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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine leadership competencies within the Concordia University System based on McDaniel’s (2002) leadership schema using the quantitative instrument developed by Smith and Wolverton (2010). This study extended the Smith and Wolverton (2010) instrument by exploring whether or not variables such as gender or employment classification (i.e., an individual’s role within the institution) show significant differences in perception of leadership competencies. This study utilized principal component analysis to determine factors based on the individual competencies and multivariate analysis of variance to determine if differences arose between reported scores in gender and employment classification. Data showed that competencies did not fit into McDaniel’s theorized four components, but rather a five component model that included a heavy emphasis on institutional mission and culture. The 5 components that emerged were communication, contextual understanding, mission mindedness, professional development, and change leadership. The initial data set of 59 individual items was reduced to a new 32 item model that fit within the new scheme. Additionally, many of the reported scores did not differ much; yet, a small number of items showed significant differences in perceived level of importance based on gender and employment classification. These differences did not warrant heavy criticism but were supported in part by the literature.
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Chapter One - Introduction

Collins (2001) describes how limiting ones understanding of leadership can lead to frustrating and sometimes ignorant decisions made by organizations, “Every time we throw up our hands in frustration, reverting back to ‘Well, the answer must be Leadership!’ we prevent ourselves from gaining deeper, more scientific understanding about what makes great companies tick” (Collins, 2001, p. 22). While Collins’ enduring work focuses on leadership from a business perspective, many in educational fields have sought a similar approach to understanding leadership within their own organizational type. Those seeking to understand institutions of higher education should also look to develop great leadership with a ‘deeper’ and ‘more scientific’ approach. This study responds to that need for a deeper and more scientific approach to leadership development, with a specific target of higher education institutions.

Leadership is a complex term that includes a variety of styles, strategies, and definitions. As one reviews the mass of literature on the topic, many descriptors and definitions emerge. Exemplifying leadership includes virtue and/or responsibility (Cameron, 2011), alluding to the inclusion of character of values-based descriptors. Beyond virtues, leadership aids in processes. Leadership can be transformational, aiding the process of change in environments or social systems (Kendrick, 2011). Leadership is also flexible and adaptive, as if it were a “meta-competency,” incorporating multiple strategies (Norton, 2010).

Leadership literature in higher education is also an evolving body of work. Early leadership studies in higher education focused on the college president. Recently, research extended into the rest of the institution, examining leadership of deans, department chairs, and directors (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006 and Wolverton, Gmelch, & Wolverton, 2000). As leadership research continues to expand, it is important to consider the various
departments and divisions within the campus community as part of comprehensive leadership research. While there exists a good deal of literature on leadership in higher education (Amey, 2006; Spendlove, 2007; Eddy & Rao, 2009; Wolverton & Smith, 2010), there are limited reviews for private colleges (Webb, 2008; Lafreniere & Longman, 2008; Owen, 2009; Hirschy, 2011; Gardner, Fubara, and Wolff, 2011). There is also very limited literature on Lutheran institutions of higher education.

Some literature on Lutheran institutions is general, discussing the history and/or current status of Lutheran higher education (Wentz, 1955; Solberg, 1985; Christiansen, 2004; Ringenberg, 2006; Korcock, 2011). Hence, there is a call for scholarship. Glanzer (2013) explains that expanding scholarship and leadership are part of the mission and calling at Christian universities; such expansion, in particularly younger Christian universities is necessary should the greater Church, itself, desire growth. He continues, “Without them [Christian universities producing leadership and scholarship], the ecosystem of Christian higher education is incomplete and perhaps not sustainable” (Glanzer, 2013, p.344). Lutheran colleges and universities in the United States are ripe for such a study. In a recent report, enrollment at Lutheran colleges within the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS) (N = 10), part of the Concordia University System (CUS) saw a new record of over 33,000 students (Ross, 2013). The study of leadership at such a particular set of institutions should also include specific investigation of variables to add to the knowledge base. Variables of gender and employment type (or, classification) are appropriate for such investigation.

Historically, many Christian institutions, including Harvard, featured male-only programming, faculty, and administrative staff. Differences in theological opinion had prevented women certain access. According to Schreiner (as cited in Longman and Lafreniere, 2012),
women today still have perceptions about their position(s) in higher education which include a lack of role models, theological conservatism that limits access to top leadership positions, embracing a collaborative leadership style that can be misunderstood or disrespected, and at times, feeling out of sync with some male-dominated administrations (Schreiner, 2002).

Additionally, newer data show women now account for approximately 50% of assistant professors, 38% of associate professors, and 24% of full professors, up from 1975 statistics: 25% assistant professor, 17% associate professors, and 10% full professors. In 2006, women accounted for 23% of college and university presidents, which is up from 5% of presidents in 1975 (Madsen, 2012). This dramatic shift in proportion is understood through a progressive shift in literature, opinion, and general public sentiment. Thus, understanding any difference in perception (if any) of leadership competencies will add to the knowledge base of higher education leadership. Such implications are not limited to Christian higher education; rather, in the author’s opinion, seem to persist through Lutheran church-related organizations.

The inclusion of athletics leadership is important to this study, as it represents an increasingly large portion of universities’ resources. Corlett (2013) argues that issues of intercollegiate athletics are primarily fiscally related, but also include questions of responsibility as they relate to the greater academic community. Moreover, intercollegiate athletics connects with community stakeholders, vital to the health of institutions. Current research suggests that stakeholder understanding of leadership is that it is complicated, and that athletics in large organizational contexts should be cognizant that how organizational stakeholders interpret a situation will influence their conceptions of what constitutes leadership; this research provides a starting point for an alternate perspective (Kihl, Leberman, & Schull, 2010). Hence, self-reflection and assessment of leadership is key for current leaders in athletics.
Leadership in academics is essential for any effective institution of learning. Experience as faculty, creating/innovating curriculum, or working with staff development takes time. Inman (2011) described the phases of developing academic leadership as a process, going through formation, accession, incumbency, and divestiture. Some facets include, (a) developing a tight adherence to core institutional values (formation); (b) proper socialization with current leaders while developing one’s own style (accession); (c) learned control over one’s own destiny, ability to develop within (incumbency); and, (d) rather than pushing to move up the ladder, leaders understand their position and their passions; and while not often a true demotion, here, leaders “reclaim” original interests and seek out interests that are accessible (divestiture). Thus, the experience of faculty and academic leaders is complex and involved, and is key to understanding higher education leadership as part of this study.

Leadership in student affairs means a presence in a diverse setting, encompassing multiple aspects of the campus community. Leaders in student affairs have regular opportunities to support, help, and offer advice to students on a daily basis; their regular presence on campus allows them to be viewed as accessible and approachable to a variety of students (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004). For the purposes of this study, campus ministry is examined alongside student affairs leadership. According to Cawthorn and Jones (2002), campus ministry originated with much of the secularization that occurred in many protestant institutions. As more non-traditional and non-protestant students came to campus, churches saw a need to minister to these un-churched students, and thus began pastoral designations (or “calls”) to universities. This unique branch of student affairs is key to understanding leadership as part of the specific population included in this study.
The focus of this research is leadership competencies at specific Lutheran institutions of higher education. Given the variety of possibilities for leadership definitions, themes, parameters, and even systems, several questions emerge in relation to Lutheran higher education: How does one define leadership? Have Lutheran colleges and universities examined leadership within the context of their institution? How is leadership defined in this environment? What competencies do leaders at Lutheran higher educational institutions need to possess to be effective? In addition to these questions are methodological considerations such as: What strategies could be employed in order to best study leadership at these institutions? What models exist in the literature that may be helpful to such an inquiry?

**Theoretical Framework**

The competency framework for this study is taken from McDaniel’s (2002) study of Fellows from the American Council on Education (ACE), which was later quantified via additional research from Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) study of leaders in higher education. This study extends the model put forth by McDaniel (2002) by replicating the survey model used by Smith and Wolverton (2010). In 2002, McDaniel qualitatively described leadership competencies in consultation with university presidents, vice-presidents, and former American Council on Education (ACE) fellows. Competencies were classified into four categories: (1) context, (2) content, (3) process, and (4) communication. Together, these categories became the structural model for Higher Education Leadership Competencies, or HELC (McDaniel, 2002).

In 2010, Smith and Wolverton sought to extend McDaniel’s work, seeking to quantify the original HELC model via a questionnaire that would be distributed to senior leaders in higher education. The Smith and Wolverton study performed a principal component analysis (PCA) to see whether or not HELC factored in to the theorized four-component construct as described by
McDaniel (2002). Results showed statistical support for a five-component model of leadership competencies as opposed to the four by McDaniel. Thus, the Smith and Wolverton model found five components consisting of thirty-five core competencies; the five components are (1) analytical, (2) communication, (3) student affairs, (4) behavioral, and (5) external relations.

Smith and Wolverton (2010) described McDaniel’s work as having laid a foundation for a new leadership model; in turn expanding upon this work with further scientific inquiry, creating a new, five-component model. It is important to note that Smith and Wolverton’s explanation for the competencies are taken directly from McDaniel’s (2002) work; synthesized with their new findings and the five-component model. Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) new model can be understood as follows: (1) Analytical competencies include the ability for “information gathering, combined with analytical thinking and facilitative communication in an effort to carry out effective and efficient systems and processes.” (2) The communication competency showed heavy support for a leader’s presentation; as in, how they are received by colleagues and peers. Smith left much of the communication competency open for further discussion. (3) In student affairs, effective leaders demonstrated competency in emerging higher education trends, responding to the needs of contemporary students, and had a good knowledge of relevant legal issues. (4) Differing from how one is perceived and received (communication), the behavioral competency shows effective leadership in how a leader acts. Most closely correlated with McDaniel’s process competency, behavioral competency recognizes a sense of humor, supports others, and demonstrates unselfishness. (5) Being competent in external relations refers to the interaction that occurs externally to the institution, including marketing, development, fundraising, public and private media, and other community or government interactions (Smith and Wolverton, 2010).
The quantitative instrument (survey) was developed in three parts: (1) collecting personal information, (2) collecting professional information, (3) and feedback on the HELC Inventory. Fifty-nine core HELC, individual statements which, taken together, make up portions of each of the five components, were identified based on McDaniel’s (2002) research and existing literature. Using a Likert-type scale, HELC were listed as a series of statements, asking participants to rate the importance of each from 1(not important) to 5(very important) (Smith & Wolverton, 2010). In the final analysis, Smith and Wolverton reduced the 59 items to 35 based on scores in the analysis.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to replicate measures by Smith and Wolverton (2010), examining leadership competencies within the Concordia University System (CUS) institutions of higher education, and to extend their study by exploring whether or not variables such as gender or employment classification (i.e., an individual’s role within the institution) show significant differences in perception of leadership competencies. The Concordia University System (CUS) is comprised of ten colleges and universities affiliated with The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. Located across the United States, CUS colleges and universities offer over 160 undergraduate and 50 graduate programs. Each institution is unique, but all ten campuses approach learning from a Lutheran context governed by the Concordia University System Board. While Smith and Wolverton’s work focused on Division 1 institutions, this study will examine institutions with the common bond of affiliation with the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod.

Because of the selected population for this study, this survey distribution was extended from the original population to also include Campus Ministry persons as part of the Student
Affairs classification; part of the extension in this study. It should be noted that many Campus Ministry offices/departments are already organized within Student Affairs departments at CUS institutions.

**Research Questions**

The HELC survey from Smith and Wolverton (2010) was disseminated to leaders at 10 Lutheran universities with the CUS system. The survey was organized into three sections: personal information, professional information, and the HELC Inventory. This study is a replication-extension of Smith and Wolverton’s work using a unique, different, and specified population: Lutheran universities within the Concordia University System (CUS). Thus, the research questions were as follows:

1. Do HELC, as developed by McDaniel (2002) factor into four groups of context, content, process, and communication at CUS institutions?

