	White
Bachelors Degree	0	2	0.00	6.25
Masters Degree	1	4	10.00	12.50
Doctoral Degree	9	25	90.00	78.13
Specialist Certificate	0	0	0.00	0.00
Professional	0	1	0.00	3.13
No Degree	0	0	0.00	0.00

Graduate and Undergraduate College Majors. Data revealing the respondents who scored high in initiating structure are compared by graduate and undergraduate college majors in Table 29. The top three majors for black respondents were education (22.22%), higher education (16.66%), and humanities (16.66%). The top three majors for the white respondents were higher education (20.76%), humanities (15.09%), and physical sciences (13.20%).

Table 29

Table of High Initiating Structure by
Graduate and Undergraduate Majors in College

Majors	Frequency		Percent	
	Black	White	Black	White
Social Sciences	1	11	5.56	20.76
Biological Sciences	1	2	5.56	3.78
Physical Sciences	1	7	5.56	13.20
Business	1	1	5.56	1.89
Administration/ Management	2	3	11.11	5.66
Humanities	3	8	16.66	15.09
Education	4	4	22.22	7.54
Higher Education	3	6	16.66	11.32
Fine Arts	0	2	0.00	3.78
Mathematics	0	1	0.00	1.89
Vocational Education	0	0	0.00	0.00
Other	2	8	11.11	15.09

Data relating to comparisons of information from
the demographic questionnaire reveal that the only
areas resulting in noticeable differences were
regarding the college majors, social sciences,
administration/management, education, and "other".

Ancillary Findings

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to
those black respondents from historically black and

88

non-historically black colleges to determine if there were statistically significant differences in their leadership behavior as assessed by the LBDQ-S. When the ANOVA was applied using the type of historically black or non-historically black institution as the independent variable and consideration as the dependent variable, analysis indicate that there was not a statistical difference in the respondents' consideration scores. An F value of 0.90 yielded a probability value (Pr>F) of 0.3667. The resulting Pr>F value of 0.3667 with 1 and 9 degrees of freedom was not statistically significant at the criterion 0.05 alpha level. Data in Table 30 presents a summary of the analysis.

The mean consideration score for respondents from historically black colleges was 47.1111111 and for respondents from non-historically black colleges was 52.500000. The difference in means was 5.3888890 for the two groups. The standard deviation for respondents from historically black colleges was 7.65578939, compared with 2.12132034 for respondents from non-historically black colleges. The difference in mean scores indicates that black chief administrators from non-historically black colleges tended to engage in consideration leadership behavior more frequently than

89

black chief administrators from historically black
colleges.

Table 30

Analysis of Variance: By Consideration of Black Chief Administrators From Historically and Non-Historically Black Colleges

Source	DF	Sum/ Square	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Type of Institution	1	47.5202020	47.5202020	0.90	0.3667
Error	9	473.3888889	52.5987654		
Total	10	520.9090909			

Comparison Between Mean Scores of Black Chief Administrators From Historically and Non-Historically Black Colleges

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Historically Black	9	47.1111111	7.65578939
Non-Historically Black	2	52.5000000	2.12132034

When the ANOVA was applied using the type of
institution as the independent variable and initiating
structure as the dependent variable, an analysis
indicates that there was no statistical difference in
respondents' initiating structure scores. An F value
of 2.61 yielded a probability value (Pr>F) of 0.1404.
The resulting Pr>F value of 0.1404, with 1 and 9
degrees of freedom, was not statistically significant

90

at the criterion 0.05 alpha level. Data in Table 31
presents a summary of the analysis.

The mean initiating structure score for black
chief administrators from historically black colleges
was 47.7777778, and for black chief administrators from
non-historically black colleges was 41.5000000. The
difference in mean scores was 6.2777770 for the two
groups. The standard deviation for black respondents
from historically black colleges was 3.7006006,
compared with 10.6066017 for respondents from non-
historically black colleges. The difference in mean
scores indicate that black chief administrators from
historically black colleges tended to engage in
initiating structure leadership behavior more
frequently than black chief administrators from non-
historically black colleges and universities.

Table 31

Analysis of Variance: By Initiating Structure of
Black and White Chief Administrators From
Historically and Non-Historically Black Colleges

Source	DF	Sum/ Square	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Type of Institution	1	64.4898990	64.4898990	2.61	0.1404
Error	9	222.0555556	24.6728395		
Total	10	286.5454545			

Comparison Between Mean Scores of Black Chief
Administrators From Historically and Non-Historically
Black Colleges

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Historically Black	9	47.7777778	3.7006006
Non-Historically Black	2	41.5000000	10.6066017

Summary of the Chapter

Eighty chief administrators (black n=11, white
n=69) of colleges and universities within the SREB
states returned usable surveys to participate in this
study that examined and compared self-perceived leader
behavior and characteristics of black and white chief
administrators of colleges and universities. An
assessment of the study's two research questions was
accomplished through survey research procedures
utilizing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

92

Self (LBDQ-S) and accompanying demographic questions.
Those two instruments were used to ascertain
respondents' self-perceived leadership behaviors and
their demographic characteristics.

Data collected in the study focused on two
specific types of self-perceived leader behavior
(initiating structure and consideration),and included
seven demographic variables, (respondents' race,
gender, age, years in present position, present salary,
highest degree earned, and college majors).
Statistical data were analyzed at the 0.05 alpha level
of significance using the General Linear Model of the
Statistical Analysis Systems (SAS). The demographic
data were also presented in frequency distributions and
analyzed through the comparisons of percentiles. A
two-tailed T-Test using ANOVA was used to determine
statistically significant differences in leader
behavior and characteristics. A statistically
significant difference was found between black and
white chief administrators in the area of initiating
structure in relation to self-perceived leader
behavior. Additionally, significant differences were
found in the following demographic variable areas: (a)
black respondents were significantly higher than white
respondents in the 55 to 59 age group for
consideration, (b) white respondents were significantly

93

higher in consideration for the major of humanities, (c) black respondents were statistically significantly higher than white respondents in the major of higher education in consideration, (d) black respondents who responded to the major "other" were significantly higher in consideration than the white respondents.

A comparison of percentiles through frequency distributions was also used to observe demographics. The data revealed that most demographic characteristics were very similar. The area that did reveal noticeable differences was the area of college majors. Whites were much more likely to have social science as a college major, and blacks were more likely to have administration/management, education, and "other" as college majors.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study. It is organized around summaries of the following sections: (a) purpose, (b) procedures, (c) descriptive data, (d) summary findings, (e) ancillary findings, (f) conclusions (g) ancillary conclusions, (h) implications, (i) recommendations, and (j) recommendations for future study.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities.

The following specific research questions guided the study:

Question 1: Is there a difference in leadership behavior between black and white chief administrators as assessed by the LBDQ-S?

Question 2: What are the differences and similarities in demographic characteristics of black and white chief administrators?

Procedures

This study used a static group comparison design (Campbell and Stanley, 1963) to examine and compare

95

self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities. The study was developed through an examination of the literature and an underlying theoretical framework grounded in models that describe leader behavior.

