

Leadership and Interpersonal Characteristics Related to
Administrator Overall Evaluations

Stephen L. Benton¹,

Amy Gross¹

William H. Pallett¹

Rodney K. Goodyear²

The IDEA Center¹

School of Education, University of Redlands²

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, Canada, April 2012. Correspondence regarding this manuscript should be directed to Stephen L. Benton, The IDEA Center, 301 South Fourth St., Suite 200, Manhattan, KS 66502-6209; steve@theideacenter.org.

Abstract

Prior research suggests personnel responses to assessment instruments in conjunction with other indicators of effectiveness can provide administrators with helpful feedback for professional development. The IDEA Center's *Feedback for Administrators* system solicits input from personnel about their administrator's strengths and interpersonal characteristics. From the spring of 2001 to the summer of 2008, 38,325 staff, faculty, colleagues, and students completed the IDEA *Impressions of Administrators* survey to evaluate the performance of 732 academic administrators from 58 institutions. Principal components analysis revealed three underlying administrative dimensions: Administrative Roles, Interpersonal Characteristics, and Leadership Style, each having high internal consistency. In a simultaneous regression, carrying out key administrative roles was most strongly associated with personnel ratings of confidence and job performance. Hierarchical moderated multiple regressions revealed no differences in summary judgments between public and private institutions. Presidents and provosts, however, received lower overall ratings than other administrators. Yet, provosts earned higher overall ratings when personnel rated them highly in fulfilling administrative roles and employing a leadership style of decisiveness and organization.

Leadership and Interpersonal Characteristics Related to Administrator Overall Evaluations

Effective leadership in higher education requires the cooperative talents and abilities of many individuals at different levels within an institution. Quality leadership is required at all levels, including deans and associate/assistant deans whose performance expectations have increased markedly (Bisbee & Miller, 2006). If institutions wish to recruit and retain effective leaders, they must provide effective professional development (Heuer, 2003). Leadership requires nurturing multiple personal characteristics, including communication skills, as well as the ability to work with others and to create and follow a vision (Gmelch, 2004). Such skills and personal characteristics can be improved (Conger & Benjamin, 1999), although leadership development is a process that sometimes requires years of experience and substantial commitment of time and resources (Carroll & Wolverson, 2004; Conger & Benjamin, 1999; Gardner, 1990).

The use of psychometrically sound instruments in conjunction with other indicators of effectiveness can contribute to useful professional development (Downey, 2002) and to formal performance ratings that provide administrators with feedback (Heuer, 2003). Using formal assessment to provide feedback to an administrator creates self-awareness, an understanding of one's skills, behaviors, needs, and values (McCauley, Moxley, & Velsor, 1998, cited in Hoppe, 2004). The IDEA Center's *Feedback for Administrators* system is an example of such formal assessment. It focuses on personnel ratings of administrative roles, which is consistent with the view that evaluation must focus on outcomes by taking into consideration the many roles administrators play (Downey, 2002). The IDEA system also provides feedback to the

administrator about personal characteristics, which have been found to be related to effective leadership (e.g., Buller, 2007; Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Sarros, 1999; Montez, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 2003).

Using the IDEA feedback tool, the key question we addressed in this study was which key administrative functions and interpersonal characteristics are associated with effective leadership in higher education? Because of the importance of this question, we expected to find much research already done on the topic. However, we found, as did others (Bryman, 2007; Smith & Hughey, 2006), that little empirical research had actually been conducted. Nonetheless, that which has been done supports the importance of the following administrative roles assessed on the IDEA feedback instrument.

1. *Communicates and displays a visionary plan for the future.* Effective leaders possess and communicate a vision and a clear sense of direction for the unit (Creswell et al., 1990; Benoit & Graham, 2005; Gmelch, 2004). They help their followers connect with and become committed to a shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).
2. *Establishes sound priorities.* Effective leaders do more than communicate a vision—they also set goals and secure the needed resources to get things done (Knight & Holen, 1985). They allocate resources (time, information, people) to set priorities that encourage the vision they have communicated (Cresswell, et al., 1990).
3. *Displays knowledge/expertise required for this position.* Faculty and staff of effective leaders view them as credible in terms of both academic knowledge/expertise and leadership (Bryman, 2007).

Creswell and Brown (1992) found that successful leaders act as role models by virtue of their expertise in and knowledge about publishing, external funding, teaching, and research.