2. Is the perception of HELC items level of importance different between variables of: (a) employment classification and/or (b) gender?

**Methodology**

This design of this study was a replication-extension of Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work. Replication-extension studies are specifically designed to replicate and extend the results of prior studies (Bonett, 2012). The replication is taken from Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work and is extended by way of application to a new and unique population along with additional analysis. This study replicated Smith and Wolverton’s analysis of principal component analysis as it sought to determine whether or not components factor in to McDaniel’s original theorized four constructs (or, factors) for the CUS population. This study then extended
the Smith and Wolverton research by executing a multiple regression analysis to determine whether the dependent variables (factor scores) are affected by several independent variables.

To examine the McDaniel (2002) four-component model, scores based on a five point Likert-type scale from each question were examined as part of principal component analysis (PCA). The concept behind PCA is to “reduce the dimensionality of a data set consisting of a large number of interrelated variables, while retaining as much as possible of the variation present in the data set” (Jolliffe, 2002, p.1). Such new variables (also called factors or constructs) are thus uncorrelated and help to inform understanding of the data considered.

To examine whether or not there are differences in level of importance by variables of employment classification and/or gender, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used. The MANOVA was suitable for testing because this study used an independent variable with more than one dependent variable. Since there is more than one dependent variable being examined, MANOVA is used as opposed to a single analysis of variance (ANOVA).

**Procedures**

The survey was created and distributed using my professional account with Qualtrics through Concordia University Wisconsin. Each recipient received the survey in an initial email, followed by one reminder email a week after the initial distribution. For emailed surveys, Schirmer (2009) notes that there are growing ethical concerns over multiple reminders, while a single reminder remains generally acceptable. The survey remained active for a total of three weeks.

An informed consent prompt was administered as part of the pre-survey. In this study specifically, the informed consent prompt outlined participants’ voluntary agreement in the survey, purpose of the survey, expected time to complete the survey, and encouragement to
participate. All participants were provided with an executive summary of the study results as a form of compensation at the conclusion of the study. Participants were also able to click a link, which indicates they have read the terms of the study and agree to participate in the survey.

As the surveys were completed, Qualtrics was used to export the data to SPSS and for analysis. Along with cloud storage through Qualtrics, data were copied to an Excel spreadsheet where it was stored in multiple locations. Relevant data analysis was conducted and exported using SPSS, discussed in later chapters. All identifiable information of participants was immediately deleted and remaining information has been stored in a password protected computer storage system (Qualtrics). Data will be stored for approximately one year (Fall 2015-Fall 2016). Saved computer data files will be deleted at the completion of the study. Any paper-based data will be shredded.

**Need for the Study**

Leadership competencies or models have not been examined within the private higher education realm. Much of the leadership literature available on higher education exists within the public sector, usually large research institutions. Such studies on religious institutions tend to be limited, often including large Baptist or Catholic colleges and universities. Yet, with aggregate student populations in the tens of thousands, Lutheran colleges and universities in the United States (N=40) are appropriate for such study. In a recent report, enrollment at Lutheran colleges within the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS) (N=10), part of the Concordia University System (CUS) hit a record high at over 33,000 students (Ross, 2013).

While there is literature on Christian higher education (Holmes, 1987; Marsden, 1997; Benne, 2002; Dockery, 2012), there has not been a definitive study into what specific competencies are needed from leaders, more specifically at Lutheran institutions. Leadership
competencies are important for any organization, and scholarly research can help support the development of such competencies. For Lutheran institutions, no such set of competencies exists. And as CUS institutions see continued record-breaking growth, leaders must aspire to grow professionally, preparing one another for the challenges of a larger community that also requires greater responsibility. Understanding that need, McDaniel writes, “Aspiring senior leaders might find it valuable to solicit 360-degree feedback on their continuing development using the leadership competencies as they move to positions of greater responsibility in higher education” (McDaniel, 2002, p.88).

**Significance and Importance**

Existing literature does not include a leadership model that is specific to Lutheran institutions. Much leadership preparation in the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS) – the affiliated church of the CUS – is devoted to school administrators and pastors, and only by way of advanced degrees at CUS schools and seminaries. By applying existing research (HELC) to a specific, unique mission-based institution, leaders within Lutheran higher education institutions may be able to identify the specific skills necessary for effective leadership. Moreover, because the current study seeks a principal component analysis, the existing HELC model has the potential to be further strengthened or refined. All this considered, readers should not assume an existing model for leadership competencies would apply across populations.

Additionally, when examining scoring differences based on gender, this study may aid in closing the gap of perceived gender bias in higher education. Because this survey is system-wide (CUS), a greater understanding of leadership perception across the boundaries of gender may help to inform current system leaders about system issues, potential, or areas of achievement. It
may also lead to new opportunities in various employment classifications as surveyed by this study.

**Assumptions**

While this study replicated and extended the Smith and Wolverton (2010) work, with additional research questions, the population was distinctly different, leading to several assumptions:

1. Similar to leaders in previous HELC surveys, this research assumes that leaders at the various CUS institutions have similar tasks and roles and serve similar constituencies.

2. The PCA analysis assumes a linear relationship between observed variables and a normal distribution for each observed variable.

**Limitations**

This study is limited to the perspective of leaders selected by the author. While there may be additional classifications of leaders at CUS institutions, this study is replicating the selection used by Smith and Wolverton (2010) and therefore seeks a similar group of recipients, only within the unique setting of CUS institutions. Additional specific limitations are as follows:

1. The study only seeks to understand leadership competencies in Lutheran higher education, as assessed by the survey population. No claims are made regarding the leaders’ actions or behaviors that may relate to the assessed competencies.

2. The study does not test the relationship between competencies and actual institutional outcomes, but only defines those competencies that leaders from the survey population assess as important or frequently employed in the conduct of their work.

3. This study is limited to the self-reporting by survey recipients. The author of the study will follow appropriate procedure to ensure a maximum response rate.
Delimitations

1. The study is delimited to leaders at Lutheran institutions that fall under one of the three employment classifications. While other leadership roles may exist on campus, this study will only examine areas of academics, athletics, and student affairs / campus ministry.

2. This study is delimited to the author’s screening of institutional directories in pursuit of appropriate survey recipients. A detailed table (3.1) has outlined the survey recipients that were selected for this research, each classified according to the standards set in the original Smith and Wolverton (2010) study.

3. This study is delimited to the ten (10) CUS institutions and does not include the two affiliated seminary institutions in Fort Wayne, IN and St. Louis, MO.

Definition of Terms

1. Higher Education Leadership Competencies (HELC): Developed first by McDaniel (2002) in conjunction with Fellows at the American Council on Education, the leadership competencies include a variety of specific characteristics, categorized into four (4) groups: understanding context of higher education; content of higher education contexts; the processes by which leaders achieve their goals; and communication in their communities. This model was also used as a quantitative survey instrument by Smith and Wolverton (2010).

2. American Council on Education (ACE) Fellows: Body of higher education professionals studied by McDaniel (2002) to develop HELC. ACE members are the presidents of U.S. accredited, degree-granting institutions, which include two- and four-year colleges, private and public universities, and nonprofit and for-profit entities. Membership includes more than 1,800 member institutions, 75 percent of which have
been with ACE for over 10 years. Their purpose includes convening to collectively “tackle the toughest higher education challenges, with a focus on improving access and preparing every student to succeed” (ACE.net.edu/about-ace).

3. **Synod (or, Synodical):** A gathering or organization of church leaders, typically given charge of doctrine or decision-making (Merriam-Webster). For example, *The LCMS Synodical Convention found there to be no conflict in the law.*

4. **Factor Analysis:** A complex algebraic method for determining the general dimensions or factors that exist within a set of concrete observations; a method of summarizing or explaining large sets of data with a smaller set of factors (Pallant, 2010; Babbie, 2010).

5. **Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS):** The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS), is a mission-oriented, Bible-based, confessional Christian denomination headquartered in St. Louis, Mo. Founded in 1847, the LCMS has more than 2.3 million baptized members in some 6,200 congregations and more than 9,000 pastors. Two seminaries and 10 colleges and universities operate under the auspices of the LCMS, and its congregations operate the largest Protestant parochial school system in America. The LCMS is in full doctrinal fellowship with 33 other confessional Lutheran church bodies worldwide and is a founding partner of Lutheran Services in America, a social ministry organization serving one in every 50 Americans (LCMS.org/about).

6. **Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA):** A form of statistical analysis used to compare groups on a number of different, but related, dependent variables (Pallant, 2010).

7. **Principal Component Analysis (PCA):** Often used interchangeably with ‘Factor Analysis,’ PCA examines an original set of variables, which are then transformed into a
smaller set of linear combinations (called factors or constructs) using all of the available variance (Pallant, 2010).

8. **Concordia University System (CUS):** The Concordia University System (CUS) is comprised of ten colleges and universities affiliated with The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. Located across the United States, the colleges and universities offer over 160 undergraduate and 50 graduate programs. While each institution is unique, all ten campuses approach learning from a Lutheran context. The common goal is to develop Christian leaders for the church, community and world.

9. **Replication-Extension Study:** Replication-extension studies combine and compare results from one or more prior studies with results from a new study. The new study is specifically designed to replicate and extend the results of the prior studies (Bonett, 2012).

**Summary**

While competency models exist for leaders and other positions within higher education, it is important that leaders at Lutheran colleges and universities also develop their own set of standards. Using existing, scientific research, this study seeks to take the initial steps in developing such a standard. This chapter has given a general overview of the research study. The chapter that follows will focus on relevant literature pertaining to the study. In Chapter Three, the specific methodological procedures will be discussed, followed by the analyzing of the collected data in Chapter Four. Finally, Chapter Five will focus on the critical findings and discuss any pertinent conclusions and/or recommendations.
Chapter Two – Literature Review

As is the case with any specific entity or group, existing literature helps to inform our understanding of higher education leadership. Therefore, throughout the review of literature, higher education research is integrated alongside the sometimes more general leadership topics. The chapter begins with a brief look at the history of higher education, particularly that of the Lutheran Church. Following is a discussion on general leadership theories and change. The topic of change is a major component of leadership literature and therefore appropriate to review alongside higher education leadership theories. Next, to inform the particular direction of this study, leadership literature on competencies and higher education is explored. The chapter concludes with a review of this study’s leadership variables: gender, academic leadership, athletics leadership, and leadership in student affairs/campus ministry.

In the early twentieth century Armentrout wrote of Christian higher education, “It is not enough to pass judgment on the contribution of the college on the basis of ministerial graduates alone. The program of the modern church demands other trained leadership to carry forward its work, especially its educational tasks” (Armentrout, 1935, p.209). The importance of understanding this intersection of leadership and faith cannot be underestimated, and begets a scholarly approach and consideration. This approach rightly begins with an understanding of Church history and the development of Lutheran institutions of higher education. The sections that follow describe the premise for the founding of the Lutheran Church (Lutheran theology and philosophy), Lutheran education, and the development of higher education in North America.

Martin Luther and the Reformation

Martin Luther grew up in a ‘typical middle-class family’ near Saxony, Germany (MacCulloch, 2003). With strong values in education, the Luther family encouraged hard work,
rigorous study habits, and values. Luther would have likely been destined for a career in law (as
his father had encouraged), but a fateful thunderstorm changed that. Caught without shelter and
fearing for his life, Luther made a vow to St. Anne (the mother of Mary, Biblical) that he would
become a monk – and that, he did. Theological studies in Erfurt took the future reformer through
readings of Church fathers like Augustine; studies also included classical philosophy like Plato
which was widely accepted at the time. When considering his studies in context with his
historical impact, Oberman (2003) writes, “When the historian turns to the sixteenth century and
Luther’s extended, painful process of emancipation from medieval monasticism, this serves not
only as a reminder that the professor was foremost a friar, but also that his schooling had
provided him with modes of thinking which would prove to sustain him in the battles awaiting
him” (Oberman, 2003, p. 670).