To collect the study's data, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S) (Halpin, 1957) with an attached demographic questionnaire, a cover letter, and postage-paid return envelopes were mailed to each participant. The LBDQ-S measured two (consideration and initiating structure) different dimensions of self-perceived leader behavior. The demographic questionnaire was used to collect data regarding respondents' characteristics.

The population for this study consisted of chief administrators of the 538 four-year colleges and universities, both public and private, within the 15 Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. The sample used was 150 randomly selected black (n=19) and white (n=132) chief administrators of colleges and universities. Due to the invalidity of two of the random samples, the total **n** changed to 148, and the sample white **n** changed to 130. This group was identified through three sources: (a) the <u>Peterson's Register of Higher Education</u> (1994), (b) the official

membership list from the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), and (c) the "Black Issues in Higher Education" (1993) publication. Three mailings of the LBDQ-S and demographic questions produced a response rate of 61.1 percent for black respondents and 53.0 percent for white respondents, which exceeded the 50 percent plus one accuracy requirement for survey studies (Kerlinger, 1986).

Data from the responses to the surveys were systematically recorded into a coded database file that was eventually transferred to the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) computer program. The SAS program was used to produce frequency tables, means, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between the demographic variables and leader behaviors. The probability criterion level for rejecting the null hypothesis was established at the 0.05 significance level, using a two-tailed T-Test to solve for the mean. At the 0.05 alpha level, one could be 95 percent assured that there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores (Sprinthall, 1990).

Descriptive Data

Demographic data collected in this study consisted of the distribution of responses by: race, gender, age, total years in position, present annual salary, highest degree earned, college majors, and

demographically by respondents high in consideration and initiating structure. The demographic data produced a general profile of the respondents, and through the use of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), allowed the researcher to test for statistically significant differences of the two leader behavior sub-groups by each targeted demographical characteristic.

Institutions in 14 states were represented in the responses to the survey. The distribution of responses by state is detailed in Appendix G. Private institutions were represented as the largest percentage for both black and white respondents, 54.5 percent (n=6) for black and 63.8 percent (n=44) for white respondents. The public institutions return percentage rates were 45.5 percent (n=5) for the black and 36.2 percent (n=25) for the white respondents.

In relation to race, there were 13.8 percent (n=11) black and 86.2 percent (n=69) white respondents. With regard to gender, 90.9 percent (n=10) black respondents and 89.9 percent (n=62) white respondents were male, and 9.1 percent (n=1) black and 10.1 percent (n=7) white were female respondents. Data for black respondents revealed that 9.1 percent (n=1) were between the ages of 39 and 44; 0.0 percent (n=0) were between the ages of 45 and 49; 36.4 percent (n=4) were between the ages of 50 and 54; 18.2 percent (n=2) were

98

between the ages of 55 and 59; and 36.4 percent (n=4) were between the ages of 60 years old or over. For the white respondents, 7.2 percent (n=5) were between the ages of 39 and 44; 13.0 percent (n=9) were between the ages of 45 and 49; 36.2 percent (n=25) were between the ages of 50 and 54; 17.4 percent were between the ages of 55 and 59; and 26.1 percent (n=18) were 60 years old or over.

With regard to the total number of years that the respondents have been in their position, data revealed that for black respondents, 0.0 percent (n=0) were in their positions for under one year, 27.3 percent (n=3) were in their position for one to three years, 9.1 percent (n=1) were in their position six to ten years, and 18.2 (n=2) were in their position over fifteen years. For the white respondents, 10.3 percent (n=7) were in their position for under one year, 22.1 percent (n=15) were in their position for one to three years, 8.8 percent (n=6) were in their position for four to five years, 26.5 percent (n=18) were in their position six to ten years, 14.7 percent (n=10) were in their position eleven to fifteen years, and 17.6 percent (n=12) were in their position for over fifteen years.

Data relative to respondents' present annual salary revealed that both black and white respondents had high representation in the salary range of over

99

$80,000. The black respondents were in three salary ranges: 9.1 percent (n=1) were between $35,000 and $39,999; 9.1 percent (n=1) were between $60,000 and $69,999; and 81.8 percent (n=9) were at $80,000 and above salary range. The white respondents were in five salary ranges: 1.5 percent (n=1) were under $20,000; 4.5 percent (n=3) were between $45,000 and $49,999; 3.0 percent (n=2) were between $50,000 and 59,999; 7.6 percent (n=5) were between $60,000 and $69,999; 6.1 percent (n=4) were between $70,000 and 79,999; and 77.3 percent (n=51) were at the $80,000 and above salary range. Three white chief administrators did not respond to this item.

The data indicated, in relation to highest degree earned, that for black respondents 9.1 percent (n=1) had earned a masters degrees, and 90.9 percent (n=10) earned a doctoral degree. For the white respondents, 2.9 percent (n=2) earned bachelors degrees, 11.6 percent (n=8) earned masters degrees, 1.4 percent (n=1) earned a specialists certificate, 79.7 (n=55) earned doctoral degrees, 2.9 percent (n=2) earned professional recognition, and 1.4 percent (n=1) earned no degree. The doctoral degree was overwhelmingly the most frequent level of education completed.

In relation to undergraduate and graduate majors, data were somewhat similar. The top three percentages

for college majors for black respondents were: 27.3

percent (n=3) for humanities, 27.3 percent (n=3) for

higher education, and 45.5 percent (n=5) for education

majors. For white respondents, the top three

percentages for college majors were: 23.2 (n=16) for

higher education, 26.1 percent (n=18) for humanities

majors, and 32.4 percent (n=22) for social science

majors. For both groups, humanities and higher

education majors ranked among the top.

Summary of Findings

An analysis of the data collected provided the

following findings which are presented in relation to

the research questions that guided the study.

Question 1: Is there a difference in leadership

behavior between Black and White chief administrators

as assessed by the LBDQ-S? In relation to the sub-

scale of consideration for the survey instrument LBDQ-

S, there was found to be no statistically significant

differences between black and white chief

administrators. The difference in mean scores for the

two respondent groups indicated that white chief

administrators tended to engage in consideration

leadership behavior more than black chief

administrators.

In relation to the sub scale of initiating

structure for the LBDQ-S, a statistically significant

difference was found between black and white chief administrators initiating structure leader behavior. The difference in mean scores between the two groups indicated that black chief administrators tended to engage in initiating structure leader behavior more than white chief administrators.

