

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS: THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG GENDER,
ATTRIBUTES, SKILLS AND INSTITUTIONS SERVED

by

NICOLE R. TOBIAS

(Under the Direction of Laura A. Dean)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between gender, leadership attributes, and skills in college presidents. Historically, the college president was a professor and served as the academic, spiritual, and ethical leader of campus (Schmidt, 1930). Since then, the role has become more administrative in nature (Thelin, 1994), requiring complex managerial and leadership skills. The study sought to determine what skill sets current presidents believe are important, whether they believe they have those skills, whether their attributes are related to the type of institution they serve, and whether there are differences in the responses of males and females.

The College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire (CPSAQ) was created and sent to 4,009 U.S. college presidents. The CPSAQ questions included demographics, educational and professional background, and skills ranked both for importance and perception of ability. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) was also included to assess the respondents on the constructs of communion/expressiveness and agency/instrumentality, which are reflective of traditional views of feminine and masculine gender roles.

Responses from 410 current college presidents yielded data that showed the respondents were similar to the national population in gender, institution size, and length of time in the presidency. Both male and female presidents received high scores in agency and communion, but female respondents scored significantly higher in communion attributes than the males. No differences were identified based on type of institution served. Honesty and integrity were found to be the most important skills overall, and the presidents perceive they have those qualities. Females gave higher ratings for both importance of skills and their own abilities.

In addition to utilizing the CPSAQ to assess the importance of skills and the skillset of college presidents, some respondents indicated interest in using the skills list for personnel evaluation purposes. Overall, it was determined that male and female college presidents across different institutional types are more similar than different and possess a similarly broad range of skills and leadership attributes, supporting the argument that women have the capacity to serve in the college presidency in greater percentages than currently exist.

INDEX WORDS: Gender, College Presidents, Attributes, Skills, Personal Attributes
Questionnaire

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS: THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG GENDER,
ATTRIBUTES, SKILLS, AND INSTITUTIONS SERVED

by

NICOLE R. TOBIAS

BSED, Mansfield University, 2003

MS, Shippensburg University, 2008

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

© 2013

Nicole R. Tobias

All Rights Reserved

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS: THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG GENDER,
ATTRIBUTES, SKILLS, AND INSTITUTIONS SERVED

by

NICOLE R. TOBIAS

Major Professor:	Laura A. Dean
Committee:	Merrily S. Dunn Karen Webber

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2013

DEDICATION

To my husband, Jeremy, thank you for your enduring support and patience. Your encouragement got me through some of the most difficult times in this process. You have supported me to achieve my goals and dreams and to always believe there are even bigger dreams and goals to pursue. The sky certainly is the limit for us.

Thank you to my grandparents for their stability in my life and their never ending love and support. From reading the newspaper with me when I was very young, to their love of crossword puzzles and watching the news, their embrace of lifelong learning is one of their greatest gifts to me.

To my teachers, professors, and educators over the last 28 years, you encouraged my love of learning and challenged me to be my best student of the world. To my classmates, and my doctoral cohort, the journey wouldn't have been the same with anyone else. We were fierce and all benefitted from the discussions, debates, and different perspectives. I am forever indebted to you for helping me to learn about myself and clarify my values both personally and professionally.

To my best friend, Crystal, I wouldn't be who I am if it weren't for our 22 years of friendship. Thank you for being you so I can be my most authentic me. To all of my close friends, thank you for your encouragement, the smiles and the laughter, and for always reminding me that I can do anything I pour my heart and soul into. Friends are the family you choose and I am so thankful I had the chance to choose you!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, thank you to Dr. Laura Dean. As my advisor, supervisor, professor and colleague, I have had the opportunity to spend the most time with you and to learn the most from you throughout the Ph.D. journey. Thank you for your patience, your encouragement, occasionally a shoulder to cry on, sometimes a strong push in a new direction, your honesty and, most of all, for believing I could do it.

Thank you also to Dr. Dunn and Dr. Webber for serving on my dissertation committee. Your passion for the topic, your feminist perspectives, and your genuine support and encouragement along the way are greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
1 Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study	6
2 Literature Review.....	8
Skills of University Presidents.....	11
Women College Presidents	22
Gender.....	25
Summary.....	35
3 Methodology.....	38
Participants.....	39
Research Questions.....	40
Research Instrument Creation and Design.....	41
Data Collection Methods and Timeline	48
Data Analysis	49
Delimitations.....	52
4 Findings.....	53
The Respondents.....	54

Skills on the CPSAQ.....	59
Skills and Institution Type	68
Gender.....	76
Current Institution Type.....	76
Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ).....	77
Results by Research Question.....	81
Summary	83
5 Summary, Discussion, and Implications.....	85
Discussion.....	86
Limitations	105
Applications and Implications for Future Practice	109
Suggested Future Research.....	112
Summary.....	114
REFERENCES	118
APPENDICES	
A Skills	128
B Solicitation Email.....	134
C Reminder Email	136
D College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire.....	138
E Statistical Analysis.....	148
F Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ).....	149
G Frequency Distributions of the Respondents	150
H Descriptive Statistics of the Skills Portion of the CPSAQ	158

I Spearman Rho Correlations between PAQ and Skills	167
--	-----

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1: Personal Leadership and General Leadership Top Five Skills	60
Table 4.2: Academic and Moral Leadership Top Five Skills	62
Table 4.3: Administrative, Executive and Presidential Leadership Top Five Skills	63
Table 4.4: Political and Strategic Leadership Top Five Skills.....	64
Table 4.5: Overall Top Five Skills for Importance.....	65
Table 4.6: Overall Top Five Skills for Ability.....	65
Table 4.7: Gender and Skills: Importance Ratings	66
Table 4.8: Gender and Skills: Ability Ratings	67
Table 4.9: ANOVA Results for Skill Importance and Institution Type	69
Table 4.10: ANOVA Results for Skill Ability and Institution Type	71
Table 4.11: Tukey Test Results for Skill Importance	73
Table 4.12: Tukey Test Results for Skill Ability	75
Table 4.13: Chi Square SPSS Output for Type of Doctorate and Current Institution Type.....	77

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Historically, the college president was a professor and served as the academic, spiritual, and ethical leader of campus (Schmidt, 1930). Since then, the role of the president has become more administrative in nature and requires decision-making that keeps the institution's reputation intact while keeping the institution popular among potential students in a competitive market and difficult economy (Thelin, 1994).

In the past few decades, the role of the college president has continued to change. Marquand (1986) discussed the changes in the roles of college presidents over time and contended that college presidents were moving away from their traditional roles as academic leaders and leaders in the "discourse on local and national public policy" (p. 1). Since that time, the American Council on Education has surveyed college and university presidents about a number of issues, one of which was their primary uses of time. In 2007, college and university presidents, overall, listed fundraising as the primary use of their time, followed by budget/financial management, community relations, and strategic planning (American Council on Education, 2007). In a later administration of the same survey, published in 2012, presidents listed budget/financial management as the primary use of their time, followed by fundraising, community relations, and strategic planning (Cook & Kim, 2012). While some of the primary uses of the presidents' time changed position on the list, the top four uses of the presidents' time remained the same.

In addition to the role of the presidency changing, so too are the demographics of students attending institutions of higher education. More students of nontraditional age are attending institutions of higher education around the country (Baum, 2010). From 2000-2010, the percentage of nontraditional students, or students over 25 years of age, increased by 42 percent (U.S. Department of Education, 2011a). More students are attending colleges on a part-time basis (Baum, 2010) rather than full time. There is an increasing number of veterans returning to college who require support and services specific to their life experience. Within this group, there is also an increase of women veterans returning to college campuses (Sander, 2012). Finally, more Hispanic Americans are attending college than in the past (Baum, 2010). More specifically, between 1976 and 2010, the number of Hispanic students attending college has increased by 10 percent, the number of Asian/Pacific Islander students increased by four percent, and the number of Black students attending college increased by five percent (U.S. Department of Education, 2011a). As the number of students of color increased over those 34 years, the percentage of White students has decreased by 22 percent (U. S. Department of Education, 2011a). Those statistics speak to institutions of higher education overall, but the trends are similar in community college settings. Data from IPEDS (as cited in American Association of Community Colleges, 2013) shows that more students attend community college part-time rather than full-time, more women than men attend community colleges, and the percentage of students of color is substantial.

News in higher education within the last few years has shown the drastic changes and trends facing administrators in higher education in 2012 and beyond. Public

institutions are facing declining state support and record cuts in funding, and in response, are raising tuition, causing greater student debt, increased numbers of student loans in default, and a reduction in access for low-income students (Hamilton & Armstrong, 2012). As more students are facing higher tuition and debt, they are finding themselves requiring employment and utilizing technology to take classes and obtain degrees from afar (Jenkins, 2012). Administrators will need to contend with the need to provide more online offerings as well as increased technology on their campuses to meet the needs of students.

Along with challenges spurred by changing student demographics and needs, college presidents are also facing pressures from governing boards and external entities. A recent situation involving the forced resignation and reinstatement of the President of the University of Virginia shows the increased involvement and power of governing boards in higher education (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2012). In the wake of the Pennsylvania State University scandal involving President Graham Spanier, Football Coach, Joe Paterno, and former Assistant Football Coach, Jerry Sandusky, the NCAA doled out sanctions that affected the institution at large, not just their athletic program (Wolverton, 2012). This shows the scrutiny college presidents face and that colleges have to deal with the implications of presidents' behaviors and choices.

As media coverage of higher education increases overall, and especially in response to higher costs of education, stakeholders are calling for increased quality, lower costs, greater assessment, and greater accountability (Carey, 2010). Politicians and parents around the country want to know that students are receiving a quality education at

an affordable price, and they want to know they are “getting their money’s worth.”

Presidents are called on to address these concerns and respond to the scrutiny that arises.

While the challenges facing higher education mount and the demographics of students continue to diversify, it could be argued that the demographics of college presidents may also need to change. In the past, college presidents have traditionally been White men in their 50s, but institutions have recently seen a steady but gradual increase in women college presidents (American Council on Education, 2011). While 16% of baccalaureate institution presidents were women in 1986 (Ross, Green, & Henderson, 1993), the percentage grew steadily to 23% in 2006 (American Council on Education, 2007) and 26% in 2011 (Green, Jaschik, & Lederman (2012). Data show that more women presidents serve in public baccalaureate institutions than private ones (Cook & Kim, 2012). Associates-granting institutions, however, have shown a dramatic increase in women presidents, rising from 8% in 1986 (Ross et al., 1993) to 29% in 2006 (ACE, 2007). The 1998 American Council on Education data also showed that of all women presidents, 42% served in institutions that have fewer than 2,000 students; 26.5% served in institutions with 2,001 to 5,000 students; 16.1% served at institutions with 5,001- to 10,000 students; and 15.1% served institutions with 10,000 or more students (Ross et al., 2000). Mary Gresham, Dean of the Graduate School of Education at the State University of New York at Buffalo, discussed the increase of women college presidents and said, “it would be wise to capitalize on – not marginalize – this amazing intellectual diversity in the hopes of finding new methods for addressing the challenges facing the academy” (Gresham, 2009, p. 2). The literature review, included in the next chapter, discusses the ways in which women lead, as well as the skills and characteristics women

bring to the workplace, and this study investigates whether gender plays a role in the importance and varying degrees of ability or skills for presidents and chief executive officers (CEOs) of institutions in higher education.

Antonaros (2010) studied gendered leadership styles and found that transformational leaders, those who exhibit communal leadership behaviors, were often considered more effective. In general, more women than men tend to use communal leadership styles and female presidents were found to be “slightly more likely than their male counterparts to be perceived by their followers as effective leaders” (Antonaros, 2010, p. 4).

As most women college presidents serve at institutions that grant associate’s degrees (ACE, 2011), it is important to consider women presidents of community colleges. The American Association of Community Colleges has defined six competencies for community college leaders. They are organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism (American Association of Community Colleges, 2006). Since community colleges and four-year institutions are seeing similar trends in the changing demographics of students, it is arguable that these competencies would be beneficial for women presidents of all types of higher education institutions.

Due to the low numbers of women in college presidencies, the lack of information and research about the skills needed to serve in the presidency, and the ever-changing nature of higher education and the students utilizing it, it is imperative that data is collected from men and women serving as college presidents in the United States. It is important to determine if there are differences in the skill sets of men and women

presidents. If there are not major differences among men and women presidents, then the argument can be made that there could be a more equitable distribution of gender in the college presidency. If there are differences, then there may be variations in the types of institutions in which women and men are able to contribute most effectively and be most successful.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationships between the leadership attributes (as defined by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire), skills, and career paths of college and university presidents in the United States. The study sought to determine what skill sets current presidents believe are important to be a college president, whether or not the responding presidents believe they have those skills, whether or not the presidents' attributes are related to the type of institution they serve, and, most importantly, if there are differences in the responses of male presidents and female presidents. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) along with the presidents' gender will be instrumental in analyzing whether or not different types of people are more likely to serve a certain type of institution. It is important to determine if presidents of certain types of institutions have similar qualities, or if presidents overall possess similar attributes and characteristics.

The self-reported assessment of each president's skill set, as well as the perceived importance of any set of skills, will also be useful and will give insight into the types of skills presidents need to have to lead a college in the current economic climate and with the current challenges in higher education, as seen by those currently holding the position. It has been found that one's rating of their own ability is positively correlated

with the ratings of their subordinates (Furnham & Stringfield, 1994). For this reason, and because this is a preliminary study, the presidents' self-assessment of their ability to perform the skills included in the CPSAQ is an appropriate way to collect this data. This information will be useful for those men and women at mid-level and upper-level administration who are considering the pursuit of a presidency.

Overall, this study seeks to answer the following broad research questions:

1. What, if any, relationship exists between the presidents' attributes (as defined by the PAQ) and their current role as president?
2. What, if any, relationship exists between the presidents' attributes and their personal qualities?
3. What, if any, relationship exists between the type of institution the presidents serve and the skills they deem are important in their role as president? Do the presidents perceive that they possess the important skills?
4. What, if any, relationships can be found between the presidents' demographic characteristics and the type of institution they serve? Is there a common profile of a president based on the type of institution they serve?

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

The American Council on Education (ACE) has collected and analyzed demographic information on college presidents since 1986. “The American College President Study is the only longitudinal, comprehensive source of demographic data on college and university presidents from all sectors of American higher education” (Cook & Kim, 2012, p. ix). Their latest publication, *The American College President 2012* highlights some of the similarities and differences in the data collected from college presidents from 1985 (found in the 1986 publication of the study) through 2011 (found in the 2012 publication).

According to Cook and Kim (2012), the percentage of college presidents that are women is the highest it has ever been, topping out at 26% in 2011, and women make up one-third of the recently hired presidents. Presidents are slightly older now than in 2006, rising to an average age of 61 years old from 60 years old (Cook & Kim, 2012). In the 2006 publication, presidents served an average tenure of 8.5 years, which decreased to 7 years in the 2012 publication (Cook & Kim, 2012).

While 90% of male college presidents are married, only 72% of their female counterparts are married (Cook & Kim, 2012). The statistics mirror this pattern for presidents who have children, as 90% of male presidents have children while only 72% of women presidents have children (Cook & Kim, 2012).

The 2011 data showed an increase in the number of college presidents whose position prior to the presidency was outside of academe. In 2001, 15% of presidents were outside of academe prior to the presidency, which decreased to 13% in 2006 and rose again to 20% in 2011. While the chief academic officer position is the most common position held by current presidents prior to their presidency (34%), 30% of current college presidents have never served as a faculty member (Cook & Kim, 2012).

The authors suggested that “opportunities for younger leaders, women, and people of color” could be limited due to institutions “increasingly selecting leaders with a great deal of senior executive experience in higher education” (Cook & Kim, 2012, p. x). Senior executive experience, experience in fundraising, skill in budget and finance management, and the ability to assess and be accountable for student learning are reported by long-serving presidents as being of increased importance. Overall, presidents spent their time working on fundraising, community relations, budgeting, and planning, but took their greatest satisfaction in their opportunities to work with students, administrators, and faculty (Cook & Kim, 2012).

Cook and Kim (2012) focus a chapter of *The American College President 2012* on the profiles of women college presidents in 2006 and 2011. “Women are most likely to head associates colleges (33.0%), followed by master’s colleges and universities (22.8%) and bachelor’s colleges (22.9%)” (p. 11). Women are least likely to preside over doctoral-granting institutions, although that percentage has risen from 14% in 2006 to 23% in 2011. Women are more likely to have served as the chief academic officer or provost than their male counterparts, and women presidents were more likely than male presidents to have an earned doctorate (Cook & Kim, 2012).

An article in the *Harvard Business Review* discussed the pathways for men and women to get to the “C-Suite” or the positions of Chief Information Officer (CIO), Chief Marketing and Sales Officer, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), General Counsel, Chief Supply-Chain Management Officer, Chief Human Resource Officer, and finally, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) (Groysberg, Kelley, & MacDonald, 2011). The authors reviewed executive profiles and interviewed managers about the requirements for the most senior leaders. One finding was that “once people reach the C-suite, technical and functional expertise matters less than leadership skills and a strong grasp of business fundamentals” (Groysberg, et al, 2011, p. 61). Specifically for the CEOs, strong communication skills, empathy, the ability to collaborate and build trust, and being a strategic thinker are increasingly important (Groysberg, et al, 2011). These are considered “softer” skills than the ones that had been necessary in the past (Groysberg, et al, 2011). This shows that the skills employees utilized to get to “C-Suite” may not be the skills necessary in their new management and leadership roles. Additional necessary skills the authors found include team-orientation, continuous multitasking, leading without rank, resisting stress, ensuring staff do not burnout, and doing it all with a smile (Groysberg et al, 2011).

One final phenomenon to be explored is that of college presidents returning to their undergraduate alma mater, or institutions like their alma mater, to become the president. People like Eric Barron (Florida State University; n.d.), Maravene S. Loeschke (Towson University; n.d.), James E. Bultman (Hope College; n.d.), Mary Reap (Marywood College; n.d.), and Francis L. Hendricks (Mansfield University; n.d.) are

recent examples of college presidents who returned to their undergraduate institution to serve as the President.

Skills of University Presidents

James Duderstadt (2007), past President of the University of Michigan, stated that:

in some ways, the university is even more complex than corporations or governments, because of the diversity of its many activities, some nonprofit, some publicly regulated, and some operating in intensely competitive marketplaces. It teaches students, conducts research for various clients, provides health care, engages in economic development, stimulates social change, and provides mass entertainment (athletics).

Many of these activities are conducted on a global scale. (p. 133)

In this changing environment, leaders of institutions of higher education are faced with challenges unlike that addressed by their predecessors.

A review of other literature written by current and past college presidents as well as a review of business related literature provided a list of skills necessary for leaders of complex corporations like institutions of higher education (Ahmed, 2005; American Association of Community Colleges, 2006; Catalyst, 2006; Duderstadt, 2007; Giannini, 2001; Goff, 2002; Green, et al., 2012; Gresham, 2009; Groysberg, Kelly, & MacDonald, 2011; Kaplan, Klebanov, & Sorensen, 2012; Kutarna, n.d.; Lopez, 2011; Mangi, Ghumro, & Abidi, 2011; Pierce, 2012; Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner, & Sabino, 2011; Shaw, 1999; Vineyard, 1993; Weill, 2009). These skills can be categorized into eight overarching areas of leadership including personal characteristics and general leadership

skills, academic leadership, administrative leadership, executive leadership, moral leadership, political leadership, presidential leadership, and strategic leadership.

Appendix A shows the accumulation of data and how it was coded and organized to create the “Overall Skills of University Presidents” section within this chapter.

Personal characteristics and general leadership skills. The first category of leadership skills to review is the presidents’ personal characteristics and their general leadership skills. Within the area of personal characteristics and leadership are the areas of general leadership skills, cognitive skills, personal attributes, and certain specific interpersonal skills. General leadership skills are broad and vast, and include aspects of self-awareness. Shaw (1999) stated that executive leaders need to know their strengths and weaknesses and be able to recognize their successes and failures.

As previously stated, Duderstadt (2007) believed that college presidents had “leadership responsibilities comparable to those of the CEO of a major corporation or the governor of the state” (p. 133). Presidents and executive leaders need to show leadership skills (Kutarna, n.d.) such as providing vision (Kutarna, n.d.; Shaw, 1999); providing thoughtful, informed, nimble, creative leadership (Pierce, 2012); inspiring others (Pierce, 2012; Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, 2011); leading by example (Pierce, 2012; Salas-Lopez et al., 2011); having drive and perseverance (Salas-Lopez et al., 2011); and demonstrating dedication, passion and commitment (Ahmed, 2005).

College presidents have the ability to influence priorities in the balance between teaching and research (Duderstadt, 2007) and to oversee all facets of university administration (such as personnel administration, academics, financial affairs, student affairs, facilities, and public relations) (Vineyard, 1993). Presidents should be dedicated

to the success of students and those who serve students (Goff, 2002), know the institution's culture and respect it (Shaw, 1999), and always show professionalism (American Association of Community Colleges, 2006).

Another component to being perceived as a leader is cognitive and intellectual skills. Mangi, Ghumro, and Abidi (2011) found that a leader needs to be perceived as sharp, learned, and an intellectual in times of organizational change and crisis.

Attributes necessary for leadership in business and higher education include being patient (Duderstadt, 2007), upbeat and optimistic (Duderstadt, 2007), and courageous (Salas-Lopez, et al., 2011). In the midst of organizational change, being perceived as creative, inspirational, and perceptive is beneficial for business leaders (Mangi, et al., 2011). Leaders are also expected to be organized (Kaplan, Klebanov, & Sorensen, 2012) and to have common sense (Goff, 2002), and they need to provide employees with the chance to be excellent, or to do important things really well (Shaw, 1999).

A review of the literature indicates that interpersonal skills are necessary in many categories of leadership. In general, however, the following interpersonal skills are beneficial to professionals across business sectors. To begin, leaders need to work with a diverse team and prioritize team building (Ahmed, 2005; Catalyst, 2007), create an environment of trust (Pierce, 2012), encourage their colleagues to provide feedback (Pierce, 2012), and provide hands-on engagement with faculty and students (Duderstadt, 2007; Salas-Lopez, et al., 2011). In addition, leaders need to be self-aware (Salas-Lopez et al., 2011). Catalyst, a "research and advisory organization working with businesses and the professions to build inclusive environments and expand opportunities for women at work" (Catalyst, 2007, para 1), asserts that leaders also need to be supportive by

encouraging, assisting and providing resources for others, as well as to consult by checking with others before making plans or decisions that affect them (Catalyst, 2007).

Team building was mentioned in the last paragraph as a priority. The literature associated with team building describes several components of building teams, such as crediting others (Shaw, 1999), utilizing teamwork, or reaching out to peers and cooperating with staff to establish relationships (Kaplan et al., 2012), collaboration (American Association of Community Colleges, 2006), and building relationships (Pielstick, 1998).

Academic and moral leadership. In addition to the personal characteristics and leadership skills of college presidents, presidents are charged with being the academic and moral leaders on their campuses. In the category of academic leadership, college and university presidents have a responsibility to ensure the quality and integrity of academic programs, provide academic leadership, enhance the institution's academic reputation, shape academic programs, be an educational leader, be an intellectual leader among the faculty, and place an emphasis on teaching and scholarship (Duderstadt, 2007). Presidents are also expected to be a public intellectual (Pierce, 2012), to learn as much as they can (Pierce, 2012), and to be intellectually stimulating (Catalyst, 2007).

As moral leaders on campus, college presidents need to possess skills in two categories: moral leadership and core values. One might argue that this section could also be called ethical leadership, but moral leadership is a better descriptor, as it involves more than right versus wrong. Moral leadership, as used in this section, is a broad umbrella that encompasses ethics, ethical decision making, having integrity, and being the moral leader of the campus. Moral leadership means making the "right" decision,

even when it is not a popular one, and it includes taking the high road even when it is more difficult to do so.

Core values include respect (i.e., valuing others, treating them fairly, and showing concern for their views and feelings) (Kaplan et al., 2012); demonstrating personal integrity (Kaplan et al., 2012; Kutarna, n.d.; Pierce, 2012; Salas-Lopez et al., 2011); finding a balance between work and home life (Kutarna, n.d.; Salas-Lopez et al., 2011); possessing honesty, fairness and objectivity (Salas-Lopez et al., 2011); and expecting civility (Shaw, 1999). Mangi, Ghumro, and Abidi (2011) found that employee satisfaction is higher when their leaders are honest.

Other skills that presidents and leaders need to exhibit within the category of moral leadership include speaking up with courage and conviction on moral issues (Duderstadt, 2007), influencing the values and practices of an organization (Duderstadt, 2007), having a pastoral role on campus (Duderstadt, 2007), and providing nurturing care and sympathetic understanding during difficult times (Duderstadt, 2007). Presidents provide leadership on an array of value-related issues on the campus (including the protection of academic values, institutional integrity, and pastoral care) (Duderstadt, 2007), and are the spiritual (Pierce, 2012) and moral (Duderstadt, 2007; Pierce, 2012) leaders on their campus. Presidents are also expected to act morally and ethically correct (Shaw, 1999), standing by their commitments (Kaplan et al., 2012), developing a healthy respect for the use of power in achieving their goals (Shaw, 1999), being a role model (Catalyst, 2007), and exhibiting character (Pielstick, 1998).

Administrative, executive, and presidential leadership skills. As the senior executive at the institution, presidents must possess administrative, executive, and

presidential leadership skills. As administrators, college and university presidents are involved in human resource and labor issues as well as management decisions.

Duderstadt (2007) stated that college presidents need to supervise the university administration; recruit key leadership of the university; recruit, build, and lead a quality team of executive officers; complete performance review and management; and make personnel changes when necessary. Mentoring staff, monitoring their performance, and rewarding them when appropriate are also cited as necessary for supervisors (Catalyst, 2007).

Mangi, Ghumro, and Abidi (2011) found that employee satisfaction is highest when their supervisors are instantaneous, understanding, knowledgeable, fascinating, and inspiring, and when they provide opportunities for the employee to feel attached to the place of employment. Supervisors, including presidents, also need to be understanding or allow employees' concerns and issues to be heard (Shaw, 1999), show gratitude and appreciation for the work of their employees (Shaw, 1999), and provide recognition (Ahmed, 2005) and personal support (Shaw, 1999) to their staff. Shaw (1999) encouraged presidents to find colleagues whose strengths balance their weaknesses, to be inclusive in forming groups and committees, to celebrate diversity, and to avoid confiding in everyone.

Also within the category of administrative leadership is a variety of management and business skills. Management skills include problem solving (Catalyst, 2007; Duderstadt, 2007), managing complex organizations (Ahmed, 2005; Duderstadt, 2007; Pierce, 2012), managing the operations and the logistics of the business (Kutarna, n.d.), holding people accountable to their goals and their progress toward goal completion

(Kaplan et al., 2012), delegating projects to others (Catalyst, 2007), and achieving results (Pielstick, 1998). Finally, presidents and business leaders need to analyze (Kaplan et al., 2012; Kutarna, n.d.), create (Kaplan et al., 2012; Kutarna, n.d.), and implement (Pierce, 2012) policies for their organization.