4. *Makes wise decisions, judgments, and recommendations.* Effective leaders deal with complex issues in a thoughtful manner (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).
5. *Initiates actions that anticipate problems or resolves them before they become major concerns.* Leaders are perceived to be effective when they can respond to a crisis in a way that noticeably improves the situation (Smith & Hughey, 2006).
6. *Is an effective “team” member.* The literature supports the value of being open to suggestions and inviting consultation (Bland et al., 2005; Moses & Roe, 1990). Effective leaders develop trusting and participatory relationships with colleagues (Goldring & Greenfield, 2002); they act selflessly to help all members of the team be successful (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).
7. *Contributes positively to the institution’s image and reputation.* The academic reputation of an institution is an important factor in faculty members’ decisions about whether to remain at their current institution or to move on to another one (Matier, 1990; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994). Accordingly, effective leaders recruit highly regarded researchers in the hopes of building the institution’s reputation and retaining and attracting capable faculty and staff (Bland, et al., 2005). Effective

leaders also make faculty research a priority, which in turn enhances image and reputation (Bryman, 2007).

8. *Communicates relevant information to appropriate constituencies.*

Effective leaders in higher education successfully promote their unit's standing within the university and beyond (Bryman, 2007). Creswell and Brown (1992) referred to this as "advocacy," in which leaders champion the unit's cause inside and outside the university community. They act as liaisons to external constituencies (Benoit & Graham, 2005) and as advocates to communicate their unit's needs to upper-level administrators (Moses & Roe, 1990).
9. *Seeks opinions of others before establishing policies or procedures that affect them.* Most academics value being involved in decisions that affect them (Bryman, 2007). They wish to function autonomously and to be unimpeded as they go about their work in their own way (Adams, 1998). To do so requires having the opportunity to participate in key decisions (Bland, et al., 2005). Shared governance and consultation are, therefore, typically viewed as hallmarks of effective leadership (Rosser et al., 2000).
10. *Earns the trust and respect of those who come in contact with him/her.*

Effective leaders are considerate of others. They earn others' respect by being trustworthy, warm, and respectful (Knight & Holen, 1985). They treat faculty and staff fairly and equitably (Ambrose, Huston, &

Norman, 2005), characteristics associated with building and maintaining morale (Moses & Roe, 1990).

Research findings also support the importance of various interpersonal characteristics (Smith & Hughey, 2006), many of which are also assessed on the IDEA survey instrument. For example, effective leaders promote trust (Goldring & Greenfield, 2002); are considerate of others (Bass, 1999; Winter, Taylor, & Sarros, 2000); fair (Ambrose et al., 2005; Moses & Roe, 1990); consistent (Ambrose et al., 2005); and unselfish and honest (Mitchell, 1987).

Questions Addressed in this Study

Differential perceptions of administrators by type of position seem intuitive, but warrant examination. Many view presidents and provosts as key change agents (Schmidt, 2002; Seldin, 1988). Upper-level administrators face increasing demands of externally imposed assessments while financial support decreases. Such pressure comes at a time when presidents and provosts are retiring in record numbers while a shortage exists in qualified successors (Bornstein, 2010). Due to their greater “distance” from faculty, one might expect presidents and provosts to receive lower ratings than those at lower levels, because the less frequently personnel interact with an administrator the lower are their performance ratings (Benton, Webster, Pallett, & Song, 2010). We, therefore, investigated whether ratings of the administrator would differ by type of position.

Another purpose of this study was to examine whether ratings of administrators would differ between public and private institutions. Whereas administrators in private institutions are generally perceived as having more autonomy than their counterparts in public universities, their focus on generating revenue through tuition and gifts is more

direct. These and other factors reasonably would affect what administrators do and how they do it. Whereas Volkwein and Parmley (2000) found few differences in administrators' satisfaction in public versus private universities, Mech (1997) demonstrated that the public versus private institutional context did affect the work of chief administrative officers. Public institutions are, in many ways, still dealing with the effects of the economic recession, whereas those in the private sector are returning to more stability (Green, Jaschik, & Lederman, 2012). Presidents in public colleges and universities are, therefore, more likely to suffer budget shortfalls, which might contribute to faculty and staff perceptions of their leadership, especially if they decide to promote early retirement, increase teaching loads, and revise tenure policies. In addition, leaders in public institutions express more concern about reductions in federal research funding compared to those in the private sector who may have alternative sources of revenue, such as contracts and investment returns (Green et al., 2012). On the other hand, leaders in private, non-profit institutions express concern about being able to fill their classrooms because of rising tuitions and increased competition for students (Green et al., 2012).