It can be surmised that Luther’s strong interest in Augustine lead him to strict Biblical
principles that would later become his ammunition for the battle with the Church (MacCulloch,
2003). Over the course of his studies, Luther developed a stern opposition to what was at the
time a widespread Aristotelian scholastic theology that emphasized merit and the natural
inclinations of man to be both good and bad. Instead, Luther held that man is naturally evil, that
it is only by Christ – as God – that one can be compelled to acts of merit. Moreover, he did not
consider his opposition a secondary matter, but a frontal assault on prevailing medieval
assumptions about the nature of human volition and the ground of morality (matters that define
salvation). He rejected Aristotle's definitions (as echoed by Aquinas) and affirmed, instead, the
affective traditions of Augustine (Frost, 1997).

Luther’s view on mankind is thought by some to have been affirmed by contemporaries
in philosophy. Kant argued that goodness in man must be superimposed, that it is not built from
the ground up. The crux of Luther’s theology supposes that God, through the revelation provided by way of his spirit (Holy Spirit) instills upon man, faith. Luther believed that no amount of earthly efforts could ever move man towards regeneration, only God decides who is worthy of it. Earthly labor only has ‘moral value’ if combined with the virtue of faith which can only be imbued in a human agent through revelation. Similarly, Kant asserts that only through respect for the moral law can the actions of man have any moral resonance. In other words, there is what Kant calls a ‘super,’ that must exist, outside of man, for man to adhere to – and juxtaposed with Luther’s theology – that is God (Vanden Auweele, 2013).

In a moment of clarity, and what MacCulloch calls the Turmerlebnis (or, tower experience), Luther distinguished a new meaning of justification. Prior to the Reformation, the Holy Roman Church interpreted Romans 1:17 to mean ‘he who through faith is righteous shall live.’ As Luther studied, the original Latin wording (from Vulgate) uses the words justia/justus, or ‘justification,’ meaning that God imputes the merits of Christ through grace to fallen beings; and thus Luther’s turmerlebnis. The word ‘justification’ in Latin literally means the making of someone to be righteous. Here began Luther’s understanding of grace, solely by the work of God and not by man (MacCulloch, 2003). Of course, this directly contradicted the Catholic Church’s disposition of faith (and actions therein) begetting righteousness.

What is now considered the ‘Reformation discovery,’ Luther’s understanding of grace came into direct conflict with a structure and building campaign strategy employed by the Holy Roman Empire. The selling of indulgences was a practice that began long before Luther’s time but was exacerbated by Pope Leo X in 1517 via a solemn papal bull, Sacrosanctis (1515) as a means to rebuild St. Peter’s Basilica. Championed by Dominican friar Johann Tetzel, the purchasing of an indulgence was to be humanity’s physical response to God’s grace, an action
(and really only a piece of paper) that bought a person less time in purgatory (MacCulloch, 2003). Luther, known for a volcanic temper, began preaching against such practices (that were actually benefitting his own church at the time). His anger would coalesce with the public on October 31, 1517, when Luther posted 95 statements (or, theses) on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenburg, Germany (Hendrix, 2004). From then, Luther went on to defend his teachings, rebuff threats from church leaders (and politicians), and write extensively on what is now considered Lutheran theology.

Changes to the church landscape brought about by the Reformation included the development of a new type of church and pastor. No longer was a parish leader separate from his parishioners by the privileges of a separate estate or by the requirement of clerical celibacy. Instead, the most important functions were preaching and teaching, a tradition that still holds today in many Lutheran churches. Newly trained and experienced devotees of Luther’s writings faced two primary challenges: the task of helping parish clergy carry out the new functions expected of a Protestant pastor, and the pedagogical task of preparing the next generation of young men who would enter the ministry as the replacements for those presently in office. In the early 15th century, protestant church leaders produced a broad range of published works all aimed at present and future pastors. Other reformers wrote study materials to be used by clergy who wanted to improve their theological knowledge, and there was a deluge of new theological literature from catechisms for children all the way through theological textbooks for higher education. The process of building a new church in Europe had begun (Burnett, 2004).

**Lutherans in North America**

The early practitioners of Christianity in North America arrived by boat, and their church was disorganized, much in the same way the travelers were after the long journey from Europe.
The conditions of organization would improve during the eighteenth century, however, as the Church improved upon practices of building projects and networking. By 1750, the practice of Christianity was far more solid than it was only a hundred years earlier (Cohen, 2003).

According to Wentz (1955), the earliest Lutheran settlers in the United States were of the Dutch colony in New Netherland in 1623 and 1625. Primarily there for commercial purposes, the few inhabitants of what is now Albany, New York, differed from many in neighboring colonies. Here, the Lutherans portrayed a specific type of worship, unwilling to consider alternatives or progressivism (an attitude mirrored by many to this day). Since the established church of Holland was of the Reformed faith, many initial attempts at private Lutheran services were met with opposition. In 1669, Pastor Jacob Fabritius introduced what was called the *Amsterdam Agende* to the earliest Lutheran colonists. The ‘agenda’ was one of the earliest forms of liturgical order that provided a reading of scripture and administration of communion (called a *sacrament*). This particular order was the only allowable form of worship for both the German and Dutch settlers, no other liturgies were even considered (Grimminger, 2007). To this day, traditional Lutheran churches follow a similar order of worship called the *Divine Service*; components of which have remained unchanged for hundreds of years.

Early Colonial years saw German immigrants ill-served in a sporadic fashion by only a few, scattered German missionary pastors. It was not until 1741 that Henry Muhlenberg was commissioned at the University of Halle in Germany to lead the scattered German Lutherans in America. Muhlenberg would spend the next 45 years in the US, working to organize, empower, and rejuvenate the Lutheran church (Solberg, 1985).

The gathering of church leaders of the Lutheran Church flourished into the 19th century, each distinguishing themselves for a variety of reasons. Even though geographical considerations
were a primary cause of distinction, small differences in doctrine also led to unique synods, (Greek synodus) meaning ‘assembly’ (Merriam-Webster, 2014). Doctrinal rifts account for the primary synodical differences to this day. The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod (LCMS) was organized in 1847 under the influence of Dr. C.F.W. Walther. Grounded in a strict interpretation for the Gospel message, Walther, and the newly founded LCMS, rose to prominence primarily for their swift transition of church writings from German to English (Wentz, 1955). Even today, some select parishes in the United States (primarily in the Midwest) hold worship in the faith’s native tongue of German.

**Higher Education in North America**

The first institutions of higher education in the U.S. are rich in theological history; in fact, most of the first institutions served as seminaries, training young men for service to the Church. Harvard College, founded in 1636, is one such institution. The purpose of Harvard was to train learned and godly ministers; these young men would be both spiritual and intellectual leaders in their communities (Morris & Myers, 2011, Beard & Beard, 1944, p.65). Harvard’s overall goal of higher learning was described, in part, in this mission statement: “… To know God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life, and therefore to lay Christ in the bottom as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning” (Ringenberg, 2006, p.38).

Harvard would go on to expand its mission and service to other areas of the community an idea called pluralism; but at inception, the focus was the Church. Crimson was chosen as the official color of the college to represent the blood of Christ (Beard & Beard, 1944). Dunster, the first president of Harvard and Anglo-American Puritan clergyman, described Harvard’s mission this way, “You shall take care to advance in all learning, divine and humane, each and every student who is or will be entrusted to your tutelage, according to their several abilities; and
especially to take care that their conduct and manners be honorable and without blame” (Thomas, 1991, p.34).

Harvard, as well as other earlier institutions (Yale, William & Mary, and Princeton) sought to develop a moral instruction curriculum that was both intellectually and spiritually challenging. Initially founded and shaped by the church, these institutions were to be publically relevant in their curriculum and mission in order that they might develop, thrive, and continue to exist well into a changing culture (Benne, 2001). Table 1 shows the early Colonial Colleges by Religious Affiliation (Ringenberg, 2006):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College (location)</th>
<th>Founding Date</th>
<th>Religious Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard (MA)</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Puritan/Congregationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William &amp; Mary (VA)</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale (CT)</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Congregationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton (NJ)</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>New Light Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia (NY)</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Essential Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania (PA)</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (RI)</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers (NJ)</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Dutch Reformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth (NH)</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>New Light Congregationalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the aforementioned institutions would remain publically relevant by continuing to develop their mission, changing, molding, and rolling with the perceived public need. For an institution desiring to remain true to their mission, Benne (2001) suggests holding firm to the bulwark of a strong ethos (or, culture). As secularization progressed in many schools, traditions
and requirements such as chapel began to wane. While many schools initially required chapel, attendance morphed into occasional, and ultimately to completely optional. School breaks corresponding with church seasons soon overlooked the celebrations they intended to honor as Lent, Advent, and Easter were replaced with longer vacations and other secularized activities (Benne, 2001).

Cox (1966), formerly a professor of church and society at Harvard Divinity School calls this process *pluralism*. Here, religion at a given institution runs the risk of being simply one ‘sector’ among many others. Ironically, Cox’s Harvard had already developed over time into a pluralistic institution, serving many sectors. Harvard had lost its original mission, and fundamentally changed their ethos.

Losing the ethos also meant the phasing out of the collegial concept of *in loco parentis*. Early institutional rules were strict for students who misbehaved; the faculty was responsible for discipline, called to be detectives amidst the student life (Thomas, 1991). Slowly phasing out the institution’s role of parent meant more student mobility, more freedoms, and a further emancipation of students; this included a departure from theological foundations (Kiendl, 1963). More freedoms, new perspectives, and different policies meant a growing change in the Christian college setting, potentially shifting from *orthodox* to *critical mass*.

Benne (2001) delineates between types of Christian institutions as orthodox or critical mass. *Orthodox* schools exist to publicly and completely assure the Christian account of life to the school, requiring all members of the academic community to subscribe to the shared belief, doctrine, or statement of faith. *Critical mass* institutions do not insist on the same community of believers, or even Christian faculty members at all. Instead, a “critical mass” must inhabit “portions” of the educational community: faculty, board, administration, and students.
Institutions define critical mass differently; some requiring three-fourths, some a small majority, others just a few. Either way, the mass must be strong enough to “maintain, shape and define the public identity and mission of the college constant with the sponsoring tradition” (Benne, 2001, p.50).

Before the 1900s, nearly all of the colleges remained orthodox. In the late nineteenth century, a progressive secularization had infiltrated many institutions. Criticism about the American Christian scholar begun in Germany where thinkers like Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Harnack contended that scholars could use sources other than the Bible to add context to their lessons. Yet, there would be no greater challenge to orthodox institutions than the development of Darwinism. Following the *Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871), college presidents in the United States ‘began to look the other way’ when faculty in the sciences continued to embrace the theory of evolution (Ringenberg, 2006). With a new era of intellectual sciences developing, Christian scholarship began to fade, and a new, progressive, secular code of ethics developed.

C.S. Lewis (1974) said that education aimed solely at practicality and not at intellectual or spiritual development runs the risk of creating men without chests. Martin Luther King, Jr. went further by saying that education that stops at efficiency is a menace to society; that men with good intellect and reason, without morals, is dangerous (King, 2004). One president of a Christian college said that, “the life and work of a Christian college must teach the history of Christianity and its central role in the development of our civilization … (and) must expound and exemplify the fundamental values which are the common heritage of Christians” (Distler, 1955). Christian colleges also have the unique opportunity to approach education with a specific worldview based on Scripture and extensive Christian intellect (Fant, 2012).
Today, much of faith-based higher education is in survival mode, focusing on avoiding increasing threats of theological-drift and fiscal disaster. As a result, a new developing literature on leadership for change at faith-based institutions has grabbed the attention of the Christian community (Henck, 2011). Still, many Christian institutions have not fully abandoned their intent, nor have they begun to drift. The Christian college is a community, but a community whose intellectual and social life is influenced by one another from a Christian point of view (Holmes, 1987). The survival of Christian institutions means a firm foundation, built on a strong mission, with a sovereign sphere (Dockery, 2012) built on mutual faith. With the need to be relevant in many areas, the mission of the institution must ring true for all stakeholders to ensure a strong future. A strong future for Lutheran colleges stands on a rich heritage of education.