As executive leaders on campus, presidents must exhibit skills and tasks for which executive members of the leadership team are responsible. Specifically, budget management, business decisions, communication skills, crisis management, decision making, and fundraising all fall within this category.

Experience with budget and fiscal management is cited as a skill that business leaders need to possess (Ahmed, 2005; Pierce, 2012). Within this area are the specific skills of resource acquisition (Duderstadt, 2007) and management (American Association of Community Colleges, 2006) and budget development (Duderstadt, 2007), including finance and cash flow (Kutarna, n.d.). Budget and fiscal management also includes the need for skill in allocating and reallocating resources (Pierce, 2012); understanding economics (Kutarna, n.d.); and recognizing the interplay between financial aid and student tuition revenue (Pierce, 2012). Finally, presidents need to be frugal when spending the institution's money (Pierce, 2012).

Business leaders also need to be able to make general business decisions from managing human, financial, and capital assets (Duderstadt, 2007) to chairing meetings and briefings (Kutarna, n.d.). These leaders act as the Chief Executive Officer of their company (Duderstadt, 2007) and are responsible for managing capital facilities (Duderstadt, 2007), for having political acumen (Duderstadt, 2007), for complying with

state and federal regulations (Duderstadt, 2007), and for being entrepreneurs (Pierce, 2012).

Communication is a large part of an executive's responsibility within an organization (American Association of Community Colleges, 2006). There are written and oral communications (Kaplan et al, 2012; Pierce, 2012), media relations responsibilities (Kutarna, n.d.), and public speaking engagements (Kutarna, n.d.; Pierce, 2012) where leaders are expected to share information with their constituents (Pierce, 2012). Presidents are also charged with communicating effectively with the constituents of their institution (Pierce, 2012). In order to do these things well, presidents and other executives are expected to have good communication skills (Ahmed, 2005; Kutarna, n.d.; Salas-Lopez et al., 2011) use open, honest, and accurate communication (Goff, 2002), listen to others (Pierce, 2012; Salas-Lopez et al., 2011), encourage criticism and debate (Pierce, 2012), and test ideas rather than pronounce conclusions (Pierce, 2012).

Another aspect of executive leadership is crisis management. Duderstadt (2007) stated that crisis management is a skill that college presidents must possess. The author further explained the crisis management skills necessary by stating that president must be the point person in crisis management, or ground zero in a crisis. Additionally, presidents have the ability to transform a crisis situation into teachable moments for moral leadership. Mangi, Ghumro and Abidi (2011) wrote that in the midst of organizational crisis, business leaders need to be up-to-date, idyllic, persistent, diligent, intuitive, calculated, stimulating, and they need to make a contribution to resolving the crisis.

Presidents and business leaders are expected to make decisions in a timely fashion (Pierce, 2012). Often in this decision making process, business leaders must use judgment (Kutarna, n.d.), choose among compelling and competing claims (Pierce, 2012), respond to forces beyond their control (Pierce, 2012), and provide a rapid response (Shaw, 1999).

Fundraising is another role of executive leadership at colleges and universities around the country (Ahmed, 2005; Duderstadt, 2007; Pierce, 2012). Being a successful fundraiser (Pierce, 2012) and someone who generates new revenue streams (Pierce, 2012; Shaw, 1999) is contingent upon establishing positive relationships with the entire campus (Pierce, 2012) and beyond. College presidents are also responsible for resource allocation (Duderstadt, 2007), for being the salesperson of the institution (Duderstadt, 2007), and for having the lead responsibility in attracting the funds required by the institution (Duderstadt, 2007).

Being the president of a college or university is a very public role. Presidents are seen as the spokesperson to the media, a cheerleader for the institution, an entertainer, the occasional parent to students, and the dad or mom of the extended university family (Duderstadt, 2007).

Presidents are accountable to the public for the welfare of the institution (Duderstadt, 2007) and serve as public relations people for the institution (Ahmed, 2005). They are expected to attend and preside over campus events (Pierce, 2012), be effective externally (Pierce, 2012), and “realize that everything they say and do could become public” (Pierce, 2012, p. 34).

Presidents also serve as the “face” of the institution (Weill, 2009). In this, they are expected to be “unfailingly gracious” (Pierce, 2012, p. 58), to walk around campus (Pierce, 2012), and to be visible (Shaw, 1999).

Political and strategic leadership. The final categories of skills necessary for college presidents to possess are political and strategic leadership skills. The category of political leadership is vast and includes the subthemes of advocacy, board relations, and relationship building. As an advocate of the institution, presidents and business leaders need to work with the legislature and other elected officials. This is especially true of presidents of public institutions (Pierce, 2012). Community college presidents are also charged with advocating for community colleges (American Association of Community Colleges, 2006). Presidents are expected to be adept both politically and strategically in order to build relationships with a variety of external constituents.

Duderstadt (2007) focused on the president’s role in working with the institution’s board of directors. Presidents need to be accountable to the governing board for the welfare of the university and have the capacity to manage the relationship between the governing board and the institution. They need to educate the board, shape the board’s agenda, be a servant to the governing board, and have the ability to relate to and guide the university board. In order to achieve a strong working relationship with the board of directors, or trustees, Pierce (2012) stated that college presidents must identify and cultivate new board members, educate trustees, have frequent and honest communication with the board, and encourage board member interaction with faculty, staff, and students.

Political leadership also encompasses relationship building. Relationship building is essential to every institution and presidents work with many constituents who are

beneficial to the institution. Presidents are charged with networking to create a large team of talented people (Kaplan et al., 2012); cultivating and soliciting alumni, parents, foundations and corporations (Pierce, 2012); developing town-gown relationships (Weill, 2009); and working as a political lobbyist and on government relations for the institution (Duderstadt, 2007).

Some skills involved in building relationships include networking (Catalyst, 2007); connecting people with one another (Shaw, 1999); influencing upward, or affecting others in positions of higher rank (Catalyst, 2007); and working with the different constituencies, such as faculty, students, governing boards, and the public (Vineyard, 1993). Negotiation (Kutarna, n.d.) and “smoothing out conflicts and occasionally picking out winners and losers” (Duderstadt, 2007, p. 161) are necessary skills for presidents to build and utilize. Pierce (2012) suggested that presidents should go to others’ offices to have meetings in order to see the campus and build relationships.

Presidents are an institution’s primary strategist and decision maker. Presidents can utilize their position on campus to be change agents (Giannini, 2001; Gresham, 2009; Shaw, 1999) and provide organizational strategic planning (Ahmed, 2005; American Association of Community Colleges, 2006; Catalyst, 2007) to the campus. In order for organizational change to happen, leaders must participate in it (Mangi, et al., 2011). Presidents must be visionary (Duderstadt, 2007; Kaplan et al., 2012; Pielstick, 1998; Pierce, 2012; Salas-Lopez et al., 2011), “prevent the concerns of today from obscuring the opportunities for tomorrow” (Duderstadt, 2007, p. 160), and provide leadership in positioning the institution (Pierce, 2012).

Strategic planning requires that presidents act strategically and tactically, that they articulate the strategic plan, and that they participate in the development, assessment, and revision of the strategic plan (Pierce, 2012). Pielstick (1998) advocated that leaders create a vision, communicate that vision, and then guide the implementation of the vision. Throughout this process, it is essential that the leader develop an organizational culture that supports the vision (Pielstick, 1998).

Knowing what skills are required of the college president is only one component of recruiting a diverse group of college presidents. One way to continue to diversify the college presidency is to add more women, but it may also be necessary to learn more about how gender affects leadership and how leaders are perceived by those around them.

Women College Presidents

The argument in favor of a broad skill set for college presidents begins to show the need for a more diverse pool of college presidents, including more women college presidents. It becomes important to consider, then, what women bring to an institution and to the presidency.

Rita Bornstein, president emerita of Rollins College, discussed her perspective as a woman president in an article entitled *Why Women Make Good College Presidents* (2007). She believed that women bring collaboration, consultative and relational leadership, relationship building, patience, empathy, creativity, and flexibility to the presidency. Her research found that more women than men used leadership styles appropriate for specific situations and that women are able to bring strong active listening skills to their work. Bornstein also suggested that women hold themselves to high ethical standards.

In a study of 72 CEOs at community colleges, 67% of women college presidents interviewed operated in a care/connected model as compared with 28% of men. The author described women administrators as intuitive, able to see situations as a whole, and as change agents working to “change and improve the system, not just become part of it” (Giannini, 2001, p. 207). She suggested that “women can become the leading visionaries and paradigm pioneers of our institutions” (p. 210).

Bauer (2009) interviewed three women who rose to academic administrative leadership in the 1990s or after. She determined that the women administrators “learned how to negotiate and tolerate ambiguity when employing her leadership style in more traditional hierarchical environments..., have been involved in interdisciplinary work, and have garnered the recognition for their interdisciplinary knowledge and experience” (p. 6).

One resource available to women who want to develop their leadership skills is the HERS Institute. Higher Education Resource Services (HERS) offers an institute where women are trained to serve in leadership roles within their institution of higher education (Higher Education Resource Services, 2011). In the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Lopez, 20011), Judith White, the executive director of HERS, discussed the HERS leadership model:

[It is] the sum of three essential roles that women leaders in higher education need to simultaneously fulfill. Women leaders need to be:

1. operational managers – those who know how to accomplish things in the institution;

2. organizational change agents – those who understand how to create and motivate;
3. academic citizens – those who honor the values that make higher education matter in our society (Lopez, 2011, p. 2).

Lopez (2011) continued to describe the “components of an effective leader’s toolkit” (p. 2). The toolkit includes developing awareness of the woman’s leadership style, learning about cultures within higher education and on their campus, and understanding why there is a need to reinvent higher education in order to “be more effective in their current position, have greater impact across their institutions, consider new possibilities for leadership, and help shape the future of higher education” (Lopez, 2011, p. 2).

The HERS leadership model, suggesting that women leaders need to be operational managers, organizational change agents, and academic citizens, proves to be a strong and concise description that could incorporate every skill described earlier in this study. Within the operational management role, women leaders provide organizational strategy (American Association of Community Colleges, 2006), manage resources, are professional, and communicate strategically. As organizational change agents (Giannini, 2001), women provide strong skills in communication (Groysberg, et al, 2011), collaboration (Bornstein, 2007), empathy (Bornstein, 2007; Groysberg et al, 2011), trust building (Groysberg et al, 2011), relationship building (Bornstein, 2007), patience (Bornstein, 2007), creativity (Bornstein, 2007) and flexibility (Bornstein, 2007). As academic citizens, women leaders utilize business fundamentals and transformational leadership skills (Bornstein, 2007) to advocate for their institutions, and utilize their

knowledge and experience working interdisciplinarily to remind people of the value of higher education (Bauer, 2009).

In addition to leadership skills that women possess, and in response to a call for greater diversity in the pool of college presidents, it becomes imperative to know what role gender plays in the workplace.

Gender

One of the first identities that people develop is their gender. New parents are often asked if the baby is a girl or a boy and from very early ages we are asked to choose “male” or “female” on important and legal forms (Pryzgoda & Chrisler, 2000). Children learn early on whether they are boys or girls and “actively socialize themselves to the gender roles embodied in their peer culture” (Adler, Kless, & Adler, 1992). Throughout life, gender continues to play a role in the jobs individuals pursue and in the ways they are treated in the general world and in the workplace (Acker, 1990). This section of the study will explore the construct of gender by defining it and then by explaining gender stereotyping, gendered organizations, practicing gender, and how gender affects the workplace.

While many people view gender and sex as synonymous, there are important differences in the constructs. Sex is determined by the anatomy with which a person is born; thus, someone can be assigned a sex of male or female based on his or her anatomical parts (Kovach, 1990). Gender is described as “the complex interrelationship between those [physical] traits and one’s internal sense of self as male, female, both or neither as well as one’s outward presentations and behaviors related to that perception” (Gender Spectrum, 2013, para. 2). Gender can also be described as the extent to which

someone possesses or exudes masculine and feminine traits (Powell, 2011). Gender is “a social construction, and is subject to change and internal contradictions. The socially constructed categories of femininity and masculinity interact in complex ways with other categories, such as ethnicity, class and age” (Volman & Dam, 1998, p. 532).

Measuring Gender. Because gender and its interactions are complex, there are many instruments that attempt to measure components of gender. Gamst, Liang, & Karabetian (2011) reviewed instruments designed to assess gender. The instruments can be organized into several groups. The first group includes instruments designed to assess a person’s perceptions of gender roles of men and women [e.g., Conformity to Feminine Norms Inventory (Mahalik, Morray, Coonerty-Femiano, Ludlow, Slattery, & Smiler, 2005); Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik, Locke, Ludlow, Diemer, Scott, Gottfried, & Freitas, 2003); Femininity Ideology Scale (Levant, Richmond, Cook, House, & Aupont, 2007); Gender Role Conflict Scale (O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986); Male Role Norm Inventory (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010), all as cited in Gamst, Liang, & Karabetian (2011)]. Other instruments assess how men or women are treated based on their gender [e.g., Genderism and Transphobia Scale (Hill & Willoughby, 2005); Neosexism Scale (Tougas, Brown, Beaton & Joly, 1995); Perceived Social Inequity Scale (Corning, 2000); Schedule of Sexist Events (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995); The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996); The Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1999) all as cited in Gamst, Liang, & Karabetian (2011)]. Some gender inventories focus on gender identity development [e.g., Feminist Identity Composite (Fischer, Tokar, Good, Hill, & Blum, 2000); Feminist Identity Development Scale (Bargard & Hyde, 1991); Feminist Identity

Scale (Gerstmann & Kramer, 1997); Reference Group Identity Development Scale (Wade & Gelso, 1998), all as cited in Gamst, Liang, & Karabetian (2011)]. Few gender instruments assess traits of men and women, or masculinity and femininity (Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981); Expanded Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich & Holahan, 1979), all as cited in Gamst, Liang, & Karabetian (2011)].

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was created by Sandra Bem to measure personality traits associated with masculinity and femininity (Bem, 1974). The Bem Sex Role Inventory analyzed each respondent's answers to determine their levels of both masculinity and femininity. The instrument was created to assign each respondent with masculinity and a femininity score, rather than assigning the respondent one score that positioned masculinity and femininity on opposite ends of a continuum. Bem believed that every man and woman could have both masculine and feminine traits (Powell, 2011). Men and women who received high scores in both the masculine and feminine scales on the BSRI were labeled "androgynous" (Bem, 1974). Korabik (1999) argued that androgynous people had a better chance of being successful in society as they had both masculine and feminine traits and attributes to utilize, specific to the situation with which they were dealing. A study looking at leader and gender roles found that "in the United States...women, but not men, have adopted a more androgynous view of managerial roles" (Schein as cited in Eagly & Carli, 2003, p. 826).

While the argument may be that androgynous people "should" be more successful, as they possess a greater number of traits and attributes to utilize than those that are found to have primarily masculine or feminine attributes alone, the perception of many people is that managers are more effective when they exhibit masculine traits. In a

study utilizing the Bem Sex Role Inventory, Powell & Butterfield (1979) found that undergraduate students, graduate students, and working managers all perceived good managers as having predominantly masculine traits. Another study showed that masculine traits were perceived as effective in both male and female leaders, but feminine traits exhibited by women were not perceived as effective (Hackman, Hills, Patterson, & Furniss, 1993).

Exhibiting masculine traits is risky for women in the workplace. A meta-analysis about the evaluation of leaders found that women were often rated lower than men when they used a stereotypically masculine leadership style, served in a traditionally male role, or were being evaluated by males (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). In general, “women do fare worse than men in masculine settings” (Eagly & Carly, 2003, p. 824). Perceptions are different from actual effectiveness, however. Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995) and Eagly and Carly (2003) found through their meta-analyses that leader effectiveness was not different between men and women overall. “Despite barriers and possible handicaps in functioning as leaders, the women who actually serve as leaders and managers are in general succeeding as well as their male counterparts” (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995, p. 137). Women were perceived as more effective than men in roles that were traditionally held by women, and men were perceived to be more effective in roles that were traditionally held by men. The women were perceived to have greater interpersonal skills and men were perceived to be better at directing and controlling people (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995).

Eagly, et.al published their work shortly before a study by Twenge in 1997. Twenge (1997) used a meta-analysis to examine changes in masculine and feminine traits

over time. She found that there was some decrease in the intensity or significance of the differences between men and women on the masculinity and femininity scores on the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). This shows that over time, men and women were, perhaps, behaving in more androgynous ways, utilizing both masculine and feminine traits. If it is true that men and women are behaving more similarly than they are different from one another, the argument could be made that there should be a more equitable distribution of women in the position of college president.

In addition to the Bem Sex Role Inventory, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) is a means of analyzing a respondent's characteristics in order to determine their scores in several gender scales. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) includes 24 opposing statements and asks that each respondent place themselves on a five-point scale between the two opposing statements (Spence & Helmreich, 1980). An example of the opposing statements is "not at all competitive," and the opposing statement, "very competitive." Respondents are asked to choose, on a five point scale, which statement is more like them. The PAQ is then analyzed to determine scores for each respondent on each of three scales, including male valued (MV), female valued (FV), and sex specific (SS). This study will utilize the Personal Attributes Questionnaire to determine how men and women, overall, score on the male valued and female valued scales. More information about the male valued scale, called the instrumentality scale, and the female valued scale, called the expressiveness scale, will be explained in the methodology section of this study.

Gender stereotyping. Gender stereotyping has been acknowledged for some time and may still present itself in today's society. Generally, male gender stereotypes

describe men as aggressive, competitive, insensitive, emotionally inexpressive, and lacking self-awareness (Powell, 2011). Additional characteristics of masculinity include assertiveness, being effective in getting things done, strong leadership skills, caring more about things than people, and being unemotional (Kovach, 1990). Generally, female gender stereotypes describe women as dependent, self-aware, expressive of their feelings, able to admit when they are wrong, and interdependent (Powell, 2011).

Gender stereotyping can lead to prejudice and discrimination. Stereotypes rarely apply to everyone within a group (Powell, 2011) and work to “draw our attention to the sexist way in which women leaders are depicted...demean and trivialize women’s achievements...and reveal gendered systems and practices” (Stead & Elliott, 2010, p. 50). One way to investigate and analyze gendered systems and practices is to look at the notion of gendered organizations.

Gendered organizations. Acker (1990) argued that organizations are gendered rather than gender neutral. Acker explained that “to say an organization is...gendered means that advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine” (Acker, 1990, p. 146). Specifically, there are five processes that interact to form a gendered work environment, as Acker described it. The first is the “construction of division along lines of gender—division of labor, allowed behaviors, of locations in physical space” (p. 146). One example of this is the fact that there are so many men in positions of highest leadership within organizations, which stereotypically includes notions like the “corner office.” The second process is the images of gender and leadership that exist to show the division of men and women in

leadership and show how leaders should behave. An example of this is an image of an executive who is a well-dressed, forceful looking man. The third process that perpetuates gendered organizations is the ways that men and women interact with one another. How men talk with other men, how women talk with other women, and how men and women speak to one another shows a hierarchy within conversation and serves as an example of the third process. The fourth process is how gendered organizations affect the way a person constructs and perceives his or her own gender identity. An example of constructing one's own gender identity because of gendered organizations occurs when someone chooses a career field based on their gender, or the kind of work that is socially acceptable for someone of their gender to perform (e.g., men as construction workers or women as administrative assistants). Finally, the fifth process includes the social structures within the work place. One example is performance evaluations of staff. When more men are in leadership at an organization, they are most often completing the performance appraisals of the women they supervise. If a man believes that his supervisees should behave in a way that shows that their work is their exclusive priority, they may rate a woman who prioritizes family obligations with a lower score (Acker, 1990).

Gender practices vs. practicing gender. Some of the processes that encourage gendered organizations are possible because people within the organization practice gender or participate in gender practices. Yancey Martin (2003) argued that men and women practice gender in the workplace. Practicing gender occurs over time and means learning how to practice masculinity and femininity. Practicing gender occurs in interactions with others and often happens without the individual realizing it. Practicing

gender includes the “literal activities of gender, physical and narrative—the doing, displaying, asserting, narrating, performing, mobilizing, maneuvering” (Yancey Martin, 2003, p. 354) and could include a man asking a woman to answer a phone, or a man advocating for himself to receive an increase in salary.

Gendered practices are learned and occur in every location where social interaction occurs. Gendered practices are the outcome of practicing gender over a lifetime. One can “act like” a man or “act like” a woman, but the person is unable to do so simultaneously (Yancey Martin, 2003). The combination of practicing gender and gendered practices solidify gender as a social practice and cycle.

The practice of gender in the workplace is complicated. Lipman-Blumen (1976) found that gendered practices occur in situations where men and women perform the same behavior but are perceived differently. In their study, men who interacted with one another frequently were seen as team players who were working to advance their careers. Women interacting with one another were perceived as wasting company time. In a study of women community college presidents, one believed she “was penalized for acting tough outside her gender” (Eddy & Cox, 2008, p. 74). Both of these examples show the complexity of “acting your gender” in the workplace, as “acting like” a man or woman can be perceived positively or negatively depending on whether the behavior is seen to reinforce or contradict gender practices.

Cultural and structural factors that perpetuate gendered organizations. There are several cultural and structural factors that perpetuate a gendered experience at work. Wichert (2011) described cultural and structural factors that affect women in the workplace. Cultural factors are “beliefs and norms that women themselves (and society

at large) hold about things such as what it means to be a woman, what women need and want, and what it means to be a leader” (Wichert, 2011, p. 4). Structural factors are “the processes and structures that women encounter in their lives” (Wichert, 2011, p. 4).

In a study of six women college presidents, Eddy and Cox (2008) found that the women faced several cultural expectations. Of the six women, one woman chose to wait until her child had completed his undergraduate education to enter higher education administration and two chose to wait to pursue a presidency until their husbands retired. Two of the other women only pursued a presidency because their chancellor, who happened to be male, asked them to serve in the position.

Another study of senior women administrators at community colleges showed that the women “largely constructed their leadership identity as a response to organizational expectations and norms as defined by typical male instrumental roles and behaviors” (Tedrow & Rhoads, 1999, p. 6). In doing so, the women often used a combination of three strategies: adaptation, reconciliation, and resistance. Women who used adaptation as a strategy seemed to model the behavior they observed by the men around them, paying attention to organizational dynamics, focusing on producing work, and being the authority. Women who used reconciliation took cues from the situation and modeled masculine or feminine behaviors to conform to the expectations of the men and women they worked with. These women used both instrumental and relational skills. Instrumental skills are thought to be more masculine in nature and promote rational thought and strategic action. Relational skills are thought to be more feminine in nature and focus on working with people, developing communities and individuals, and sharing power (Tedrow & Rhoads, 1999). Finally, women who utilized resistance wanted to “be

themselves” and worked to create an environment where that was valued. They “saw themselves as social change agents or transformative educators and played the role of facilitator, group organizer, and consciousness-raiser” (Tedrow & Rhoads, 1999, p. 12).

Structural factors facing women in the workplace are most often found in the policies and processes of the organization. Some of the processes that can be described as structural factors that may work against women include the personnel evaluation (Nieva & Gutek, 1980; Powell, 2011) and promotion processes, hiring processes, and work schedules (Wichert, 2011). Nieva and Gutek (1980) found that “the evaluation of qualifications in selection and promotion situations...show fairly consistent bias in favor of men” (p. 273). As men continue to be the top executives, these men are the ones evaluating both men and women in the organization, and women could receive lower evaluation ratings because of it (Powell, 2011). In addition, many organizations hire and promote employees who follow a traditional linear career path. Taking time off to have children or care for a family member, or requesting a change in the typical work schedule, can work against a woman (Powell, 2011; Wichert, 2011). In these ways, “women have to be even more ambitious than men to make it to the top as they face additional hurdles along the way” (Wichert, 2011, p. 3).

Women in the Workplace. Additional considerations are required to fully describe the career path of women senior administrators in higher education. Some of these include the phases of the administrators’ careers and the choices they make along the way, their level of ambition, and the perceptions others have of their commitment to their position or work overall.

Life and career decisions seem to go hand in hand with ambition. Wichert (2011) argued that women have to work harder to make it to senior administrative positions than men do. “Delaying child-bearing, returning to work after maternity leave, and in some (admittedly rare) cases even consciously deciding not to have children, are signs that women are serious about their careers” (Wichert, 2011, p. 14). Mothers often find themselves making decisions about their work schedule, flexibility, availability, and career paths that put their family first and can cause others to make judgments about the woman’s commitment to their job or employer and can cause people to question the woman’s level of ambition (Wichert, 2011). In addition, women often choose positions and career paths that place them in a supportive or tangential role to the central function of the institution, such as human resources or marketing, which can cause “their business acumen to be questioned” (Wichert, 2011, p. 7). In these roles, women may not be as visible and may not be given as many opportunities for advancement.

Summary

In conclusion, there are many factors to consider when examining the college and university presidency and analyzing the need for a diverse group of presidents in the United States. There are a variety of leadership skills that college and university presidents need to possess and exhibit. These skills can be categorized into eight themes, including personal characteristics and general leadership skills; academic and moral leadership skills; administrative, executive and presidential leadership skills; and, finally, political and strategic leadership skills. The specific skills listed in each of those eight themes will be included in the questionnaire this research study will disseminate to analyze which skills current college presidents utilize in their daily work at their specific

institutional type. The skills will also be analyzed to determine if men and women utilize different skills as college presidents.

Women are currently in the minority in the college presidency (Cook & Kim, 2012), but their numbers are growing steadily. Women bring many skills to their roles as leaders, such as collaboration, relational leadership, relationship building, patience, empathy, and creativity (Bornstein, 2007). The concept of gender and the role gender plays in leadership have to be investigated. Gender stereotyping can affect women negatively and potentially reduce a woman's ability to be fairly evaluated and promoted within the college setting. Cultural and structural factors can work together within gendered organizations to make colleges and other work environments a difficult place for women to exhibit their skills and be chosen for positions in senior leadership.

There are many instruments that measure gender, but only one measures masculine and feminine attributes, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ, Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). This study will utilize the PAQ as a component within a larger questionnaire that will collect demographic information from both women and men college presidents and examine skills the presidents use to run colleges in the United States. The data will be analyzed to understand the skills needed and used in the presidency and to determine if women and men have different or similar skills and attributes. As previously stated, the intensity or significance of the difference of masculinity and femininity scores for both men and women on the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) has decreased over time (Twenge, 1997). It is worth noting that the decrease in the difference of the scores between men and women is not as strong on the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) as it is in the BSRI (Twenge, 1997). This is

important because the PAQ continues to show statistically significant differences between masculine and feminine attributes. To date, the researcher has been unable to locate an instrument that assesses the gender roles of college presidents or administrators specifically or to find a more effective instrument to evaluate sex roles and attributes than the PAQ. Since the role of college presidents is similar to the role of high-ranking business executives, and due to the shorter length of the PAS, it will serve as an appropriate means of assessing the presidents' gender roles.