Question 2: What are the differences and similarities in demographic characteristics of Black and White administrators? In relation to the demographic data and those respondents who scored "high" in the consideration sub scale of the LBDQ-S, the following information was found. Responses by race were consistent with overall return rates and total population; the values by gender for both groups were almost exactly the same; and comparisons by age revealed that black respondents were general older than white respondents. Additionally, in relation to the total years chief administrators had been in their present position, it was found that for both groups the highest general pattern of tenure was from one to three years, six to ten years, and 11 to 15 years for both groups. Data revealed that in relation to chief administrators' present salary, for both black and white chief administrators, the most frequent present salary total is $80,000 and above. With regard to respondents' highest level of education completed and

102

those who scored high in consideration, both black and
white chief administrators had as a major the doctoral
degree, with the masters degree ranking second. In
relation to undergraduate and graduate college majors
for respondents, data revealed that the two most
frequent college majors for black chief administrators
were education and higher education, and social
sciences and humanities for white chief administrators.
Findings indicated that in relation to demographic
characteristics and consideration leader behavior,
black and white chief administrators were very similar
in every area other than college majors earned.

In relation to the demographic data and those who
scored "high" in initiating structure, the following
information was revealed. Responses regarding race
revealed that the percentage rate for black respondents
was higher than that of the total population. The
values by gender for both groups was basically
consistent with norms, with white female respondents
and black male respondents having higher frequencies in
initiating structure behavior than their counterparts.
Additionally, data showed that the most frequent age
for black respondents is 60 years old or over, and for
white respondents is the ages between 50 and 54. In
relation to respondents total years in their present
position, data revealed that the highest tenure for

both the black and white chief administrators was one to three years, and six to 10 years. Data regarding respondents' present annual salary indicated that overwhelmingly the majority of both the black and white chief administrators were in the $80,000 and above salary range. In reviewing data regarding the respondents' highest level of education completed, it was found that for both the black and white chief administrators, the doctoral degree by far was the most frequent and that the masters degree was the second most frequent highest level of education completed. In relation to undergraduate and graduate college majors for respondents, data revealed that the top college major for black chief administrators was education, and higher education, and humanities; for white chief administrators the top college majors were social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences.

Findings indicated that in relation to demographic characteristics and those who scored high in initiating structure leader behavior by race, that black respondents participated in initiating structure leader behavior at a higher frequency than stated in descriptive data, and that black respondents were generally older than white respondents. All other data for respondents were similar, with the exception of college majors, which revealed that humanities was the

104

only common top major among the two groups.

The findings of this study indicate that in relation to the statistical testing of demographics, in relation to initiating structure, no differences were found between black and white chief administrators. In relation to demographics and consideration, there were four areas that revealed statistically significant differences. Those were the college major areas of administration/management, education, "other", and social sciences.

Ancillary Findings. In reviewing results relative to black chief administrators, using the type of institution (historically or non-historically black) as the independent variable and consideration as the dependent variable, analysis indicate that there was no statistical difference in responses from black chief administrators from historically black colleges and non-historically black colleges. The difference in mean scores indicated that black chief administrators from non-historically black colleges tended to engage in consideration leadership behavior more than black chief administrators from historically black colleges.

When using type of institution as the independent variable and initiating structure as the dependent variable, analysis indicate that there was no statistical difference in respondents' initiating

105

structure scores. The difference in mean scores indicated that black chief administrators from historically black colleges tended to engage in initiating structure leadership behavior more than black chief administrators from non-historically black colleges.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities. A number of conclusions may be drawn from the findings yielded by analysis of the data generated by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self (LBDQ-S) and additional demographic questions. They include the following:

1. The findings of this study support those of Hicks (1985), which indicate that there is no significant relationship between black and white chief administrators in relation to the self-perceived leader behavior consideration. Black and white chief administrators were found to have similar leader behaviors in relation to areas such as mutual trust, respect, friendship, and warmth in relationships with other members of their group. This result differs from the findings of earlier studies (Johnson, 1971; Willie and MacLeish, 1976; Hill, 1975; and others) which

stated that black chief administrators caused an
environment that is threatening, hostile, and non-
supportive due to their leadership behaviors. Results
also contradicted assertions that white and black chief
administrators' leadership is fundamentally different,
and characterized black chief administrators as
authoritative and paternalistic leaders (Johnson 1971,
Hill, 1975).

2. The findings of this study indicate that there was
a significant difference between black and white chief
administrators in relation to self-perceived initiating
structure leader behavior. These results, support
those of Hicks (1985), who found black chief
administrators to engage in this type of leadership
behavior (defining precisely organizational structures,
establishing channels of communication, implementing
methods and procedures to get objectives accomplished)
more than white chief administrators. Results of this
study contradict those of Staples (1972), who implied
that black chief administrators were not independent
enough to engage in initiating structure.

3. The findings of this study indicate that in
relation to the demographic characteristics of black
and white chief administrators and consideration leader
behavior, that there were instances where four areas
revealed statistically significant differences. Those

areas were the age category of 55 to 59 and the college majors of humanities, higher education and "other."

4.   The findings of this study indicate that there was no statistically significant difference between black and white chief administrators in relation to demographic characteristics and initiating structure. Although there was a statistically significant difference found in black and white chief administrators initiating structure leader behavior, demographics did not seem to be a factor.

5.   The findings of this study indicate that in relation to demographics, the respondents had very similar profiles. The only results that revealed noticeable percentile differences were regarding graduate and undergraduate college majors in the areas of social sciences, administration/management, education and "other".

Ancillary Conclusions

Ancillary data reveal findings relative to black respondents from historically black and non-historically black colleges and universities. The following represent results relative to ancillary data:

1.   Results of ancillary findings indicate that there was no statistical difference between black respondents of historically black and non-historically black institutions in relation to consideration.

108

2. Results of ancillary findings indicate that there was no statistical difference between black respondents from historically black and non-historically black colleges and universities in relation to initiating structure.

3. Findings reveal that black respondents from non-historically black colleges and universities engage in consideration leader behavior more than respondents from historically black colleges and universities.

4. Findings reveal that black respondents from historically black colleges and universities engage in initiating structure leader behavior more frequently than respondents from non-historically black colleges and universities.

Implications

Results of data relative to consideration leader behavior found there to be no significant differences between black and white chief administrators. These findings support those of Hicks (1985), who found black and white presidents to be extremely similar in consideration behavior, indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth, as well as equal regard for the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of others. The findings of this study dispute those of the 1960's and 1970's (Johnson, 1971; Willie and Machish, 1976) which described black chief

109

administrators as authoritarian and paternalistic, operating in a hostile and threatening environment bought about by their efforts to maintain personal control.

Guyden (1992) suggested that the studies of the 1960's and 1970's examined the leader behaviors of those chief administrators who had been in their position before integration in 1954. Studies conducted in the early and middle 1980's included presidents of a new generation, many of which came through the faculty ranks during the troubled years of the 1960's and 1970's, with more sensitivity for greater participation and democratization, suggested Guyden (1992). Hicks (1985) had earlier refuted this theory, stating that it would be difficult to imagine such a profound change over a population the size of black chief administrators.

Results of this study imply that there was a statistical difference between black and white chief administrators initiating structure leader behavior. Data revealed that black chief administrators tended to engage in this leader behavior more frequently than white chief administrators. This data supports findings of Guyden (1992), who found black chief administrators to score high in initiating structure, and Hicks, who found that black chief administrators

110

tended to engage in initiating structure leader
behavior more frequently than white chief
administrators. Hicks (1985) found that black chief
administrators were strong in outlining the
relationships between themselves, staff or cabinet, and
others in the institutional environment. These results
imply that black chief administrators leader behavior
was strong in delineating the relationship between the
members of the group and themselves, and in endeavoring
to establish channels of communication, well-defined
patterns of organization, and ways of getting things
done.