Purposes of the Study

We sought to answer the following specific questions. Which interpersonal and leadership qualities of higher education administrators are most highly correlated with overall ratings of their job performance and the confidence others have in them? Do overall ratings vary by general institutional affiliation (public vs. private) and by type of administrative position (university level vs. college level)? Finally, does the type of administrative position moderate the effects of interpersonal characteristics and leadership style on overall ratings of the administrator?

In the current study, then, we compared public and private institutions, although we posited no directional hypothesis because of the previously mentioned equivocal findings. We expected that personnel ratings of the administrator's performance of roles, interpersonal characteristics, and leadership style would be positively related to ratings of overall effectiveness and confidence. The research literature also supported the view that central administrators (presidents and provosts) would receive lower overall ratings than college administrators (deans, assistant/associate deans).

Method

Instrumentation

The IDEA Center *Feedback for Administrators* system was developed in the 1990s to provide information for formative and/or summative evaluation. The IDEA Center is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to serve colleges and universities committed to improving learning, teaching, and leadership performance. Founded in 1975, the Center supports the evaluation and development of both programs and people at nearly 500 higher educational institutions.

The *Impressions of Administrators* survey solicits input from personnel about their administrator's strengths regarding 10 administrative roles. Raters use a five-point scale, ranging from 1 = *Definite Weakness* to 5 = *Definite Strength*. Respondents also provide impressions of the administrator with respect to 18 personal characteristics (each using a 1 to 7 semantic differential scale). They answer two questions designed to assess overall summary judgments of the administrator's effectiveness. One asks, "What kind of a job is this administrator doing?" Five responses are possible: 1 = *Poor*, 2 = *Mediocre*, 3 = *Good*, 4 = *Excellent*, 5 = *Superb* and CJ = *Can't Judge*. (Cases responding CJ are not

included in analyses.) The second asks, “Does this administrator have your confidence?” It offers five options: 1 = *Definitely not*, 2 = *No, but I have reservations about this*, 3 = *Yes, but I have reservations about this*, 4 = *Definitely yes*, and 5 = *I have formed no stable opinion*. (Cases responding “5” are not included in any analyses.) . See the *Survey Form* (<http://www.theideacenter.org/our-services/feedback-administrators/0097-administrator-survey-form>) for specific item content.

Data Sources

From the spring of 2001 to the summer of 2008, 732 academic administrators from 58 institutions participated. From the spring of 2002 to the summer of 2008, 38,325 personnel from those institutions were invited to rate their respective administrator. Of those invited, 72.1% (27,632) responded. The current analyses were performed on the aggregated ratings for each of the 732 administrators.

Administrators came from 33 U. S. states, Guam, and the Marshall Islands. The majority (51.7%) came from the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools followed by those in the Middle States Association (27.7%). They included presidents, chief academic officers, chief financial officers, chief student affairs officer, deans, associate/assistant deans, academic department chairs, directors, and others. Most administrators had been in their current position five or fewer years (61.5%). Personnel included faculty (55.5%), administrative staff (19.1%), other individuals reporting meaningful contact with the administrator (22.5%), as well as students (2.9%). Most personnel (67.2%) had been in their current institution for more than five years. An average of 5 support staff and other professionals served within the administrator’s unit. Most personnel who responded to the survey were, in general, experienced individuals

that met with the administrator fairly frequently. Tables 1 and 2 present frequencies and percentages of various participant demographic characteristics.

Results

Principal Components Analyses

We first examined the underlying factor structure of the 10 administrative roles (Items 1 to 10). Principal components analysis (PCA) yielded one clear factor (eigenvalue = 8.72) that explained 87.2% of the variance. All 10 roles had component matrix coefficients of at least .88 and contributed to the high reliability of the scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .98$, $SEM = .08$), which we named Administrative Roles. The highest loading qualities were making wise decisions, judgments, and recommendations; earning the trust and respect of others; being an effective team member; establishing sound priorities; and anticipating problems or resolving them. Table 3 presents component matrix coefficients for all 10 administrative roles.

We then performed PCA on ratings of the 18 personal characteristics of the administrator (Items 11 to 18). Initially, three factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, explaining in total 83.2% of the variance. Several items were highly correlated and conceptually redundant, which created ambiguity in the factor structure. Item total correlations and component matrix coefficients led us to delete five items. We then performed PCA on the remaining 13 items. Only two factors had eigenvalues greater than 1. Following varimax rotation, the first factor explained 47.1% of the variance (eigenvalue = 6.12) and was associated with 8 items that seemed conceptually related to the quality of Interpersonal Characteristics (e.g., understanding, receptive, trustworthy, fair, approachable, and straightforward). All items had high item-total correlations with

the overall scale score, which had high internal consistency ($\alpha = .96$, $SEM = .15$). The second rotated factor, which explained 34.2% of the variance (eigenvalue = 4.44), was comprised of five items, which concerned Leadership Style (e.g., decisiveness, organization, consistency). All five had high item-total correlations with the overall scale score, which had high internal consistency ($\alpha = .91$, $SEM = .18$). Table 4 presents component matrix coefficients for all items loading on these two principal components.