**Lutheran Higher Education**

The early German Lutherans of North America brought a model for higher education that would endure to modern times. Samuel S. Schmucker was educated at the University of Pennsylvania and Princeton Theological Seminary, and in 1826 he helped establish the Gettysburg Seminary, becoming its first professor and president. In 1832, Gettysburg Seminary became the first Lutheran college, Gettysburg College. Ironically, several of the same Lutherans to help Walther start the LCMS were originally from Gettysburg, citing ‘confessional laxity’ as a reason to move and start anew. Today, the Gettysburg institution is affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA) while the LCMS has separate institutions across the country. It would be the LCMS that established a system of education working from grade school through seminary (Simmons, 1998). Today, the largest LCMS seminary (of any world-wide) still resides in the founding location of the synod at St. Louis, Missouri.
Walther’s view of the liberal arts undoubtedly linked him to Martin Luther’s epistemological views and traditions on education. Like Luther, Walther held that all truth, regardless of area of study, had its origins with God. While not a truly original idea of Walther, scholarship of the time aligned with the concept of learning as a vessel that leads one to divine truth in God. Therefore, no one could ever stand to accuse the Church of being counter to ideas in the sciences, the arts, or higher education in general; for all existed as part of the essential nature of the Church, and ultimately, of God (Korcok, 2011).

In *Lutheran Higher Education: An Introduction for Faculty*, Simmons (1998) reflects on the unique set of circumstances that brought about a distinctly Lutheran approach to higher education. Drawing from both Reformed (Christian worldview) and Mennonite (service and discipleship) educational traditions, Simmons (1998) says that the Lutheran tradition is characterized by paradox, by the dialectical tension between the finite and the infinite in the world and the ambiguous nature of the world and human life. Rather than resolving to either the intellect or service, the Lutheran tradition attempts to keep them in simultaneous tension with one another (Simmons, 1998). Today, many Lutheran institutions of higher education share a common name, Concordia, which is Latin for *harmony*.

As Lutheran higher education moves forward, harmony remains a focus of leadership. Demonstrated in early colonial times, taking a strong stand on one’s faith and religious practices can cause discomfort and even isolation. While Lutherans in the past (including Luther, himself) were often intolerant of others, the task of Lutherans in higher education is building community. Christenson warns, “Historically, (Lutherans) have proven to be quite intolerant of persons within or without who question commonality … we have forgotten our own story and its
implications and have formed our own too exclusive Lutheran communities” (Christenson, 2004, p.170-171).

Therefore, it becomes incumbent upon leaders in Lutheran higher education to develop community, focus on outreach (and thus, mission), and remain exclusive to beliefs while being inclusive of others. Korcok (2011) says that addressing this problem begins in the classroom. In order to continue the mission and hold true to their calling of Christ, students of the church must develop their skills of learning, rhetoric, grammar, and logic all with the understanding that these are tools of the missional trade that calls Lutherans to reach out and bring others into the fold. Calling it the *handmaiden* of the Gospel, Korcok (2011) says that if these skills are not developed at an early age, the contemporary challenges to Lutheran higher education and the Church aggregate will prevail.

As to other challenges facing Lutheran education today, Lagerquist (2011) argues that there is a growing religious diversity in North America and a growing awareness of religious diversity worldwide, and that there must be a revision to the Lutheran approach. Lagerquist says, “Lutheran theology provides warrants for revising educational practice at Lutheran colleges to better serve the students and in the hope of a transformation of church and theology. American Lutheran colleges and universities are suited to this task by their theological heritage, by their educational experience, and by their place within the ecology of their churches” (Lagerquist, 2011, p. 174). The argument here is for a deeper understanding of diverse cultures, changing demographics of students (traditionally white, German-Lutheran), and taking a more active role in global issues.
The Study and Scholarship of Leadership

Leadership literature in higher education is, by itself, an evolving body of work. Early studies focused on the college president; however, since the 1990s, research extended into the rest of the institution, examining leadership of deans, department chairs, and directors (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006 and Wolverton, Gmelch, & Wolverton, 2000). Because of the diverse, evolving, and competitive nature of higher education, understanding the development and theory behind general leadership studies is imperative (Alalfy, Al-Aodah, & Shalaby, 2013). The following sections examine some common leadership theories and explore how leadership can be examined and viewed within practical and higher education settings.

Transformational leadership.

Initial work on transformational leadership is often attributed to Burns (1978). A transformational leader can “create an impression that he or she has high competence and a vision to achieve success” (p.202). Subordinates then respond with a positive, enthusiastic commitment to the organization’s objectives (Keller, 2006). Additional work by Bass (1985, 1990, and 1999) shows how transformational leadership also includes a morality component; ethics, character, and virtue are all components of true transformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

For higher education, Kezar (2013) notes that leaders who excel at transformational leadership engage in both sense-making and sense-giving. Here, leaders move institutions toward transformation by (1) depth of process; (2) breadth of engagement across departments and campus-wide; and (3) connection to strategies and barriers. Specifically, Kezar (2013) explains that leaders engage people at a system level in higher education and campus level to incorporate effective transformational strategies.
One case study examined transformational leadership in the context of major developments occurring at a larger university (Randall, 2012). Here, an institution responded to higher enrollment by changing from an ‘upper division’ and mostly evening class university to a four-year undergraduate university; a massive change that impacted the behavior of almost everyone on campus. Randall (2012) described how transformational leadership alludes to a change in behavior from subordinates (i.e., encouraging others to agree with a change). This change in behavior (transformational leadership) is also linked to adaptive leadership. In adaptive leadership theory, adjustments are made based on situational circumstances causing leaders to adapt. Randall (2012) describes a six-step process for adaptation that does not necessarily describe fundamental change, but rather an intentional approach to a changing environment. In this study, change was demonstrated from multiple university officials contributing to a collective change effort. Using a case study method, Randall used a qualitative approach to gather data, analyzing the leadership process for the change that was occurring at the university of study. The study focused on the initial phase of the change, which established the style of leadership employed to transform the institution. The productivity of this adaptive leadership contributed to several outcomes including new programming, increased enrollment, interdisciplinary learning experiences, and greater retention.

Transformational and adaptive leadership are important facets of the change process. As noted in Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) study using McDaniel’s HELC leadership competencies, the study of leadership has evolved over time wherein a shift of attention has occurred from the leadership makeup to leadership processes of management, particularly change. In a recent review of leadership literature, Martin, Riggio, and Thomas (2013) concluded that much of what embodied leadership amounted to a social psychological process that involves leaders, followers,
key stakeholders, and other actors along the way. Leaders and organizations both participate in processes, whether voluntarily or involuntarily; and a most common process experienced by both is change.

**Leadership and change.**

In organizations, there is perhaps no greater time to display leadership qualities and effectiveness than in times of change - and that is precisely where much of higher education finds itself today. The need for leadership in higher education is more urgent now than ever before; the days of regular budgetary increases from government are over, and the days of accountability, assessment, globalization, and competition are here to stay (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Leadership during change means vision *and* implementation, the ability to motivate others. Many college presidents enter their position with great vision, but can lack the drive to implement the vision, or continue the vision of stakeholders of the past (Kezar, 2009). Competent management is critical for sustainability in times of uncertainty. Gilley, McMillan, and Gilley (2009) showed that effectively leading change may be predicated on the leader’s ability to motivate others, communicate effectively, and build teams. In their study, Gilley et al. (2009) examined leadership skills as identified by subordinates, thus offering a picture of effectiveness from the eyes of those who receive direction. To examine subordinates, researchers used a quantitative survey that was distributed to students in MBA and organizational development (OD) master’s and Ph.D. programs at three 4-year universities (two public and one private) over 3 years (six semesters). Respondents were asked about their managers. In order of importance, the study found the following skills as important in leadership for change: Ability to motivate others, communicate effectively, building teams, ability to coach, ability to involve others, and appropriate rewarding.
It is also important to understand how change occurs: how the change dialogue begins and where it comes from. Boxer (2005) says that change in higher education comes about by way of four possible frameworks: (1) traditional educator; (2) incentive-coerced academic; (3) change leaders; and (4) activists. Boxer emphasizes major differences in discourse based on the four frameworks, and that such an understanding can give support to leaders who seek to be effective agents of change. He notes, “Various stakeholders engage in unique discourses about change that reflect each stakeholder group and the perceptions of individuals in those stakeholder groups. This understanding can be used to better understand issues and how each group treats them. With detailed contextual data, such an analysis can provide educationalists with increased intelligence that enables more appropriate decision-making” (Boxer, 2005, p.351).

Some in leadership resist change to reserve their position in the hierarchy. Influenced by a fear of loss of power, the purposeful resistance theory approach examines leader behavior as it is influenced by organizational change occurring in the social-cultural environment. One such example outside of higher education, but within leadership theory, comes from Prindle’s (2012) suggestion that further research on measuring the magnitude of organizational change and how leaders respond or ought to respond. While some organizations encourage dissent and an open dialogue on imminent change, purposeful resistance theory brings to light the potential for aggressive resistance; “…leadership must recognize that employees, including leadership at certain levels within the organization may want to retain the present system. And while some organizations encourage employee dissent in the spirit of openness in discussions of organizational operations, dissent may ultimately translate into resistance” (Prindle, 2012, p.12). Additionally, dissent remains a common element to higher education leadership as departments,
colleges, and other internal organizations have a limited ability to function independently from one another.

**Leadership and ambiguity.**

Colleges and universities are organizations with ambiguous goals and purpose, complete with diffused power and decentralized systems (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). As Cohen and March (1972) describe, organizations (such as those in education) tend to exhibit a “garbage can” model of organization, where multiple items are thrown into the can together with others from around the institution. This model reflects the independent nature of colleges and departments within institutions, each with a potential for unique leadership. Lutz (1982) elaborates on this concept noting that the garbage can model is a view that leaders have come to accept as imperative rather than descriptive. Lutz says that a blind acceptance of this model does not inherently welcome accountability as it shows deference to the practitioners (power brokers) in the university. The practitioners amongst all other stakeholders, Lutz says, are the individuals driving the model forward; he argues for a modest ‘tightening’ of these systems.

Ambiguity within higher education happens by way of three characteristics: (1) problematic preferences; (2) unclear technologies; and (3) fluid participation. Cohen and March (1972) describe *problematic preferences* as a loose collection of ideas; this concept can be analogous to any higher educational institution that has multiple schools or colleges, even departments. In other words, what one leader may prefer in terms of policy, procedure, or attributes, a leader within a different department on campus may not prefer (yet these same departments and colleges within institutions are “coupled” together by a common mission and higher system of organization). Unclear technologies demonstrate the uncertainty of the production/processes throughout various departments; even though students graduate in one
school, the neighboring school has little/no information on the process by which they arrived there. And fluid participation implies the varying amount of time and effort put for by participants, resulting in uncertain and changing boundaries. This model of higher education referred to as the “garbage can” model (Cohen & March, 1972) is similar to a system of loose coupling.

By one definition, loose coupling implies that events are responsive, and that separate events retain their own identity and some of its “logical separateness” (Weick, 1976). Alternatively, Eckel and Kezar (2002) note that within these loosely coupled units, information runs the risk of traveling slowly and indirectly; that coordination can be minimal. This happens as a result of decisions by leaders that are not coordinated across units and to their subordinates, and that decisions made in one place may be at odds with those made elsewhere (Eckel & Kezar, 2002).