Recommendations

An analysis of the descriptive data and findings
of this investigation have formed the basis for the
following recommendations:

1. Several authors have expressed the need for
empirical data in relation to the leadership behavior
of black chief administrators. This information should
be added to the body of literature relating to black
chief administrators to assist in filling a void in
this area.

2. Information relative to institutions within the
SREB states should be expanded and publicized or shared
with others interested in the information.

3. Some administrators have stated that the LBDQ may

111

be outdated and that there is a need for the revisement of the instrument to be more up-to-date with the words and phrases of the twenty-first century. It may be appropriate to critique the LBDQ to ascertain if it would be profitable to make changes or create a new instrument.

Recommendation For Future Study

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following additional recommendations are offered:

1. It is recommended that this study be replicated using all the states in the United States to ascertain if results of that study would agree with the finding of Hicks (1985) and this study.

2. It is recommended that this study be replicated using sampling procedures that would allow sample sizes to be more equal.

3. It is recommended that additional research be done in ten years to update the profile of both black and white presidents.

4. It is recommended that additional research be done in ten years to evaluate any possible changes between groups.

5. Strong variations in consideration and initiating structure scores were found among respondents within the same race. Therefore, it is recommended that

112

additional research be done to possibly ascertain rationale for those differences. It may be found that there is more relevance in researching areas other than race as effectors of leader behavior differences and similariites.

References

Adkinson, J. (1981). Women in school administration:
A review of the research. Review of Educational
Research, 51 (3), 311-343.

Amodeo, L.B. & Emslie, J.R. (1985). Minority women in
administration: Amethnographic study. (ERIC
Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258 123).

Babbie, E.R. (1973). Survey research methods.
Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Barnard, C.I. (1938). The functions of the executive.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barnard, C.I. (1940). Comments on the job of the
executive. Harvard Business Review, 18, 295-308.

Barnard, C.I. (1978). The function of the executive.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Beck, L.G. & Murphy, J. (1993). Preparing ethical
leaders: Over-viewing current efforts and
analyzing forces that have shaped them. Paper
presented at the Annual Meeting of the University
Council for Educational Administration. Huston,
TX, October 29-31, 1993). (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED 364 936).

Benezet, L.T., Katz, J. & Magnuson, F.W. (1981). Style
and substance:Leadership and the college
presidency. Washington, DC: ACE.

114

Bennis, W.G. (1989). Leadership theory and administration behavior. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, <u>4</u>, 259-300.

Binning, J.F. and Fernandez, G.H. (1986). <u>Heuristic processes in ratings of leader behavior: Assessing item-induced availability biases</u>. Paper presented at the Ninety-fourth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (Washington, DC, August 22-26, 1986). (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 281 122).

Bobbit, F. (1913). <u>Some general principles of management applied to problems of city school systems</u>. In, <u>The supervision of city schools, Twelth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I</u>. (pp. 137-196). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boyan, N.J. (1988). <u>Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association</u>. New York: Longman.

Buchele, R.B. (1977). <u>The management of business and public organizations</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Buros, O.K. (Ed.). (1978). <u>The eighth mental measurements yearbook</u>. Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon Press.

Cambell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Campbell, R. (1971). NCPEA - Then and Now. Paper presented at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration Meeting (University of Utah, August 1971).

Campbell, R. (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Chacko, H.E. (1988). Administrators' methods of upward influence and perceptions of their supervisors' leadership styles. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 476).

Chaffee, E.E. & Tierney, W.G., (1988). Collegiate culture and leadership strategies. New York: American Council on Education.

Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G. (1974). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cunningham, J.J. (1992). <u>Black administrators as</u> <u>managers in higher education</u>. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Research Association of Minority Professors. (Houston, TX, February, 1992). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 342 307).

Dipoboye, R. (1978). In, O. Buros (Ed). <u>The eighth</u> <u>mental measurements yearbook</u>. (pp. 1174-1176). Highland Park: Gryphon Press.

Evans, M.G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationships. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human Performance</u>, <u>5</u>, 277-298.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967) <u>A theory of leadership</u> <u>effectiveness</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F.E. (1981). <u>Leader attitudes and group</u> <u>effectiveness</u>. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Fiedler, F.E. & Garcia, J.E. (1987). <u>New appraoches to</u> <u>effective leadership: Cognitive resources and</u> <u>organizational performance</u>. New York: Wiley.

Fisher, J.L., Tack, M.W. & Wheeler, K.J. (1988). <u>The</u> <u>effective college president</u>. New York: Macmillian.

Fleishman, E.A. (1957). A leader behavior description
        for industry. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons
        (Eds.), <u>Leader behavior: Its description and</u>
        <u>measurement</u>. (pp. 120-133). Columbus, OH:
        College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State
        University.

Fleishman, E.A. (1973). <u>Current developments in the</u>
        <u>study of leadership</u>; a centennial event symposium
        held at Southern   Illinois University at
        Carbondale. Edwin A. Fleishman and James G. Hunt.
        (EDS). Carbondale, Southern Illinois University
        Press.

Follett, M.P. (1924). <u>Creative experience</u>. London:
        Longmans and Green.

Follett, M.P. (1941). <u>Dynamic administration</u>. New
        York: Harper & Row.

Gable, S. and Kavich, L. (1981). <u>Ethical perspectives:</u>
        <u>Leadership subscales applied to education</u>.
        University of Northern Iowa, Department of
        Educational psychology and Foundations (ERIC
        Document reproduction Service No. ED 252 293).

Gill, W.E. and Showell, D.R. (1991). The Cinderella
    concept of the black female in higher education.
    Paper presented at the National Conference on
    African Americans in Higher Education (College
    Park, MD, April 19, 1964). (ERIC Document
    Reproduction Service No. ED 331 379).

Griffin, B.Q. (1992). Perceptions of managers:
    Effects of leadership style and gender. Paper
    presented at the Annual Meeting of the
    Southeastern Psychological Association.
    (Knoxville, TN, March 1992). (ERIC Document
    Reproduction Service, No. ED 347 396).

Grill, S.A. (1978). Ideal expectations and real
    perceptions reported by presidents, members of
    boards of trustees, and administrative staff
    members relative to leader behaviors of
    selected Christian college presidents.
    Dissertation Abstracts International (39, 5230A).

Griffith, F. (1979). Administrative theory in
    education: Text and readings. Midland, Michigan:
    Pendell.

Guyden, J.A. (1992). Senior administrator perception
    of leader behavior and the relationships of the
    perception to senior administrator decision-
    making. Dissertation Abstracts International
    (University Microfilm Order No. 9228136).

119

Halpin, A.W. (1954). The leadership behavior and

    combat performance of airplane commanders.

    Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49,

    1922.