The primary purpose of this research is to determine if women and men possess different attributes and leadership skills, and whether those attributes are specific to the type of institution they serve. If there are differences in attributes and leadership skills among women and men, then it is worth determining whether there is a pattern to the type of institutions in which their skills and attributes are most commonly utilized. If their skills and attributes are more similar than different, then the argument can be made that more women could be utilized in college presidencies around the country. Broadly speaking, having more women in the presidency, and having presidents with different attributes, skills, and abilities increases the diversity in the pool of college presidents across the United States. The following chapter will describe the methodology that will be used to collect the data to answer these questions. A full description of the questionnaire will also be included so the study could be replicated in the future.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between the attributes (as defined by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire), skills, and career paths of college and university presidents in the United States. The study examined what skill sets current presidents believe are important to be a college president, the extent to which the responding presidents believe they have those skills, whether or not the presidents' attributes are related to the type of institution they serve, and, most importantly, whether there are differences in the responses of male presidents and female presidents.

This research included a quantitative, nonexperimental study that utilized survey research. Non-experimental research includes samples that are not random and allows the researcher to “observe how variables relate to one another” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 357). The utilization of survey research allows the researcher to collect information from respondents in order to look at the survey responses in aggregate and to look for trends and relationships between and among the data collected (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1995). This study utilized survey research as the methodology and a questionnaire served as the method. Participants were asked to respond electronically to a researcher-designed questionnaire that included the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, or PAQ, created by Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp (1974). The questionnaire also asked the presidents for demographic information as well as educational and professional background, and asked that they assess skills that are important in their work and indicate

the extent to which they possess those skills. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) was included to assess the respondents on the constructs of expressiveness and instrumentality (described in more detail below).

Participants

To answer the research questions, the questionnaire was sent electronically to U.S. college and university presidents who are included in the Higher Education Publications (HEP) directory and who serve institutions included in the Carnegie Classification system. According to Barb Herrman, an employee of HEP, there are 4,117 institutional records in the directory (personal communication, March 19, 2013). The directory includes public, private, and for-profit institutions in the United States.

The Carnegie Classification system was created in 1970 as a “way to represent and control for institutional differences” and is used “in the design of research studies to ensure adequate representation of sampled institutions, students, or faculty” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, para 1). Carnegie classifications are assigned to each institution in the country and the classifications fall into six basic categories, including associates colleges, doctorate-granting universities, master’s colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, special focus institutions, and tribal colleges. Individuals listed in the HEP directory as presidents and chief executive officers of institutions classified within this system were invited to participate in the research study. Institutions that are assigned a Carnegie Classification of negative three are considered “not classified” or “not in the classification universe” (U.S. Department of Education, 2012). Not classified institutions include schools for areas such as

cosmetology and barber training, as well as state systems of higher education. Presidents and Chief Executive Officers of these institutions were not surveyed.

Research Questions

This research study sought to answer the broad research questions, included earlier in this report. Listed below are the broad research questions and several additional sub-questions that show how the broad research questions will be answered. Methods for answering each of the following questions are included in the text to follow.

1. What, if any, relationship exists between the presidents' attributes (as defined by the PAQ) and their current role as president?
 - a. What, if any, relationship exists between presidents' Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) score and the type of institution they serve?
 - b. What, if any, relationship exists between the presidents' Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) score and their assessment of the important skills needed in their position?
2. What, if any, relationship exists between the presidents' attributes and their personal qualities?
 - a. What, if any, relationship exists between the presidents' gender and their Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) score?
 - b. What, if any, relationship exists between the presidents' Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) score and the self-assessment of their leadership skills?

3. What, if any, relationship exists between the type of institution the presidents serve and the skills they identify as important in their role as president? Do the presidents perceive that they possess the important skills?
4. What, if any, relationship can be determined by the presidents' demographic characteristics and the type of institution they serve? Can the type of institution a president will serve be predicted by any combination of personal demographic information?

Research Instrument Creation and Design

In order to determine if there are similarities or differences among men and women related to their personal attributes score, the types of institutions they serve, the skills they deem important in their presidency, and their self-assessment of those skills, a questionnaire (see Appendix D) was created to collect the data necessary to run the appropriate statistical analyses to answer the research questions. Further detail on the analyses is included below.

The questionnaire collected the participants' demographic information in order to analyze the demographic data with other components of the questionnaire. One section of the questionnaire included the skills listed in the literature review and asked the presidents to assess the importance of each skill in their work as president. The participants were also asked to assess, on a Likert-like scale, their own performance on each of the skills listed. The 24-item Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) as designed by Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974) was also included in the questionnaire.

College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire (CPSAQ). The questionnaire that was created by the researcher is comprised of five sections, including demographic information, educational experience, professional experience, skills, and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. The Demographic Information section includes four questions that collect information about gender, title, first generation college student status, and age.

The Educational Experience section collected information about the degrees each president holds, as well as the type of institution from which each degree was earned. This section asked about the degrees the chief executive officer at the institution holds, the academic discipline of the degree, whether the granting institution was public or private, and the size of each institution.

The Professional Experience section included six questions and collected information about the number of years in the presidents' current position, the type of institution they preside over, and the total number of years served in the presidency. In addition to information collected about their current role, the presidents were asked to list three positions they held prior to their current presidency.

The Skills section of the questionnaire included a list of 94 skills as described in Chapter Two and Appendix A. The presidents were asked to rate the importance of each skill on a Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The presidents were also asked to rate their level of ability on each skill on a Likert-like scale from "not a strength" to "highly skilled." Finally, the last section of the questionnaire was the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) where each

president was asked to choose their placement between two polar statements in a list of polar statements.

Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) was created in an attempt to replicate the intent of the Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire (SRSQ) while reducing the number of question items and the length of time necessary to complete the questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). The SRSQ is a 122-item questionnaire created to determine sex-role stereotypes of men and women. The questionnaire includes a list of bipolar responses (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970), and men and women were asked to “indicate the extent to which each item characterized an adult man (masculinity response), an adult woman (femininity response), and themselves (self-response)” (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972, p. 62). Forty-one of the 122 items on the questionnaire were determined to be “stereotypic” of men or women because they exhibited at least 75% agreement among the respondents (Broverman et al., 1972). Both men and women agreed on which responses were stereotypic of men and women. The responses of both men and women on male traits correlated to $r = 0.96$ and to $r = 0.95$ on female traits (Broverman et al., 1972). The 41 items found to be stereotypic of men and women became the items included in the masculinity and femininity scales. Further analysis of the data showed that “masculine poles of the various items were more often considered to be socially desirable than the female poles” (Broverman et al., 1972, p. 65). It is worth noting, however, that neither men nor women rated themselves as strongly masculine or feminine, respectively, as their perceptions of the “average” man or woman (Broverman, et al, 1972). This shows that stereotypes for

men and women are more extreme than men and women perceive their own behavior to be.

Some of the items from the SRSQ were utilized in the original version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. The original PAQ, now called the Expanded Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ), consists of 55 opposing statements and asks that each respondent place themselves on a five-point scale between the two statements (Spence et al., 1974). The EPAQ has been reduced to 24 opposing statements and this shortened version is now called the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, or PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1980). As an example of the opposing statements, a respondent reads “not at all competitive” and the opposing statement, “very competitive” and chooses on a five point scale which statement is more like them. Each of the items has been organized into one of three scales including male valued (MV), female valued (FV), and sex specific (SS). The male valued, female valued and sex specific scales were created through the collection and analysis of the data from the Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire (Broverman, et al., 1972). Spence and Helmreich (1980) renamed the male valued scale the instrumental scale and the female valued scale the expressiveness scale (Helmreich, Spence & Wilhelm, 1981; Spence & Helmreich, 1980). The instrumental scale is described as reflecting the more independent traits and the ones that show concern with self. The expressiveness scale is said to include more interpersonal traits and shows a willingness to think about others before self (Spence & Helmreich, 1980).

Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974) did not describe the origination of the terms “instrumental” or “expressive,” but further exploration of the terms leads to work by Parsons and Bales (1955). Parsons and Bales (1955) studied family systems and labeled

the father as instrumental and the mother as expressive. Instrumental traits focus on goals external to the family system while expressive traits focus on the family system internally. Mothers were said to be focused on maintaining the relationships among the family members, while fathers are said to be bosses and managers of the family. The instrumental leader of the nuclear family is “the final court of appeals, final judge and executor of punishment, discipline, and control over the children of the family” (Parsons & Bales, 1955, p. 318). Meanwhile, the expressive leader of the nuclear family “is the mediator, conciliator, of the family...soothes over disputes...is affectionate, solicitous, warm, emotional to the children and family...the ‘comforter’, the ‘consoler’, is relatively indulgent, relatively unpunishing” (Parsons & Bales, 1955, p. 318). Through these descriptions, men and woman are portrayed in some of the stereotypical ways described earlier in this study.

To further describe instrumentality and expressiveness, it is useful to describe the statements included in each of the scales in the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ, Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974), which is included in Appendix F. The instrumental scale includes statements about independence, activeness, competitiveness, self-confidence, and superiority. The expressive scale includes statements about kindness, helpfulness, warmth, and understanding. In addition to the eight statements within the instrumental scale and the eight statements in the expressive scale, there are an additional eight statements that fit into a third scale, called the unmitigated agency scale. The unmitigated agency scale was not analyzed in this study, but aids in the validity of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire.

Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974) saw similarities in their instrumental and expressiveness scales and Bakan's (1966) work on communion and agency. In describing Bakan's 1966 work, Hundhammer and Mussweiler (2012) explained that "agency and communion denote two basic orientations toward interpersonal behavior, with agency reflecting a priority concern for the self and communion a concern for others" (p. 177). Spence, et al. stated that "equating agency and communion with masculinity and femininity suggests that the challenge differs for the two genders, men having to temper a dominant tendency towards agency with communion and women the reverse" (Spence, et al., 1974, p. 13). In this description, instrumentality was likened with agency and expressiveness is likened with communion (Spence, et al., 1974).

The PAQ was originally tested on 530 college students (Spence et al., 1974) and was then utilized with high school students and the parents of the college students (Spence, et al., 1974). Analyses confirmed that it was valid and reliable across these populations (Spence, et al., 1974). While a review of the literature does not indicate that the PAQ has been utilized on college presidents, it is reasonable to believe that it would work similarly with adult college presidents as it did in previous studies of other adults. The PAQ was created and tested to measure a person's placement on agency and communion scales without consideration of their profession. The fact that the person taking the PAQ is a college president will not influence the validity of the instrument.

The PAQ was analyzed for internal consistency and part-whole correlations were completed. "The range of r values for the mean [*sic*] and women respectively was 0.23 to 0.64 and 0.24 to 0.70 for the Male-valued items. For the Female-valued items, the values ranged from 0.22 to 0.56 and 0.27 to 0.55 for the men and women....All r values were

significant. Within each sex the items tended to correlate satisfactorily with the individuals' 'masculinity' or 'femininity' as reflected in their overall score on the subscale to which the items belonged" (Spence, et al., 1974, p. 11).

A shortened version of the Expanded Personal Attributes Questionnaire (EPAQ) was designed that included 8 items from each of three subscales within the EPAQ, Male-valued, Female-valued, and Sex-specific (Spence, et al., 1974). This shortened version of the EPAQ is now just called the PAQ. The correlation values remained strong in the short form of the PAQ. The correlation for the total self-score for the full PAQ compared with the shortened PAQ was 0.92. The correlations between the Male-valued scale, the Female-valued scale, and the Sex-specific scale in the short version and the regular version were all 0.90 (Spence, et al., 1974) showing that the items on the male-valued scale are primarily chosen by men, and the items included on the female-valued scale are chosen primarily by women. This shows that the scales work to differentiate male and female attributes as perceived by respondents.

The study done by Helmreich, et al. (1981) included discriminant analysis of the parents who had taken the PAQ, finding that they could predict the gender of the respondent based on their attributes score. Their prediction for the gender for the parents was 81% and had a "highly significant chi square of $p < 0.0001$ " (Helmreich et al., 1981, p. 1105). This means that 81% of the people who took the PAQ had a result on the PAQ that matched their gender and that it was statistically significant. This statistic shows that the PAQ can accurately measure the respondent's gender on a continuum of instrumentality and expressiveness. It was useful for this study to determine if women college presidents earn scores that place them on the expressiveness or feminine end of

the continuum or if they score more similar to their male counterparts on the instrumental or masculine end of the continuum. The same analysis was done to determine if the male presidents score on the expressive or instrumental scale as well. This analysis allowed men and women presidents' attributes scores to be compared to determine if women and men presidents have similar attributes or if there are differences by gender.

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire has been used more recently to study masculinity and femininity. In 2000, an article was published that utilized the PAQ to study sex-role stereotyping among African American males and females (Dade & Sloan, 2000). A study published in 2004 (Toller, Suter, & Trautman, 2004) used the PAQ to study males' and females' attitudes toward feminism. Cox, Van Velsor, Hulgus, Weatherman, Smenner, Dickens, and Davis (2004) studied women's perceptions of their anger expression using the PAQ as a data collection method. In 2006, a study was published that looked at the measurement of the agency and communion scales along with emotional vulnerability using the PAQ (Ward, Thorn, Clements, Dixon, & Sanford, 2006). While it is true that the PAQ is an older instrument, it is still utilized in research as a means of studying masculinity and femininity, instrumentality and expressiveness, agency and communion.

Data Collection Methods and Timeline

As previously stated, the college presidents from designated institution types included in the Higher Education Publications directory were contacted to participate in the study. Each of the presidents received an email with a link to the questionnaire in the Qualtrics survey system. Qualtrics is a web-based program provided by the University of Georgia to the students, faculty and staff of the institution as a way to “design,

implement, and evaluate survey results” (University of Georgia, 2012, para. 4). Qualtrics allows a researcher to create an instrument to be emailed out to those people for whom the researcher has uploaded email addresses. In addition, Qualtrics sends reminders to the recipients who have not completed the instrument and retains the responses of the participants. Some statistical analysis can be completed via Qualtrics, and the software can export the data to other programs, such as PASW, formerly known as IBM SPSS.

With the approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Georgia, the 4,009 chief executive officers included in the Higher Education Publications directory were invited via email to complete the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Respondents were asked to respond within two weeks. One reminder email was sent one week after the invitation email (see Appendix C). Qualtrics tracked who had not completed the questionnaire and sent the reminder email only to those who have not completed the questionnaire. The list of participants and non-participants remains confidential from the researcher.

The questionnaire includes 144 questions (see Appendix D) and should take the presidents between 10 and 20 minutes to complete, as determined by the researcher and other colleagues who piloted the questionnaire. When the two week timeframe concluded, the data was cleaned to remove incomplete data or questionnaires that the respondents stated they did not want to be included. The data was then exported to PASW Statistics 18 (formerly SPSS).

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was run on the data collected from the completed questionnaires. Some of the data collected was reported through descriptive statistics,

such as the number of respondents for the survey, the gender of the respondents, and the presidents' previous professional positions, to describe the participant group and their characteristics.

Gender. Much of the analysis related to gender included running chi-square statistics. Anytime a categorical variable with two values is analyzed with another categorical variable, a cross tab or chi-square analysis is done (Statslectures, 2010a). A chi-square will show whether or not there is a statistically significant relationship between two values within one categorical variable and the other variable being analyzed. For example, is there a statistically significant difference between responses of men and women on variables such as the type of institution they serve or the type of terminal degree they have? Similar analysis occurs when running a t-test to analyze a categorical variable, like gender, with a continuous variable, like the PAQ score, to determine if there are statistically significant differences between men and women on their PAQ scores.

Institution served. Additional chi-square analyses were done to show any statistically significant relationships between the type of undergraduate institution the presidents attended and the type of institution they now serve, as well as any relationships between the type of terminal degree they obtained and the type of institution they serve. An ANOVA was run to determine if there are differences by respondents' PAQ score and the type of institution they serve.

Skills. The skills portion of the instrument required a different type of analysis because the data collected was ordinal and in the form of a Likert-like scale. The presidents were asked to rate the importance of a number of skills in their daily work as college presidents and then were asked to rate their own ability to perform each of the

skills listed. It was noted that the president should consider only the current position when answering these questions so the data could be analyzed based on the type of institution they serve. Ordinal data, assumed to have equal distance between the item options, can be analyzed with a categorical variable with two values, such as gender, using a Mann-Whitney test, or a non-parametric t-test (Statslectures, 2010b). The Mann-Whitney analysis shows if there are statistically significant differences between men and women regarding the skills they perceive are important and their ability to perform those skills.

A Kruskal Wallis test, or a non-parametric ANOVA, is used when there is a categorical variable with three or more values being analyzed with ordinal data (Statslectures, 2011). An example of this includes determining if there is a statistically significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of the importance of skills related to the type of institution they serve.

Further descriptive analysis was done to show the skills that have been ranked most or least important for the presidents overall, as well as which skills the presidents assess are their strongest and weakest skills. Finally, descriptive analysis was used to show the skills with the highest means for importance and ability compared with PAQ scores.

Spearman Rho, a nonparametric correlation, was run on the top five skills for importance and ability to determine if there was a correlation between the skills and the presidents' agency and communion scores. Spearman Rho analyses work well with interval and ordinal variables that are not equidistant from one another. A chart of all of the analyses to be completed can be found in Appendix E.

Delimitations

There are a few delimitations to this study. To begin, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire was created in the 1970s and some of the descriptors used may have become outdated. Although the psychometrics are strong, it is possible that the instrument is becoming less relevant over time. For example, it has been found that differences in agency scores based on sex have decreased over the years since it was originally tested (Twenge, 1997).

Another limitation to the study is that the presidents are assessing themselves on the skill portion of the inventory. While this information is meaningful, it is also subject to inaccuracies of self-assessment. A more accurate way to assess the presidents' skills might be to utilize their self-assessment as well as the assessment of the president's skills by the people with whom each works.

Another limitation of the study has to do with the participants. Presidents are very busy people who live their lives in the spotlight. It is possible that these participants may choose not to complete the questionnaire due to time limitations or because they are hesitant about sharing their personal information. Another ramification of a lack of time is that college presidents may ask a personal assistant to complete the questionnaire on their behalf which could affect the accuracy of the data collected by the researcher. Finally, the respondents to the questionnaire may be an unbalanced sample by skill ability or by levels of happiness with their position as president.

A final limitation of this study is the pool of respondents. There were a limited number of respondents to this study. In addition, the respondents were imbalanced across the institutional type and were primarily from small institutions.

CHAPTER 4

The Findings

The College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire (CPSAQ) was distributed through Qualtrics to 4,009 college chief executive officers as listed in the Higher Education Publications (HEP) directory. The CPSAQ was composed of six sections that included questions to collect data about their demographic information, educational experience, professional experience previous professional experience, their professional skills, and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The questionnaire was available to the respondents for two weeks and 410 questionnaires were collected, a 10.23% response rate.

This chapter will include the findings of the statistical analysis from the questionnaires that were collected. The chapter is organized similarly to the CPSAQ and begins with the demographics of the respondents, discusses the data collected related to the respondents' educational and professional backgrounds, their analysis of the importance of the skills listed, their sense of their ability to do the skill, and concludes with analysis of the PAQ. Questionnaires were completed to varying degrees which accounts for the variation in n values throughout the SPSS frequency tables, which can be found in Appendix G. An analysis of the data that responds to the research questions can be found at the end of the chapter in a section titled "Results by Research Question."

The Respondents

The questionnaire began with an opportunity for the presidents to consent to participate in the research study and to complete the questionnaire. If they chose to participate, the first section of questions they were asked were about demographics. The respondents were asked about their gender, title, first generation college student status, and their age.

Of the 410 questionnaire responses, there were 139 females (34.2%) and 268 males (65.8%) who completed the instrument. No respondents chose “transgender” as their gender. Three questionnaires had missing data in response to the question about gender. For position titles, a large majority (88.9%) of respondents identified as “President” with another 7.4% identifying as “Chancellor.” About half, or 51.6%, reported that they had been first generation college students.

The respondents’ ages ranged from the thirties through the eighties. The most frequent response for age was 60 to 69 years old (45.6%). The second most common response was 50 to 59 years old, totaling another 33.8%. Together, 79.4% of responding presidents were between 50 and 69 years old. Two percent of the respondents were in their thirties, and one respondent was over the age of 80. (See Appendix G for complete demographic data.)

Educational Background. Among the respondents, the most frequent profile is a President who holds a Ph.D. from a very large, public institution. Eighty-six percent (86.2%) of the respondents have earned doctorate degrees. Of those with earned doctorate degrees, Ph.D. degrees were the most common at 60.6%. Another 29.1% of the respondents have an Ed.D. Over two thirds of the respondents (67.8%) attained their

doctoral degree at a public institution, with almost 40% (39.8%) at very large institutions enrolling 25,000 students or more. Another 16.8% attended institutions that enrolled 10,000-14,999 students and 14.2% attended institutions that enrolled 20,000 to 24,999 students. Institutions that enrolled 15,000 to 19,999 students were attended by 11.4% of the respondents. Smaller schools were attended by fewer respondents, with 10.2% of respondents attending institutions of 5,000-9,999 students and 7.7% attending institutions that enrolled less than 5,000 students.

The institution types the presidents had to choose from in the questionnaire were modeled from the Carnegie Classifications (Carnegie Foundation, 2010) and included associates colleges, baccalaureate colleges, masters colleges and universities, doctoral granting universities, special focus institutions and tribal colleges. The definitions provided to the presidents are included in the questionnaire that can be found in Appendix D. The names of the classification categories account for the primary type of degree awarded at that institution, but each type has some variation in the types of degrees that are awarded there. The data gleaned from the CPSAQ showed that a very large majority (92.3%) of the presidents received their doctoral degrees from a doctoral granting institution, or one where the institution awarded 20 or more research doctoral degrees during the academic year, not including doctoral level degrees necessary for entry into professional practice such as JD, MD, PharmD, and DPT.

Almost all of the respondents have an earned master's degree (92.2%). Similar to the response for the doctoral degrees, twice as many respondents went to a public institution to obtain their master's degree (64.1%), and again, the highest percentage of the respondents went to institutions that enrolled 25,000 students or more (32%). The

next most common size of institution to pursue a master's degree was 10,000 to 14,999 students (20.7%). The other response options were evenly distributed from 10.8% (20,000-24,999 students) to 13.7% (less than 5,000 students).

There was a broad range of responses to the type of master's degree the respondents had earned. Master of Arts was the most common at 34.9%. Master of Science ranked second at 23.5% and 17.3% of respondents earned an M.Ed. The least common types of master's degree held by presidents were MSW (0.5%), MPA (0.8%), and MBA (1.3%). A large majority of the respondents obtained their master's degrees at doctoral granting universities (68.5%), followed by another 25.0% at masters colleges and universities, or those institutions that awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees during the academic year. Another 4.3% of respondents earned their degrees at special focus institutions and 2.2% at baccalaureate colleges.

The type of institution where the respondents attained their bachelor's degrees was much more evenly distributed, as 45% went to private institutions and 55% attended public institutions. The most popular institution size to attend at the bachelor's level was less than 5,000 students at 37.5%, followed by the largest option for institution size at 25,000 students and above, accounting for 17.8% of respondents. Another 16.5% of respondents attended institutions that enrolled 10,000-14,999 students, 9.5% attended institutions enrolling 15,000-19,999 students, 6.8% went to institutions with 20,000-24,999 students, and 2.0% attended institutions with enrollments of 5,000-9,999 students. Only four types of institutions were chosen by the respondents as types of institutions they attended for their bachelor's degree. They were doctoral granting university at

43.3%, baccalaureate colleges at 28.7%, master's colleges and universities at 25.5% and special focus institutions at 2.5%.

Professional Background. A majority of the presidents who responded to the questionnaire stated that they have worked in higher education for more than 15 years (83.7%). Another 5.4% have worked in higher education for 13-15 years and 4.2% have been in higher education for 10-12 years. Almost three quarters of the respondents are in their first presidency (73.5%), and another 17.9% are in their second presidency. Of the respondents, 6.1% are in their third presidency and 2.5% are in their fourth.

There is an even distribution of the respondents regarding the number of years they have been in a presidency overall. Presidents who have been in that role for one to three years accounted for 21.9% of the respondents. Next are presidents who have been in the role for four to six years (21.4%). Another fifth of the respondents, or 18.4%, have been in the position of president for more than 15 years. Seven to nine years of service as a college president came in fourth at 15.7%, while 13.8% of respondents have been in the presidency for 10 to 12 years, and the final 8.8% of respondents have been in the presidency for between 13 and 15 years.

Regarding their current presidency, over half of the respondents have been in their position for less than six years. A little more than 28% of the responding presidents have been in their current position between one and three years and another 25.2% of have been in their position for four to six years. Seven to nine years in their current position ranks third at 17.4%. Ten to twelve years of service accounted for 11.5% of the respondents. An additional 6.1% served between 13 and 15 years and 11.3% have served as a president for more than 15 years.

Most of the respondents reported serving at one of three institution types. Associates college presidents were the most frequent respondents, at 37.7%. Baccalaureate college presidents made up another 22.2% of the respondents and master's college and university presidents comprised another 22.2% of the respondents. This accounts for over 82.1% of the respondents. Only about 10% of the respondents currently serve as the Chief Executive Officer at doctoral granting universities (9.4%) while 7.9% of the respondents serve at special focus universities and 0.7% of the respondents serve at tribal colleges.

All of the institution size options were represented within this group of respondents. The majority of the respondents, 65.7% serve at small institutions that enroll less than 5,000 students. Another 16.9% of respondents work at the next larger size institution, enrolling between 5,000 and 9,999 students. The third most common size institution to serve was those institutions that enroll over 25,000 students (6.1%), followed by institutions serving 10,000 to 14,999 students at 5.6%. Presidents that serve at institutions enrolling 15,000 to 19,999 students accounted for 3.4% of the respondents, and the final 2.2% of respondents work at institutions enrolling 20,000 to 24,999 students.

The presidents were asked about their previous professional positions. Vice President ($n=187$, 46%) was the most common position held by the presidents just prior to their presidency. An additional 16% ($n=65$) were presidents or chancellors just before their current position. Eight percent ($n=33$) of the respondents were Deans before this presidency and 9% ($n=38$) responded with "other" or that the position they held prior to this presidency was not included in the list of possible responses.

Skills on the CPSAQ

The skills portion of the CPSAQ included a list of 94 skills that were collected from the literature about college presidencies or about running large, complex organizations. The respondents were asked to rate the importance of each skill in their daily work and to assess their own ability to perform each skill. A five point Likert-scale response from strongly disagree to strongly agree was given for the importance rating. A five point Likert-like scale was given for the ability rating and the respondents could choose responses ranging from low to high. Utilizing the five-point Likert scale rating system allows for overall means for the ratings of importance and ability to be between one and five.