Birnbaum (1988) notes that loose coupling allows for adaptation by individual units rather than the whole institution, that changes can actually happen without creating disequilibrium for the whole institution (Birnbaum, 1988). This also raises a question of goal ambiguity. Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker and Riley (1977) express that most leaders often “try to be all things to all people … because their existing goals are unclear” (Baldridge, et al, 1977). Still, leaders must minimally identify the institutional goals and the effective behavior needed to achieve them. “When an organization achieves its most critical outcomes, it does so through the behaviors of its members. But not just any behaviors will lead to critical outcomes. Rather, the members must emit the right behaviors. The right outcomes are the product of the right behaviors” (Ricciardi, 2005, p.488). These correct behaviors are also known as competencies.
Leadership and competence.

In recent decades, competence-based leadership and theory have become commonplace in the literature. And with a broad history, it is helpful to have a general knowledge of what embodies competence apart from leadership: how it is used in professional fields and how it is defined. This section examines definitions of competencies within the literature and then connect competencies to the higher education field of study.

Ricciardi (2005) defines competencies as a, “…distinct sets of behaviors applied to reliably complete a task that is directly linked to a critical outcome” (Ricciardi, 2005, p.488). Here, it is important to understand the connection between the behavior and outcome, moreover, successful outcomes. Competencies then become important as they direct organizations; they can also be measurable, learned, and can integrate and develop management practices (Intagliata, Ulrich, and Smallwood, 2000). In addition, a competency model can be determined when an organization adopts a specific set of these competencies as ‘desirable’ for specific outcomes (Marcus, Cooper-Thomas, & Allpress, 2005). Adopting or developing these competencies is important work for leaders.

Developing a competence or set of competencies is a process. Based on Weick’s (1979) theories of organizational objectives, McGrath, MacMillan, & Venkataraman (1995) describe competence development as a “more-or-less linear, evolving sequence in which comprehension helps groups develop deftness which in turn helps them develop competence” (p. 266). Understanding competencies for leaders in any organization must include a degree of careful observation, assessment, and/or description. Competency models also exist in fields outside of higher education. For example in business and nursing competency models have been developed
by qualitative study involving a series of observations and interviews (Sherman, Bishop, Eggenberger, & Karden, 2007; Gupta, 2013).

Competency models also exist in higher education, albeit in small quantities. The model used for this study comes initially from McDaniel’s (2001) work with the American Council on Education (ACE). Smith and Wolverton (2010) used McDaniel’s model to formulate a measurable questionnaire, later arriving at a five-component leadership competency model via quantitative methods. In another study, Martinez (2008) examined competencies of higher education policy analysts first using the Delphi method and then creating an online survey using Likert-type scaling. A factor analysis of Martinez’s work showed support for a four-competency model: external–technical; internal–technical; internal–interpersonal; and external–technical or interpersonal (2008).

Additionally, higher education organizations also hold their own professional competencies for their respective members. For example, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) have professional competencies for student affairs educators. Initially developed in 2009 and most recently revised in July of 2015, ACPA and NASPA’s joint task force on professional competencies and standards developed the following areas: personal and ethical foundations (PEF); values, philosophy, and history (VPH); assessment, evaluation, and research (AER); law, policy, and governance (LPG); organizational and human resources (OHR); leadership (LEAD); social justice and inclusion (SJI); and student learning and development (SLD) (NASPA & ACPA, 2015). According to NASPA and ACPA, the professional competencies were designed with the intention to, “set out the scope and content of professional competencies required of student affairs educators in order for them to succeed within the current
higher education environment as well as projected future environments” (NASPA & ACPA, 2015).

**Leadership in Higher Education**

*Leadership* is a complex term that can include a variety of styles, strategies, and definitions. Exemplifying leadership is being virtuous or responsible (Cameron, 2011). Leadership is transformational, causing change in environments or social systems (Kendrick, 2011). Leadership is also flexible and adaptive, as if it were a “meta-competency,” incorporating multiple strategies (Norton, 2010). For the purposes of this study, leadership must ultimately be examined within the context of higher education; understanding the specific responsibilities, duties, and competencies that leaders in higher education possess.

Amey (2006) suggests that leaders in higher education should be developed not on a series of manuals or ‘how-to’ writings, but rather by understanding identities, roles, gender and race, critical thinking, and learning. Effective leadership, now and into the future, must rely on “authentic insights that come from critical reflection about and deep understanding of organizational culture and values” (Amey, 2006, p.58). While personal reflection, self-development, journaling, and examining one’s emotions can be uncomfortable and difficult, leadership research suggests that successful leaders are in touch with their emotions (Goleman, 1995). Successful leaders are authentic and behave with consistency, can read the emotions of others, and attend to the emotional aspects of the organization (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006).

Along with authenticity, other qualities of effective leaders can also be found in Goldberg’s study (2001) on commonalities in educational leadership. Goldberg conducted 43 interviews with educational leaders, qualitatively examining the data for traits/commonalities of
leaders. Of Goldberg’s list of commonalities, the belief in a *bedrock* principle stands out in Goldberg’s article. Goldberg states that one must, “believe that what you are doing will actually help people” (Bedrock Belief section, para. 3). Although many of the attributes discussed in the Goldberg article appear to be elementary or simplistic, they provide a good starting ground for the development of leadership competencies. Another commonality of educational leadership from Goldberg (2001) is *situational mastery*. Here, Goldberg describes the ability of leaders to manage a staff with minimal authority. Citing one of his interviews, Goldberg says that people often perform their best if everyone knows the *why* of leadership and not just the *how*. The quality of *managing* is also a leadership quality mentioned by Martin and Marion (2005). With some of the aforementioned qualities and/or competencies of leadership in tow, it is important to understand that leadership has not only developed over time, is has also taken on characteristics that may be attributable to specific societies and organizations.

Burns (2005) offers insight on the growth of leadership research; he discusses it as a field of academic study, as a field in development, and (in some instances) a field that changes. Burns even goes so far as to assert that theoretical work and practical application in non-American contexts will inevitably move leadership theory away from its overly American emphases and bias toward a more international perspective. By ‘American bias’ Burns is referring to how the study of leadership has been a predominantly Western endeavor since the mid-20th century. Burns perspective on this changing landscape of study is helpful in that it should alert those who study it to become increasingly aware of the global voice it potentially brings to the conversation. This is of particular worth when being mindful of the different theories and definitions of leadership as they are discussed in this study.
In step with the development discussed in Burns research, Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2008) speak to a developing model of leadership from an individual to a relational understanding. Different from managerial styles as mentioned above, Bolden et al. (2008) states that leadership as an area of academic study has grown exponentially over the past 70 years. Yet, Bolden’s study remains firmly focused on the individual ‘leader,’ treating followers as somewhat passive or subservient in the process. Bolden’s et al. qualitative study also offers five dimensions to leadership that together shape the ways in which leadership is perceived and enacted; they are personal, social, structural, contextual, and developmental. For the study, authors used a qualitative interview method, examining data from 152 university leaders across various disciplines. Interview findings were supplemented by available documentation along with two collaborative workshops with staff representatives. The data showing a ‘relational’ understanding of leadership is evidence of a more interpersonal connection between leaders and their community.

Trivellas and Dargenidou (2009) take leadership one step further as they discuss the services provided by leaders, with the added perspective of faculty and students. From a sample of 134 faculty leaders and administration members at one institution, Trivellas and Dargenidou examined leadership roles and quality in services and internal processes. In their findings, leadership is found to mean more than simply being a manager, but also working for the good of the institution, in and amongst colleagues. The study isolates leadership roles and qualities as they pertain to specific types of leaders; this was accomplished using a structured questionnaire with Likert-type scaling, followed by principal component analysis (PCA) to identify eight factors for leadership roles and accounted for 94 percent of the total variation. The resulting analysis showed, “The producer, director and coordinator proved to be the most prevalent roles
among administration staff, while the director, coordinator and mentor roles dominated among faculty members” (p. 53). The Trivellas and Dargenidou (2009) study accomplishes a unique perspective on leadership from various positions within the university and its community.

While understanding leadership as a general topic within higher education is helpful, it is important to focus on specific areas where leadership attributes may not be unique. Moreover, and for the purposes of this study, it is necessary to examine leadership amongst the variables used in analysis for this study: gender, academic leadership, athletics leadership, and leadership in student affairs/campus ministry.

**Leadership and Gender**

Not until the 1980s had there been a greater contingency of women leaders in positions of power in either public or private sector positions. By the late 1980s the world had seen women prime ministers in Britain, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Philippines and Norway. In the United States, women have risen to prominence in the private sector with an influx of new CEOs, most recently with General Motors’ Mary Barra in 2014. Furthermore, women in politics have continued to gain presence, with two Vice-President Nominees (Ferraro and Palin) in 2012, and at the time of this study Hillary Clinton as a potential Presidential Nominee (2016).

Recent data in higher education have echoed this trend. Based on data for faculty, women now account for approximately 50% of assistant professors, 38% of associate professors, and 24% of full professors, up from 1975 statistics: 25% assistant professor, 17% associate professors, and 10% full professors. In 2006, women accounted for 23% of college and university presidents, which is up from 5% of presidents in 1975 (Madsen, 2012). This dramatic shift in proportion is understood through a progressive shift in literature, opinion, and general
public sentiment. Still, perceptions of the “glass ceiling” remain in tact, and women across higher education still feel adversity.

In a mixed method study of women in leadership in higher education, Diehl (2014) conducted face-to-face interviews with 26 women in senior leadership roles in higher education and asked, “How do women leaders in higher education make meaning of adversity?” Participants reported experiencing wide-ranging types of adversity, including gender-based leadership barriers. Perhaps even more impressive, however, were how the women made sense of the adversity; how they chose to manage it. Of the responses, five themes emerged: (1) Out of adversity comes opportunity for growth; (2) how an individual perceives a situation often determines how they manage it; perspective is important; (3) privacy is important when managing potential challenges; (4) women must make sense of adversity and find meaning in it; and (5), women who identified the adversity were empowered to continue a climb toward success, calling themselves “survivors” (Diehl, 2014). Yet, what contributes to such adversity?

Bass (1990), in a study of business organizations, considered a variety of underlying traits that contribute to potential leadership when considering male against female job candidates. Bass identified potential differences in the following areas: verbal and nonverbal communication skills; cognitive skills; differences in personality, values, and interests; reactions to conflict; sex-role identification and stereotype; and differences in self-confidence.

Based on a review of research, Bass (1990) concluded that women are favored by having slightly better verbal skills (communication) and that cognitive skill differences were difficult to identify. Bass notes that women who do exhibit personality traits that are inconsistent with leadership tend to lose or modify those traits as they move up the ladder. In other words, women adjust to so-called ‘cultural norms’ as necessary to gain access to leadership positions (Bass,
This growing, positive reception of women leaders suggests a divergence in attitude from earlier studies, and according to one related study, the trend is growing. Beyond general studies of women’s leadership styles, characteristics, or skills, the topic of women in leadership is of particular interest in the realm of Christian higher education.

In their work, surveying over 1,500 faculty at Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) member institutions, Joeckel and Chesnes (2009) found that women who seek leadership positions met more barriers than men. Historically, many Christian institutions including Harvard featured male-only programming, faculty, and administrative staff. Differences in theological opinion had prevented women certain access. According to Schreiner (as cited in Longman and Lafreniere, 2012), women today still have perceptions about their position(s) in higher education which include a lack of role models, theological conservatism that limits access to top leadership positions, embracing a collaborative leadership style that can be misunderstood or disrespected, and at times, feeling out of sync with some male-dominated administrations. Such implications are not limited to Christian higher education; rather, they seem to persist through Christian church-related organizations.