Halpin, A.W. (1958). Administrative theory in

    education. Chicago: Midwest Administration

    Center, University of Chicago.

Halpin, A.W. (1966). Theory and research in

    administration. New York: MacMillian.

Halpin, W.W. & Winer, B.J. (1952). The leadership

    behavior of the airplane commander. Washington,

    DC: Human Resources Research Laboratories,

    Department of the Air Force.

Harvard, P.A. (1986). Successful behaviors of black

    women administrators in higher education:

    Implications for leadership. Paper presented at

    the Annual Meeting of the American Education

    Research Association. (San Francisco, CA, April

    16-20, 1986). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service

    No. ED 272 092).

Hemphill, J.K. & Coons, A.E. (1950). Leader behavior

    description. Columbus, OH: Personnel Research

    Board, The Ohio State University.

Hemphill, J.K. & Coons, A.E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R.M. Stogill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), <u>Leader behavior: Its description and measurement</u>. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University.

Hicks, E.J. (1985). A study of leadership behavior of presidents of historically black colleges: A comparison with the leadership behavior of presidents of traditionally white colleges. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u> (46, 3618A).

Hill, J.R. (1975). Presidential perception: Administrative problems and needs of public black colleges. <u>The Journal of Negro Education</u>, <u>44</u>, 53-62.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, <u>16</u>, 321-338.

Hoy, W. K. and Misket, C. G. (1991). <u>Educational Research</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Johnson, T. (1971). The black college as a system. <u>Daedalus 100</u>, 798-812.

Jones, S. (1984). Adapting governance, leadership styles, and management to a changing environment. In A. Garibaldi (Ed.), <u>Black Colleges and Universities</u>: Challenge for the future (pp. 268-286). New York: Praeger.

Kappner, A.S. (1989). <u>Black Americans and educational leadership for the 21st century</u>. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (Washington, DC, March 29-April 7, 1989). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 308 885).

Kean, B., Leary, P, & Toth, P. (1992-93). School Principals: Left brain, right brain leadership. <u>National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal</u>. <u>5</u>, <u>No.2</u>, 69-73.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). <u>Foundations of behavorial research</u>. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kerr, C. & Gade, M.L. (1986). <u>The many lines of academic presidents: Time, place, and character</u>. Washington, DC: AGB.

Lane, W.R., Corwin, R.G. & Monahan, W.G. (1967). <u>Foundations of educational administration; a behavorial analysis</u>. New York: Macmillian.

Larwood, L., & Powel, G.N. (1981). Isn't it time we were moving on? Necessary future research on women in management. Group and organizational studies, 6, 65-72.

Lieberson, S. & O'Conner, J.F. (1972). Leadership and organizational performance: A study of large corporations. American Sociological Review, 37, 117-130.

Lucas, J. (1993). The relationship between self-perceived psychological types of male and female community college deans of instruction and their self-perceived leadership styles. (Doctorial dissertation, West Virginia University, 1993).

Mark, S.F. (1981). Leadership in higher education: A critical review of sex difference. Journal of Educational Equity and leadership, 1, 180-200.

Marshall, C. (1992). School administrators' values a focus on atypicals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28, 368- 386.

Mayo, E. (1933). The human problems in an industrialized civilization. New York: MacMillian.

Mayo, E. (1945). The social problems of an industrial civilization. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

123

McPhail, I.P.   (1989).   The changing job of the
    president.   Paper presented at the National
    Conference of the American Association on Higher
    Education.   (Chicago, IL, April 4, 1989).   (ERIC
    Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311 847).

Morton, C.N.   (1982).   Higher education's response to
    the needs of minority students: Leadership and
    institutional issues.   Paper presented at the
    Annual Conference of the Society of Ethnic and
    Special Studies.   (Edwardsville, IL, October,
    1982).   (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED
    224 853).

National Commission on Excellence in Educational
    Administration.   (1987).   Leader's for America's
    schools.   University Council for Educational
    Administration, Tempe, AZ, 1987.   (ERIC Document
    Reproduction Service No. ED 286 265).

Nagy, P. (1991).   An analysis of school administration
    using schema theory.   Paper presented at the
    Annual Meeting of the American Educational
    Research Association.   (Chicago, IL, April 3-7,
    1991).   (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED
    334 691).

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher
Education. (1993). Official membership of the
National Association for Equal Opportunity in
Higher Education in Black Excellence, published by
the National Association for Equal Opportunity in
Higher Education Excellence, Incorporated,
Washington, DC.

Oritz, F., (1981). Career patterns in education:
Women, men and minorities in public school
administration. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Papa-Lewis, R. & Leonard, P.Y. (1987). Factors and
perceptions of equal access for women and
minorities in educational administration. Paper
presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
Educational Research Association (Washington, DC,
April 20-24, 1987). (ERIC Document Reproduction
Service No. ED 283 282).

Peterson's Register of Higher Education. (1994).
Princeton, NJ: Peterson's Guides.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership.
Academy of Management Review, 2, 104-112.

Roethlisberger, F.J., and Dickson, W.J. (1939).
Management and the worker. Cambridge: Harvard
University Press.

Russell, R.J. & Wright, R.L. (1990). <u>Visible</u>
<u>minorities and women in education leadership: A</u>
<u>report of research in progress</u>. Paper presented
at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council for
Multicultural and Intercultural Education.
(Ottawa, Ontario, November, 1990). (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED 337 867).

Scott, W.G., Mitchell, T.R. & Birnbaum, P.H. (1981).
<u>Organization theory: A structural and behavioral</u>
<u>analysis</u>. Homewood, IL.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Serafin, A.G. (1992). <u>Charismatic behaviors and</u>
<u>traits of future educational leaders</u>. Paper
presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest
Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL.,
October 14-16, 1992). (ERIC Document Reproduction
Service No. ED 353 870).

Simon, H.A. (1947). <u>Administrative Behavior</u>. New
York: Macmillian.

Simon, H.A. (1968). Administrative Behavior. In, D.
Sills (Ed.) <u>International Encyclopedia of the</u>
<u>Social Sciences. (pp. 74-79). New York:</u>
<u>Macmillian</u>.

Smith, C.H. (1980). The peculiar status of
educational administrators - The university
setting. <u>Journal of Black Studies</u>, <u>10</u>
(March), 323-334.

Staples, R. E. (1972). The black scholar in academia. <u>Change</u>, (November), 44.

Stevenson, C.T. (1991). <u>College and university chief administrative officers: A comparison of black and white administrators (black administrators, college chief administrative officers)</u>. Dissertation Abstracts International, <u>52</u>, 06-A. (University Microfilms Order No. AAD91-33536).

Stogdill, R.M. (1974). <u>Handbook of leadership</u>. New York: The Free Press.

Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. (Eds.). (1957). <u>Leader behavior, its description and measurement</u>. Columbus, Ohio: College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University.

Stogdill, R. M. & Coons, A.E. (Eds.), (1973). <u>Leader behavior, its description and measurement</u>. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University.