A full list of the skills can be found in the CPSAQ in Appendix D. The descriptive statistics for the “importance” rating of each section of skills can be found in Appendix H and are sorted, within each section, from the highest to the lowest overall mean score. The descriptive statistics for the “ability” rating of each section of skills can be found in Appendix H and are sorted, within each section, from the highest to the lowest overall mean score.

Personal Leadership and General Leadership Skills. The first section of skills on the CPSAQ is called the Personal Leadership and General Leadership Skills section and included 28 skills for evaluation. The five skills with the highest means regarding the importance of the skill include “provide vision” ($M=4.85$, $SD=0.38$), “demonstrate commitment” ($M=4.81$, $SD=0.40$), “create an environment of trust” ($M=4.8$, $SD=0.42$), “lead by example” ($M=4.80$, $SD=0.42$) and “possess perseverance” ($M=4.78$, $SD=0.44$).

Within the “Personal Leadership and General Leadership Skills” section, three of the five highest rated skills were the same for importance and ability. The presidents reported the following five as the skills at which they are most adept. First, with a mean of 4.73 ($SD=0.47$) was “demonstrating commitment.” Second, with a mean score of 4.67 ($SD=0.58$) was “crediting others.” The third highest mean was 4.67 ($SD=0.55$) for “possessing perseverance”. The fourth and fifth highest mean scores for ability were “leading my example” ($M=4.66$, $SD=0.52$) and “possessing common sense” ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.53$).

The table below shows the ranking of the top five importance skills and their position on the ability list. It also includes the top five scoring skills related to ability and their position on the importance list. The table serves to illustrate the three skills that were included in the highest mean scores for both importance and ability and how their rankings compare on each scale.

Table 4.1

Personal Leadership and General Leadership Top Five Skills

Position on Importance List	Skill	Position on Ability List	Position on Ability List	Skill	Position on Importance List
1	Provide vision	15	1	Demonstrate commitment	2
2	Demonstrate commitment	1	2	Credit others	6
3	Create an environment of trust	14	3	Possess perseverance	5
4	Lead by example	4	4	Lead by example	4
5	Possess perseverance	3	5	Possess common sense	13

Academic and Moral Leadership Skills. In the second section, Academic and Moral Leadership Skills, the importance ratings for the top five skills had the highest means of all of the sections and included the smallest standard deviations. In addition, three of the five skills with the highest means in this section were three of the five highest ranking skills overall. Therefore, the respondents perceive these skills as most important for college presidents, with little variation in their ratings. Of the 17 skills included in this section, those that scored the five highest means include “am honest” ($M=4.93$, $SD=0.26$), “demonstrate personal integrity” ($M=4.92$, $SD=0.27$), “respect others” ($M=4.83$, $SD=0.39$), “exhibit character” ($M=4.83$, $SD=0.38$), and “am fair” ($M=4.80$, $SD=0.46$).

Regarding the ability scores for this section of skills, “am fair” had the highest mean score at 4.89 ($SD=0.33$). The second highest score for ability in this section was “am honest” where $M=4.87$ ($SD=0.35$). “Demonstrate personal integrity” came in third with a mean score of $M=4.78$ ($SD=0.46$) and “am objective” came in fourth with a mean score of $M=4.72$ ($SD=0.47$). Finally, the fifth highest ability score within this section was $M=4.60$ ($SD=0.60$) for “having a pastoral role on campus”. The table below illustrates the positioning of the top five skills in this section with regard to importance and ability. Again, there are three skills from this section that ranked in the top five for both importance and ability.

Table 4.2

Academic and Moral Leadership Skills Five Skills

Position on Importance List	Skill	Position on Ability List	Position on Ability List	Skill	Position on Importance List
1	Am honest	2	1	Am fair	5
2	Demonstrate personal integrity	3	2	Am honest	1
3	Respect others	11	3	Demonstrate personal integrity	2
4	Exhibit character	7	4	Am objective	7
5	Am fair	1	5	Have a pastoral role on campus	17

Administrative, Executive, and Presidential Leadership Skills. The third section was Administrative, Executive, and Leadership Skills. This was the longest list and included 34 skills. The means of this section ranged from 4.86 to 3.90 for importance and from 4.65 to 3.87 for ability. The top five scoring skills on importance within this section include “lead the team of executive officers” with a mean score of 4.85 ($SD=0.37$), “recruit key leadership” with a mean score of 4.82 ($SD=0.41$), “serve as the ‘face’ of the institution” with a mean score of 4.78 ($SD=0.51$), “problem solve” with a mean score of 4.73 ($SD=0.48$), and “listen to others” with a mean score of 4.73 ($SD=0.46$).

Within the Administrative, Executive, and Leadership Skills section, the ability ratings had the highest standard deviations, meaning that responses on these items reflected a wider range of ratings than on others. The highest scoring skills regarding the respondents’ self-perceived ability include “serve as the ‘face’ of the institution” scoring

a mean of 4.65 ($SD=0.59$), “problem solving” which scored a mean of 4.62 ($SD=0.57$), “lead the team of executive officers which scored a mean of 4.58 ($SD=0.58$), “am visible” which scored a mean score of 4.58 ($SD=0.66$), and “possess strong written communication skills” which scored a mean of 4.55 ($SD=0.66$). The table below shows the highest scoring skills within this section with regard to importance and ability and the relationship of items on importance and ability.

Table 4.3

Administrative, Executive and Presidential Leadership Top Five Skills

Position on Importance List	Skill	Position on Ability List	Position on Ability List	Skill	Position of Importance List
1	Lead the team of executive officers	3	1	Serve as the “face” of the institution	3
2	Recruit key leadership	11	2	Problem solve	4
3	Serve as the “face” of the institution	1	3	Lead the team of executive officers	1
4	Problem solve	2	4	Am visible	7
5	Listen to others	7	5	Possess strong written communication skills	12

Political and Strategic Leadership Skills. The fourth and final section, Political and Strategic Leadership Skills, included 15 skills. The highest mean scores regarding importance of the skills were “act strategically” ($M=4.81$, $SD=0.41$), “am accountable to the governing board of the institution” ($M=4.72$, $SD=0.65$), “am a strategic planner for the institution” ($M=4.66$, $SD=0.59$), “work with a variety of constituents” ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.54$) and “serve as a change agent” ($M=4.59$, $SD=0.62$).

The Political and Strategic Leadership Skills section was the only section where the same five items were rated highest for both importance and ability. The highest scoring skills for ability within this section were “am accountable to the governing board of the institution” ($M=4.6$, $SD=0.65$), “act strategically” ($M=4.60$, $SD=0.61$), “work with a variety of constituents” ($M=4.52$, $SD=0.62$), “am a strategic planner” ($M=4.51$; $SD=0.71$), and “serve as a change agent” ($M=4.47$, $SD=0.69$). The table below illustrates the position of the top five skills on both the importance and ability lists within the section.

Table 4.4

Political and Strategic Leadership Skills Five Skills

Position on Importance List	Skill	Position on Ability List	Position on Ability List	Skill	Position on Importance List
1	Act strategically	2	1	Am accountable to the governing body of the institution	2
2	Am accountable to the governing body of the institution	1	2	Act strategically	1
3	Am a strategic planner for the institution	4	3	Work with a variety of constituents	4
4	Work with a variety of constituents	3	4	Am a strategic planner for the institution	3
5	Serve as a change agent	5	5	Serve as a change agent	5

Overall top scoring skills. Analyzing all of the skills together, a top five skills list was created based on the highest means for both importance and ability. The mean scores for the five skills that the respondents rated the highest overall for importance ranged from 4.93 ($SD=0.26$) to 4.83 ($SD=0.39$). The mean scores for the five skills that the respondents rated highest overall for their perceived ability ranged from 4.89 ($SD=0.33$) to 4.72 ($SD=0.47$). The tables below show the top five overall skills and their mean scores.

Table 4.5

Overall Top Five Skills for Importance

Top Five Skills (Importance)	Skill Section	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Am honest	Academic & Moral Leadership Skills	4.93	0.26
Demonstrate personal integrity	Academic & Moral Leadership Skills	4.92	0.27
Lead the team of executive officers	Administrative, Executive & Presidential Leadership Skills	4.85	0.37
Provide vision	Personal Leadership & General Leadership Skills	4.85	0.38
Respect others	Academic & Moral Leadership Skills	4.83	0.39

Table 4.6

Overall Top Five for Ability

Top Five Skills (Ability)	Skill Section	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Am fair	Academic & Moral Leadership Skills	4.89	0.33
Am honest	Academic & Moral Leadership Skills	4.87	0.35
Demonstrate personal integrity	Academic & Moral Leadership Skills	4.77	0.46
Demonstrate commitment	Personal Leadership & General Leadership Skills	4.73	0.47
Am objective	Academic & Moral Leadership Skills	4.72	0.47

Gender and Skills. T-tests were run to determine if there were statistically significant differences among females and males with regard to their ratings of the importance of skills and their self-perception of their ability. There were 31 skills that showed statistically significant differences between females and males in their ratings for importance. The statistics for the importance *t*-tests are included in Table 4.7. There are another 31 skills that showed statistically significant differences between females and males in the ratings for ability. The statistics for the ability *t*-tests are included in Table 4.8. Both tables are organized by the significance level, with those skills that show the greatest difference between men and woman at the top of the list.

Table 4.7

Gender and Skills: Importance Ratings

Skill	Female Mean	Male Mean	<i>t</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)
Lead by Example	4.91	4.74	4.72	0.000
Am Objective	4.75	4.55	3.75	0.000
Act Strategically	4.91	4.76	3.84	0.000
Know the Institution's Culture	4.84	4.69	3.47	0.001
Respect the Institution's Culture	4.68	4.46	3.29	0.001
Intellectual in Times of Change	4.11	3.82	2.04	0.001
Am Courageous	4.62	4.40	3.50	0.001
Am Honest	4.98	4.91	3.24	0.001
Speak with Courage and Conviction	4.82	4.66	3.35	0.001
Show Professionalism	4.84	4.70	3.14	0.002
Demonstrate Personal Integrity	4.97	4.89	3.12	0.002
Find Colleagues Who Have Strengths to Balance My Weaknesses	4.75	4.56	3.19	0.002
Respond to Forces Beyond My Control	4.45	4.21	3.19	0.002
Encourage Diversity in Committees	4.47	4.24	2.96	0.003
Serve as a Change Agent	4.61	4.40	2.95	0.003
Respect Others	4.90	4.79	2.93	0.004
Am a Role Model	4.70	4.54	2.88	0.004
Make Decisions in a Timely Fashion	4.75	4.61	2.82	0.005
Make Personnel Changes When Necessary	4.77	4.65	2.54	0.011
Build Relationships	4.83	4.72	2.47	0.014

Possess Strong Written Communication Skills	4.72	4.58	2.43	0.016
Dedicated to Student Success	4.81	4.70	2.27	0.024
Inspire Others	4.79	4.68	2.20	0.029
Academic Leader on Campus	4.09	3.90	2.16	0.031
Fund Raise	4.31	4.55	-2.11	0.036
Establish Relationships	4.81	4.71	2.09	0.037
Am Fair	4.86	4.76	2.05	0.041
Demonstrate Commitment	4.86	4.78	2.04	0.042
Intellectual in Times of Crisis	3.99	3.78	2.04	0.042
Negotiate	4.42	4.26	1.98	0.048
Provide Resources for Others	4.53	4.41	1.97	0.050

p<.05

Table 4.8

Gender and Skills: Ability Rating

Skill	Female Mean	Male Mean	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Establish Relationships	4.67	4.42	4.07	0.000
Build Relationships	4.68	4.44	3.84	0.000
Make Decisions in a Timely Fashion	4.61	4.35	4.06	0.000
Inspire Others	4.50	4.29	3.15	0.002
Respect Others	4.34	4.08	3.18	0.002
Manage the Operations and Logistics of the Business	4.27	4.00	3.12	0.002
Complete Performance Reviews	4.09	3.81	2.95	0.003
Provide Staff Recognition	4.42	4.18	2.95	0.003
Exhibit Character	4.57	4.39	2.93	0.004
Intellectual in Times of Change	4.05	3.82	2.75	0.006
Lead by Example	4.76	4.62	2.69	0.007
Respect the Institution's Culture	4.48	4.27	2.69	0.007
Have a Pastoral Role on Campus	4.70	4.54	2.71	0.007
Make Personnel Changes When Necessary	4.49	4.27	2.67	0.008
Respond to Forces Beyond My Control	4.21	3.98	2.65	0.008
Mentor Staff	4.29	4.06	2.63	0.009
Demonstrate Commitment	4.81	4.69	2.56	0.011
Demonstrate Personal Integrity	4.84	4.73	2.55	0.011
Dedicated to Student Success	4.71	4.56	2.54	0.012
Hold Staff Accountable	4.33	4.12	2.49	0.013
Am Supportive	4.50	4.32	2.45	0.015
Monitor Performance	4.17	3.96	2.44	0.015
Am Self-Aware	4.43	4.24	2.40	0.017
Encourage Diversity in Committees	4.29	4.08	2.40	0.017

Moral leader	4.05	3.84	2.34	0.020
Find Colleagues Who Have Strengths to Balance My Weaknesses	4.47	4.30	2.30	0.022
Provide Resources for Others	4.32	4.15	2.24	0.025
Am Courageous	4.44	4.30	2.05	0.041
Know Strengths and Weaknesses	4.44	4.30	2.01	0.045
Intellectual in Times of Crisis	4.09	3.91	2.02	0.045
Serve as a Change Agent	4.61	4.40	3.12	0.002

p<.05

Further nonparametric testing through a Mann Whitney U showed that three of the five importance skills and two of the five ability skills were significant based on gender. The three importance skills were “am honest” (p=.008), “demonstrate personal integrity” (p=.009) and “respect others” (p=.011). In each of these skills, the females rated their importance statistically significantly higher than the males. The two ability skills that show a statistically significant relationship with gender in this analysis are “demonstrate personal integrity” (p=.035) and “demonstrate commitment” (p=.013). Similar to the analysis of the importance skills, the females rated their ability on these two skills higher than the males at the p<.05 level.

Skills and Institution Type

In order to determine if there were statistically significant differences among the skills ratings for both importance and ability and the current institution type of the respondents, an ANOVA was run. The ANOVA analysis showed if, overall, the respondents’ ratings of the skills for importance and ability show any significant difference based on the type of institution where they currently work. It was determined that there were a total of 23 skills that showed statistically significant differences among institution types; 12 were skills ratings based on importance and the other 11 were based on ability. Table 4.9 shows which of the skills showed significant difference for

importance based on the respondents' current institution type. Table 4.10 shows which of the skills showed significant difference for ability based on the respondents' current institution type.

Table 4.9

ANOVA results for Skill Importance and Institution Type

Skill	Institution Type	Mean	F	Sig.
Identify new board members	Associates College	3.41	5.04	0.000
	Baccalaureate College	4.13		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.93		
	Doctoral Granting University	3.35		
	Special Focus Institution	3.93		
	Tribal College	3.67		
Dedicated to student success	Associates College	4.83	3.99	0.002
	Baccalaureate College	4.79		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.61		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.65		
	Special Focus Institution	4.55		
	Tribal College	5.00		
Serve as a political lobbyist	Associates College	3.85	3.62	0.003
	Baccalaureate College	3.46		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.29		
	Doctoral Granting University	3.65		
	Special Focus Institution	3.62		
	Tribal College	5.00		
Implement policies for the organization	Associates College	4.29	3.47	0.004
	Baccalaureate College	3.97		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.98		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.05		
	Special Focus Institution	4.45		
	Tribal College	4.33		
Cultivate board members	Associates College	3.75	3.32	0.006
	Baccalaureate College	4.27		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.14		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.00		
	Special Focus Institution	4.10		
	Tribal College	5.00		
Demonstrate commitment	Associates College	4.79	3.10	0.009
	Baccalaureate College	4.82		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.87		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.84		

	Special Focus Institution	4.55		
	Tribal College	5.00		
Encourage board member interaction with the faculty, staff and students	Associates College	3.36	3.06	0.010
	Baccalaureate College	3.90		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.58		
	Doctoral Granting University	3.27		
	Special Focus Institution	3.52		
	Tribal College	3.33		
Establish relationships	Associates College	4.82	2.95	0.012
	Baccalaureate College	4.70		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.70		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.78		
	Special Focus Institution	4.66		
	Tribal College	4.00		
Problem solve	Associates College	4.83	2.67	0.022
	Baccalaureate College	4.73		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.60		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.74		
	Special Focus Institution	4.66		
	Tribal College	4.67		
Fund raise	Associates College	4.37	2.46	0.033
	Baccalaureate College	4.55		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.69		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.49		
	Special Focus Institution	4.07		
	Tribal College	4.67		
Shape academic programs	Associates College	3.80	2.44	0.034
	Baccalaureate College	3.65		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.47		
	Doctoral Granting University	3.57		
	Special Focus Institution	3.55		
	Tribal College	4.33		
Possess strong conflict management skills	Associates College	4.60	2.38	0.038
	Baccalaureate College	4.33		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.34		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.41		
	Special Focus Institution	4.52		
	Tribal College	4.67		

p<.05

Table 4.10

ANOVA results for Skill Ability and Institution Type

Skill	Institution Type	Mean	F	Sig.
Serve as a political lobbyist	Associates College	3.73	3.77	0.002
	Baccalaureate College	3.25		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.23		
	Doctoral Granting University	3.75		
	Special Focus Institution	3.28		
	Tribal College	4.33		
Am self-aware	Associates College	4.34	3.13	0.009
	Baccalaureate College	4.26		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.15		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.46		
	Special Focus Institution	4.57		
	Tribal College	3.33		
Respond to forces beyond my control	Associates College	3.96	3.13	0.009
	Baccalaureate College	4.03		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.08		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.43		
	Special Focus Institution	4.00		
	Tribal College	5.00		
Identify new board members	Associates College	3.40	3.11	0.009
	Baccalaureate College	3.98		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.62		
	Doctoral Granting University	3.53		
	Special Focus Institution	3.76		
	Tribal College	2.33		
Create an environment of trust	Associates College	4.58	2.96	0.012
	Baccalaureate College	4.47		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.27		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.62		
	Special Focus Institution	4.50		
	Tribal College	4.67		
Am supportive	Associates College	4.49	2.87	0.015
	Baccalaureate College	4.33		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.32		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.39		
	Special Focus Institution	4.25		
	Tribal College	3.33		
Interact with the media	Associates College	4.27	2.83	0.016
	Baccalaureate College	4.14		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.23		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.57		

	Special Focus Institution	3.90		
	Tribal College	3.67		
Develop town gown relationships	Associates College	4.17	2.79	0.017
	Baccalaureate College	4.12		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.26		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.51		
	Special Focus Institution	3.86		
	Tribal College	3.00		
Fund raise	Associates College	3.88	2.73	0.019
	Baccalaureate College	4.06		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.10		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.19		
	Special Focus Institution	3.45		
	Tribal College	4.33		
Implement policies for the organization	Associates College	4.23	2.33	0.042
	Baccalaureate College	4.00		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	3.98		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.00		
	Special Focus Institution	4.28		
	Tribal College	4.67		
Dedicated to student success	Associates College	4.69	2.24	0.050
	Baccalaureate College	4.62		
	Masters Colleges and Universities	4.58		
	Doctoral Granting University	4.46		
	Special Focus Institution	4.39		
	Tribal College	5.00		

p<.05

After determining that the 23 skills above were shown to have a relationship with the current institution type of the respondents, a Tukey test was run to determine which skill(s) had relationships with which types of institution. Tukey tests are follow up tests that are run to delve deeper into the results of an ANOVA (Central Virginia's Governors School for Sciences and Technology, 1997). The ANOVA showed which skills were statistically significant based on institution type. The Tukey test shows which types of institutions differ significantly by skill. The table of each skill, a list of the two institutions that have a statistically significant difference between them with regard to the skill, and the p value is included below. Because each institution is paired with another

institution, there were 66 times when a pair was shown to be significant. Given that half of the pairings are redundant, there were 33 occurrences of significant pairings.

Table 4.11 shows the statistical results of the Tukey test for skill importance and institution type. Table 4.12 shows the statistical results of the Tukey test for skill ability and institution type. Each table includes the skill, the two institutions that show a statistically significant difference, the significance level for the ANOVA analysis and the significance level for the Tukey test analysis. The tables are sorted by ANOVA significance, then skill, and finally Tukey significance.

Table 4.12 does not include four of the skills that were statistically significant from the ANOVA analysis because when the Tukey test was done, some of the sample sizes were too small to complete the analysis. These four skill abilities were “am self-aware,” “develop town-gown relationships,” “implement policies for the organization,” and “dedicated to student success.”

Table 4.11

Tukey Test Results for Skill Importance

Skill	Institution Type One	Institution Type Two	ANOVA Sig.	Tukey Sig.
Identify new board members	Associates College	Baccalaureate College	0.000	0.000
Identify new board members	Baccalaureate College	Doctoral Granting University	0.000	0.019
Identify new board members	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.000	0.028
Dedicated to student success	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.002	0.007
Dedicated to Student Success Importance	Associates College	Special Focus Institution	0.002	0.049

Serve as a political lobbyist	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.003	0.007
Implement policies for the organization	Associates College	Baccalaureate College	0.004	0.037
Cultivate board members	Associates College	Baccalaureate College	0.006	0.007
Demonstrate commitment	Masters Colleges & Universities	Special Focus Institution	0.009	0.003
Demonstrate commitment	Baccalaureate College	Special Focus Institution	0.009	0.017
Demonstrate commitment	Associates College	Special Focus Institution	0.009	0.030
Demonstrate commitment	Doctoral Granting University	Special Focus Institution	0.009	0.040
Encourage board member interaction with the faculty, staff, & students	Associates College	Baccalaureate College	0.010	0.005
Establish relationships	Associates College	Tribal College	0.012	0.031
Problem solve	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.022	0.007
Fund raise	Masters Colleges & Universities	Special Focus Institution	0.033	0.030
Shape academic programs	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.034	0.032
Possess strong conflict management skills	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.038	0.021

p < .05

Table 4.12

Tukey Test Results for Skill Ability

Skill	Institution Type One	Institution Type Two	ANOVA Sig.	Tukey Sig.
Serve as a political lobbyist	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.002	0.020
Serve as a political lobbyist	Associates College	Baccalaureate College	0.002	0.026
Identify new board members	Associates College	Baccalaureate College	0.009	0.009
Respond to forces beyond my control	Associates College	Doctoral Granting University	0.009	0.013
Create an environment of trust	Associates College	Masters Colleges & Universities	0.012	0.006
Am supportive	Associates College	Tribal College	0.015	0.029
Interact with the media	Doctoral Granting University	Special Focus Institution	0.016	0.012
Fund raise	Masters Colleges & Universities	Special Focus Institution	0.019	0.028
Fund raise	Doctoral Granting University	Special Focus Institution	0.019	0.030
Fund raise	Baccalaureate College	Special Focus Institution	0.019	0.045

p<.05

The ANOVA and Tukey test results show statistically significant differences in the skills ratings of the presidents on both importance and ability, based on the type of institution the president serves. This shows that the skills used and possessed by the presidents may be different based on the work they are charged with doing at their specific institutions.

Institution Type and Skills with the Highest Means. A Chi square analysis and a Kruskal Wallace analysis were run to determine if there were any statistically

significant relationships between the type of institution the presidents currently serve and their rating on the importance and ability skills. The Kruskal Wallace analysis is a non-parametric ANOVA analysis, where categorical variables are analyzed with the means of the top five highest rated skills for importance and ability. The analysis showed that none of the five highest rated importance or ability skills had statistically significant relationships with the current institution type.

Gender

Three chi square analyses were run to determine if there was a relationship between the respondents' gender and the type of doctorate they received, gender and the type of institution they currently preside over, and between gender and the size of the institution the respondents preside over. There were no statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in any of the aforementioned analyses.

Current Institution Type

Chi square analysis was run to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the type of institution where the respondents attained their bachelor's degree and their current institutional type. The chi square showed statistical significance of 0.000 or $p < .01$. This means that there is less than a 5% chance that the relationship between attaining a Bachelor's degree at a baccalaureate college and working at a special focus institution is coincidental.

Another analysis was done to determine if the type of the respondents' doctoral degrees had a relationship with the type of institution they currently serve. Again, the chi square showed statistical significance at the $p < 0.01$ level. Table 4.13 is the SPSS output for the chi square analysis of the respondents' current institutional type and the type of

doctorate they earned. This shows there is a significant relationship between the type of doctorate respondents hold and the type of institution where they work.

Table 4.13

Chi Square SPSS Output for Type of Doctorate and Current Institutional Type

	Institutional Type of Current Institution						Total
	Associates College	Baccalaureate College	Masters Colleges and University	Doctoral Granting University	Special Focus Institution	Tribal College	
Ph.D.	55	52	63	30	8	3	211
Ed.D.	64	16	12	4	6	0	102
J.D.	4	2	3	1	2	0	12
M.D.	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Other	7	6	3	0	6	0	22
Total	130	76	81	36	23	3	349

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	79.317 ^a	20	.000
Likelihood Ratio	72.935	20	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.068	1	.795
N of Valid Cases	349		

a. 18 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ)

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) is a 24 question instrument that, when scored, gives each respondent a score on the agency scale and a score on the communion scale (Bakan, 1966; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Agency is a

construct that reflects a concern for self, is most often linked with masculinity, and can also be called instrumentality (Hundhammer & Mussweiler, 2012; Spence, et al., 1974). Communion is a construct that reflects a concern for others, is most often linked with femininity, and can also be called expressiveness (Hundhammer & Mussweiler, 2012; Spence, et al., 1974). Several analyses were completed based on the respondents' scores on both scales.

Each item on the agency and communion scales was assigned a score ranging from one to five points. Each scale included eight statements, which means a respondent could have scored between eight and 40 points on each scale. On the agency scale, the female respondents' scores ranged from 24 to 38. The mean score for the females on the agency scale was 33.22 ($SD=2.95$) and 72% ($n=93$) of the females scored in the top fourth on the scale. The males' scores ranged from 22 to 39 with an outlying score of 16. The mean male score on the agency scale was 32.90 ($SD=3.38$) and 70% ($n=182$) of the males scored in the top fourth on the scale. The descriptive analysis appears to show that the females and the males answered similarly on the agency scale.

On the communion scale, the females' scores ranged from 24 to 40 with a mean score of 32.13 ($SD=3.67$) and 56% ($n=73$) scored in the top fourth of the scale. The males' scores ranged from 20 to 39 with a mean score of 31.30 ($SD=3.56$) and 49% ($n=127$) scoring in the top fourth of the scale. The descriptive analysis appears to show that the females and the males answered similarly on the communion scale.

In order to determine if the females and males did answer similarly on the agency and communion scales, a *t*-test was utilized. A *t*-test analysis showed a statistically significant difference between females and males on the communion scale at the $p<0.05$

level of 0.033, with the women scoring higher. There was no statistically significant difference among the females and the males on the agency scale.

Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) and Skills. The next analysis that was completed determines if there are any relationships between the respondents' PAQ scores and the highest ranked skills for importance and ability. The agency scale scores were analyzed through a Spearman Rho nonparametric correlation analysis with the top five highest mean skills for importance and ability. Only one of the skills ranked in the top five for importance showed a statistically significant relationship with the agency scores. "Lead the team of executive officers" was significant at the $p < .05$ level and showed a very weak, positive correlation with the agency scores. All five of the skills rated at the top on importance showed weak, positive correlations with the communion scores. "Am honest," "demonstrate personal integrity," "lead the team of executive officers," and "respect others" each had a statistically significant relationship with the communion scores at the $p < .01$ level. "Provide vision" had a statistically significant relationship with the communion scores at the $p < .05$ level. "Respect others" had the highest correlation with communion scores with a correlation coefficient of 0.304.

With regard to the five skills rated highest for ability, four of the five showed statistically significant relationships with the agency scale. "Am fair," "demonstrate commitment," and "am objective" were significant at the $p < .01$ level and "am honest" showed significance at the $p < .05$ level. All four of the skills showed a very weak, positive relationship. Overall, the highest correlations were observed when comparing the skills rated in the top five for ability and the communion scores. All five showed a statistically significant relationship at the $p < .01$ level. Each of the five skills showed

weak, positive correlations with the communion scores. The skills and their corresponding correlation coefficients are as follows: “am fair” (.173), “am honest” (.235), “demonstrate personal integrity” (.360), “demonstrate commitment” (.209), and “am objective” (.241).

Similar analysis was run to determine if there were any relationships between the communion scale and any of skills, as rated for either importance or ability. “Am honest” (.008), “demonstrate personal integrity” (.007) and “respect others” (.000) were found to be statistically significant importance skills at the $p < .01$ level. The chi-square analysis also shows that there is a statistically significant relationship between the communion scale scores and all five of the skills that were highest scoring for ability at the $p < .01$ level. The ability skills that show a statistically significant relationship with the communion scale scores are “am fair” (.000), “am honest” (.000), “am objective” (.000), “demonstrate personal integrity” (.000), and “demonstrate commitment” (.000).

Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) and Current Institution. The final analysis run with the PAQ scores was to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in the PAQ scores of the respondents based on the type of institution where they currently work. An analysis using ANOVA showed statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. The ANOVA analysis shows that there is a relationship, but does not show where the relationship is. A follow-up analysis using the post-hoc Tukey test showed that the significant difference was between doctoral granting universities and tribal colleges. This suggests that the PAQ scores for presidents at doctoral granting universities are different from the PAQ scores for presidents at tribal colleges.

Results by Research Question

Research question #1. The first research question seeks to determine if there are any relationships between the presidents' attributes, measured by PAQ score, and the type of institution they currently serve, or between the PAQ score and the presidents' rating of which skills are important in their current position. ANOVA analysis shows that there is a statistically significant relationship between the PAQ score and the current institution type of the respondents at the $p < .05$ level. A post hoc Tukey test shows that presidents of doctoral granting institutions and presidents of tribal colleges have statistically significant differences in their PAQ scores.

Spearman Rho nonparametric correlations were run to determine if the PAQ scores of the respondents showed any relationships with the respondents' ratings of the importance of the skills included in the CPSAQ. The analysis determined that there are weak positive correlations between the communion scores and all five of the skills that were highest rated for importance. "Respect others" had a .304 correlation coefficient with communion scores at the $p < .01$ level. Only one of the skills that was top rated for importance had a correlation with the agency scale, and it was a very weak correlation. These results can be found in Appendix I.

Research question #2. The second research question explores the respondents' PAQ scores in relationship to their gender and the ability skills ratings. While it appeared as though the females and the males responded similarly to the agency and communion scales in a descriptive analysis, a *t*-test analysis showed that there is a statistically

significant difference in females and males on the communion scale, with females scoring higher than males.

Analyzing the respondents' gender with the ability ratings for each of the skills showed that 31 skills showed statistically significant differences in the ratings between females and males. The list of skills and each of the skills' significance levels can be found in Table 4.8.

A Spearman Rho correlation analysis of the respondents' PAQ scores and the ratings of the highest rated skills for ability shows that four of the five skills have a very weak, positive correlation with the agency scale. All five showed weak correlations with the communion scale. "Demonstrate personal integrity" had the highest positive correlation of all of the skills at .360 at the $p < .01$ level. These results can be found in Appendix I.

Research question #3. Research question three explores any relationship between the respondents' current institution type and the skills they rate as important and/or believe they perform well at. An ANOVA analysis showed that 23 different skills, 12 for importance and 11 for ability, show statistically significant relationships with the current institution type. The importance skill ratings and their significance levels can be found in table 4.9. The ability skill ratings and their significance levels can be found in Table 4.10.

Further analysis through a post hoc Tukey test shows 33 pairings of institutional types where presidents rate the importance or ability of skills statistically significantly differently. The Tukey analysis for importance skill ratings by institutional type pairs can

be found in Table 4.11. The follow up analysis for the ability skill ratings by institutional type pairs can be found in Table 4.12.

Kruskall Wallace analysis determined that there were no significant differences based on institutional type for the five highest rated skills for importance and ability.

Research question #4. This question focused on the relationships between demographic characteristics and institution type. It was determined that there is no statistically significant relationship between the presidents' gender and the type of institution they currently serve. It appears likely, however, that of the respondents who work at special focus institutions, a statistically significant number of them received their doctoral degree from baccalaureate institutions ($p=.009$).

Summary

This chapter provided the results of the analysis of the data collected from a sample of the Chief Executive Officers of individual colleges and universities across the United States ($n=410$, or 10.23%). While some of the analyses did not show any differences by gender, and others did not show any statistically significant differences by their doctoral degree or the current type of institution they serve, the data provides information about the presidency that was not known before.

The statistical analysis showed that for the presidents in this sample, there is no relationship between gender and the type of institution that the president currently serves. Analysis of gender and the PAQ scales shows that females and males score similarly on the agency, or instrumentality, scale but they score differently on the communion, or expressiveness, scale. The PAQ scale scores show differences by institutional type. This shows that presidents at different types of institutions rate themselves differently on the

agency and communion scales. Finally, when rating the importance of each of the skills and the presidents' ability to perform the skill, the institution type of the president matters as there were statistically significant differences on ratings of skill importance and ability based on the current institution type of the president.

This chapter was meant to discuss the findings of the College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire. The following chapter will delve into further analysis of the findings to discuss implications for the current presidency and for those people who may be striving to be college presidents in the future.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Discussion, and Implications

“Someone cannot really understand the position [presidency] until she/he is in it” commented one of the respondents to this research study. This shows the complexity of the position of the college president, especially considering the varied types of institutions that exist around the country. While complex, it is important to learn from current institutional presidents about their daily work on college and university campuses around the United States.

This study was designed to look broadly at several components of the presidents’ demographic information as well as the skills and attributes they utilize in their work. This led to the creation of four research questions that would explore the presidents’ attributes as defined by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), their demographic information, the skills they believe are important, their self-assessment of their performance on those skills, and relationships between these characteristics.

The College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire (CPSAQ) questionnaire was disseminated at 10:00pm Eastern Standard Time (EST) on a weeknight to approximately 4000 college and university presidents across the U.S. By 1:10am the following morning, 41 questionnaires had been completed. Questionnaires continued to be submitted at 5:15am that morning. In reviewing the questionnaire completion data, questionnaires were collected on other days at 1:30am and 4:25am. Since the questionnaires were disseminated from a computer on the East coast and the times of

completion were also calculated on Eastern Standard Time, some of these times may be up to three hours earlier in the respondents' own time zones. It is clear that presidents do not keep traditional business hours.

Several presidents commented that they struggled to complete the instrument on their mobile electronic devices, such as smart phones and tablets while they were traveling. Other presidents mentioned receiving dozens of requests each week to complete research studies like this one. Thirteen of the respondents requested a copy of the results of the study. Anecdotally, this information suggests that the presidents completed the questionnaires themselves rather than delegating the task to a staff member.

Discussion

Respondents. Overall, the sample of respondents consisted of a majority (67%) of presidents from institutions that have fewer than 5,000 students. In the United States, small institutions, or those with fewer than 5,000 students, account for approximately 75% of the total number of institutions of higher education (United States Department of Education, 2010). In this way, the sample in this study is proportional to, and largely representative of, the national sample in that the majority of the sample are presidents of small institutions, and the majority of institutions in the country are small. While there are more presidents of small institutions, it might also be possible that presidents of smaller institutions are more likely to complete research requests, or that more small college presidents completed the questionnaire because they check their own email regularly.

Of all of the presidents of colleges and universities in the United States in 2011, 26% were women (Green, et al., 2012). The respondents of this study were comprised of 139 females (34%) and 268 males (66%), so there is a higher representation of women in this study than the percentage of women college presidents in the country.

The average age of all college presidents, according to Cook and Kim (2012), is 61 years old. The age range of 60-69 years old was the most common among the respondents, accounting for 45%, demonstrating that the respondents were representative of college presidents in terms of age.

Cook and Kim (2012) found that the average tenure of a president is seven years. Of the presidents in this study, only 17% said they were in their current position between seven and nine years. Another 25% have been in their current presidency for between four and six years and 12% have been in their presidency between 10 and 12 years. This shows that more than half of the respondents to this study are between their fourth and twelfth years, so the sample of the study is representative of the national average of seven years.

While a majority of the respondents are in the first six years of their presidency, a majority of the respondents have served in higher education for more than 15 years. Approximately 86% of the respondents hold the title of “president” and almost 61% of them have a doctor of philosophy degree. A very large majority (92%) of the respondents received their doctoral degree from a doctoral granting institution.

Of the presidents who responded, more than a third of them serve at associate’s colleges. One quarter of the respondents serve at baccalaureate colleges and another quarter serve as master’s colleges and university presidents. About half of the current

presidents who responded to the CPSAQ held the position of Vice President just prior to becoming a president.

Much of the demographic profile of the respondents may have been anticipated, based on national statistics. For example, a majority of colleges and universities in the United States are small or have fewer than 5,000 students enrolled, and the majority of respondents were from small institutions. The proportion of women in the study is higher than the national percentage, but not dramatically so. It is a bit surprising that less than half of the current presidents served in vice presidencies before the presidency, but feedback from some of the respondents stated that they did not have the option of choosing “provost” as their prior position. Perhaps if those people who would have chosen “provost” would have chosen “vice president” and entered “academic affairs” as their functional area, there would have been a greater percentage of vice presidencies chosen as the prior position. The average age of the respondents, as well as the time they have served in their current position, are also relatively similar to national statistics. Overall, the sample of presidents who responded to this study is proportional to the overall population nationally.

Review and Summary of Findings Related to the Research Questions. As a means of discussing and making meaning of the data found in chapter four, the following section will describe the data as it relates to each of the research questions. There is one overall finding that is worth including here, as it would fit into more than one research question. Of the 31 skills rated for importance that showed a statistically significant difference between females and males, the females rated the importance of the skills higher than the males on every skill except “fund raise.” Of the 31 skills that showed

significant differences between females and males for ability, the females rated their ability higher than the males rated their own ability on all 31 skills. Women may generally use higher ratings, but it may also be that they perceive that more of the skills are of greater importance, and they may actually be more confident in their ability to perform those skills than the males are. This suggests that the women who become college presidents have a high level of confidence in their abilities. Given the challenges they face on their way to the presidency, it is reasonable to believe that achieving that level requires significant self-confidence to persevere.

Research question one: PAQ, institution type, and skill importance. Research question one explores the relationships between the presidents' attributes, as defined by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), and their current institution type. Question one also seeks to determine if there are relationships between the respondents' attributes and the skills they rated as the most important in their daily work.

Throughout the rest of this chapter some of the phrases regarding the scales in the PAQ will be used interchangeably. In order to clarify, it is important to remember that the agency scale includes attributes that are related to instrumentality and are often associated with traditionally masculine traits. The communion scale includes attributes that are related to expressiveness and are often associated with traditionally feminine traits.

The analysis of the data shows that while for most respondents, there are no differences in their attributes related to the type of institutions they serve, there is a significant difference in the PAQ scores of presidents at doctoral granting institutions compared to peers at tribal colleges. Further research would need to be completed to

determine where and to what extent the PAQ scores differ based on these institutional types, but it seems plausible that the PAQ scores differ significantly between presidents at these two types of institutions because they are the most dissimilar from one another of the six institutional types as listed by the Carnegie Foundation (Carnegie Foundation, 2010). Different PAQ results between the presidents at these two types of institutions indicate that individuals who become presidents of doctoral granting institutions differ significantly in terms of instrumentality/expressiveness from those who are presidents of tribal colleges.

It is plausible that the differences between the skills presidents utilize while leading tribal colleges are different than the skills that presidents of doctoral granting institutions utilize due to the vast differences in institutional mission and type. Tribal colleges are traditionally and stereotypically known to serve disenfranchised populations that face poverty, substance abuse, and unemployment. Tribal college staff serve as advocates for their students. In addition, students who have the opportunity to attend a tribal college may see their college education as their hope for a different future than they have known. Mission driven tribal colleges focus on improving retention and graduation rates, are traditionally smaller in size and, like other small institutions, focus on relationships between students, staff, faculty and administrators. In addition, Native Americans consider themselves to be part of a collectivist culture and “describe themselves through their relational roles in society” (Gorodnichenko & Roland, 2011, p. 11). A collectivist paradigm that involves relationships is likely to appreciate people who possess strong expressiveness/communion attributes. In contrast, doctoral granting institutions are often very large in size, focus on majority populations, have sizable

budgets, receive large grants to pursue research, and are generally considered “wealthy” in comparison with other types of institutions. Because of the scope of the role and the need to manage large, complex organizations, individuals with strengths in instrumental attributes may be more likely to be drawn to this set of challenges, selected for the role, and find a fit in the position.

With regard to the PAQ scores and the skills the presidents ranked as most important, “lead the team of executive officers” was the only skill that showed a correlation with the agency scores. In other words, respondents who describe themselves as more instrumental and who possess traditionally masculine attributes believe that leading the team of executive officers is a more important component of their daily work as president than people who rate themselves lower on agency. This suggests that the role of leading the executive team is more important to presidents who see themselves as stronger in traditionally masculine attributes than to others. It is possible that those higher in communion attributes see themselves more as a member of the team than as the leader of it.

The communion scale scores showed correlations with all five of the highest ranked skills for importance. The highest correlation was between the communion scores and “respect others.” This indicates that the respondents who describe themselves as more expressive and with traditionally feminine attributes believe that respecting others is a more important skill than those respondents who rate themselves lower on the communion scale. Given that women scored significantly higher on the communion scale in this study, this data would suggest that women overall rated “respecting others” as very highly important to them in their work. High communion scores show a focus on

community and on other people rather than self, so a finding that “respecting others” is important to them is not surprising. Still, it does reflect a congruence of attributes and attitudes, wherein an individual focus on community is coupled with a valuing of acting with respect.

The literature review for this study included information about how presidents spend their time. While this study did not investigate the actual use of the presidents’ time, it is possible to look at the skills they identified as important in light of the ways that they spend their time, as identified through the literature. In 2007 and 2012 the American Council on Education (American Council on Education, 2007; Cook & Kim, 2012) surveyed presidents about how they spend their time. Fundraising and budget management ranked in the top two both years. Interestingly, the respondents’ ratings of the importance of fundraising placed it as the 19th most important skill within the Administrative, Executive and Presidential Leadership skills, in the bottom half of 34 total skills. Budget management was ranked 24th in the list of 34 skills, also in the bottom half. Based on this study, it would seem that presidents spend a majority of their time using skills that they do not believe are the most important in their work. However, findings from this study would indicate that the skills that presidents see as important are also ones in which they are skilled. Perhaps the skills that are important to the presidents also come easily to them and take less of their time. Another possibility is that the presidents have worked to develop the skills that are important to their positions, so those come more easily to them now than the skills may have in prior positions. A third possibility is that some of the skills that the presidents believe are less important do, in fact, take more of their time than other, more important skills. Said another way, the

areas that take most of their time require skills that they see as less important to the presidency, and they have less time than they would like to employ the skills they see as important to their work. Finally, and more specifically, presidents in this study may have perceived the task of fundraising differently than the presidents who responded to the studies by the American Council on Education.

The first research question focused on relationships between presidents' attributes of agency and communion and two factors: current institution type and skills important to their work. With only one exception, there did not appear to be a relationship between attributes and institution type. Presidents with varying attributes were not clustered by institution type, suggesting that their attributes were not factors either in constraining or leading to their choice of institution to serve. Attributes did, however, seem to be related in some ways to the skills that presidents saw as important. Those higher in agency saw leading the executive team as very important in their work, and those higher in communion rated respecting others more highly than their counterparts do. While these associations make intuitive sense, they also serve to confirm that personal attributes are expressed in the valuing of various skills. Interestingly, however, there is also evidence that the skills that presidents value are not always those that take up most of their time. While it is beyond the scope of this study to determine whether this is because they do not value the skills they use most (for fundraising and budget management) or because the skills they value most are not strictly task-related, the results do suggest that presidents are spending significant time on tasks that differ from the ones they see as most important in their work.

Research question two: PAQ, gender, and skill ability. Research question two explores the relationships between the respondents' PAQ scores and their gender and between their PAQ scores and the skills on which they rate their ability highest. While there was no significant relationship between the respondents' gender and their agency scale scores on the PAQ, there was a statistically significant difference between the respondents' genders and their communion scale scores on the PAQ. Females scored higher on the communion scale than their male counterparts. Antonaros (2010) found that women were more communal than men, and this study supports that finding. However, this study also supports Twenge's (1997) finding that women and men show less difference in their masculinity scores now than they did 10 years before. Overall, both males and females rated themselves in the top third of the possible scores on the agency and communion scales, showing that both males and females believe they have both instrumental and expressive attributes. In this study, females and males rated themselves similarly to one another on the agency scale, or the scale that includes instrumental and traditionally masculine attributes. The female respondents to the study rated themselves higher than the males in the communion, or traditionally feminine attributes listed in the PAQ. This would show that while male presidents perceive that they possess traditional attributes of leadership, female presidents also perceive that they possess those attributes. The females in this study also perceive that they possess more expressive attributes than males peers do. In short, the females perceive that they possess both the instrumental and expressive attributes and rate themselves higher on expressive attributes compared with their male counterparts. The female respondents seem to be

able to have added the instrumental attributes without forfeiting any of their expressive attributes.

Although the findings from this research study agree with recent literature (Antonaros, 2010; Twenge, 1997), it is perhaps more complicated than it seems. Women presidents are in the minority in the United States, comprising only 26% of the college presidencies (Green, Jaschik, & Lederman, 2012). If attributes were the deciding factor in who attains the presidency, it would seem that the numbers would be more equal, given that, in this study, women seem to have adopted the instrumental attributes that also characterize male presidents. Males and females are both shown, in this study, to preside over all six types of institutions as listed by the Carnegie Foundation (2010), and they rate themselves highly on their ability to perform the skills they deem are important to the presidency. In addition, most of the skills rated important by the presidents are the same across institutional type. It seems clear that the skills and attributes required of college presidents are broad, diverse, and varied, and that they are similar regardless of institution type. It is also clear that females and males who become college presidents believe that they are up to the task of performing the skills and that they possess the important attributes. Again, there seems to be no reason based in the factors examined in this study why there would be a discrepancy in the numbers of male and female presidents.

Another consideration, however, is that the respondents to this study are currently employed as college presidents. It is possible that their confidence in their ability to perform the necessary skills of a college president is precisely what allowed them to be noticed and chosen as college presidents, and that their selection, in turn, reinforced their confidence. A third consideration, not exclusive of the others, is that the respondents

were hired because of their ability to perform a variety of skills well. Perhaps others who apply for presidencies are not chosen because their skillset has not yet been developed for such a broad role or because their attributes are not seen as suited for the role.

Beyond personal skills and attributes, there may also be external reasons influencing male and female presidents to rate their skills and attributes similarly. As more colleges and universities across the United States face budget cuts, all administrators are forced to do more in their positions than they used to. Having to complete new tasks and manage different projects forces administrators to build their arsenal of professional skills, abilities, and attributes. Such expansion of responsibility inevitably leads to expanded and enhanced skills and broadened perspectives. Perhaps as a result there will be even more administrators encouraged to pursue the presidency because they are prepared in ways they have not been prepared for the position in the past.

In this study, both male and female presidents identified with attributes reflecting a traditional understanding of leadership. It is possible that the stereotypes about male and female leaders leading differently are no longer accurate. The results of this study would suggest that female leaders have acquired skills and attributes traditionally associated with male leaders. It is also possible that over the years, both males and females have had to build skills, such as being honest, demonstrating personal integrity, and being fair, that would allow them to effectively lead a diverse population of staff. In doing this, perhaps males and females have found it necessary to employ both agency and communion attributes in their leadership order to be as effective in their roles as possible, with women still possessing more communion attributes than males.

Regardless of whether they scored high on agency or high on communion, presidents rated a similar set of skills as most reflective of their abilities. These skills – being fair, honest, and objective, and demonstrating commitment – were associated with strength of attributes rather than a specific profile of them. It is beyond the scope of this study to determine why having strong personal attribute scores would be associated with self-perceived strengths in these particular skills. However, it is possible that the skills are rated highly by different individuals for different reasons, based on their attributes.

Research question three: Institution type and skills. Research question three explores the relationships between the current institution type of the respondents and the skills they rated as highest for importance and ability. This analysis was completed to determine if there are skills that are more important to presidents of certain types of institutions than others, or if presidents of certain types of institutions believe they are more skilled in certain areas than presidents at other institutions.

Results of this analysis revealed no differences based on institution type, indicating again that presidents across institution types may be more similar than different. Further analyses demonstrated relationships among the skills in terms of those rated as important and those the respondents believed that they possess.

When comparing skills that the presidents rated in terms of importance and their own ability, only two skills were in top five of both lists. They were “demonstrate personal integrity” and “am honest.” While other skills were rated as high for importance or for ability, presidents rated “demonstrate personal integrity” and “am honest” as skills that are both important and reflective of themselves. Integrity and honesty are perceived as crucial to the role and to the way that individuals perform it. This is both important

and heartening, given recent scandals implicating presidents; this finding may also reflect a heightened focus on these skills because of current mixed perceptions of the presidency.

While integrity and honesty were the two skills that appeared in the top five skills rated for importance and ability from the entire list of 34, additional insight can be gained by looking at the ratings by the four theme areas contained in the full skills list. Three skills were rated in the top five for both importance and ability in the Personal Leadership and General Leadership skills category. Those three skills were “demonstrate commitment,” “lead by example,” and “possess perseverance.” The Academic and Moral Leadership skill section also had three skills in common for both importance and ability. The skills that the presidents rated as important and in which they rated themselves as highly competent were “am honest”, “demonstrate personal integrity” and “am fair.” The third category of skills, Administrative, Executive and Presidential Leadership skills, only had two skills that were rated highest in both importance and ability. They were “lead the team of executive officers” and “serve as the ‘face’ of the institution.” Finally, four of the skills in the Political and Strategic Leadership section were the most important to the presidents and they felt adept at completing them. The four skills were “act strategically,” “am accountable to the governing body of the institution,” “work with a variety of constituents,” and “serve as a change agent.”

Although the categories had face validity, they were created for convenience and did not represent statistically tested separate constructs. However, it is interesting that each category had a few items that were identified as important and as reflective of the respondents’ skills; it may be as interesting that there was not more correlation between the skills they see as important and the skills they believe they have. While further

research would be needed to better understand this, it would seem that presidents possess skills that they do not see as imperative for their work, and that they are also able to identify those areas where their skills could be stronger.

Across the four themes of skills, 12 of the 20 top rated skills were rated in the top five for both importance and ability. That equates to presidents rating their ability highly on 60% of the skills they rated as the most important. Overall, the presidents who responded to this study believe they possess the skills that they believe are important to leading an institution of higher education. Given that the most skills that were rated high for importance and ability were in the Political and Strategic Leadership skills section, presidents need to be able to serve their institutions in political and strategic ways, perhaps above the other category areas.

Research question four: Demographic characteristics and institution type. The fourth research question explores the relationships between demographic information and the type of institution the president serves. There was no relationship between the gender of the respondents and the type of institution that they preside over. This shows that males and females alike have been hired to serve at many different types of institutions. Put another way, there is no specific type of institution more likely to have a female or male president. It is worth noting that prior research has shown that most female college presidents work at associates colleges, baccalaureate colleges, and master's colleges and universities (Cook & Kim, 2012), but that was not found in this study. While it is possible that the response rate affected this, it is also possible that the historic relationships between gender and institution type have begun to change.

On another note, this study also indicated that presidents of special focus institutions were more likely to receive their doctoral degree from a baccalaureate institution. It is uncommon for presidents to receive their doctoral degree from a baccalaureate institution, as those institutions by definition award few doctoral degrees, and most of the respondents received their doctoral degree at a doctoral granting institution, as would be expected. Further research could explore in more depth the nature of the presidency at special focus institutions and the specific paths that may lead there.

Comments from the Presidents. Several of the presidents submitted comments to the final question on the questionnaire, where they were able to add any additional information they would like the researcher to consider that was not included in the questionnaire. There were a few comments that were repeated multiple times. Several presidents mentioned the need to have thick or tough skin. They encouraged those people who might pursue presidencies to reflect on whether they are “tough enough” for the job. Several presidents also mentioned that the presidency is a very lonely role at the institution, one that causes them to make many unpopular decisions. A few presidents acknowledged that there is no position or set of experiences that truly prepares someone for a college presidency, and that the position cannot truly be understood unless you are in it. Overwhelmingly though, the presidents that responded to the CPSAQ said that they loved their jobs, that they loved going to work every day, and that it was the most challenging but also the most rewarding position they had held. They described the presidency as a lifestyle rather than a job. The respondents described their roles as presidents as “amazing,” “the very best jobs in the world,” “a very dynamic and engaging

role,” “still the best job I ever had and I still love coming to work most every day,” and “extremely personally rewarding.”

The presidents also seem to see their position as involving very broad and lofty ideas and goals. The comments are visionary and motivational in nature. There were significant comments about serving their constituents rather than themselves and about serving a greater good even when it is unpopular. One respondent stated, “Our communities count on us. Our nation counts on us.”

While most of the respondents had very positive, thoughtful, and contributory comments, others had a more negative view of their position. One person said, “Don’t do it! Respect and appreciation are long gone and never will return.” Another respondent commented, “To expect that simply by having a doctorate and chalk dust on your sleeve qualifies you to be a college president is crazy.”