Scott (2014) examined the differences between gender-role generalizations (i.e., stereotypes) and characteristics perceived in relation to successful leadership within evangelical nonprofit organizations. Of the implications in the regression analysis, Scott notes that while there is inconsistency in the number of women in leadership roles at church-related organizations, data show that women were found to have more desirable traits of middle-level managers than men. In other words, despite being underrepresented, women are perceived to have more desirable leadership qualities than men.
Leadership in Academics

Leaders develop over time, and academic leadership is no different. Experience as faculty, creating/innovating curriculum, or working with staff development takes time. Inman (2011) described the phases of developing academic leadership as a process, going through formation, accession, incumbency, and divestiture. By qualitatively examining 18 academic leaders from ‘middle leadership’ such as heads of departments and programs within higher education, Inman drew conclusions about the leadership process, proposing a contextualized model of the journey to leadership. This gradual process is worth consideration for any academic leader, and should not happen too fast. Some of the facets to this process include, (a) developing a tight adherence to core institutional values (formation); (b) proper socialization with current leaders while developing ones own style (accession); (c) learned control over one’s own destiny, ability to develop within (incumbency); and, (d) rather than pushing to move up the ladder, leaders understand their position and their passions; and while not often a true demotion, here, leaders “reclaim” original interests and seek out interests that are accessible (divestiture).

Leadership as a process appears in other works (Askling & Stensaker, 2002; Burns, 1990; Hesburgh, 1988). In these other studies, leadership as a process is partnered with dedication to vision. Being contextually aware of a given dilemma or circumstance, development of a plan with team members, and adherence to the vision at nearly all cost are just a few of the steps necessary within academic leadership (Hesburgh, 1988). This process of leadership development is aided by self-reflection.

At one recently created pharmacy college, senior faculty members reflected upon the first few years their school was operational. Confirming the process that others in academic leadership discuss, three main themes emerged (McCall & Brazeau, 2011): (a) Successful leaders
don’t need to know everything, and they don’t need to be the first to know, (b) there will always
be some individuals who are not pleased with your decisions, and, (c) leadership can be lonely,
so utilize your friends, family, and hobbies. This honest, yet practical approach to academic
leadership draws upon a human element of leadership. At their university, McCall and Brazeau
(2011) learned lessons based on real-life experiences. They summarized the reflection by
acknowledging the real-life application: “We have, like many before us, realized some of these
lessons can and will only be achieved with service and leadership activities and responsibilities
to our college and to numerous professional educational, practice, and scientific organizations”
(p. 1). Such an approach to professional development can have a direct impact on teaching at the
post-secondary level.

In higher education, academic leadership almost always includes elements of teaching,
service, and scholarship. Ball (2007) suggests that while many variations exist, there are two
clear approaches to research leadership in higher education: (1) Research leadership that is
collegial and informal in nature; and (2) research leadership that includes formally organized
assessment methods such as Research Assessment Exercises (RAE). Ball (2007) goes on to
suggest that if universities decide to go the formal route including RAES, they should also
appoint dedicated research professionals to oversee the process. Moreover, suggested behavior
patterns within research processes at institutions should include an understanding of each
person’s responsibilities within the department, motivation, support, and a mutual sense of
responsibility.

Leadership in academics is essential for any effective institution of learning. Yet, many
colleges and universities around the world have additional extracurricular activities that are now
commonplace in the higher education landscape. And there is, perhaps, no more notable extracurricular sector of higher education than that of athletics.

**Leadership in Higher Education Athletics**

College athletics provide a unique setting for issues regarding leadership within higher education. Due to the complex nature of college athletics, collaborative efforts are a necessity when addressing the issues within. Ryska (2002) says that leaders who exemplify a collaborative approach in supporting athletes and teams report high levels of personal accomplishment in their jobs. These same effective leaders also emphasized the development and maintenance of positive relations between the athletic department and community-based constituents (external relations competency). Issues and rifts may exist externally, but there exists a long-held battle for academic integrity that continues within the institution’s own walls; beckoning the need for strong leadership from coaches, academics, and supporters alike. This issue of integrity is at the core of much athletics-based literature and research.

Boehm, Justice, and Weeks (2009) cite issues of academic integrity as being responsible for rising costs, consumption of valuable administrative time, damaging the image of integrity campus-wide, and causing students to devalue respect and ethical values. In their study, Boehm et al. surveyed and interviewed chief academic officers and provosts and used a mixed methods design that included a qualitative section guided by two research questions: (a) What are the perceived initiatives that are most effective in promoting academic integrity and reducing scholastic dishonesty? And (b) What is the perceived single best initiative most effective in promoting academic integrity and reducing scholastic dishonesty? On higher education campuses, respondents identified a failure of institutional leadership to establish integrity
standards and practices across campus. Respondents agreed that lack of training and communication has played a role in dishonest conduct within academia.

Benford calls institutional integrity the ‘core issue’ within the college athletics reform movement. From academic scandals to poor standards within athletic departments, Benford paints a picture of corruption and seeming despair for college athletics. He describes how various levels of higher education are all to blame for the perpetual problem of integrity (Benford, 2007). Institutional integrity can encompass a host of issues, including the oversight of recruitment practices, practice time, academic work, and issues with amateurism.

The topic of integrity and college athletics is as old as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). A variety of bylaws and rule changes from the NCAA have made continuous attempts at curving issues of integrity, only to watch college sports grow, and with it, new problems. Lawry (2005) opines that the depth of the issue requires true reform to happen on a system level, and that the issues including money, fame, and even winning, are to blame. In order for Lawry’s system level change to happen, leadership must come from every room in the academic house, starting with leadership within the faculty.

Gerdy (2002) suggests that an institution’s faculty is often too involved in their own discipline to become involved in athletics or reform for that matter. To suggest that they be the sole agents of leadership for change is unfair. Institutions expect their faculty to be experts in their academic fields, not in athletics. Yet, Gerdy (2002) opines that the faculty can start the dialogue and advance the conversation about integrity in athletics. As the so-called gatekeepers of higher education, faculty members ought to begin taking a more active role in the athletic department, a change in behavior that is likely to take some time (Gerdy, 2002). Others have called for the creation of a national network to monitor and to hold presidents and boards
accountable. Earl (2004) calls for help for all stakeholders in college athletics, to bring about comprehensive reform of the entire industry for the sake of both college athletics and the university system. If the faculty, then, are to drive the change through senates and their own personal efforts, what role must administration and institutional leaders take?

Of Curren’s (2008) Three Cardinal Virtues for administration, integrity is called the most summative and complete. Curren says that academic achievement and an all-consuming commitment to fielding winning teams cannot be compatible. This commitment may find leaders tolerating a number of things they should not, including diversion of resources away from academic operations, lower academic admissions standards, and student cultures that are hostile or indifferent to academic achievement. Curren does not, however, ignore the possibilities of contributions that an athletic department might make to the institution; he suggests that an institution’s success could be dependent on how well the two (athletics and academics) are unified and connected.

In step with this idea, Curry (1996) says that this administrative integrity must start in the president’s office. In his article on a “Platform for Reform,” Curry says the president's office must be clear, direct, and focused on mission and vision when it comes to reforming college athletics. Reform cannot be passive; rather it must be proactive in mixing the academic and athletic politics, revenue and negotiations (Curry, 1996). Curry’s vision for the president’s office is in concert with Curren’s call for a better cohesion between academics and athletics.

The rooms of administration and faculty are not separate, but adjoining, and their cooperation and cohesion of mission can play an important role in keeping institutional integrity a high priority. Lumpkin (2008) says that faculty members must be invited to the table by administrators from both the academic and athletic arenas to tackle the issues. Earl’s (2004)
suggestion for a national network may be found in part with the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). According to their website, COIA’s mission is to provide a national faculty voice on intercollegiate sports issues. COIA’s primary interests include academic integrity and quality, student-athlete welfare, campus governance of intercollegiate athletics, commercialization, and fiscal responsibility (COIA, 2012). Such a coalition with faculty, administration and leaders alike adds a strong voice in the area of institutional integrity.

Other research on college athletics focuses on academic achievement for student-athletes. Harrison and Comeaux (2011) state that many colleges and universities offer a host of support services and programs for student–athletes, but they have not managed to consistently and effectively enhance student–athletes’ learning and personal development. Instead, many support centers focus on simply maintaining academic eligibility, which clearly creates an athletic subculture of low academic expectations, thus reducing the possibilities for developing high-achieving student–athletes. Harrison and Comeaux (2011) suggest a conceptual model for success that focuses primarily on student engagement and motivation to learn, inside and outside the classroom. In his analysis on athlete monitoring, Symonds (2009) echoes the focus on engagement and says that studying the student engagement levels of athletes may provide institutions another tool for reform as they push for further institutional integrity.

Leadership in Student Affairs / Campus Ministry

The following two sections explore the Smith and Wolverton (2010) classification of ‘Student Affairs’ as expanded for this study to include both leaders in student affairs and campus ministry.
**Student affairs.**

Change is a commonality in student affairs leadership. Trends, fads, perceptions, and especially legal issues become a regular part of the lives of leaders of student affairs. To work effectively, leaders must be willing to think in new and innovative ways, work together with subordinates towards the student affairs mission, and be sufficient with (often times) limited resources (Dalton & Imanuel-Gardner, 2002). This reflects multiple elements found in the higher education leadership competencies (HELC) including productive relationships, understanding of student affairs, leverages institutional resources for maximum benefit, etc. Of course, campus ministry maintains its own unique focus, one not often grouped into any specific category or department. For the purposes of this study, campus ministry is examined alongside student affairs.

Because of its broad spectrum, leadership in student affairs means a presence in a diverse setting, encompassing multiple aspects of the campus community. Leaders in student affairs have regular opportunities to support, help, and offer advice to students on a daily basis; their regular presence on campus allows them to be viewed as accessible and approachable to a variety of students (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004). Reynolds (2011) describes the nature of these helping professionals in a study of student affairs leaders \((n=159)\). Respondents included entry-level and mid-level student affairs administrators from institutions across the United States. Practitioners indicated the need for effective communication, diversity, and crisis management while requiring knowledge on student development, family issues, and institutional resources (Reynolds, 2011). A more broad approach to effective student affairs leadership is simply called “practical” by Dalton (2002) as he describes the need for common sense development among student affairs leaders: “Effective long-term success as a student affairs professional
requires both sound knowledge and good judgment. We respect and honor those professionals
whose expertise and good judgment over time have earned them success in their careers and the
respect and admiration of their peers” (Dalton, 2000, p.3). These descriptions of student affairs
leaders draw attention to the very personal nature of student affairs in higher education, where
faculty/staff are regularly engaged with students.

Kuh (2009) says that student engagement should be a priority for campus leaders.
Leaders who facilitate engagement help students to, “attain his or her educational and personal
objectives, acquire the skills and competencies demanded by the challenges of the twenty-first
century, and enjoy the intellectual and monetary advantages associated with the completion of
the baccalaureate degree” (p.683). Students from all backgrounds need this development, and
attaining such competencies can be different for unique groups of students. When analyzing data
from 190 students from one public university, Roberts and McNeese (2010) found that there
were statistically different levels of engagement for students based on their educational origin.
Educational mode is also a point of emphasis for student engagement with the rise in online
education. Robinson and Hullinger (2008) note, “The online learning environment is an ideal
setting to promote greater involvement in mental capacities. Slightly more emphasis can be
given to incorporating assignments that require synthesis of and making judgments on course-
related materials. Memorization of facts and information has to be minimized to the extent that
there is a clear emphasis on higher order levels of thinking” (p.107).

At the center of each of the aforementioned engagement topics, Thomas (2002) says that
student affairs leadership must focus on ethical values, integrity and courage. While leaders are
not exempt from occasional mishap or doubt, core values act as a guide. Thomas writes,
“Effective leaders are almost always characterized by personal convictions about what is good
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and worthy. In the work of student affairs, commitment usually includes loyalty to [the] institution, our leaders, and followers; the learning development and welfare of students’ and a recognizable set of guiding values and ethical principles” (Thomas, 2002, p.61). Such leadership centering on core values echoes Goldberg’s (2001) call for bedrock principles in leadership; a principle that is in many cases the mission of the Christian institution.