Sutermiester, R. A. (1963). <u>People and productivity</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Syrett, M. & Hogg, C. (Eds.). (1992). <u>Frontiers of leadership: An essential reader</u>. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). Principles and methods of scientific management. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Tierney, W. G. (1987). Symbolism and presidential perceptions of leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. (Baltimore, MD, November 21-24, 1987). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 405).

Thomas, A. B. (1988). Principles and methods of scientific management. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Thompson, D. E. (1971). Favorable self-perception perceived supervisory style, and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 349-352.

Thompson, T.E. & Bjork, L.G. (1989). A collaborative approach to preparing minority administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Education Administration. (Columbia, SC, November 11-14, 1989). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 782).

Tonnsen, S., Pigford, A., Barnett, B., Truesdale, V., & Paqueo, E. (1989). <u>Programs for preparing minorities and women in education administration</u>. Southeastern Educational Improvement Lab., Research Triangle Park, NC. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 768).

Torres, B.M. & Kapes, J.T., (1990). <u>Work values and job satisfaction of potential minority leaders in community college settings</u>. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association. (Austin, TX, January 26, 1990). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319-469).

Vroom, V.H. & Yetton, W.W. (1973). <u>Leadership and decision making</u>. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Weber, M. (1947). <u>The theory of social and economic organizations</u>. Talcott Parsons (Ed.), A.M. Henderson & Talcott Parsons (trans.) New York: Free Press.

Wheeler, K.J. & Tack, M.W. (1989). Male and female college presidents: Leadership behaviors and attitudes. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association. (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 687).

Williams, A.Y. (1986). A profile of black female administrators at a large urban public university. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 16-20) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 407).

Williams, J.M., Fortune, J.C. & Pantili, L. (1991). Operationalization of leadership by black and white leaders: Implications for validity. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. (Lexington, KY, November 13-15, 1991). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 340 133).

Willie, C.V. (1984). Leadership development programs for minorities: An evaluation. Urban Review, 16 (4), 209-217.

Yukl, G.A. (1981). Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zhang,C. & Strange, C.C. (1992). Shaping
institutional vision the risk of presidential
leadership in small colleges. Paper presented at
the Annual Meeting of the Association for the
study of higher education. (Minneapolis, MN,
October 29-November 3, 1992). (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED 352 921).

APPENDICES

132

APPENDIX A

Sample of Colleges and Universities With

Black Chief Administrators

Total Sample of Colleges and Universities With
Black Chief Administrators

133

Alabama

Alabama A & M University
Talladega College
Tuskegee University

Arkansas

Arkansas State University

Florida

Bethume-Cookman College
Florida A & M University
Florida Memorial College

Georgia

Savannah State College

Louisiana

Grambling State University
Xavier University of Louisiana

Mississippi

Jackson State University

North Carolina

Baber-Scotia College
Bennett College
Shaw University

Tennessee

Middle Tennessee State

Texas

Huston-Tillotson College

Virginia

Hampton University
Norfolk State University

APPENDIX B

Total Sample of Colleges and Universities With

White Chief Administrators

Total Sample of Colleges and Universities With
White Chief Administrators

Alabama

Auburn University at Montgomery
Huntington College
International Bible College
Samford University
Spring Hill College

Arkansas

Harding University
University of Arkansas

Florida

Eckerd College
Florida Atlantic University
Florida Institute of Technology
International Academy of Merchandising & Design
International College
ITT Technical Institute
Jones College
Lynn University
Southeastern College of the Assemblies of God
Tampa College
University of Central Florida
University of Miami
University of North Florida

Georgia

Augusta College
Brewington-Parker College
Covenant College
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia Southern University
Kennesaw State College
Savannah College of Art & Design
Southern College of Technology
University of Georgia
Valdosta State University
West Georgia College

Kentucky

Bellarmine College
Clear Creek Baptist Bible College
Cumberland College
Lexington Baptist College

Pikeville College
University of Louisville

Louisiana

McNeese State University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
University of Southwestern Louisiana

Maryland

Baltimore Hebrew University
Capitol College
College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Eastern Christian College
Western Kentucky University
Goucher College
John Hopkins University
New Israel Rabbinical College
St. Johns College
Salisbury State University
University of Maryland at Baltimore
Washington Bible College

Mississippi

Belhaven College
Magnolia Bible College
Mississippi College
University of Southern Mississippi
Wesley College
William Carey College

North Carolina

Barton College
Belmont Abbey College
Davidson College
Elon College
Gardner-Webb University
High Point University
Lees-McRae College
North Carolina Wesleyan College
St. Albans Presbyterian College
Wingate College
Incarnate Word College

Okalahoma

Cameron University
Mid-American Bible College
Oklahoma Christian University

Oklahoma State University
Oral Roberts University
Phillips University
South Nazarene University
University of Tulsa

South Carolina

Anderson College
Central Wesleyan College
Costal Carolina University
Converse College
Francis Marion University
Limestone College
Medical University of South Carolina
Presbyterian College

Tennessee

Austin Peay State University
Belmont University
Crichton College
East Tennessee State University
Lambuth University
Lee College
Union University
University of Tennessee at Martin
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
University of Tennessee, Memphis
William Jennings Bryan College

Texas

Angelo State University
Arlington Baptist College
Baylor University
East Texas State University at Texarkana
Hardin-Simmons University
Howard Payne University
Institute for Christian Studies
Letourneau University
Lubbock Christian University
McMurray University
Sam Houston State University
Southwest Texas State
Sul Ross State University
Texas A&M University
Texas A&M University at Galveston
Texas A&M University, Kingsville
Texas Chiropractic College
Texas Tech University
Texas Women's University

University of Houston-Victoria
University of North Texas
University of St. Thomas
University of Texas at Brownsville
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston
University of Texas-Pan American

Virginia

Averett College
Eastern Mernunite College
Ferrun College
Hampden-Sydney College
Liberty University
Randolph-Macon Women's College
Shenandoan University
University of Virginia
Virginia Intermont College
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

APPENDIX C

Total Random Sample of Colleges and Universities

Within the Southern Regional Education

Board States

Random Sample of Colleges and Universities
Within the Southern Regional Education Board States

Alabama

Alabama A & M University
Auburn University at Montgomery
Huntington College
International Bible College
Samford University
Spring Hill College
Talladega College
Tuskegee University

Arkansas

Arkansas State University
Harding University
University of Arkansas

Florida

Bethume-Cookman College
Eckerd College
Florida A & M University
Florida Atlantic University
Florida Institute of Technology
Florida Memorial College
International Academy of Merchandising & Design
International College
ITT Technical Institute
Jones College
Lynn University
Southeastern College of the Assemblies of God
Tampa College
University of Central Florida
University of Miami
University of North Florida

Georgia

Augusta College
Brewington-Parker College
Covenant College
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia Southern University
Kennesaw State College
Savannah College of Art & Design
Savannah State College
Southern College of Technology
University of Georgia