Several of the respondents commented that they were impressed with the questionnaire and believed that the list of skills in the CPSAQ was comprehensive and accurately described the skills utilized in their daily work. Others, however, believed that leadership “is not a collection of traits as your study seems to indicate” and still others suggested skills that they believed should have been included in the instrument. Some of the skills that were suggested include working with alumni, working with athletics, building relationships with employers, listening, and being transparent. Many of the presidents offered advice, such as the need to build relationships with a variety of constituents and the importance of getting comfortable operating outside of your comfort zone. One respondent said that the “best professional experiences I had to prepare me to be a president were those in Student Services.” One comment summed up many of the

other comments included in the open response question. The respondent stated that the “key factors for success” are:

(1) ability to operate effectively beyond one’s comfort zone, (2) emotional intelligence, (3) knowing when to listen, and when to act – it is an art form, (4) building a leadership team of professionals who are aligned with you on priorities, and yet are independent thinkers who bring different perspectives and strengths to the team, and (5) being strong physically, mentally, and of character.”

The open ended responses, like the study results, suggest that the presidency is a complex role, requiring a wide range of skills and attributes as well as a sense of dedication and purpose.

Overview of Discussion. This study was initiated and completed to gain information from college and university presidents across the United States about their skills, characteristics, and positions, as well as any differences related to gender or other factors. The data collected and analyzed give a good overview of who the presidents are that responded to this study, and what types of skills they believe are important in their work, and what types of skills they believe they possess.

The respondents were fairly representative of the population of presidents from across the country. Specifically, there were fewer females than males represented in the respondent pool; a majority of the respondents preside over small institutions, although all sizes and Carnegie Classes of institutions were represented; and the respondents’ ages and tenure in their current position were similar to the national population.

With regard to the skills included in this study, several trends were observed. On every skill where there was a significant difference between how males and females rated

themselves, the female presidents rated themselves higher. The females also gave higher ratings for importance than their male counterparts to all of the skills except fund raising. . It may just be that the female respondents tended to use the rating scales differently, giving higher ratings overall. However, it may also be that the females have a high level of confidence that they can perform the most important skills included in the CPSAQ.

In analyzing the results of the PAQ agency and communion scale scores, it was determined that both males and females score similarly on the agency scale. It was also determined that females score higher on the communion scale than their male counterparts. Over time, there have been stereotypes of men and women in leadership; men have been thought to be forceful, action-oriented leaders, while women have been seen as more relationship oriented and focused on process over task (Kovach, 1990; Powell, 2011). In the context of the literature and the PAQ, these approaches have been characterized as agency, or instrumentality, and communion, or expressiveness (Spence & Helmreich, 1980; Spence & Wilhelm, 1981). As women ascended the ranks of leadership, there has been speculation that they would need to act in traditionally male ways in order to achieve, and that the traditionally masculine traits would come at the cost of their traditionally feminine traits. While the design of this study does not permit causal conclusions to be drawn, the results suggest that women have, in fact, adopted attributes associated with men, but that they have also retained those characteristics attributed to women. In other words, in this study, male presidents seem to identify with traditionally male attributes, while female presidents identify with the broad range of male and female attributes. Further, as the respondents rated a list of skills for importance and for their own ability, the top five rated skills for both correlated with

communion scores. The attributes traditionally seen as feminine are related to the skills seen as important and necessary to the presidency.

Two other important findings came to light in this study. First, presidents of tribal colleges and doctoral granting institutions are different from one another in their leadership attributes. This raises interesting questions about whether the presidency as it exists at these two institution types actually requires a different set of characteristics. Second, there was no relationship between gender and institution type in this study, showing that females were presidents of every type of institution included in this study. As previously stated, the presidency requires a great number of skills and abilities. In order for males and females to be successful in the presidency at any type of institution, they must possess these broad skills. Although the females respondents rated themselves higher in communion attributes than the males did, the females and the males rate the importance of skills and their ability to perform the skills more similarly than differently. The understanding of the presidency by those who are in that role seems to be similar across differences; based on these results, it appears that presidents overall have similar views of what is important in the role.

Finally, it is clear that most of the presidents that participated in this research study enjoy their work. Comments from the presidents stated that they loved their jobs, they enjoy coming to work, and that their jobs are very rewarding. The respondents believe that presidents need to be “tough” but that the good outweighs the bad.

Limitations

Although there were some very important and interesting findings to this study, there are also some limitations. This section will focus on limitations in response rates, questionnaire design, and questionnaire validity.

Respondents and Response Rates. The CPSAQ was emailed out to over 4,000 college presidents across the United States. Just over 10% of those people who received the questionnaire completed the research study. Although the respondents are a fairly representative sample based on the demographic information that was collected by the instrument, it is not possible to generalize findings from 10% of the population to the entire population.

Although the respondents' gender, institution size, tenure in their current position, and age are similar to the national statistics, the data in this study could be skewed to show greater representation of small institution presidents and of women. Those presidents may also be different in some way(s) that were not able to be assessed. The respondents to this study could be more participative, more collaborative, or more communal than their counterparts who chose not to participate. Again, the data and analysis in this study may not be able to be generalized to the entire population of college presidents throughout the country.

Questionnaire Design. Some of the feedback received from the open-ended question on the CPSAQ and from the presidents via email suggested some items to consider for future iterations of the instrument. Some of the presidents believed the instrument was too long or took too much time. Even though some people completed it in 12 minutes, others said they did not have the time to set aside. Some of the

respondents said it was difficult to navigate the instrument through Qualtrics on technology other than a computer, such as a cell phone or tablet. These issues may have reduced the number of participants in the study or caused people to skip questions or answer quickly in order to complete the questionnaire.

In addition to that overall feedback about the instrument, some of the questions were perceived to be lacking by some of the respondents. To begin, several people noted that “provost” was not an option that could be chosen as a previous position. The researcher had planned for the provosts to choose Vice President for their position, and enter Academic Affairs as their functional area, but some of the respondents did not interpret that as a possibility. This misunderstanding would have affected the responses to the “previous professional experience” section of the questionnaire, and so the data related to previous positions could not be analyzed reliably.

Some other presidents did not feel that they had an option to choose a for-profit institution among the institutional type categories. Presidents who came from outside of academia also said it was difficult to explain their professional background. These people said they were corporate attorneys, had led an art museum, and one respondent had recently served as the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education for the Obama administration. While it would have been impossible to anticipate each possible option, creating more possibilities for the respondents to choose from in the Previous Professional Experience section would have added to the accuracy of the data collected. Finally, some of the presidents mentioned that they do not have local governing boards or the same amount of control on their campus as someone who runs a campus separate

from a system. This would need to be taken into account in the skills section especially. Offering a “not applicable” option might have helped with these presidents’ selections.

A large portion of the CPSAQ included a list of skills for the presidents to rate on importance and ability. While the skills were taken from the literature and organized into four different categories, they have not been separately or psychometrically tested, so there is no way to know if the list of skills includes all of the skills that presidents believe are important in their daily work. Without psychometric testing, the CPSAQ or any of the sections within it cannot be considered reliable or valid. The categories were constructed based on simple clustering of items, but those clusters were not verified through statistical analysis. If that were done for a future version of the instrument, the resulting clusters could be used in subsequent analyses. In spite of these limitations, however, some of the presidents noted in their comments that the list of skills was accurate and well informed and that the list served as a method for collecting the presidents’ perceptions of the skills they need in their position and their ability to perform those skills. The CPSAQ was successful in doing that.

Finally, the utilization of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire may also be a limitation in this study. The PAQ is an older instrument and presumes that females and males have the same attributes now as they had in 1970s and that they will respond in the same ways as they would have when the original instrument testing was conducted. The PAQ also assumes that “male” and “female” attributes are different from one another, or put another way, that males and females will respond in different and predictable ways from one another. It is difficult to know if the similarity in responses of females and

males on the PAQ items in this study shows that female and male presidents act similarly, or if females and males in general would now score similarly on the PAQ.

College presidents were a unique group of people with whom to utilize the PAQ. As leaders of complex organizations, in a position that has been traditionally male, it is interesting to note that male and female presidents rate themselves similarly on the agency scale but that females still rate themselves higher than males do on the communion scale. This analysis provided a snapshot of current college presidents and leads to an interesting discussion about the attributes that it may be necessary for those pursuing the college presidency to build. It is clear that current presidents perceive that they possess attributes on both the agency and communion scales. Regardless of whether the distinctions between agency and communion attributes are beginning to blur, or the increasingly complex job of president requires a correspondingly complex set of skills, it seems clear that future college presidents will continue to need a broad set of skills and attributes to navigate the complexities of that role.

In this study, the PAQ was useful to show that male and female presidents are more similar than they are different in their leadership attributes. If both men and women exhibit the attributes and skills required for the presidency, and both men and women are already serving successfully as presidents at various institution types, it follows that women should be considered as viable candidates for the presidency.

Questionnaire Validity. The College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire (CPSAQ) was designed to be used in an exploratory and preliminary study to collect data from college presidents across the country about demographics, the skills they utilize in their work, and their attributes as defined and gathered through the

Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The instrument as a whole has not been psychometrically tested as it was not the goal of the study to do that. This questionnaire worked well to collect preliminary data on the presidents and to allow basic statistical analysis of the responses. Further research may be done to test the psychometrics of the instrument, specifically the skills section, so that it may be refined and more stringent analysis could be completed on the data collected.

Another limitation, due to the analysis being limited to descriptives, frequencies, cross tabs, chi squares, *t*-tests, ANOVA, and Spearman Rho nonparametric correlation analyses, is that there were numerous individual tests run. In running so many individual tests, rather than one more rigorous test, like a regression, it is possible that some of the statistically significant findings could be due to the quantity of analyses run.

There are many questions that provide the respondent with a Likert-scale or Likert-like scale as a rating mechanism. The most common method for analysis of responses like these is to find the mean of the responses across the respondents. This method has been called into question as there is not a way to determine if respondents see the ratings as equidistant from one another (Lantz, 2013). For example, is the difference between a rating of one and two the same as the difference between a rating of four and five? The analysis used for this study utilized the mean scores, but further testing and analysis may be helpful in determining if this is the most accurate way to collect and analyze the data.

Applications and Implications for Practice

In spite of the limitations of the current study, the results offer insight to those interested in the presidency and implications for institutional practice. To begin, sharing

information about the types of skills someone needs to possess in order to serve as a college president could be quite helpful to those people who might be considering pursuing a college presidency as a career path. The five skills that were rated highest in importance overall were honesty, demonstrating personal integrity, leading the team of executive officers, providing vision, and respecting others. Each of these is a skill that presidents perform in relationship with others. These seem to be skills that prospective college presidents will need to master in order to be successful, no matter what type or size institution they will preside over. It is clearly worth acknowledging that the necessary skills for college presidents could change over time, but this list of skills, as identified as important by sitting presidents, is a good starting point for those people who are considering serving as a college president in the future.

People considering the pursuit of a college presidency could use the list of skills from the CPSAQ as a roadmap for their future professional development activities. Finding ways to assess their own ability, as well as receiving feedback from others about their abilities, would allow someone to determine what skills they would need to improve on in order to prepare for a presidency on a college campus. The next step would be to determine what kinds of activities would help them to build the skills in which they are less proficient.

In addition to specific skills someone would need to build in order to serve as a president, it is also important to think about the attributes they would need. It has become clear through this research that attributes related to agency, such as independence and self-confidence, are important. For female respondents, though, it was also apparent that they believe that they bring attributes of both agency and communion to their roles as

president. For females who are considering a presidency, it may be necessary to bring traditional leadership values, like those included in the agency scale, along with people-centered attributes, like those included in the communion scale. Males, on the other hand, may tend to be less oriented to the communion-related attributes, such as understanding and helpful to others, and may want to consider the merits of adding those attributes to their repertoire.

Another potential use of the skills portion of the CPSAQ is to assess a group or an individual's ability to perform the skills. A half a dozen presidents who completed the study contacted the researcher to ask for a copy of the CPSAQ. The presidents said that it was a comprehensive list of skills that they would like to use as an assessment of individuals in their leadership team, or of the leadership team as a whole. One president said,

a meeting where we discuss our organizational effectiveness from those perspectives may be interesting. Without me having to be specific on anyone's strengths or weaknesses there will be a discussion of this by my team. I have also thought about how I can use this list as a guide as I prepare my direct reports annual performance reviews. These "soft skills" are the things that make all the difference in campus leadership effectiveness. Pinpointing deficiencies is the first step to addressing them.

The researcher had not anticipated the use of the skills portion of the CPSAQ as a means of personnel evaluation, but it does seem reasonable to be able to pull certain skills that would be expected from everyone in the leadership team out of the CPSAQ. Finally, the skills portion of the CPSAQ could serve as a tool to determine potential gaps in the skills

or leadership abilities of the team when looking to fill a position or pursue professional development and training opportunities.

Another way that the findings of this study could be useful for potential presidents is to read and reflect on the written comments from the respondents. The written comments provided both positive and more critical lenses through which to view the presidency and how to achieve it. Acknowledging that the presidency has both positives and challenges could also help potential presidents to have a better understanding of the role of the college president by gaining insight into how current presidents view their role.

Suggested Future Research

There are many opportunities for future research that can grow out of this preliminary study. To begin, a factor analysis for the skills included in the study should be conducted. It would be important to determine if the skills are appropriate in their totality, if there is redundancy, and if the skills fit into the categories as they have been grouped in the CPSAQ. It seems that the leadership categories have face validity for the skills within each group, but further statistical analysis would prove whether or not they belong together.

In addition to factor analysis, further validation of the instrument could be done to test and analyze the psychometrics of the instrument across different populations of college presidents. Utilizing the CPSAQ with a population of presidents that offered more diversity in terms of institutional type and size would also help to determine if there are more differences between the skills required of the presidents.

Once it was determined to be psychometrically sound, it would be valuable to determine how the importance and ability ratings of the presidents might change for the skills longitudinally. It has been stated in this study that fundraising is a skill that requires a lot of time, but the presidents in this study did not rate it as one of the most important skills. It will be interesting to determine if fundraising becomes one of the most important skills, and to see what other skills rise and fall in importance throughout the years. Being able to assess the skills that are important in the presidency, as well as the skills that the presidents perceive they do well, would show trends in the professional development of the presidents as well as skills that gain or lose importance for the presidents over time. Continuing this study longitudinally could show the priorities of presidents as they shift over time.

Another consideration for future research would be to determine if the presidents rank themselves as higher in ability on the skills they also rated as high on importance because they are rating them side-by-side as formatted on the questionnaire. Requiring the presidents to rate all of the skills for importance and then separately rate all of the skills for ability, or the reverse, might show a greater variability in their ratings. It could be possible that the ratings for ability are inflated when the president has just ranked the skill as highly important.

Further analysis could be completed on the current data to look for additional relationships between the demographic data and the skills and PAQ scores. Specifically, this study analyzed relationships between the PAQ score and the ratings for importance and ability of the skills. Another relationship that could be examined is skill importance and ability compared with the respondents' ages or years in a presidency. Perhaps

respondents would rate skill importance or their ability to perform a skill differently based on their age or tenure in their position. This is just one option for further analysis, and many other such questions could be explored.

Finally, it was previously stated that the skills portion of the CPSAQ may be useful as an assessment and evaluation tool for individuals and groups. If the instrument were to be used in this way, it might add to the reliability of the findings if it were given to a leader's supervisor, supervisees, and colleagues as a 360° evaluation tool. If utilized in this way, a supervisor would need to compile the ratings done by the individual and their colleagues to determine where their strengths and areas of opportunity are. The supervisor would then need to share the findings with the individual, and together they could create a professional development plan to improve the skills in which the person is less adept. In this way, the person's colleagues may not need to rate the importance of the skill, only the person's ability to perform the skill. While this approach is unlikely to be feasible for use with presidents, due to the realities of the position in relation to others, it may still have utility with other groups or parts of an organization.

Summary

This research study was completed in the fall of 2013 in an attempt to collect data from current college presidents about their role as a college president. Relationships between their demographic information, skills utilized in their jobs, and their attributes were explored. The respondents to this study fairly represent the national statistics for college presidents in the United States.

There were several very important findings overall. When asked to rate skills in terms of their importance and to rate their ability to perform those skills, men and women

responded differently in some ways and similarly in others. Overall, where scores differed, women rated the skills as more important than men did, with the exception of fund raising. Additionally, where men and women differed in the ratings of their own abilities, women rated themselves higher than men did on every skill. While it may be that women just use the rating scale differently, this may also suggest that women who become college presidents have an extremely strong skill set, or that they are very confident in their skills. Since women still represent only a fraction of college presidents, it is reasonable to surmise that those who ascend to the presidency are in fact both highly skilled and highly confident.

Further, respondents were asked to choose attributes that characterize them, and their choices yielded scores on scales associated with agency, or traditionally male leadership attributes, and communion, or traditionally female ones. In this study, the male respondents, not surprisingly, generally scored higher on the agency scale. The female respondents, however, scored high on both. The presidency is a traditionally male role, and the men who hold it seem to inhabit it in ways that reflect that. For women, however, these results suggest that they bring attributes that have traditionally been characterized as male without sacrificing those that have been seen as female.

Regardless of gender, however, respondents who scored high on either agency or communion rated “demonstrating commitment” as the most important skill. The importance of commitment, then, cuts across attributes, and whether it looks the same or different to individuals who exhibit agency or communion, it is a vital element in the role of the president.

Similarly, the responding presidents ranked “demonstrating personal integrity” and “am honest” as the two skills in which importance and ability converged. In an age of increasing complexity of higher education, institutions, and the role of the president, those who responded prized integrity and honesty as key components in their work. Finally, written comments from the responding presidents show that, overall, they love their jobs and find them very rewarding while stating that someone who serves as a college president needs to be “tough.”

This study was grounded in the desire to understand the college presidency today, particularly the skills and attributes that are important, as seen by sitting presidents, and to examine the relationships between those attributes and the characteristics of current presidents. With over 10% of current presidents responding, the results indicate that both male and female presidents serve across institution types and that they view the presidency in similar ways. They place a strong value on integrity and honesty, and they believe that they have these qualities. Overall, both male and female respondents score high in both agency and communion, with female respondents scoring statistically higher on the communion scale than their male counterparts. The high scores on agency and communion may suggest that either the college presidency attracts candidates with broad attributes or that the work of the presidency develops those attributes in the presidents. While the results of this study cannot definitively be interpreted to mean that gender roles are beginning to blur in the presidency, there is evidence that the complex role of college president requires a broad, non-gendered set of attributes. As institutions become increasingly complex, they will require an increasingly complex set of skills and abilities in those who serve as president. This study provided a preliminary look at the

demographic information of the respondents as well as their leadership attributes, as well as an assessment of the important skills needed in their role and how well they perform those skills. One of the goals of the study was to determine if male and female presidents ranked the importance of skills or attributes differently. This study found that male and female presidents believe that similar skills are important, that they are able to perform those skills, and that they employ attributes of traditionally male and female leaders. It was also determined that women have great confidence in their abilities to perform skills necessary to the presidency and that they employ traditionally female attributes at a greater extent than their male counterparts. Finally, it was determined that presidents employ similar leadership attributes independent of the type of institution they serve, except that presidents of doctoral granting institutions and tribal colleges possess attributes that differ from one another. In sum, male and female college presidents across different institutional types are more similar than different and possess a broad range of skills and leadership abilities, supporting the argument that women could serve in the college presidency in greater percentages than currently exist.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2), 139-158.
- Adler, P. A., Kless, S. J., & Adler, P. (1992). Socialization to gender roles: Popularity among elementary school boys and girls. *Sociology of Education, 65*(3), 169-187.
- Ahmed, S. (2005). Desired competencies and job duties of non-profit CEOs in relation to the current challenges: Through the lens of CEOs' job advertisements. *Journal of Management Development, 24*(10), 913-928. doi: 10.1108/02621710510627055.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2006). Competencies for community college leaders: American Association of Community Colleges. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/competencies/Documents/competenciesforleaders.pdf>.
- American Council on Education. (2007). *The American college president: 2007 edition*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Antonaros, M. (2010). Gendered leadership styles and the climate for women leaders in higher education. *On Campus With Women, 39*(2), 1-7.
- Bauer, D. (2009). New opportunities for feminist-inspired leadership. *On Campus with Women, 38*(1), 8.

- Baum, S. (2010, August 22). As students change, colleges must follow. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Student-Demographics-As/123919/>.
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Bornstein, R. (2007). Why women make good college presidents. *Presidency, 10*(2), 20-23.
- Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34*(1), 1-7.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*(2), 59-78.
- Carey, K. (2010, December 12). Student learning: Measure or perish. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Measure-or-Perish/125671/>.
- Carnegie Foundation. (2010). *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>
- Catalyst. (2007). *The double-bind dilemma for women in leadership: Damned if you do, doomed if you don't*. New York, NY: Catalyst. Retrieved at <http://www.catalyst.org/page/59/about-us>.

Central Virginia's Governors School for Sciences and Technology. (1997). *Tukey Test*.

Retrieved from

http://www.cvgs.k12.va.us:81/DIGSTATS/main/Guides/g_tukey.html.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (2012, June 19). What Teresa Sullivan's ouster means for higher education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

<http://chronicle.com/article/What-Teresa-Sullivans-Ouster/132413/>.

Cook, B. & Kim, Y. (2012). *The American college president, 2012 edition*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Cox, D. L., Van Velsor, P., Hulgus, J. F., Weatherman, A., Smenner, M, Dickens, D., & Davis, C. (2004). What's the use in getting mad? Anger and instrumentality in women's relationships. *Health Care for Women International*, 25, 813-834.

Dade, L. R., & Sloan, L. R. (2000). An investigation of sex-role stereotypes in African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30(5), 676-690.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2007). *The view from the helm: Leading the American university during an era of change*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 807-834.

Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 125-145.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B.G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin*, 111, 3-22.

- Eddy, P. L., & Cox, E. M. (2008). Gendered leadership: An organizational perspective. In J. Lester (Ed.), *Gendered Perspectives on Community Colleges* (pp. 69-79). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 142. Edison, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.
- Florida State University. (n.d.). *Biography*. Retrieved from <http://president.fsu.edu/Biography>.
- Frankel, J., & Wallen, N. (1995). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Furnham, A., & Stringfield, P. (1994). Congruence of self and subordinate ratings of managerial practices as a correlate of supervisor evaluation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 57-67.
- Gamst, G. C., Liang, A. T. H., & Der-Karabetian, A. (2011). *Handbook of multicultural measures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gender Spectrum. (2013). *Understanding gender*. Retrieved from <https://www.genderspectrum.org/understanding-gender>.
- Giannini, S. T. (2001). Future agendas for women community college leaders and change agents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 25(3), 201-211.
- Goff, D. G. (2002). *Community college presidency: What are the challenges to be encountered and traits to be successful?* (ERIC Accession #ED476681). Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Gorodnichenko, Y., & Roland, G. (2011). *Understanding the individualism-Collectivism cleavage and its effects: Lessons from cultural psychology*. Paper presented at the XVIth Congress of the International Economic Association. Retrieved

- from <http://emlab.berkeley.edu/~groland/pubs/IEA%20papervf.pdf>
- Green, K.C., Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2012). *The 2012 Inside Higher Ed survey of college and university presidents*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/concerns-about-sports-backing-obama-survey-presidents>.
- Gresham, M. H. (2009). New wine in old bottles: Cutting a new path in the academy. *Forum on Public Policy: A Journal of the Oxford Round Table*, 5(2), 1-15.
- Groysberg, B., Kelly, L. K., & MacDonald, B. (2011). The new path to the C-Suite. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(3), 60-68.
- Hackman, M. Z., Hills, M. J., Paterson, T. J., & Furniss, A. H. (1993). Leaders' gender-role as a correlate of subordinates' perceptions of effectiveness and satisfaction. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 77, 671-674.
- Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. (2012, July 2). Social life and social inequality. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Social-LifeSocial/132631/>
- Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Wilhelm, J.A. (1981). A psychometric analysis of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. *Sex Roles*, 7(11), 1097-1108.
- Higher Education Resource Services. (2011). *HERS institutes*. Retrieved from <http://www.hersnet.org/institutes.asp>
- Hope College. (n.d.). *James E. Bultman*. Presidents of Hope College. Retrieved from <http://www.hope.edu/president/presidents-hope-college>.

- Hundhammer, T., & Mussweiler, T. (2012). How sex puts you in gendered shoes: Sexuality-priming leads to gender-based self-perception and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*(1), 177-193.
- IBM Corp. Released 2012. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 21.0.
Armonk, NY: IBM Corp
- Jenkins, R. (2012, March 13). Online classes and college completion. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Online-ClassesCollege/131133/>.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kaplan, S. N., Klebanov, M. M., & Sorensen, M. (2012). Which CEO characteristics and abilities matter? *Journal of Finance*, *67*(3), 973-1007. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6261.2012.01739.x.
- Kutarna, H. (n.d.). The leadership skill set: While leadership styles may vary, current leading Canadian CEOs practice a time-honoured leadership skill set. *Banff Center*. Retrieved from www.banffcentre.ca/leadership/library/pdf/skill_set_6-7.pdf.
- Lantz, B. (2013). Equidistance of Likert-type scales and validation of inferential methods using experiments and simulations. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods* *11*(1), 16-28.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1976). Toward a homosocial theory of sex roles: An explanation of the sex segregation of social institutions. *Signs*, *1*(3), 15-31.

- Lopez, E. (2011). HERS: Drawing new maps for institutional change. *On Campus with Women*, 40(1), 4.
- Mangi, R. A., Ghumro, I. A., & Abidi, A. R. (2011). A view on leadership skills and qualities with reference to crisis, change and employee relationship. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(7), 398-408.
- Mansfield University (n.d.). *Office of the President*. Retrieved from <http://president.mansfield.edu/>.
- Marquand, R. (1986, December). The role of a college president. Is 'fundraiser' displacing traditional 'scholar, teacher, leader'? *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/1986/1201/dpres-f.html>.
- Marywood College. (n.d.). *Sister Mary Reap, IHM, Ph.D.* President's page: Past presidents of Marywood University. Retrieved from <http://www.marywood.edu/president/past-presidents.html>.
- Nieva, V. F., & Gutek, B. A. (1980). Sex effects on evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, (5)2, 267-276.
- Pielstick, C. D. (1998). The transforming leader: A meta-ethnographic analysis. *Community College Review*, 26(3), 15.
- Pierce, S. R. (2012). *On being presidential: A guide for college and university leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Powell, G. N. (2011). *Women & men in management* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (1979). The 'good manager': Masculine or androgynous? *Academy of Management Journal*, 22(2), 395-403.