Regression Analyses

We created scale means for each principal component. Table 5 shows means and standard deviations for the three scales (administrative roles, personal characteristics, and leadership style) and the two summary judgments of overall job performance and confidence in the administrator. Table 6 presents inter-correlations among the three scales, which served as explanatory variables, and the two summary judgments, which were the criterion variables.

We first performed simultaneous regression to investigate the relative importance of the three administrative dimensions in explaining ratings on each of the two summary judgments. Because of the large sample size and the number of analyses performed, we set Type I error rate at $\alpha = .01$. The zero-order correlations between each of the three explanatory variables and the rating of overall job performance were high (see Table 5), but the standardized beta coefficients were significant only for administrative roles ($\beta = .841$, $p < .001$) and leadership style ($\beta = .138$, $p < .001$). Regarding the question of overall confidence, the zero-order correlations were again high for all three predictors (see Table 6), but the standardized beta coefficients were significant only for administrative roles ($\beta = .750$, $p < .001$) and interpersonal characteristics ($\beta = .186$, p

< .001). The successful performance of administrative roles was, therefore, the most important dimension for explaining overall summary judgments of the administrator.

Next, we investigated whether type of position moderated the effects of administration dimensions on overall summary judgments. We analyzed the two summary judgments, which were the criterion variables, separately and developed unique models for administrative roles, interpersonal characteristics, and leadership style. For each analysis, type of institution (1 = private, 0 = public) was entered on the first step; administrative position--dummy coded (president, provost, dean, assistant/associate dean)-- on the second step; the performance dimension (administrative roles, interpersonal characteristics, or leadership style) on the third step; and the interaction of Administrative Position by Performance Dimension on the fourth step.

Overall job performance. Table 7 present relevant statistics for the models tested. There was no main effect for the public versus private distinction ($R^2 = .009$, $p < .012$), so overall job performance ratings did not differ between public and private institutions. However, type of position was significant (R^2 Change = .051, $p < .001$). Provosts followed by presidents were rated lower than other administrators on overall performance (see Table 5). On the third step, administrators who were rated higher on fulfillment of administrative roles earned higher overall performance ratings (R^2 Change = .859, $p < .001$). The same was true in the models that entered interpersonal characteristics (R^2 Change = .654, $p < .001$) and leadership style (R^2 Change = .673, $p < .001$) on the third step. Regardless of position or institution, administrators who were rated higher on those dimensions earned higher overall ratings of job performance. On the fourth step, there was a significant Administrative Position x Leadership Style interaction for provosts

versus others ($\beta = .057, p < .006$). The slope of the line for leadership style predicting overall job performance was somewhat greater for provosts ($b = .592$) than for other administrators ($b = .482$). This suggests leadership style characteristics (e.g., decisiveness, organization, and consistency) are especially important for chief academic officers with respect to ratings of job performance.

Confidence in the administrator. As with overall job performance, the public versus private distinction again had no effect ($R^2 = .004, p < .082$) on the ratings for confidence in the administrator. However, type of position did have an influence ($R^2 \text{ Change} = .054, p < .001$), as provosts, followed by presidents, were again rated significantly lower than other administrators. On the third step, those who were rated higher on administrative roles ($R^2 \text{ Change} = .828, p < .001$) had higher ratings of confidence. The same effect was observed in the models for interpersonal characteristics ($R^2 \text{ Change} = .706, p < .001$), and leadership style ($R^2 \text{ Change} = .584, p < .001$). So, higher ratings on all three administrative dimensions were associated with greater confidence in the administrator. On the fourth step, there were significant interactions for Position x Administrative Role and Position x Leadership Style. Administrative roles ($b = .463$) and leadership style ($b = .461$) were somewhat more important for raters' confidence in provosts than in other administrators ($b = .321$ and $.391$, respectively). In turn, administrative roles ($b = .448$) and leadership style ($b = .417$) were more important in ratings for assistant/associate deans than for others ($b = .399$ and $.329$, respectively).