Valdosta State University
West Georgia College

Kentucky

Bellarmine College
Clear Creek Baptist Bible College
Cumberland College
Lexington Baptist College
Pikeville College
University of Louisville

Louisiana

Grambling State University
McNeese State University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Xavier University of Louisiana

Maryland

Baltimore Hebrew University
Capitol College
College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Eastern Christian College
Western Kentucky University
Goucher College
John Hopkins University
New Israel Rabbinical College
St. Johns College
Salisbury State University
University of Maryland at Baltimore
Washington Bible College

Mississippi

Belhaven College
Jackson State University
Magnolia Bible College
Mississippi College
University of Southern Mississippi
Wesley College
William Carey College

North Carolina

Baber-Scotia College
Barton College
Belmont Abbey College
Bennett College

Davidson College
Elon College
Gardner-Webb University
High Point University
Lees-McRae College
North Carolina Wesleyan College
St. Albans Presbyterian College
Shaw University
Wingate College
Incarnate Word College

Okalahoma

Cameron University
Mid-American Bible College
Oklahoma Christian University
Oklahoma State University
Oral Roberts University
Phillips University
South Nazarene University
University of Tulsa

South Carolina

Anderson College
Central Wesleyan College
Costal Carolina University
Converse College
Francis Marion University
Limestone College
Medical University of South Carolina
Presbyterian College

Tennessee

Austin Peay State University
Belmont University
Crichton College
East Tennessee State University
Lambuth University
Lee College
Middle Tennessee State
Union University
University of Tennessee at Martin
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
University of Tennessee, Memphis
William Jennings Bryan College

Texas

Angelo State University
Arlington Baptist College

Baylor University
East Texas State University at Texarkana
Hardin-Simmons University
Howard Payne University
Huston-Tillotson College
Institute for Christian Studies
Letourneau University
Lubbock Christian University
McMurray University
Sam Houston State University
Southwest Texas State
Sul Ross State University
Texas A&M University
Texas A&M University at Galveston
Texas A&M University, Kingsville
Texas Chiropractic College
Texas Tech University
Texas Women's University
University of Houston-Victoria
University of North Texas
University of St. Thomas
University of Texas at Brownsville
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston
University of Texas-Pan American

Virginia

Averett College
Eastern Mernunite College
Ferrun College
Hampden-Sydney College
Hampton University
Liberty University
Norfolk State University
Randolph-Macon Women's College
Shenandoan University
University of Virginia
Virginia Intermont College
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

APPENDIX D

The Research Instrument

and Scoring Key

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Self

and Demographic Questions

Originated by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to
describe how you behave as a leader.   This is not a test of ability.
It simply asks you to describe as accurately as you can, how you
behave as a leader of the group that you supervise.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items,
refers to a department, division, unit, or collection of people that
you supervise.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit that you
supervise.

DIRECTIONS:

    a.   READ each item carefully.

    b.   THINK about how frequently you engage in the behavior described by the item.

    c.   DECIDE whether you (A) Always, (B) Often, (C) Occasionally, (D) Seldom or (E) Never act as described by the item.

    d.   DRAW A CIRCLE around <u>one</u> of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A	=	Always
B	=	Often
C	=	Occasionally
D	=	Seldom
E	=	Never

<u>As a Leader, I:</u>

1.   Do personal favors for group members .... A   B   C   D

2.   Make my attitudes clear to the group .... A   B   C   D

3.   Do little things to make it pleaseant to be a member of the group .... A   B   C   D

4.   Try out my new ideas with the group .... A   B   C   D

5.   Act as the real leader of the group .... A   B   C   D

6.   Am easy to understand .... A   B   C   D

7.   Rule with an iron hand .... A   B   C   D

8.   Find time to listen to group members .... A   B   C   D

9.   Criticize poor work .... A   B   C   D

10.   Give advance notice of changes .... A   B   C   D

11.   Speak in a manner not to be questioned .... A   B   C   D

12.   Keep to myself .... A   B   C   D

13.   Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members .... A   B   C   D

14.   Assign group members to particular tasks .... A   B   C   D

15.   Am the spokesman of the group .... A   B   C   D

16. Schedule the work to be done .... A   B   C   D

17. Maintain definite standards of performance .... A   B   C   D

18. Refuse to explain my actions .... A   B   C   D

19. Keep the group informed .... A   B   C   D

20. Act without consulting the group .... A   B   C   D

21. Back up the members in their actions .... A   B   C   D

22. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines .... A   B   C   D

23. Treat all group members as my equals .... A   B   C   D

24. Encourage the use of uniform procedures .... A   B   C   D

25. Get what I ask for from my superiors .... A   B   C   D

26. Am willing to make changes .... A   B   C   D

27. Make sure that my part in the organization is understood
     by group members .... A   B   C   D

28. Am friendly and approachable .... A   B   C   D

29. Ask that group members follow standard rules and
     regulations .... A   B   C   D

30. Fail to take necessary action .... A   B   C   D

31. Make group members feel at ease when talking with them .... A   B   C   D

32. Let group members know what is expected of them .... A   B   C   D

33. Speak as the representative of the group .... A   B   C   D

34. Put suggestions made by the group into operation .... A   B   C   D

35. See to it that group members are working up to capacity ... A   B   C   D

36. Let other people take away my leadership in the group ..... A   B   C   D

37. Get my superiors to act for the welfare of the group
     members .... A   B   C   D

38. Get group approval in important matters before going
     ahead .... A   B   C   D

39. See to it that the work of group members is coordinated.... A   B   C   D

40. Keep the group working together as a team .... A   B   C   D

148

Background Information

Please check the appropriate space or provide information where needed:

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Race: Black_____ White_____ Other_____

3. Age (Check one):

    _____20-29   _____45-49
    _____30-34   _____50-54
    _____35-39   _____55-59
    _____39-44   _____60 or over

4. Time in present position (Check one):

    __Under 1 year   _____6-10 years
    __1-3 years   _____11-15 years
    __4-5 years   _____over 15 years

5. Present annual salary from position (Check one):

    _____Under 20,000   _____45,000 - 49,999
    _____20,000 - 24,999   _____50,000 - 59,999
    _____30,000 - 34,999   _____60,000 - 69,999
    _____35,000 - 39,999   _____70,000 - 79,999
    _____50,000 - 44,999   _____80,000 and above

6. Check highest level of education completed:

    _____Bachelor's Degree   _____Specialist Certificate   _____Professional
    _____Master's Degree   _____Doctoral Degree

7. Majors in college (indicate U or G for undergraduate or graduate). Please reflect both.

    _____Social Sciences   _____Education
    _____Biological Sciences   _____Education, Higher
    _____Physical Sciences   _____Fine Arts
    _____Business   /   _____Mathematics
    _____Administration/Management _____Vocational Education
    _____Humanities   (Home Ec., Voc. Ag.)
                                    _____Other (Please specify)

8. Graduate of_____(first degree)
              (undergraduate institution)

   Graduate of_____(other degree)
              (undergraduate institution)

9. Graduate of_____(first degree)
              (graduate institution).

   Graduate of_____(other degree)
              (graduate institution)

10. Previous positions held:

a. _____   c. _____
   Title   Title

b. _____   d. _____
   Title   Title

11. What level of education and major would you consider most helpful for a potential or newly appointed college president?