- Pryzgodna, J., & Chrisler, J. C. (2000). Definitions of gender and sex: The subtleties of meaning. *Sex Roles, 43*(7/8), 553-569.
- Ross, M., & Green, M. F. (1993). *The American college president: A 1993 edition*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Salas-Lopez, D., Deitrick, L. M., Mahady, E. T., Gertner, E. J., & Sabino, J. N. (2011). Women leaders - challenges, successes, and other insights from the top. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(2), 34-42. doi: 10.1002/jls.20216
- Sander, L. (2011). In the game, but rarely no. 1. (cover story). *Chronicle of Higher Education, 57*(26), A1.
- Schmidt, G. (1930). *The old time college president*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Shaw, K. A. (1999). *The successful president: "Buzzwords" on leadership*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1979). On assessing "androgyny." *Sex Roles, 5*(6), 721-738.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4*(43), 1-40.
- Statslectures. (2010, October 3a). Chi-Square Test for Independence [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LE3AIyY_cn8
- Statslectures. (2010, October 3b). Mann-Whitney U-Test [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nRAAAp1Bgnw>

- Statslectures. (2011, September 11). The Kruskal-Wallis Test [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BkyGuNuaZYw>
- Stead, V., & Elliott, C. (2009). *Women's leadership*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tedrow, B. A., & Rhoads, R. A. (1999). A qualitative study of women's experiences in community college leadership positions. *Community College Review*, 27(3), 1-18.
- Thelin, J. R. (1994). Campus and the commonwealth: A historical interpretation of higher education in American society. In G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, & P.J. Gumpert (Eds.), *Higher education in American society* (pp. 21-36). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Press.
- Toller, P.W., Suter, E.A., & Trautman, T. C. (2004). Gender role identity and attitudes toward feminism. *Sex Roles*, 51(1/2), 85-90.
- Towson University. (n.d.). *Biography*. Office of the President. Retrieved from <http://www.towson.edu/president/president.asp>.
- Twenge, J. M. (1997). Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles*, 36, 305-325.
- University of Georgia. (2012). *Qualtrics Survey Tool*. Retrieved from (<http://www.coe.uga.edu/oit/support/applicationweb-development/applications/>).
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). Number of degree-granting institutions and enrollment in these institutions, by enrollment size, control, and level of institution: Fall 2010. *Digest of Education Statistics* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_248.asp.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). Fast

- facts. *Digest of Education Statistics* (NCES 2012-001). Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98>.
- Vineyard, E. (1993). *The pragmatic presidency: Effective leadership in the two-year college*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Volman, M., & Dam, G. T. (1998). Equal but different: Contradictions in the development of gender identity in the 1990s, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19(4), 529-545.
- Ward, L. C., Thorn, B. E., Clements, K. L., Dixon, K. E., & Sanford, S. D. (2006). Measurement of agency, communion, and emotional vulnerability with the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 86(2), 206-216.
- Weill, L. V. (2009). *Out in front: The college president as the face of the institution*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Wichert, I. (2011). *Where have all the senior women gone?: Nine critical job assignments for women leaders*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Wolverton, M., & Poch, S. (2000). The nexus between academic deans and corporate CEOs: An opportunity in the making. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 7(3), 122-132. doi: 10.1177/107179190000700309.
- Yancey Martin, P. (2003). "Said and done" versus "saying and doing": Gendering practices, practicing gender at work. *Gender and Society*, 17(3), 342-366.

Appendix A: Skills

Descriptor	Source	Category in CPSAQ
ensuring the quality and integrity of academic programs	Duderstadt, p. 108	Academic Leadership
academic leadership	Duderstadt, p. 109	Academic Leadership
enhancing academic reputation	Duderstadt, p. 109, 162	Academic Leadership
shaping academic programs	Duderstadt, p. 109, 162, 163	Academic Leadership
teaching and scholarship	Duderstadt, p. 163	Academic Leadership
intellectual leader of the faculty	Duderstadt, p. 111	Academic Leadership
recruiting the key leadership of the university	Duderstadt, p. 108	Administrative Leadership
recruiting, building, and leading a quality team of executive officers	Duderstadt, p. 135, 163	Administrative Leadership
performance review/management	Duderstadt, p. 141	Administrative Leadership
make changes when necessary (personnel)	Duderstadt, p. 141	Administrative Leadership
find colleagues whose strengths balance your weaknesses	Shaw, p. 93	Administrative Leadership
be inclusive in forming groups	Shaw, p. 93	Administrative Leadership
provide Understanding (having concerns and issues listened to)	Shaw, p. 37	Administrative Leadership
provide gratitude (appreciation or expression of indebtedness)	Shaw, p. 37	Administrative Leadership

provide recognition (acknowledgement of effort, accomplishment, or abilities)	Ahmed, p. 922	Administrative Leadership
provide personal support (personal and emotional backing)	Shaw, p. 37	Administrative Leadership
Mentoring (facilitating the skill development and career advancement of subordinates)	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	Administrative Leadership
Monitoring (evaluating the performance of subordinates and the organizational unit for progress and quality)	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	Administrative Leadership
Rewarding (providing praise, recognition, and financial remuneration when appropriate.)	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	Administrative Leadership
management as problem solving	Duderstadt, p. 160	Administrative Leadership
Logistics, Operations	Kutarna, p. 1	Administrative Leadership
holds people accountable (sets goals for team and follows up to ensure progress toward completion)	Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992	Administrative Leadership
Problem Solving (identifying, analyzing, and acting decisively to remove impediments to work performance.)	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	Administrative Leadership
Delegating	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	Administrative Leadership
analysis and policy making	Kutarna, p. 2; Kaplan, Klebanov, & Sorensen, p. 992	Administrative Leadership
implement college policies	Pierce, p. 23	Administrative Leadership
allocate and reallocate resources	Pierce, P. 29	Executive Leadership

budget management	Pierce, p. 83	Executive Leadership
political acumen	Duderstadt, p. 111	Executive Leadership
written communication	Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992	Executive Leadership
oral communication	Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992	Executive Leadership
media relations	Kutarna, p. 2	Executive Leadership
listen to others, good listening	Pierce, p. 31; Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner @ Sabino, p. 37	Executive Leadership
encourage criticism and debate	Pierce, p. 34	Executive Leadership
test ideas rather than pronounce conclusions	Pierce, p. 34	Executive Leadership
public speaking	Pierce, p. 83; Kutarna, p. 2	Executive Leadership
good communication skills	Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, p. 37; Ahmed, p. 922; Kutarna, p. 2	Executive Leadership
crisis management	Duderstadt, p. 134	Executive Leadership
respond to forces beyond your control	Pierce, p. 30	Executive Leadership
make decisions in a timely fashion	Pierce, p. 31	Executive Leadership
intellectual (for organizational change)	Mangi, Ghumro & Abidi, p. 402)	General Leadership Skills
sharp (for org. crisis)	Mangi, Ghumro & Abidi, p. 403)	General Leadership Skills
inspire others	Pierce, p. 36; Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, p. 37	General Leadership Skills
lead by example	Pierce, P. 58; Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, p. 37	General Leadership Skills
have drive and perseverance	Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, p. 37	General Leadership Skills
know the institution's culture & respect it	Shaw, p. 93	General Leadership Skills

Professionalism	AACC, p. 5	General Leadership Skills
constant dedication to the success of students and those who serve students	Goff, p. 11	General Leadership Skills
dedication, passion, commitment	Ahmed, p. 922	General Leadership Skills
credit others	Shaw, p. 92	General Leadership Skills
teamwork (reaches out to peers and cooperates with supervisors to establish relationship)	Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992	General Leadership Skills
Team-Building	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	General Leadership Skills
Collaboration	AACC, p. 4	General Leadership Skills
building relationships	Pielstick, 1998	General Leadership Skills
know your strengths and weaknesses	Shaw, p. 93	General Leadership Skills
creating a vision	Pielstick, 1998	General Leadership Skills
respect (values others, treating them fairly and showing concern for their views and feelings)	Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992	Moral Leadership
personal integrity (does not cut corners ethically. Earns trust and maintains confidence)	Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992; Pierce, p. 150; Kutarna, p. 2	Moral Leadership
Honest (emp. Satisfaction)	Mangi, Ghumro & Abidi, p. 404)	Moral Leadership
Core values: integrity, honesty, fairness, objectivity	Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, p. 37	Moral Leadership
speak up with courage and conviction on moral issues	Duderstadt, p. 110	Moral Leadership
pastoral role	Duderstadt, p. 110, 225	Moral Leadership
nurturing care and sympathetic understanding during difficult times	Duderstadt, p. 110	Moral Leadership
moral leader of campus	Pierce, p. 29; Duderstadt, p. 110;	Moral Leadership

	Shaw, p. 37	
exhibit character	Pielstick, 1998	Moral Leadership
upbeat and optimistic	Duderstadt, p. 110	Personal Leadership
patience	Duderstadt, p. 159	Personal Leadership
courageous	Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, p. 37	Personal Leadership
organization	Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992	Personal Leadership
common sense	Goff, p. 11	Personal Leadership
work with a diverse group/team-building	Ahmed, p. 922	Personal Leadership
create an environment of trust	Pierce, p. 34	Personal Leadership
Supporting (encouraging, assisting, and providing resources for others.)	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	Personal Leadership
Consulting (checking with others before making plans of decisions that affect them.)	Catalyst, 2006, p. 13; Catalyst, 2007, p. 5	Personal Leadership
self-awareness	Salas-Lopez, Deitrick, Mahady, Gertner & Sabino, p. 37	Personal Leadership
being accountable to the governing board for welfare of the university	Duderstadt, p. 108	Political Leadership
Educating the Board	Duderstadt, p. 108; Pierce, p. 24	Political Leadership
Shaping the Board's agenda	Duderstadt, p. 108	Political Leadership
identifying and cultivating new board members	Pierce, p. 24, 96	Political Leadership
encourage trustee interaction with faculty, staff and students	Pierce, p. 50	Political Leadership

smoothing out conflicts and occasionally even picking winners and losers, conflict management	Duderstadt, p. 161	Political Leadership
Negotiation	Kutarna, p. 2	Political Leadership
political lobbyist	Duderstadt, p. 111	Political Leadership
work with a variety of constituents (faculty, students, governing board, public)	Vineyard, Ch. 5	Political Leadership
develop town gown relationships	Weill, Ch. 8	Political Leadership
visibility (the chance to be known by higher-ups or significant others in the organization)	Shaw, p. 37	Presidential Leadership
"face" of the institution	Weill, entire book	Presidential Leadership
change agent	Giannini, p. 206; Gresham, p. 2; Shaw, p. 93	Strategic Leadership
strategic planning	Ahmed, p. 922; Duderstadt, p. 111; Kaplan, Klebanov & Sorensen, p. 992	Strategic Leadership
act strategically	Pierce, p. 31	Strategic Leadership

Appendix B: Solicitation Email

DATE

Dear College President/Chancellor:

The college and university presidency is one of the most important roles in higher education today. Unfortunately, little research has been done to learn how presidents view their role and to determine what skills they bring to their leadership role.

I am writing to college and university presidents/chancellors to invite your participation in a research study. I am a doctoral candidate under the direction of Dr. Laura Dean in the Counseling and Human Development Services Department at The University of Georgia. This research study is designed to increase our awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to serve as a college or university president and to explore the relationships between the attributes, skills, and career paths of college and university presidents/chancellors in the United States. The survey has been sent to college and university presidents/chancellors across the country, with the goal of gathering perspectives about the presidency from those who understand it best. While much has been written about the role, little of it has been informed by large-scale studies. Please consider adding your perspective to those of your presidential colleagues so that we can gain insight into this crucial leadership role.

If you choose to participate you will be asked to complete an online questionnaire that should take approximately 10 to 20 minutes of your time. You will be able to save your responses in the event that you need to come back at a later time to complete it. The researchers will not obtain any individually identifiable information beyond your IP address, which will be stripped from the research record. The results of the research study may be published, but the results will be presented in summary form only. Your involvement in this study is voluntary. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

The findings from this project may provide a better understanding of the nature of the college and university presidency today. In addition, it may help others who aspire to the role to determine if it might be a potential career for them.

This study has received approval from the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (717) 515-0820 or send an e-mail to ntobias@uga.edu. You may also contact Dr. Laura Dean at (706) 654-6551 or ladean@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia

Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

To participate in this study, please click [here](#).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Nicole R. Tobias
Doctoral Candidate, College Student Affairs Administration
Counseling and Human Development Services
University of Georgia

Laura A. Dean, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Counseling and Human Development Services
University of Georgia

Appendix C: Reminder Email

Dear College President/Chancellor:

Approximately a week and a half ago you received an email inviting you to participate in a research study about the skill sets of college presidents. This research study is designed to increase our awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to serve as a college or university president and to explore the relationships between the attributes, skills, and career paths of college and university presidents/chancellors in the United States. The survey has been sent to college and university presidents/chancellors across the country, with the goal of gathering perspectives about the presidency from those who understand it best. While much has been written about the role, little of it has been informed by large-scale studies. Please consider adding your perspective to those of your presidential colleagues so that we can gain insight into this crucial leadership role.

If you choose to participate you will be asked to complete an online questionnaire that should take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time. You will be able to save your responses in the event that you need to come back at a later time to complete it. The researchers will not obtain any individually identifiable information beyond your IP address, which will be stripped from the research record. The results of the research study may be published, but the results will be presented in summary form only. Your involvement in this study is voluntary. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

The findings from this project may provide a better understanding of the nature of the college and university presidency today. In addition, it may help others who aspire to the role to determine if it might be a potential career for them.

This study has received approval from the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (717) 515-0820 or send an e-mail to ntobias@uga.edu. You may also contact Dr. Laura Dean at (706) 654-6551 or ladean@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

To participate in this study, please click [here](#).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Nicole R. Tobias
Doctoral Candidate, College Student Affairs Administration
Counseling and Human Development Services
University of Georgia

Laura A. Dean, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Counseling and Human Development Services
University of Georgia

Appendix D: College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire

Qualtrics Survey Software

9/11/13 11:38 AM

Default Question Block

Dear College President/Chancellor:

I am writing to college and university presidents/chancellors to invite your participation in a research study. I am a doctoral candidate under the direction of Dr. Laura Dean in the Counseling and Human Development Services Department at The University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in a research study designed to increase our awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to serve as a college or university president. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationships between the attributes, skills, and career paths of college and university presidents/chancellors in the United States. The study will ask what skill sets you believe are important in your role as the college president/chancellor, the extent to which you believe you have those skills, and questions about your educational and professional background. The data will be analyzed to explore the relationships between respondent attributes and the type of institution served, as well as to examine presidents' perceptions of the skills most needed in the role today.

The survey has been sent to college and university presidents/chancellors across the country, with the goal of gathering perspectives about the presidency from those who understand it best. While much has been written about the role, little of it has been informed by large-scale studies. Please consider adding your perspective to those of your presidential colleagues so that we can gain insight into this crucial leadership role.

Respondents will complete the College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire (CPSAQ) which includes questions related to your demographic information, educational experience, professional experience, skills, and attributes. The questionnaire should take less than 20 minutes for you to complete. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose not to complete the questionnaire, the investigator will exclude your data from all analysis. If you decide to withdraw from the study, the information that can be identified as yours will not be analyzed.

All of your responses will remain anonymous; your name will not be attached to the questionnaire responses you submit. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only.

The findings from this project may provide information on the skills necessary to serve as a college president. Additionally, it may help aspiring presidents learn the skills they most need to build, based on the type of institution they would like to serve. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

This study has received approval from the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (717) 515-0820 or send an e-mail to ntobias@uga.edu, or contact Dr. Laura Dean at (706) 654-6551 or ladean@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRG, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

By completing and submitting this questionnaire via Qualtrics, you are agreeing to participate in the above described research project.

Please keep this letter for your records. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Nicole R. Tobias
Doctoral Candidate
Counseling and Student Personnel Services

Laura A. Dean, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Counseling and Human Development Services

- I consent and am willing to complete the CPSAQ
 I do not consent to take the CPSAQ.

College President Skills and Attributes Questionnaire (CPSAQ)

This questionnaire is designed to determine characteristics of college presidents, including demographics and educational and professional experiences. The importance and presence of leadership skills will also be explored. Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey.

Demographics

Please choose the response that describes you best:

Are you:

- Female
 Male
 Transgender

What is your title?

<https://s.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/Ajax.php?action=GetSurveyPrintPreview&T=1qt8Jw>

Page 1 of 10

- President
 Chancellor
 Other

Were you a first generation college student?

- Yes
 No

What is your age?

- 20-29 years old
 30-39 years old
 40-49 years old
 50-59 years old
 60-69 years old
 70-79 years old
 80 years old and older

Educational Experience

College and University Presidents come from a wide range of educational backgrounds. In the following sections, please think about your educational background and answer the following questions by choosing the single best answer for your experience.

Do you have an earned doctorate?

- Yes
 No

What is the type of doctorate you've earned?

- Ph.D.
 Ed.D.
 J.D.
 M.D.
 Other

What was the academic discipline of your doctoral degree? If you have more than one degree in this section, please separate the disciplines by a comma. For example: Higher Education, Economics, History

At what type of institution did you earn your doctorate degree?

- Private
 Public

What was your doctoral institution's total enrollment?

- Less than 5,000 students
 5,000-9,999 students

- 10,000-14,999 students
- 15,000-19,999 students
- 20,000-24,999 students
- 25,000 students and above

What type of institution did you earn your doctoral degree?

- Baccalaureate College (Baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10% of all undergraduate degrees and where less than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees were awarded during the academic year)
- Masters Colleges and Universities (Institution awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees during the academic year)
- Doctoral Granting University (Institution awarded 20 or more research doctoral degrees during the academic year. Excludes doctoral-level degrees necessary for entry into professional practice, such as JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.)
- Special Focus Institution (Institution awards baccalaureate or higher-level degrees where 75% or more are in a single field or set of related fields such as medicine, engineering, business, law, etc.)
- Tribal College (Colleges and universities that are members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium)

Do you have a master's degree?

- Yes
- No

What is the type of master's degree you've earned?

- M.A.
- MBA
- M.Ed.
- MFA
- MPA
- M.S.
- MSW
- Other

What was the academic discipline of your master's degree? If you have more than one degree in this section, please separate the disciplines by a comma. For example: Higher Education, Economics, History

What type of institution did you earn your master's degree?

- Private
- Public

What was the total enrollment of the institution where you earned your master's degree?

- Less than 5,000 students
- 5,000-9,999 students
- 10,000-14,999 students
- 15,000-19,999 students
- 20,000-24,999 students
- 25,000 students and above

What type of institution did you earn your master's degree?

- Associates College (All degrees are at the associates level or less than 10% of all undergraduate degrees are bachelor's degrees.)
- Baccalaureate College (Baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10% of all undergraduate degrees and where less than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees were awarded during the academic year)
- Masters Colleges and Universities (Institution awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees during the academic year)
- Doctoral Granting University (Institution awarded 20 or more research doctoral degrees during the academic year. Excludes doctoral-level degrees necessary for entry into professional practice, such as JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.)
- Special Focus Institution (Institution awards baccalaureate or higher-level degrees where 75% or more are in a single field or set of related fields such as medicine, engineering, business, law, etc.)
- Tribal College (Colleges and universities that are members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium)

What type of institution did you earn your bachelor's degree?

- Private
- Public

What was the total enrollment of the institution where you earned your bachelor's degree?

- Less than 5,000 students
- 5,000-9,999 students
- 10,000-14,999 students
- 15,000-19,999 students
- 20,000-24,999 students
- 25,000 students and above

What type of institution did you earn your bachelor's degree?

- Associates College (All degrees are at the associates level or < 10% of all undergraduate degrees are bachelor's degrees.)
- Baccalaureate College (Baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10% of all undergraduate degrees and where less than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees were awarded during the academic year)
- Masters Colleges and Universities (Institution awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees during the academic year)
- Doctoral Granting University (Institution awarded 20 or more research doctoral degrees during the academic year. Excludes doctoral-level degrees necessary for entry into professional practice, such as JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.)
- Special Focus Institution (Institution awards baccalaureate or higher-level degrees where 75% or more are in a single field or set of related fields such as medicine, engineering, business, law, etc.)
- Tribal College (Colleges and universities that are members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium)

Professional Experience

In the following section, please think about your professional experience and answer the following questions by choosing the single best answer.

Including the current year, how many years have you worked in higher education?

- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10-12 years
- 13-15 years
- more than 15 years

Including your current presidency, how many presidential positions have you held?

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four or more

Including the current year, how many years have you been a college/university president?

- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10-12 years
- 13-15 years
- more than 15 years

Including the current year, how many years have you been in your current position?

- 1-3 years
- 4-6 years
- 7-9 years
- 10-12 years
- 13-15 years
- more than 15 years

What type of institution do you currently preside over?

- Associates College** (All degrees are at the associates level or less than 10% of all undergraduate degrees are bachelor's degrees.)
- Baccalaureate College** (Baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10% of all undergraduate degrees and where less than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees were awarded during the academic year)
- Masters Colleges and Universities** (Institution awarded at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees during the academic year)
- Doctoral Granting University** (Institution awarded 20 or more research doctoral degrees during the academic year. Excludes doctoral-level degrees necessary for entry into professional practice, such as JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.)
- Special Focus Institution** (Institution awards baccalaureate or higher-level degrees where 75% or more are in a single field or set of related fields such as medicine, engineering, business, law, etc.)
- Tribal College** (Colleges and universities that are members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium)

What size is the institution you currently preside over?

- Less than 5,000 students
- 5,000-9,999 students
- 10,000-14,999 students
- 15,000-19,999 students
- 20,000-24,999 students
- 25,000 students and above

Previous Professional Experience

Position Code: Please select the appropriate letters to describe the three positions you held prior your current Presidency/Chancellorship. Letters can be combined to create the appropriate title. For example, BD = Associate Dean. If you changed institutions but kept the same title, please make separate entries. Also, if you changed titles within the same institution, please make separate entries. Position Codes can be found in the table below.

Functional Area: Please type in the functional area associated with the position title, such as Residence Life, or Academic Affairs.

Years in Position: Type the number, in years, that you served in each position. If you served in the position less than one year, please enter 0.

Institutional Code: Please enter the code from the table below that corresponds to the type of institution you were working at when you held that position.

Position Code	Institutional Code
A = Assistant	1 = Associates College
B = Associate	2 = Baccalaureate College
C = Department Chairperson	3 = Masters College or University
D = Dean	4 = Doctoral Granting University
E = Director	5 = Special Focus Institution
F = Faculty (all ranks)	6 = Tribal College
G = Coordinator	
H = Assistant to the...	
I = Vice President	

J = President/Chancellor	
K = Other	

	Position Code	Functional Area	Years in Position	Institution Code
Position just prior to this Presidency	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Position two positions prior to this Presidency	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Position three positions prior to this Presidency	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Professional Skills

The following list of skills has been obtained from literature on leadership and college presidencies. The skills may or may not be necessary in your current presidency. As you read each skill, please rate the importance of the skill as it relates to your current presidency in the left column and rate your ability to perform each of the skills in the right column.

Please select the numbered response that best answers each prompt.

Each statement can be read as I _____.

This section refers to skills and characteristics within the topic of Personal Leadership and General Leadership Skills.

In my current position, it is important that I exhibit this skill or characteristic.					I would rate my ability to perform this task as:					
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Low	Moderately Low	Moderate	Moderately High	High	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Know my strengths and weaknesses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Provide vision	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Inspire others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Lead by example	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess drive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess perseverance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Demonstrate commitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am dedicated to student success	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Know the institution's culture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Respect the institution's culture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Show professionalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am perceived as an intellectual in times of organizational change	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am perceived as an intellectual in times of crisis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am patient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am optimistic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am courageous	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess common sense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Prioritize team building	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Create an environment of trust	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am self-aware	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am supportive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Provide resources for others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Consult with others before making decisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Credit others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Collaborate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Establish relationships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Build relationships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am organized	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following list of skills has been obtained from literature on leadership and college presidencies. The skills may or may not be necessary in your current presidency. As you read each skill, please rate the importance of the skill as it relates to your current presidency in the left column and rate your ability to perform each of the skills in the right column.

Please select the numbered response that best answers each prompt.

Each statement can be read as I _____.

This section refers to skills and characteristics within the topic of Academic and Moral Leadership Skills.

In my current position, it is important that I exhibit this skill or characteristic.						I would rate my ability to perform this task as:				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		Low	Moderately Low	Moderate	Moderately High	High
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am an academic leader on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am a moral leader on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ensure the quality and integrity of academic programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Enhance the institution's academic reputation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Shape academic programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am an intellectual leader among the faculty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Emphasize teaching and scholarship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Respect others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Demonstrate personal integrity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am honest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am fair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am objective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Speak with courage and conviction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Have a pastoral role on campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am nurturing in difficult times	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am a role model	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Exhibit character	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following list of skills has been obtained from literature on leadership and college presidencies. The skills may or may not be necessary in your current presidency. As you read each skill, please rate the importance of the skill as it relates to your current presidency in the left column and rate your ability to perform each of the skills in the right column.

Please select the numbered response that best answers each prompt.

Each statement can be read as I _____.

This section refers to skills and characteristics within the topic of Administrative, Executive, and Leadership Skills.

In my current position, it is important that I exhibit this skill or characteristic.						I would rate my ability to perform this task as:				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree		Low	Moderately Low	Moderate	Moderately High	High

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Recruit key leadership	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Lead the team of executive officers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Complete performance reviews	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Monitor performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Hold staff accountable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Make personnel changes when necessary	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Mentor staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Hear employees' concerns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Appreciate employees' work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Provide staff recognition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Provide personal support to staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Find colleagues who have strengths to balance my weaknesses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Encourage diversity in committees	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Problem solve	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Manage the operations and logistics of the business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Delegate projects to staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Analyze policies for the institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Create policies for the organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Implement policies for the organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Manage the budget	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Allocate resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess political acumen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess strong written communication skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Interact with the media	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess strong public speaking skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Listen to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Encourage debate about campus issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Test ideas publicly, rather than pronounce conclusions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess crisis management skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Make decisions in a timely fashion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Respond to forces beyond my control	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Fund raise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Serve as the "face" of the institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am visible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following list of skills has been obtained from literature on leadership and college presidencies. The skills may or may not be necessary in your current presidency. As you read each skill, please rate the importance of the skill as it relates to your current presidency in the left column and rate your ability to perform each of the skills in the right column.

Please select the numbered response that best answers each prompt.

Each statement can be read as I _____.

This section refers to skills and characteristics within the topic of Political and Strategic Leadership Skills.

In my current position, it is important that I exhibit this skill or

I would rate my ability to perform this task as:

characteristic.						Low	Moderately Low	Moderate	Moderately High	High
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree						
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am accountable to the governing board of the institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Educate the board	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Shape the board's agenda	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Identify new board members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Cultivate board members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Encourage board member interaction with faculty, staff, & students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Develop town-gown relationships	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Serve as a political lobbyist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Network	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Work with a variety of constituents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Negotiate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Possess strong conflict management skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Serve as a change agent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Am a strategic planner for the institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Act strategically	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following items are taken from an instrument designed to assess characteristics associated with different styles of leadership. The results will be used to examine patterns of characteristics related to self-reported skills, experiences, and demographics.

Please select the position on the continuum that best describes you as the president/chancellor of your institution.