Scientific or Scholarly Significance of the Study

The current findings can be summarized as follows. Administrators who are perceived as more successful at fulfilling administrative roles; exhibiting a leadership

style of decisiveness and organization; and in being democratic, understanding, receptive, and fair are more likely to earn high marks on overall job performance and to instill confidence in their leadership. Second, presidents and provosts tend to receive lower ratings than others on overall job performance and confidence. Third, perceived strength in administrative roles is more strongly associated with ratings of confidence in chief academic officers and associate/assistant deans than it is with those of other administrators. Fourth, exhibiting a decisive and organized leadership style is more strongly associated with confidence in provosts and associate/assistant deans than in other administrators. Fourth, leadership style plays a greater role in overall ratings of job performance of chief academic officers than it does in that of other administrators.

Taken together, these findings support the view that effective leadership at all levels within an academic institution—be it public or private--requires the application of multiple talents, abilities, and personal characteristics (Gmelch, 2004). Regardless of position or type of institution, administrators who were rated highest in satisfying administrative roles received higher ratings of job performance and confidence. This was by far the most important dimension of leadership. This confirms the research of others who found several of the highest loading roles assessed in this study to have been essential leadership traits in previous studies: making wise decisions (Kouzes & Posner, 2002), earning the trust and respect of others (Knight & Holen, 1985; Ambrose et al., 2005), being an effective team member (Bland et al., 2005; Moses & Roe, 1990), and establishing sound priorities (Knight & Holen, 1985; Cresswell, 1990). Regardless of the type of institution or leadership position, these are essential attributes of effective leadership.

Administrators who received the highest overall ratings in this study were also rated highly on several interpersonal characteristics. Among them, some matched those found by others in previous research: being trustworthy (Goldring & Greenfield, 2002), considerate (Bass, 1999), fair (Ambrose et al., 2005; Mitchell, 1987; Moses & Roe, 1990), unselfish, and honest (Mitchell, 1987). Moreover, high overall ratings in this study were associated with a leadership style that included characteristics noted by others to be important: being clear (Bryman, 2007) consistent (Ambrose et al., 2005), and active (Knight & Holen, 1985).

The finding that presidents and provosts earned lower marks than others was not surprising given that those in upper-level administrative positions face challenging issues, such as declining legislative support, rising costs of tuition, and potential cuts to student aid (Green, et al., 2012). When faced with such challenges, some presidents and provosts are currently considering strategies that spur controversy: shifting more classes online, eliminating underperforming academic programs, reorganizing administrative units, promoting early retirement programs, increasing teaching loads, and revising tenure policies (Green et al., 2012). When faced with such daunting challenges, perhaps upper-level administrators will be viewed as more successful if they attend to key administrative roles and convey a leadership style than projects decisiveness, organization, and consistency, as was true of provosts in the current study.

Contrary to what might have been expected, we found no differences in administrator ratings between public and private institutions. Administrators in public and private institutions share many of the same challenges: potential cuts in student aid, budget shortfalls, and rising tuition/college affordability (Green et al., 2012). Although

their plans for generating revenue may differ, some of the strategies they pursue to address budget shortfalls are similar—exploring new collaborative opportunities with other institutions, shifting more classes online, and eliminating underperforming academic programs (Green et al., 2012). In spite of the challenges administrators face, and the controversial nature of some of the solutions they consider, the current results indicate that faculty and staff in public and private institutions, on average, give good-to-excellent ratings of their administrators' performance and express confidence in them, with reservations.

The moderating effects of specific administrative roles, interpersonal characteristics, and leadership style on overall summary judgments of provosts and associate/assistant deans may speak to the possible value of professional development. The aging of current upper-level administrators could lead to widespread turnover at a time when the pool of available candidates is thin (Bornstein, 2010). Where will the next generation of leaders be found? Professional development can be offered to internal candidates who show promise, including both current administrators and faculty (Bornstein, 2010). Unfortunately, on-campus professional development for administrators rarely involves substantive leadership skills, such as conflict management, team building, or implementing change (Hecht, Higerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999). The current findings have identified several leadership qualities and interpersonal characteristics that might provide appropriate content for such professional development.

Having identified qualities of effective leadership in higher education, what can institutions do to develop such behaviors and skills in its current pool of faculty and department heads? One means is developmental job assignments, which are tasks that

require individuals to move beyond their current role so that they are forced to think and act differently (Ohlott, 1998 cited in Hoppe, 2004). Examples include responsibilities added to an existing job (such as...), working on a piece of another job (such as...), or taking on an entirely new job assignment for a period of time. Interim appointments also enable such professional development.