**Campus ministry.**

Models of campus ministry have changed over the years (Brittain as cited in Moran-Craft, C.D., Weber, W. M., & Menke, D. J., 2009). In the mid 20th century, campus ministry was a responsive, passive presence on campuses, reacting to the ever-changing culture of the academy. In the late 1970s, campus ministries focused on networking, leading students to other church-related activities. The on-campus model emerged in the late 1980s, when ministries began to offer an increased number of study groups and worship services on campus, rather than within a local church. This model-shift is dramatic and telling of the changing nature of the higher education landscape throughout the mid to late 20th century; yet some models persist today.

According to Cawthorn and Jones (2002), campus ministry originated with much of the secularization that occurred in many protestant institutions. As more non-traditional and non-protestant students came to campus, churches saw a need to minister to these un-churched students, and thus began pastoral designations (or “calls”) to universities. Now, campus ministry organizations tend to follow one of three different models: (1) presence (actual pastor on campus), (2) networking/resource (network of ministry-minded individuals on campus with a connection to a local parish), or (3) church-on-campus (Cawthorn & Jones, 2002).
Moran-Craft et al. (2009) examined campus ministers as they serve as facilitators of religious development, personal development, and leadership development among the students with whom they work. Using a phenomenological approach, data were gathered by interviewing campus ministers, students, and campus ministry leaders. As the study describes campus ministry as showing high-levels of engagement and development with students, the authors note, “…student affairs administrators are encouraged to reframe their involvement in the realm of religious development among students. Furthermore, professionals in student affairs may consider how to build relationships with campus ministers and how to engage in collaborative efforts to facilitate student development” (Moran et al., 2009, p. 74).

At one public institution, student affairs has, indeed, utilized campus ministry for student development as part of a broader basis for engagement. At the University of South Carolina (USC), members of campus ministry staff are considered ‘adjunct’ members of the Student Affairs staff. Fidler, Poster, and Strickland (1999) report, “The close relationship chaplains enjoy with the University results in greater access to campus resources which, in turn, promotes increased involvement and greater pride in community membership. Chaplains frequently participate in extra-curricular activities, attend athletic events, and contribute to the University's annual fund-raising programs” (p.24).

While designed for spiritual and relational well being of students on campus, effective campus ministries do not inherently improve academic performance. Leaders for student affairs and campus ministries have targeted goals, and while not implicitly connected to academics, the social and spiritual well-being acts as an aid at many Christian institutions of higher education. Despite that, one study found no significant correlation between students’ active participation in
campus ministry activities and a higher collegiate GPA (Schubmehl, J., Cubbellotti, S., & Van Ornum, W., 2009).

Higher Education Leadership Competencies

In 2002, McDaniel qualitatively identified leadership competencies through the consultation with university presidents, vice-presidents, and former American Council on Education (ACE) fellows. Competencies were classified into four categories: (1) context, (2) content, (3) process, and (4) communication. Together, these categories became the structural model for Higher Education Leadership Competencies, or HELC (McDaniel, 2002). McDaniel’s work was qualitative in nature, not quantitatively tested. In 2010, Smith and Wolverton sought to extend McDaniel’s work, seeking to quantify the original HELC model via a questionnaire that would be distributed to senior leaders in higher education. The Smith and Wolverton research asked whether or not HELC factored into the theorized four groups. Results showed statistical support for a five-component model of leadership competencies as opposed to the four by McDaniel. The five components consist of 39 core competencies; the five components are (1) analytical, (2) communication, (3) student affairs, (4) behavioral, and (5) external relations. The following sections explore the theoretical framework of the higher education leadership competencies (HELC) by examining its origin, development, and current model structure used for this study.

HELC origins and development.

Competency-based models for leadership specify the attributes and frameworks necessary for effective leadership (McDaniel, 2002). McDaniel (2002) reports on the specific leadership competencies developed by Fellows of the American Council on Education (ACE). Individuals chosen for the ACE Fellows Program are placed for one year at another institution
with other leaders and mentors; they are engaged in an intense year of study, taking on the role of listener, questioner, and occasional active participant in host institution activities. The ACE Fellows project was “designed to articulate … a framework or set of competencies of senior leaders in higher education that can be used to foster self-assessment and continuing leadership development” (McDaniel, 2002, p.82).

In 1998, the Fellows Program set out to reframe its leadership development as a career-long process, with a comprehensive model for senior leadership. To accomplish this, a group of 30 former ACE Fellows were brought together to review past programs, goals and curriculum, and then to articulate these criteria as leadership behaviors or competencies. After formal adoption by the ACE Leadership Commission (with suggested revisions), competencies were organized into four categories: (1) understanding context of higher education; (2) content of higher education contexts; (3) the processes by which leaders achieve their goals; and (4) communication in their communities (McDaniel, 2002).

Until the HELC questionnaire was developed by Smith and Wolverton (2010), McDaniel’s work on leadership competencies remained qualitative, not yet subject to empirical testing. After a pilot test and review of literature, Smith and Wolverton (2010) disseminated the HELC Questionnaire using a Likert-type scale – the most common and popular method for testing relative intensity of different items (Babbie, 2004) – based on principles from Dillman (2002). Results were analyzed against McDaniel’s four-competency model using a varimax rotation, which statistically organized the fifty-nine (59) items into observable groups. The study found that a five (5)-component model was stronger than McDaniel’s four. Fit indices were used to evaluate the model included the incremental fit index (IFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA).
Because of Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work in developing a refined component model for higher education leadership, this research will first examine the new model which includes five competencies of: (1) analytical, (2) communication, (3) student affairs, (4) behavioral, and (5) external relations. Overall, competencies in the 5-component model accounted for 53.22% of the total variance, with 5 being the observed optimal number of components accounting for the maximum amount of variance. The following sections review literature that supports Smith and Wolverton’s model and adds validity to the newly outlined leadership competencies. The following sections examine the five-component model as developed by Smith and Wolverton (2010).

**Analytical.**

Analytical competencies include the ability for information gathering, combined with analytical thinking and facilitative communication in an effort to carry out effective and efficient systems and processes (Smith, 2010). According to Smith and Wolverton’s analysis, analytical leadership competencies include much of the decision-making processes that leaders embody on the job. Effective decision making includes: (1) reflective practices, (2) understanding relationships, and (3) having contextual knowledge of one’s area.

According to Weick (1979), understanding starts with reflection and looking in the past. As people interact with their surroundings, they compartmentalize experiences, assigning meaning, value, and connections. When leaders engage in reflective practices, their own goals and performance are likely to thrive. “Effective leaders self-monitor and reflect on their practice of leadership using information they collect and analyze, and they set goals to enhance their own efficacy and performance” (McDaniel & DiBella-McCarthy, 2012, p. 232).
Leaders must understand their own relationships within context with the organization around them. Popper (2004) theorizes that there are three different types of relationships that are formed between leaders and followers: (1) regressive, (2) symbolic, and (3) developmental. Described by Popper as a “projective,” this relationship includes how either leader or follower perceives the projected behaviors of the other. In other words, regressive relationships are more subconscious, unofficial, and personal. Symbolic relationships, on the other hand, develop from content-based meanings, messages, ideologies, and values. Here, the leader is expected to represent or embody a certain form. Finally, Popper identifies developmental relationships in concert with transformational leadership. Taking cues from Bass (as cited in Popper, 2004), Popper explains that developmental relations are bolstered over time, developed, or made to “be more” than they were before initial relations with any given leader (Popper, 2004, p. 117).

Developing relational abilities in leadership is important to organizations. In their study on building successful leadership relationships, Boyce, Jackson, & Neal (2010) collected data from 74 client-coach pairs participating in a voluntary leadership program and analyzed data in order to examine the impact of certain criteria within client-coach relationship as they focused on outcomes. Consistent with their conceptual framework, Boyce et al. (2010), found that relationship processes of rapport, trust, and commitment positively predicted coaching program outcomes (leadership/relationship development).

Context as part of a leadership competency refers to a leader’s broad knowledge base. Kelley & Kelloway (2012) outlined four elements of context as they examined leaders of online/remote academic programs: (1) ability to control; (2) prior knowledge; (3) unplanned communication; and (4) regularly scheduled communication. For the specific environment
parameters of this study online learning, called “remote” in the Kelley & Kelloway study, understanding the context becomes increasingly important, as the face-to-face element is absent:

…in the remote environment, context is so omnipresent that it filters the way in which individuals perceive and interpret leader behaviors. The “remote” relationship environment is, after all, defined by its context - and that context is fundamentally different from the environment in which the majority of leader-member, indeed most human relationships have been conducted since the dawn of time (Kelley & Kolloway, 2012, p. 446).

Communication.

On the communication competency, Smith and Wolverton (2010) write, “The conclusion here is that higher education leaders should be competent in both oral communication and writing and should engage multiple perspectives in decision making” (Wolverton & Smith, 2010, p.66). The communication competency showed heavy support for a leader’s presentation; as in, how they are received by colleagues and peers. Smith left much of the communication competency open for further discussion.

Burns (1978) discusses communication amongst colleagues as a skill one must develop if he or she is to lead effectively. In his section on power, Burns says that leaders must communicate their professional needs to colleagues in such a way that does not simply wield power, but that also addresses the wants, needs, and other motivations at play amongst his or her colleagues (Burns, 1978). This approach is far more collegial than what Burns refers to as a hierarchical approach.

Bakker-Pieper & de Vries (2010) looked at communication styles among leaders at a public institution, understanding the importance of communication as a core competency in
leadership. They found that both charismatic and human-oriented leadership styles are rooted in communication; and that communication is less regarded among task-oriented leadership (which is really more managerial than leader). The study showed that leadership essentially translated as effective communication for charismatic and human oriented leadership.

Aside from discourse and communication, organizational leaders generally hold the ability to construct their own realities into their positions (Neumann, 2012). The idea of a self-constructed reality, or, internal communication, is not new. Morgan (2006) describes this in Plato’s cave example whereby people are seeing only shadows and noises inside the finite awareness of a cave wall. Furthermore, this idea of actually studying the leader’s head, or rather, how they make sense and “create” organization, is a relatively untouched area of study.

Student affairs.

Smith and Wolverton (2010) explained the Student Affairs competency is the most ‘ill-defined’ category, one needing further refinement. Yet, as part of their five-factor solution, competencies here were associated with student needs, issues, trends, and legal considerations. In student affairs, effective leaders demonstrated competency in emerging higher education trends, responding to the needs of contemporary students, and had a good knowledge of relevant legal issues.

Student needs in higher education can include academic, social, health, spiritual, and emotional needs. Moreover, the needs of international students, students from different/low socio-economic status, and those with disabilities put increasing pressure on student affairs leaders to understand a variety of resources needed for these students (Bettinger & Long, 2009, Bartram, B. 2007). Understanding these backgrounds and needs allows student affairs leaders to be more personally engaged. Kuh (2009) says engagement increases the chances that any
student, regardless of educational and social background, will reach educational and personal goals and “acquire the skills and competencies demanded by the challenges of the twenty-first century” (Kuh, 2009, p. 698).

Flynn and Vredevoogd (2010) describe how responsiveness to global change is necessary for higher education communities to be competitive. “We need to seek out change; to be more flexible, more thoughtful, and more open to student decision making; and to build outcomes measurement feedback into integrated planning” (Flynn & Vredevoogd, 2010, p. 5). Reporting feedback of representatives from research universities, state colleges, community colleges, private institutions, and architectural and design firms, Flynn and Vredevoogd (2010) identified 12 trends that will impact the higher education landscape in coming years. From this list, several that directly impact student affairs leadership include the following:

- The wide range of ability, preparedness, background, opportunity, and motivation of higher education students will require more varied and holistic approaches to inclusive learning.
- Advancements in technology will drive ongoing changes in all aspects of college and university life and offer new opportunities to enhance and broaden learning experiences.
- The average age of students will continue to rise; the mix of cultures, ages, and learning styles will become increasingly varied and rich.
- Competition for students and resources will force colleges and universities to sharpen their brands and identities and to distinguish themselves in new ways.