Not at all arrogant	<input type="radio"/>	Very arrogant
Not at all independent	<input type="radio"/>	Very independent
Not at all emotional	<input type="radio"/>	Very emotional
Looks out for self	<input type="radio"/>	Looks out for others
Very passive	<input type="radio"/>	Very active
Not at all egotistical	<input type="radio"/>	Very egotistical
Difficult to devote self completely to others	<input type="radio"/>	Easy to devote self completely to others
Very rough	<input type="radio"/>	Very gentle
Not at all helpful to others	<input type="radio"/>	Very helpful to others
Not at all boastful	<input type="radio"/>	Very boastful
Not at all competitive	<input type="radio"/>	Very competitive
Not at all kind	<input type="radio"/>	Very kind
Not at all aware of others' feelings	<input type="radio"/>	Very aware of others' feelings
Can make decisions easily	<input type="radio"/>	Has difficulty making decisions
Not at all greedy	<input type="radio"/>	Very greedy
Gives up easily	<input type="radio"/>	Never gives up
Not at all self-confident	<input type="radio"/>	Very self-confident
Feels very inferior	<input type="radio"/>	Feels very superior
Not at all dictatorial	<input type="radio"/>	Very dictatorial
Not at all understanding of others	<input type="radio"/>	Very understanding of others

Not at all cynical	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Very cynical
Very cold in relations with others	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Very warm in relations with others
Not at all hostile	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Very hostile
Goes to pieces under pressure	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Stands up well under pressure

Thinking about the role of the presidency/chancellorship today, or your experience in it, is there anything else you would like to add? If so, please include it here.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Nikki Tobias (ntobias@uga.edu) or Dr. Laura Dean (ladean@uga.edu). If you would like a copy of the results, please notify Nikki Tobias (ntobias@uga.edu).

Please click "Submit" to finish your questionnaire and have it included in the analysis.

If you do NOT want your answers to be included in the analysis, click "Discard the data".

- Submit my responses for inclusion in the research study.
- Discard the data, I do NOT wish to participate in this study.

Appendix E: Statistical Analysis

Question 1 (variable type)	Question 2 (variable type)	Type of Analysis
Gender (Categorical-2 values)	Terminal Degree Type (Categorical: 3+ values)	Cross Tab/Chi-Square
Gender (Categorical-2 values)	Type of Institution Served (Categorical: 3+ values)	Cross Tab/Chi-Square
Gender (Categorical-2 values)	PAQ Score (Continuous)	t-test
PAQ Score (Continuous)	Type of Institution Served (Categorical: 3+ values)	ANOVA
PAQ Score (Continuous)	Skills	Spearman Rho
Type of Undergraduate Institution (Categorical: 3+ values)	Type of Institution Served (Categorical: 3+ values)	Cross Tab/Chi-Square
Terminal Degree Type (Categorical: 3+ values)	Type of Institution Served (Categorical: 3+ values)	Cross Tab/Chi-Square
Previous Professional Position	None	Descriptive Statistics
Type of Institution Served (Categorical: 3+ values)	Skills	Chi square
Gender (categorical: 2 values)	Skill Importance (Ordinal/Ranked data)	Mann-Whitney U: non-parametric t-test
Gender (categorical: 2 values)	Skill Self-Assessment (Ordinal/ranked data)	Mann-Whitney U: non-parametric t-test
Type of Institution Served (Categorical: 3+ values)	Skill Importance (Ordinal/Ranked data)	Kruskal Wallis: non- parametric ANOVA
Type of Institution Served (Categorical: 3+ values)	Skill Self-Assessment (Ordinal/ranked data)	Kruskal Wallis: non- parametric ANOVA

APPENDIX F: Personal Attributes Questionnaire

Not at all arrogant	1	2	3	4	5	Very arrogant
Not at all independent	1	2	3	4	5	Very independent
Not at all emotional	1	2	3	4	5	Very emotional
Looks out for self	1	2	3	4	5	Looks out for others
Very passive	1	2	3	4	5	Very active
Not at all egotistical	1	2	3	4	5	Very egotistical
Difficult to devote self completely to others	1	2	3	4	5	Easy to devote self completely to others
Very rough	1	2	3	4	5	Very gentle
Not at all helpful to others	1	2	3	4	5	Very helpful to others
Not at all boastful	1	2	3	4	5	Very boastful
Not at all competitive	1	2	3	4	5	Very competitive
Not at all kind	1	2	3	4	5	Very kind
Not at all aware of others' feelings	1	2	3	4	5	Very aware of others' feelings
Can make decisions easily	1	2	3	4	5	Has difficulty making decisions
Not at all greedy	1	2	3	4	5	Very greedy
Gives up easily	1	2	3	4	5	Never gives up
Not at all self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	Very self-confident
Feels very inferior	1	2	3	4	5	Feels very superior
Not at all dictatorial	1	2	3	4	5	Very dictatorial
Not at all understanding of others	1	2	3	4	5	Very understanding of others
Not at all cynical	1	2	3	4	5	Very cynical
Very cold in relations with others	1	2	3	4	5	Very warm in relations with others
Not at all hostile	1	2	3	4	5	Very hostile
Goes to pieces under pressure	1	2	3	4	5	Stands up well under pressure

Appendix G: Frequency Distributions of the Respondents

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	139	33.9	34.2	34.2
	Male	268	65.4	65.8	100.0
	Total	407	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.7		
Total		410	100.0		

Title

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	President	360	87.8	88.9	88.9
	Chancellor	30	7.3	7.4	96.3
	Other	15	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	405	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.2		
Total		410	100.0		

First Generation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	210	51.2	51.6	51.6
	No	197	48.0	48.4	100.0
	Total	407	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.7		
Total		410	100.0		

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

	30-39 years old	8	2.0	2.0	2.0
	40-49 years old	40	9.8	9.8	11.8
	50-59 years old	138	33.7	33.8	45.6
Valid	60-69 years old	186	45.4	45.6	91.2
	70-79 years old	35	8.5	8.6	99.8
	80 years old and older	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	408	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		410	100.0		

Earned Doctorate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	350	85.4	86.2	86.2
Valid	No	56	13.7	13.8	100.0
	Total	406	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.0		
Total		410	100.0		

Type of Doctorate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Ph.D.	212	51.7	60.6	60.6
	Ed.D.	102	24.9	29.1	89.7
	J.D.	12	2.9	3.4	93.1
	M.D.	2	.5	.6	93.7
	Other	22	5.4	6.3	100.0
	Total	350	85.4	100.0	
Missing	System	60	14.6		
Total		410	100.0		

Doctoral Institution Type (Public/Private)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Private	113	27.6	32.2	32.2
Valid	Public	238	58.0	67.8	100.0
	Total	351	85.6	100.0	

Missing	System	59	14.4		
Total		410	100.0		

Doctoral Institution Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 5,000 students	27	6.6	7.7	7.7
	5,000-9,999 students	36	8.8	10.2	17.9
	10,000-14,999 students	59	14.4	16.8	34.7
	15,000-19,999 students	40	9.8	11.4	46.0
	20,000-24,999 students	50	12.2	14.2	60.2
	25,000 students and above	140	34.1	39.8	100.0
Total		352	85.9	100.0	
Missing	System	58	14.1		
Total		410	100.0		

Doctorate Carnegie Classification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Baccalaureate College	4	1.0	1.1	1.1
	Masters Colleges and Universities	12	2.9	3.4	4.6
	Doctoral Granting University	324	79.0	92.3	96.9
	Special Focus Institution	11	2.7	3.1	100.0
	Total	351	85.6	100.0	
Missing	System	59	14.4		
Total		410	100.0		

Earned Master's Degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	376	91.7	92.2	92.2
	No	32	7.8	7.8	100.0
	Total	408	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		410	100.0		

Master's Institutional Type (Public/Private)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Private	134	32.7	35.9	35.9
	Public	239	58.3	64.1	100.0
	Total	373	91.0	100.0	
Missing	System	37	9.0		
Total		410	100.0		

Master's Degree Institutional Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 5,000 students	51	12.4	13.7	13.7
	5,000-9,999 students	41	10.0	11.0	24.7
	10,000-14,999 students	77	18.8	20.7	45.4
	15,000-19,999 students	44	10.7	11.8	57.3
	20,000-24,999 students	40	9.8	10.8	68.0
	25,000 students and above	119	29.0	32.0	100.0
	Total		372	90.7	100.0
Missing	System	38	9.3		
Total		410	100.0		

Type of Master's Degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	M.A.	131	32.0	34.9	34.9
	MBA	40	9.8	10.7	45.6
	M.Ed.	65	15.9	17.3	62.9
	MFA	3	.7	.8	63.7
	MPA	5	1.2	1.3	65.1
	M.S.	88	21.5	23.5	88.5
	MSW	2	.5	.5	89.1
	Other	41	10.0	10.9	100.0
Total		375	91.5	100.0	
Missing	System	35	8.5		
Total		410	100.0		

Master's Carnegie Classification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Baccalaureate College	8	2.0	2.2	2.2
	Masters Colleges and Universities	93	22.7	25.0	27.2
	Doctoral Granting Universities	255	62.2	68.5	95.7
	Special Focus Institution	16	3.9	4.3	100.0
	Total	372	90.7	100.0	
Missing	System	38	9.3		
Total		410	100.0		

Bachelor's Institution Type (Public/Private)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Private	181	44.1	45.0	45.0
	Public	221	53.9	55.0	100.0
	Total	402	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	8	2.0		
Total		410	100.0		

Bachelor's Institution Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 5,000 students	150	36.6	37.5	37.5
	5,000-9,999 students	48	11.7	12.0	49.5
	10,000-14,999 students	66	16.1	16.5	66.0
	15,000-19,999 students	38	9.3	9.5	75.5
	20,000-24,999 students	27	6.6	6.8	82.3
	25,000 students and above	71	17.3	17.8	100.0
	Total	400	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.4		
Total		410	100.0		

Bachelor's Carnegie Classification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Baccalaureate College	116	28.3	28.7	28.7
	Masters Colleges and Universities	103	25.1	25.5	54.2
	Doctoral Granting University	175	42.7	43.3	97.5
	Special Focus Institution	10	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	404	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.5		
Total		410	100.0		

Years in Higher Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-3 years	7	1.7	1.7	1.7
	4-6 years	9	2.2	2.2	4.0
	7-9 years	11	2.7	2.7	6.7
	10-12 years	17	4.1	4.2	10.9
	13-15 years	22	5.4	5.4	16.3
	more than 15 years	339	82.7	83.7	100.0
	Total	405	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.2		
Total		410	100.0		

Number of Presidencies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	300	73.2	73.5	73.5
	Two	73	17.8	17.9	91.4
	Three	25	6.1	6.1	97.5
	4.00	10	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	408	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		410	100.0		

Total Years as President

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-3 years	89	21.7	21.9	21.9
	4-6 years	87	21.2	21.4	43.2
	7-9 years	64	15.6	15.7	59.0
	10-12 years	56	13.7	13.8	72.7
	13-15 years	36	8.8	8.8	81.6
	more than 15 years	75	18.3	18.4	100.0
	Total	407	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.7		
Total		410	100.0		

Years in Current Presidency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-3 years	116	28.3	28.4	28.4
	4-6 years	103	25.1	25.2	53.7
	7-9 years	71	17.3	17.4	71.1
	10-12 years	47	11.5	11.5	82.6
	13-15 years	25	6.1	6.1	88.7
	more than 15 years	46	11.2	11.3	100.0
	Total	408	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		410	100.0		

Institutional Type of Current Institution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Associates College	153	37.3	37.7	37.7
	Baccalaureate College	90	22.0	22.2	59.9
	Masters Colleges and Universities	90	22.0	22.2	82.0
	Doctoral Granting University	38	9.3	9.4	91.4
	Special Focus Institution	32	7.8	7.9	99.3
	Tribal College	3	.7	.7	100.0

	Total	406	99.0	100.0
Missing	System	4	1.0	
Total		410	100.0	

Current Institution Size

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Less than 5,000 students	268	65.4	65.7	65.7
	5,000-9,999 students	69	16.8	16.9	82.6
	10,000-14,999 students	23	5.6	5.6	88.2
Valid	15,000-19,999 students	14	3.4	3.4	91.7
	20,000-24,999 students	9	2.2	2.2	93.9
	25,000 students and above	25	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	408	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.5		
Total		410	100.0		

Appendix H: Descriptive Statistics of the Skills Portion of the CPSAQ

Personal and General Leadership Skills Section (Importance Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Provide Vision	399	3.00	5.00	4.8471	.38067
Demonstrate Commitment	400	4.00	5.00	4.8050	.39670
Environment of Trust	399	3.00	5.00	4.8020	.42343
Lead by Example	399	3.00	5.00	4.8020	.41745
Possess Perseverance	399	3.00	5.00	4.7794	.43868
Credit Others	398	3.00	5.00	4.7688	.45651
Build Relationships	397	3.00	5.00	4.7607	.46130
Show Professionalism	399	3.00	5.00	4.7444	.45920
Know the Institution's Culture	400	3.00	5.00	4.7400	.46685
Establish Relationships	400	3.00	5.00	4.7400	.47218
Demonstrated to Student Success	400	3.00	5.00	4.7350	.47995
Inspire Others	398	3.00	5.00	4.7211	.47092
Possess Common Sense	396	3.00	5.00	4.7146	.48459
Possess Drive	399	3.00	5.00	4.6942	.46672
Know Strengths & Weaknesses	399	2.00	5.00	4.6692	.51199
Collaborate	398	2.00	5.00	4.5980	.58460
Am Optimistic	400	3.00	5.00	4.5950	.54930
Respect the Institution's Culture	400	1.00	5.00	4.5325	.66336
Am Supportive	397	2.00	5.00	4.5113	.57997
Am Self-Aware	400	1.00	5.00	4.4900	.67531
Consult with Others	399	3.00	5.00	4.4837	.59234
Am Courageous	398	2.00	5.00	4.4698	.62914
Provide Resources for Others	397	3.00	5.00	4.4484	.60759
Prioritize Team Building	398	2.00	5.00	4.4045	.64248
Am Organized	398	2.00	5.00	4.3668	.69261
Am patient	400	1.00	5.00	4.0275	.86523

Intellectual in Times of Change	396	2.00	5.00	3.9192	.82280
Intellectual in Times of Crisis	395	1.00	5.00	3.8532	.94451
Valid N (listwise)	368				

Personal and General Leadership Skills Section (Ability Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Demonstrate Commitment	391	3.00	5.00	4.7340	.46503
Credit Others Ability	392	2.00	5.00	4.6709	.57783
Possess Perseverance	391	3.00	5.00	4.6675	.54720
Lead by Example	392	3.00	5.00	4.6633	.52447
Possess Common Sense	391	2.00	5.00	4.6419	.53078
Show Professionalism	392	3.00	5.00	4.6276	.56229
Demonstrated to Student Success	392	2.00	5.00	4.6071	.57104
Possess Drive	392	2.00	5.00	4.5791	.57561
Know the Institution's Culture	391	2.00	5.00	4.5422	.58409
Build Relationships	393	2.00	5.00	4.5216	.63500
Am Optimistic	390	2.00	5.00	4.5179	.67144
Establish Relationships	393	2.00	5.00	4.5064	.63534
Collaborate	392	2.00	5.00	4.5026	.62758
Environment of Trust	391	2.00	5.00	4.4834	.63980
Provide Vision	392	2.00	5.00	4.4286	.64368
Am Supportive	391	2.00	5.00	4.3811	.65676
Consult with Others	392	1.00	5.00	4.3724	.69271
Inspire Others	392	3.00	5.00	4.3597	.63625
Know Strengths & Weaknesses	391	3.00	5.00	4.3504	.62634
Am Courageous	391	2.00	5.00	4.3453	.66869
Respect the Institution's Culture	390	2.00	5.00	4.3385	.74400
Am Self-Aware	393	2.00	5.00	4.3028	.72662
Provide Resources for Others	388	2.00	5.00	4.2113	.70192
Prioritize Team Building	388	2.00	5.00	4.1804	.73553
Am Organized	392	2.00	5.00	4.1020	.85213

Intellectual in Times of Crisis	389	1.00	5.00	3.9769	.82298
Intellectual in Times of Change	386	1.00	5.00	3.9016	.79325
Am patient	392	1.00	5.00	3.7679	.92683
Valid N (listwise)	350				

Academic and Moral Leadership Skills Section (Importance Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Am Honest	399	4.00	5.00	4.9298	.25576
Demonstrate Personal Integrity	398	4.00	5.00	4.9196	.27226
Respect Others	397	3.00	5.00	4.8312	.38825
Exhibit Character	392	3.00	5.00	4.8291	.38364
Am Fair	397	2.00	5.00	4.7960	.45636
Speak with Courage and Conviction	394	3.00	5.00	4.7132	.50087
Am Objective	397	2.00	5.00	4.6146	.57304
Am a Role Model	396	3.00	5.00	4.5985	.55839
Moral Leader	393	2.00	5.00	4.5496	.64143
Enhance Institutional Reputation	397	2.00	5.00	4.4383	.65083
Quality of Academic Programs	397	1.00	5.00	4.3552	.68336
Emphasize Teaching and Learning	397	1.00	5.00	4.2846	.71921
Am nurturing in Difficult Times	394	2.00	5.00	4.1827	.78284
Academic Leader on Campus	390	1.00	5.00	3.9692	.81696
Shape Academic Programs	398	1.00	5.00	3.6558	.83053
Intellectual Leader Among the faculty	396	1.00	5.00	3.5581	.87680
Have a Pastoral Role on Campus	398	1.00	5.00	3.1633	1.23589
Valid N (listwise)	360				

Academic and Moral Leadership Skills Section (Ability Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Am Fair	393	3.00	5.00	4.8855	.32673
Am Honest	393	3.00	5.00	4.8728	.34861
Demonstrate Personal Integrity	394	3.00	5.00	4.7665	.45822
Am Objective	389	3.00	5.00	4.7198	.47205
Have a Pastoral Role on Campus	393	2.00	5.00	4.5954	.59477
Speak with Courage and Conviction	392	3.00	5.00	4.4617	.61404
Exhibit Character	391	2.00	5.00	4.4501	.64605
Quality of Academic Programs	387	2.00	5.00	4.4496	.66708
Shape Academic Programs	394	2.00	5.00	4.2411	.74152
Enhance Institutional Reputation	393	2.00	5.00	4.1705	.74158
Respect Others	393	1.00	5.00	4.1679	.79686
Am a Role Model	393	2.00	5.00	4.0789	.84900
Moral Leader	385	1.00	5.00	3.9169	.84060
Academic Leader on Campus	198	1.00	5.00	3.7071	.89842
Intellectual Leader Among the faculty	390	1.00	5.00	3.6974	.85489
Emphasize Teaching and Learning	395	1.00	5.00	3.5949	.87142
Am nurturing in Difficult Times	394	1.00	5.00	3.1269	1.30925
Valid N (listwise)	164				

Administrative, Executive, and Presidential Leadership Skills Section (Importance Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Lead the Team of Executive Officers	392	3.00	5.00	4.8546	.36717
Recruit Key Leadership	394	3.00	5.00	4.8173	.41241
Serve as the "Face" of the Institution	392	2.00	5.00	4.7806	.51358

Problem Solve	388	2.00	5.00	4.7345	.48132
Listen to Others	390	3.00	5.00	4.7308	.45556
Make Personnel Changes When Necessary	390	3.00	5.00	4.6897	.48488
Am Visible	389	1.00	5.00	4.6889	.57742
Appreciate employees' work	389	3.00	5.00	4.6838	.48723
Make Decisions in a Timely Fashion	389	2.00	5.00	4.6581	.51153
Possess Strong Public Speaking Skills	390	2.00	5.00	4.6564	.55067
Possess Crisis Management Skills	392	3.00	5.00	4.6301	.54319
Possess Strong Written Communication Skills	392	2.00	5.00	4.6276	.56682
Find Colleagues who have Strengths to Balance My Weaknesses	392	2.00	5.00	4.6276	.59328
Possess Political Acumen	391	1.00	5.00	4.5831	.67757
Hold Staff Accountable	391	2.00	5.00	4.5601	.56916
Provide Staff Recognition	388	2.00	5.00	4.5335	.59837
Delegate Projects to Staff	387	2.00	5.00	4.5297	.59881
Allocate Resources	391	2.00	5.00	4.4706	.65125
Fund Raise	388	1.00	5.00	4.4691	.96533
Hear Employees' Concerns	392	2.00	5.00	4.3750	.65914
Mentor Staff	392	1.00	5.00	4.3673	.68057
Monitor Performance	389	2.00	5.00	4.3599	.64139
Encourage Diversity in Committees	391	1.00	5.00	4.3197	.73212
Manage the Budget	392	1.00	5.00	4.3087	.82427
Interact with the Media	392	1.00	5.00	4.2985	.81871
Respond to Forces Beyond My Control	391	1.00	5.00	4.2916	.77255
Complete Performance Reviews	394	2.00	5.00	4.2386	.77750
Test Ideas Publicly, Rather than Pronounce Conclusions	390	1.00	5.00	4.1795	.79107
Implement Policies for the Organization	387	1.00	5.00	4.1395	.82145

Analyze Policies for the Institution	388	1.00	5.00	4.1340	.80539
Encourage Debate about Campus Issues	389	2.00	5.00	4.0951	.78235
Manage the Operations and Logistics of the Business	392	2.00	5.00	4.0179	.87136
Provide Personal Support to the Staff	390	1.00	5.00	4.0154	.83913
Create Policies for the Organization	392	1.00	5.00	3.9031	.87347
Valid N (listwise)	337				

Administrative, Executive, and Presidential Leadership Skills (Ability Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Serve as the "Face" of the Institution	388	2.00	5.00	4.6469	.58981
Problem Solve	384	2.00	5.00	4.6198	.56552
Lead the Team of Executive Officers	388	3.00	5.00	4.5825	.57592
Am Visible	387	2.00	5.00	4.5788	.65647
Possess Strong Written Communication Skills	390	2.00	5.00	4.5462	.66237
Appreciate employees' work	387	2.00	5.00	4.4987	.68807
Listen to Others	386	2.00	5.00	4.4922	.64158
Possess Strong Public Speaking Skills	387	2.00	5.00	4.4858	.67269
Possess Crisis Management Skills	388	1.00	5.00	4.4381	.66960
Make Decisions in a Timely Fashion	387	2.00	5.00	4.4341	.66960
Recruit Key Leadership	390	2.00	5.00	4.4154	.63470
Allocate Resources	388	2.00	5.00	4.3686	.67876
Find Colleagues who have Strengths to Balance My Weaknesses	389	2.00	5.00	4.3599	.73501
Maker Personnel Changes When Necessary	389	1.00	5.00	4.3470	.77684
Possess Political Acumen	390	1.00	5.00	4.3179	.82782
Manage the Budget	390	2.00	5.00	4.2667	.79242

Hear Employees' Concerns	385	2.00	5.00	4.2571	.74921
Provide Staff Recognition	386	1.00	5.00	4.2565	.76889
Interact with the Media	388	1.00	5.00	4.2268	.82287
Delegate Projects to Staff	387	2.00	5.00	4.1964	.80329
Hold Staff Accountable	389	1.00	5.00	4.1902	.75628
Encourage Diversity in Committees	390	2.00	5.00	4.1538	.82501
Mentor Staff	389	1.00	5.00	4.1388	.81939
Implement Policies for the Organization	386	2.00	5.00	4.1088	.76859
Manage the Operations and Logistics of the Business	387	2.00	5.00	4.0930	.80260
Analyze Policies for the Institution	388	1.00	5.00	4.0670	.81374
Respond to Forces Beyond My Control	388	1.00	5.00	4.0593	.78690
Monitor Performance	387	1.00	5.00	4.0336	.78285
Test Ideas Publicly, Rather than Pronounce Conclusions	388	1.00	5.00	3.9974	.79566
Provide Personal Support to the Staff	388	2.00	5.00	3.9665	.80464
Fund Raise Ability	389	1.00	5.00	3.9614	.99538
Complete Performance Reviews	386	1.00	5.00	3.9041	.95272
Encourage Debate about Campus Issues	387	2.00	5.00	3.8966	.81734
Create Policies for the Organization	386	1.00	5.00	3.8653	.88713
Valid N (listwise)	338				

Political and Strategic Leadership Skills Section (Importance Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Act Strategically	386	3.00	5.00	4.8083	.41345
Am Accountable to the Governing Board of the Institution	395	1.00	5.00	4.7190	.65262
Am a Strategic Planner for the Institution	394	1.00	5.00	4.6574	.59417

Work with a Variety of Constituents	393	2.00	5.00	4.6438	.53957
Serve as a Change Agent	390	2.00	5.00	4.5923	.61719
Possess Strong Conflict Management Skills	394	1.00	5.00	4.4797	.62260
Network	394	2.00	5.00	4.4543	.67239
Educate the Board	394	1.00	5.00	4.4492	.84631
Negotiate	389	2.00	5.00	4.3188	.75038
Develop Town-Gown Relationships	392	1.00	5.00	4.2985	.86725
Shape the Board's Agenda	392	1.00	5.00	4.1990	.97341
Cultivate Board Members	392	1.00	5.00	4.0153	1.13298
Identify New Board Members	395	1.00	5.00	3.7291	1.28246
Serve as a Political Lobbyist	394	1.00	5.00	3.6117	1.19752
Encourage Board Member Interaction with the Faculty, Staff, & Students	394	1.00	5.00	3.5381	1.13909
Valid N (listwise)	367				

Political and Strategic Leadership Skills Section (Ability Ratings)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Am Accountable to the Governing Board of the Institution	388	2.00	5.00	4.6134	.65100
Act Strategically	384	2.00	5.00	4.5964	.60983
Work with a Variety of Constituents	385	2.00	5.00	4.5247	.61664
Am a Strategic Planner for the Institution	387	1.00	5.00	4.5090	.71025
Serve as a Change Agent	390	2.00	5.00	4.4692	.68987
Educate the Board	388	1.00	5.00	4.2577	.80088
Possess Strong Conflict Management Skills	389	1.00	5.00	4.2108	.75422
Network	389	2.00	5.00	4.2057	.81789
Develop Town-Gown Relationships	390	1.00	5.00	4.1821	.94048
Shape the Board's Agenda	384	1.00	5.00	4.1094	.94690
Negotiate	387	1.00	5.00	4.0853	.85198

Cultivate Board Members	376	1.00	5.00	3.8511	1.11673
Identify New Board Members	385	1.00	5.00	3.6130	1.25555
Encourage Board Member Interaction with the Faculty, Staff, & Students	388	1.00	5.00	3.5825	1.07155
Serve as a Political Lobbyist	387	1.00	5.00	3.4806	1.17465
Valid N (listwise)	354				

Appendix I: Spearman Rho Correlations between PAQ and Skills

Nonparametric Correlations: PAQ Scales and Highest Rated Importance Skills

PAQ Scale	Am honest	Demonstrate personal integrity	Lead the team of executive officers	Provide vision	Respect others
Agency	.083	.037	.105*	.072	.051
Communion	.195**	.152**	.159**	.106*	.304**

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Nonparametric Correlations: PAQ Scales and Highest Rated Ability Skills

PAQ Scale	Am fair	Am honest	Demonstrate personal integrity	Demonstrate commitment	Am objective
Agency	.143**	.108*	.082	.136**	.133**
Communion	.173**	.235**	.360**	.209**	.241**

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).