We must acknowledge several limitations to the current study. First, participation was voluntary, and the reasons administrators had for selecting the IDEA Feedback system varied. Some may have been required to participate, some may have wanted feedback for professional development, whereas others may simply have been interested in finding out how they were perceived. Nonetheless, the sample represented a widespread group of administrators from many regions of the country, and institutions of various sizes and affiliations. Second, ratings were based on individual perceptions of the respondent and not on the administrator's actual performance. Other measures of achievement (e.g., external funding, program development, effective budgeting, student outcomes) would have been helpful to more validly assess the administrator's effectiveness. Third, the results of this study were correlational and say nothing about which behaviors, interpersonal characteristics, or leadership styles might cause one to be a more effective leader. Fourth, we have presented no evidence that providing administrators with feedback will necessarily improve their performance or their ratings. Future research should address this question in the hopes of identifying efficacious professional development for future higher education leaders.

References

- Adams, D. (1998). Examining the fabric of academic life: an analysis of three decades of research on the perceptions of Australian academics about their roles, *Higher Education*, 36, 421-435.
- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method of assessing faculty satisfaction, *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 803-830.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
- Benoit, P., & Graham, S. (2005). Leadership excellence: constructing the role of department chair. *Academic Leadership: the Online Journal*, 3 (1), (<http://www.academicleadership.org/volume3/issue1/index.html>)
- Benton, S. L., & Webster, R., Pallett, W., & Song, J. (2010). *Report on the analysis of IDEA feedback for administrators data*. Manhattan, KS: The IDEA Center.

- Bisbee, D. C., & Miller, M. T. (2006). *A survey of the literature related to executive succession in land grant universities*. Online Submission; 30pp.
<http://www.eric.ed.gov.er.lib.k-state.edu/PDFS/ED491565.pdf>
- Bland, C. J., Weber-Main, A. M., Lund, S. M., & Finstad, D. A. (2005). *The research-productive department: strategies from departments that excel* (Boston, MA: Anker).
- Bornstein, R. (2010). Succession planning: The time has come. *Trusteeship, 18*, 28-33.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*, 693-710.
- Buller, J. L. (2007). *The essential academic dean*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carroll, J. B., & Wolverson, M. (2004). Who becomes a chair? *New Directions for Higher Education, 126*, 3-10.
- Conger, J. A., & Benjamin, B. (1999). *Building leaders: How successful companies develop the next generation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J., & Brown, M. L. (1992). How chairpersons enhance faculty research: a grounded theory study. *Review of Higher Education, 16*, 41-62.
- Creswell, J., Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J. & Beyer, K. D. (1990). *The academic chairperson's handbook*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Downey, J. A. (2002). Who assesses the assessors? Measuring administrative effectiveness in higher education. Blue Ridge Community College: Officer of Institutional Research.
- Gmelch, W. H. (2004). The department chair's balancing acts. *New Directions for Higher Education, 124*, 68-84.

- Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L. & Sarros, J. C. (1999). The academic dean: An imperiled species searching for balance. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(6), 717–740.
- Goldring, E., & Greenfield, W. (2002). Understanding the evolving concept of leadership in education: Roles, expectations and dilemmas. In J. Murphy (ed.). *The educational leadership challenge: Redesigning leadership for the 21st Century*. 101st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Green, K. C., Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2012). *The 2012 Inside Higher Education Ed Survey of College & University Presidents*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/concerns-about-sports-backing-obama-survey-presidents>
- Hecht, I. W. D., Higginson, M. L. Gmelch, W. H., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader*. The American Council on Education: The Oryx Press.
- Heuer, J. J. (2003). Succession planning for key administrators at ivy-plus universities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64/03, 740.
- Hoppe, S. L. (2004). Identifying and nurturing potential academic leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2003(124), 1-11.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (1994). A university's faculty: identifying those who will leave and those who will stay. *Journal for Higher Education Management*, 10, 71-84.
- Knight, W. H., & Holen, M. C. (1985). Leadership and the perceived effectiveness of department chairpersons. *Journal of Higher Education*, 56, 677-690.