_____   _____
        Degree   Major

12. What previous experience would you consider to be most helpful to a potential or newly appointed college president?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Your institution is: A — Historically Black
                           B — Traditionally White

14. Your total undergraduate student enrollment is:_____

15. Your percentage of black students is:_____

/

SCORING KEY FOR CONSIDERATION

Item No.	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
1	4	3	2	1	0
3	4	3	2	1	0
6	4	3	2	1	0
8	4	3	2	1	0
12	0	1	2	3	4
13	4	3	2	1	0
18	0	1	2	3	4
20	0	1	2	3	4
21	4	3	2	1	0
23	4	3	2	1	0
26	4	3	2	1	0
28	4	3	2	1	0
31	4	3	2	1	0
34	4	3	2	1	0
38	4	3	2	1	0

SCORING KEY FOR INITIATING STRUCTURE

Item No.	Always	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
2	4	3	2	1	0
4	4	3	2	1	0
7	4	3	2	1	0
9	4	3	2	1	0
11	4	3	2	1	0
14	4	3	2	1	0
16	4	3	2	1	0
17	4	3	2	1	0
22	4	3	2	1	0
24	4	3	2	1	0
27	4	3	2	1	0
29	4	3	2	1	0
32	4	3	2	1	0
35	4	3	2	1	0
39	4	3	2	1	0

Items in the Consideration Scale

Item No.	Item
1.	He does personal favors for group members.
3.	He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
6.	He is easy to understand.
8.	He finds time to listen to group members.
12.	He keeps to himself.*
13.	He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
18.	He refuses to explain his actions.*
20.	He acts without consulting the group.*
21.	He backs up the members in their actions.
23.	He treats all group members as his equals.
26.	He is willing to make changes.
28.	He is friendly and approachable.
31.	He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.
34.	He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
38.	He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.

Items 5, 10, 15, 19, 25, 30, 33, 36, 37 and 40 are not scored on either dimension.

* These items are scored in reverse.

Items in the Initiating Structure Scale

Item No.	Item

2. He makes his attitudes clear to the group.

4. He tries out his new ideas with the group.

7. He rules with an iron hand.

9. He criticizes poor work.

11. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.

14. He assigns group members to particular tasks.

16. He schedules the work to be done.

17. He maintains definite standards of performance.

22. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.

24. He encourages the use of uniform procedures.

27. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood
     by all group members.

29. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

32. He lets group members know what is expected of them.

35. He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.

39. He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.

154

APPENDIX E

Cover Letter, First Survey Mailing

West Virginia University

Dear Chief Administrator:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Administration at West Virginia University. The focus of my dissertation research is to compare self perceived leader behavior and characteristics of Chief administrators in the Southern Regional Education Board States. Data from this study will not only serve as a model for new chief administrators but will also enlarge the body of leadership knowledge generally, and college presidential leadership specifically.

You are being asked to describe your leadership behavior as accurately as possible on the enclosed Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. There are no right, wrong, or expected answers. The instrument was originated at The Ohio State University and has been used successfully for nearly thirty years.

Completion of the questionnaire implies your consent to participate in the study. While you do not have to respond to every item, my study will be stronger if you do so. However, because the study is seeking aggregate data, your responses will be anonymous and individual institutions will not be identified in the presentation of the study's findings. Please use the self-addressed envelope to return your completed response to the survey by July 29, 1994.

If you have any concerns about the questionnaire or the study or would like a summary of the results, please feel free to contact me at (304) 766-3282.

I greatly appreciate your time and assistance for your participation in this research effort.

Sincerely,

Gregory D. Epps

156

APPENDIX F

Cover Letter, Second Survey Mailing

Dear Chief Administrator:

A number of chief administrators of colleges and universities have already completed and returned the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire for my doctoral study of self perceived leader behavior and characteristics. However, more responses are needed to ensure accuracy of the study. If you have not yet completed the survey, please do so and use the self-addressed envelope to return the survey by the extended deadline of November 18, 1994.

Third copies of the survey and a return envelope are enclosed. If you have already returned the survey, please disregard this letter and accept my apologies for further intrusion on your time. Because the study is seeking aggregate data, your responses to the survey will be anonymous, and individual institutions will not be identified in the presentation of the study's findings.

The dissertation, for which the data are being collected, will lead to my successful completion of degree requirements and a doctorate in educational administration from West Virginia University. Please take a few minutes and complete this survey.

Your cooperation and assistance with this study is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gregory D. Epps

APPENDIX G

Distribution of Responses by

State

159

Frequency of Responses by State

State	Frequency Black	White	Percentage Black	White
Alabama	2	4	18.2	5.8
Arkansas	1	1	9.1	1.4
Florida	2	2	18.2	8.7
Georgia	1	7	9.1	10.1
Kentucky	0	3	0.0	4.4
Louisiana	0	3	0.0	4.4
Maryland	0	6	0.0	8.7
Mississippi	0	2	0.0	2.9
North Carolina	2	7	18.2	10.1
Oklahoma	0	3	0.0	4.4
Tennessee	1	6	9.1	8.7
Texas	1	12	9.1	17.4
South Carolina	0	4	0.0	5.8
West Virginia	0	0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	1	5	9.1	7.2

Self-Perceived Leader Behavior and Characteristics
of Black and White Chief Administrators
of Colleges and Universities: A Comparative Study

Gregory D. Epps

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine and compare self-perceived leader behavior and characteristics of black and white chief administrators of colleges and universities. The population for this study included chief administrators of the 538 four year colleges and universities, both public and private, within the 15 Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. A randomly selected sample of 18 black and 12 white (total n=150) chief administrators was used for this study.

Data collected by the LBDQ-S focuses on two types of self-perceived leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration. The demographic questionnaire collected data which included respondents, race, gender, age, years in present position, present salary, highest degree earned, and college majors. Data were analyzed at the 0.05 alpha level of significance using the General Linear Model of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Other data relating to demographics were presented in frequent distributions and analyzed through the comparison of percentiles.

161

The results of the study follow. There was a statistically significant difference found between black and white chief administrators in the area of initiating structure self-perceived leader behavior. Additionally, significant differences were found in the following demographic areas of consideration, the age group of 55 to 59, and the college majors humanities, higher education and "other".

An observation of demographics through frequency distributions revealed the most characteristics were very similar. The area that did reveal noticeable differences was the area of college majors. Whites were more likely to major in social science and blacks were more likely to major in administration/management, education, and "other".

The following major conclusions were drawn from the study's findings: (1) There was not a statistically significant difference found between black and white chief administrators consideration self-perceived leader behavior, but a difference was found in initiating structure; (2) Both black and white chief administrators scored high in initiating structure and consideration self-perceived leader behavior, indicating that both are effective leaders; (3) In relation to demographic characteristics, respondents had similar profiles.

162