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge* (2nd edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Matier, M. W. (1990). Retaining faculty: a tale of two campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, 31, 39-60.
- McCauley, C. D., Moxley, R. S., and Velsor, E. V. (eds.). *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, and Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership, 1998.
- Mech, T. (1997). The managerial roles of chief academic officers. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 282-298.
- Mitchell, M. B. (1987). The process of department leadership, *Review of Higher Education*, 11, 161-176.
- Montez, J. M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2003). The roles and challenges of deans. *Review of Higher Education*, 26, 241-246.
- Moses, I., & Roe, E. (1990). *Heads and chairs: managing academic departments*. St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
- Ohlott, P. "Job Assignments." In C. D. McCauley, R. S. Moxley, and E. V. Velsor (eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass and Greensboro: Center for Creative Leadership, 1998.
- Rosser, V. J., Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (2000, November). *Mapping the domains of effective leadership: the case of deans and directors*. Paper presented at the

- annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Sacramento, CA.
- Schmidt, P. (2002, February 22). Most states tie aid to performance, despite little proof that it works. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 48 (24), A20-A22.
- Seldin, P. (1988). *Evaluating and developing administrative performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, B. L., & Hughey, A. W. (2006). Leadership in higher education--its evolution and potential: A unique role facing critical challenges. *Industry and Higher Education*, 20, 157-163.
- Volkwein, J. F., & Parmley, K. (2000). Comparing administrative satisfaction in public and private universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 41, 95-116.
- Winter, R., Taylor, T., & Sarros, J. (2000). Trouble at mill: Quality of academic worklife issues within a comprehensive Australian University. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25, 279-293.

Table 1
*Frequencies and Percentages of Numbers of Support Staff
 And Professionals in the Unit*

Number of Staff	Support Staff		Professionals	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
< 10	449	65.5	352	51.3
10 to 19	88	12.9	102	14.9
20 to 29	42	6.1	60	8.7
30 or more	106	15.5	172	25.1
<u>Total</u>	<u>685</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>686</u>	<u>100.0</u>
NR	47	6.4	46	6.3

Table 2
Frequencies and Percentages of Various Personnel Characteristics

Respondent Characteristics	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>What is the principal way you are affiliated with this institution?</i>		
I am a faculty member.	13,151	55.5%
I am a student.	681	2.9%
I am a member of this administrator's staff.	4,534	19.1%
I have meaningful contacts with this administrator but don't report to this person.	5,323	22.5%
<u>Total</u>	<u>23,689</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Chose not to respond	3,943	14.3%
<i>What is the principal type of contact you have with this administrator?</i>		
We work together on mutual responsibilities or assignments.	3,869	18.7%
My work requires his/her supervision, approval, or judgment.	5,896	28.4%
This administrator provides services I want or need.	4,945	23.9%
Our contact consists primarily of informal interaction.	6,022	29.0%
<u>Total</u>	<u>20,732</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Chose not to respond	6,900	25.0%
<i>How often do you have meaningful contact with this administrator?</i>		
Once a week or more	6,301	27.1%
One to three times a month	5,396	23.3%
One to three times a term	5,669	24.5%
Less than once a term	5,831	25.1%
<u>Total</u>	<u>23,197</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Chose not to respond	4,435	16.1%
<i>How long have you been at this institution?</i>		
This is my first year	1,348	5.7%
One to two years	2,109	9.0%
Three to five years	4,253	18.1%
More than 5 years	15,792	67.2%
<u>Total</u>	<u>23,502</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Chose not to respond	4,130	14.9%

Note: Percentages based upon total *Ns* excluding missing values.

Table 3
*Component Matrix Coefficients for Personnel Performance Ratings of
 Administrative Roles (N = 732)*

Administrative Roles	Component Matrix Coefficients
4. Makes wise decisions, judgments, and recommendations.	.97
10. Earns the trust and respect of those who come in contact with him/her.	.96
6. Is an effective "team" member.	.95
2. Establishes sound priorities.	.95
5. Initiates actions that anticipate problems or resolves them.	.94
8. Communicates relevant information to appropriate constituencies.	.93
7. Contributes positively to this institution's image and reputation.	.92
9. Seeks opinions of others before establishing policies or procedures.	.91
3. Displays knowledge/expertise required for this position.	.90
1. Communicates and displays a visionary plan for the future.	.88

Note: Extracted using principal components.

Table 4
Rotated Component Matrix Coefficients for Personnel Ratings of Personal Characteristics (N = 732)

Characteristics	Factors	
	Interpersonal Characteristics	Leadership Style
16. Autocratic vs. Democratic	0.93	0.12
23. Insensitive vs. Understanding	0.90	0.28
24. Opinionated vs. Receptive to ideas	0.89	0.21
15. Unfair vs. Fair	0.87	0.35
13. Remote vs. Approachable	0.83	0.20
18. Manipulative vs. Straightforward	0.81	0.40
25. Untrustworthy vs. Trustworthy	0.79	0.44
22. Self-centered vs. Institution-centered	0.74	0.44
11. Indecisive vs. Decisive	0.17	0.91
12. Disorganized vs. Organized	0.22	0.84
26. Passive vs. Active	0.21	0.77
21. Ambiguous vs. Clear	0.59	0.70
19. Inconsistent vs. Consistent	0.56	0.68

Note: Extracted using principal components.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of Explanatory and Criterion Variables by Administrator Position and Institutional Affiliation

Affiliation/Position	<i>n</i>	Administrative Scales			Summary Judgments	
		Roles <i>M(SD)</i>	IC <i>M(SD)</i>	LS <i>M(SD)</i>	Performance <i>M(SD)</i>	Confidence <i>M(SD)</i>
Public						
President	33	3.88(.43)	5.27(.63)	5.47(.41)	3.44(.40)	3.31(.38)
Provost	62	3.79(.65)	5.19(.96)	5.45(.49)	3.39(.66)	3.26(.59)
Dean	54	4.11(.38)	5.60(.55)	5.66(.44)	3.79(.40)	3.56(.31)
Associate/Assistant Dean	55	3.98(.54)	5.61(.63)	5.52(.59)	3.64(.60)	3.44(.46)
Private						
President	8	4.19(.38)	5.57(.70)	6.08(.29)	3.94(.34)	3.56(.30)
Provost	24	3.77(.41)	5.10(.54)	5.44(.45)	3.44(.49)	3.27(.34)

Table continues

Affiliation/Position	<i>n</i>	Explanatory Variables			Criterion Variables	
		Roles	IC	LS	Performance	Confidence
		<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>
Private						
Dean	12	4.20(.39)	5.69(.74)	5.67(.41)	3.87(.40)	3.64(.30)
Associate/Assistant Dean	21	4.09(.42)	5.58(.66)	5.76(.39)	3.66(.44)	3.54(.41)

Note. Roles=Administrative Roles; IC = Interpersonal Characteristics; LS = Leadership Style; Performance = “What kind of job is this administrator doing”?; Confidence = “Does this administrator have your confidence”?

Table 6

Pearson r Correlations, Reliability Estimates Means and Standard Deviations for All Variables

Variables	Explanatory Variables			Criterion Variables		<i>M (SD)</i>
	Roles	IC	LS	Performance	Confidence	
Roles	.98	.89	.83	.96	.94	4.06 (.53)
IC		.96	.69	.84	.87	5.60 (.73)
LS			.91	.84	.78	5.59 (.61)
Performance				.82	.92	3.72 (.59)
Confidence					.77	3.50 (.43)

Note. Reliabilities along the diagonal are Cronbach alphas for explanatory variables and item split-half reliabilities for the criterion variables.

Table 7

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Models Predicting Job Performance

Step/Variable	Dimension Model					
	Roles		IC		LS	
	R^2	β	R^2	β	R^2	β
1. Institution classification	.009	-.013	.009	.011	.009	-.060 ^a
2. Position	.051		.051		.051	
President		-.026		-.012		-.094 ^b
Provost		-.021		-.024		-.126 ^b
Dean		.010		.037		-.016
Assoc./asst. dean		-.012		-.04		-.064 ^b
3. Leadership Dimension	.859	.969 ^b	.654	.881 ^b	.673	.794 ^b
4. Position x Dimension	.001		.004		.004	
President x Dimension		-.019		-.039		.023
Provost x Dimension		-.024		-.041		.057 ^b
Dean x Dimension		-.015		-.049		.006
Assoc./asst. dean x Dimension		-.005		-.017		.038

Note. Positions dummy coded. Roles = Administrative Roles; IC = Interpersonal Characteristics; LS = Leadership Style.

^a $p < .01$

^b $p < .001$

Table 8

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Models Predicting Confidence in the Administrator

Step/Variable	Dimension Model					
	Roles	IC		LS		
	R^2	ΔR^2	R^2	ΔR^2	R^2	ΔR^2
1. Institution classification	.004	.004	.004	.036	.004	-.041
2. Position	.054		.054		.054	
President		-.026		-.008		-.102 ^b
Provost		-.002		.004		-.128 ^b
Dean		.016		.045		-.007
Assoc./asst. dean		.002		-.027		-.051
3. Leadership Dimension	.828	.882 ^b	.706 ^b	.853	.584	.706 ^b
4. Position x Dimension	.006		.003		.015	
President x Dimension		.032		.000		.051
Provost x Dimension		.081 ^b		.054		.101 ^b
Dean x Dimension		.005		-.027		.022
Assoc./asst. dean x Dimension		.050 ^b		.016		.079 ^b

Note. Positions dummy coded. Roles = Administrative Roles; IC = Interpersonal Characteristics; LS = Leadership Style.

^a $p < .01$

^b $p < .001$