Perhaps the single greatest challenge facing leadership in student affairs is that of keeping up with the law. Because of an ever-increasing litigious society, higher education must continue
to prepare for and study the law. It is advisable for each office within the institution to be proactive in training its staff. According to Mellander (2005), many cases have gone against the institution because proper education did not take place amongst the institution’s workers. It is then incumbent upon higher education leaders to be proactive and even aggressive in adapting to legal issues.

_Behavioral._

Differing from how one is perceived and received (communication), the behavioral competency shows effective leadership in how a leader acts. Most closely correlated with McDaniel’s process competency, behavioral competency recognizes a sense of humor, supports others, and demonstrates unselfishness. Smith and Wolverton (2010) describe the behavioral competency as, “defined by exhibiting lighthearted, unselfish behavior, with a strong focus on and interest in the actual people within the organization who contribute to successful organizational outcomes” (p. 66). Collins (2001) echoes these behavioral leadership values as he explains that great institutions achieve four things: (1) results in relationship to mission, (2) impact on distinctiveness as an institution, (3) esteem from those within and those outside, and (4) endurance. A strict adherence to core values and organizational outcomes can distinguish universities from one another based on mission and values.

In his prominent work on Christian college identity, Holmes (1987) says that distinguishing values and adherence to mission is paramount, and that there is a four-step behavioral approach to doing so. Attitudinal; where the college must cultivate a positive atmosphere of Christian learning. The positive attitude must be reflected around campus in all aspects: chapel, admissions, publications, counseling, etc. The attitude must be pervasive. Ethical; describing how a faith-based institution should teach value judgments. By this, ethics are
not spoken of in passing or “pontificated” from pulpits, but a deliberate inclusion as part of course structures. It is relational, not anecdotal. Foundational; with an approach to historical elements at the institution, building curriculum around classical Christian intellect, philosophy, and scripture. Worldview; also called a ‘life view,’ Holmes says this approach allows those in the institutional community to see all things in relationship to God as their creator, redeemer and Lord (Holmes, 1987, p. 47-58).

With the ever-expanding nature of higher education, remaining distinct by way of Christian mission is important. As part of a qualitative study reviewing current and potential future trends in Christian higher education, Glanzer (2013) writes that many Christian institutions in North America have expanded from their original theologically-based majors and programs and have expanded to additional, more technical programs. While doing so has helped to expand the reach and scope of institutions, maintaining a distinctively Christian approach remains a priority. He writes, “In light of the professional/technical emphasis of most global universities, Christian universities will stand apart by offering additional courses, as well as instruction within the basic courses in the field, that address larger theological, philosophical, and ethical issues (Glanzer, 2013, p. 339). Moreover, keeping up with the market demands of higher education poses a potential threat to maintaining the additional coursework required at Christian institutions (ethics, philosophy, theology, etc).

Leaders concerned with the enduring quality of Christian higher education must seek a balance between higher education’s market demand and foundational values. Some authors claim that there is little reason for concern for Christian higher education’s future, pointing out that many institutions have emerged in just the latter half of the twentieth century, and some even in the early twenty-first century (Glanzer, Carpenter, & Lantinga, 2011). Loomis and
Rodriguez (2009) note that many institutions have blossomed into the regional and even national markets by strategic franchising satellite, distance, and virtual campuses. Moreover, some institutions will continue to expand on the basis of a social justice argument, bringing higher education access to under-represented minority groups or those in lower socio-economic status groups (Loomis & Rodriguez, 2009).

Collins (2001) says that great organizations achieve esteem from those within and those outside of the institution. Eldridge and Mason (2010) explain how institutions that adhere to their mission in times of change and who are effective at communicating such adherence to their stakeholders retain positive relationships with key institutional stakeholders. In addition, the development of an effective communication strategy is key for leaders who seek to communicate with the diverse interests of stakeholders both within and outside of the institution.

**External relations.**

When considering fifth competency of external relations, it is the president that often sees the bulk of responsibility and workload. Being competent in external relations refers to the interaction that occurs externally to the institution, including marketing, development, fundraising, public and private media, and other community or government interactions. Driven by competition for funding and multiple stakeholders’ interests, competencies for effective external relations include relating with various constituent groups, working effectively with the media, and understanding advancement, and athletics (Smith & Wolverton, 2010).

Practicing effective leadership with the various constituent groups of the institution is crucial for advancing mission. One such prominent group is the board of regents (or governing board). Tasked with upholding the mission of the institution, boards are often alumni, business people, or other important members of society who collaborate for the advancement of the
Institutional missions, then, need to be clear and understood by all stakeholders and should essentially dictate the decisions, agendas and priorities set by the governing board (Mortimer & Sathre, 2007). It is then the responsibility of the board to see that the institution’s best interests are served as board members adhere to a mission-centered agenda. In a sense, the mission is both the governance and institutional ‘rudder.’ Without a meaningful mission, governance can drift, go awry, and cease to have a guiding light in dark times (Orlikoff, 1995).

Missions serve different purposes for different stakeholders and are also impacted by these various groups. First, governing boards see missions as crucial; they are the proverbial ‘guardians’ of the institution and have their best interests at mind. Second, presidents are often seen as change agents; as Chait (1979) notes, no one will accept a president who is interested in maintaining the status quo. Presidents often reexamine missions and seek to improve them, often based on their goals and ambitions. Third, accrediting associations require mission statements for accreditation (Chait, 1979).

External relations outside of the institution can also include members of the media. One media specialist writes that media relations are just that, relationships that are formed, developed and maintained just as one would have with any given associate or friend. Kureczka’s firm in California adds that it is beneficial for organizational leaders to seek out the media to tell their story or side of any issue first, rather than become reactionary to media inquiries (Kureczka,
2006). Here, leaders must have the contextual understanding of how the media works and how to foster positive relationships therein.

External relations also means fund raising efforts and advancement. Decline in aid from state and federal allocations has caused colleges and universities to explore sources and methods of funding, increasing higher education’s involvement in fund raising (Satterwhite & Cedja, 2005). Two such methods for specific fundraising efforts include an emphasis on donor involvement and promotion of institutional brand. Chung-Hoon, Hite, & Hite (2007) used a 44-question quantitative survey instrument, the National Survey of Fund Raising Practice (NSFRP), to explore respondents’ responsibilities and involvement in fund raising. Results showed that organizations seeking to improve success in fund raising should focus on ‘complex relational and structural donor interactions.’ Some of these ‘complex relationships’ could mean inviting high-level donors to strategic planning and/or vision meetings (Chung-Hoon, Hite, & Hite, 2007). In terms of brand, McAlexander, Koenig, & Padilla (2006) indicate, “…strong brand community relationships indicate integration within the community, greater customer loyalty, and all the behaviors that customer loyalty implies, including increased positive word-of-mouth” (p.109). Here, authors emphasize the need for a shared brand amongst stakeholders.

**Conclusion**

This chapter took a brief look at the history of higher education, specifically the Lutheran Church. The chapter also discussed general leadership theories, change, leadership literature on competencies and higher education, and a look into the leadership variables used in this study (gender, academic leadership, athletics leadership, and leadership in student affairs/campus ministry). The following chapter will describe the methodology used in this study.
Chapter Three - Methodology

The purpose of this study was to replicate measures by Smith and Wolverton (2010), examining leadership competencies within the Concordia University System (CUS) institutions of higher education, and to extend their study by exploring whether or not there are reporting differences in variables such as gender or employment classification (i.e., an individual’s role within the institution). The Concordia University System (CUS) is comprised of ten colleges and universities affiliated with The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS). Located across the United States, the colleges and universities offer over 160 undergraduate and 50 graduate programs. While each institution is unique, all ten campuses approach learning from a Lutheran context governed by the Concordia University System Board. While Smith and Wolverton’s work focused on Division 1 institutions, this study will examine institutions with the common bond of affiliation with the LCMS.

Because of the selected population for this study, this survey distribution will be extended from the original population as prescribed by Smith and Wolverton (2010) to also include Campus Ministry persons as part of the Student Affairs classification. It should be noted that many Campus Ministry offices/departments are already organized within Student Affairs departments at CUS institutions.

The preceding chapter offered insight into the current study by presenting an introduction and relevant literature. This chapter will examine the methodology used to replicate the Smith and Wolverton (2010) instrument within the aforementioned context. The competency frameworks for this study are taken from McDaniel’s (2002) study of Fellows from the American Council on Education (ACE), later quantified via additional research from Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) study of leaders in higher education.
The study design is a replication-extension of Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work. Replication-extension studies are specifically designed to replicate and extend the results of prior studies (Bonett, 2012). The replication is taken from Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work and is extended by way of application to a new and unique population along with additional analysis. This study has replicated Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work of principal component analysis as it seeks to determine whether or not components factor in to McDaniel’s (2002) original theorized four constructs for the CUS population. This study then extended the Smith and Wolverton research by executing an analysis of variance to determine whether the dependent variables (factor scores) are statistically different by the independent variables of gender and employment classification.

**Research Questions**

The HELC survey from Smith and Wolverton (2010) were disseminated to leaders at 10 Lutheran universities with the CUS system. The survey was organized into three sections: personal information, professional information, and the HELC Inventory. This study is a replication-extension of Smith and Wolverton’s work using a unique, different, and specified population: Lutheran universities within the Concordia University System (CUS). Thus, the research questions are as follows:

1. Do HELC, as developed by McDaniel (2002) factor into four groups of context, content, process, and communication at CUS institutions?
2. Is the perception of HELC items level of importance different between variables of: (a) employment classification and/or (b) gender?
Survey Population

The survey population (N=633) was comprised of leaders from Lutheran institutions of higher education within the Concordia University System (CUS). Donathen and Hines (1998) at the Leadership Development Program at Texas A&M University describe a leader as a mentor of faculty and staff, a catalyst for critical thinking and political support; a servant who transcends his or her self-interest, and a visionary who plans, forecasts, and takes action (Donathon & Hines, 1998, as cited in McDaniel, 2002). Because there are only ten (10) CUS institutions, this research sought to include each available leader from CUS institutions within the classifications described in this study.

The Smith and Wolverton (2010) study selected representatives from three sub-levels of the independent variable: athletics directors, senior student affairs officers, and chief academic officers. Whereas the Smith and Wolverton study focused on National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I institutions, this study applied the model to private, Lutheran institutions (CUS institutions). Since this study is a replication-extension, it is necessary to note that this survey will expand upon the student affairs category by adding Campus Ministry leaders (e.g. a campus pastor). Campus ministry is a section unique to Christian colleges that offer unique leadership opportunities for those who serve in that capacity (Holmes, 1987). The table below identifies specific categories of survey recipients within the aforementioned classifications:
Table 3.1 Survey Distribution for Leaders (with specific classifications and categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Campus Ministry / Student Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Athletics Directors</td>
<td>Campus Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Presidents</td>
<td>Asst. Athletic Directors</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice Presidents</td>
<td>Senior Women’s Admin.</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors</td>
<td>Head Coaches</td>
<td>Residence Life (RL) Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School Deans</td>
<td>Athletics Administrators</td>
<td>RL Program Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>Ath. Training Administrators</td>
<td>Student Affairs Dept Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center/Institute Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because a “Lutheran College Leaders” email listserv does not exist, relevant data was gathered using faculty/staff directory tools from the included various CUS institutional websites (e.g. www.cuw.edu). Email addresses were collected via public directories and used in the survey distribution. Email addresses were then entered into an Excel spreadsheet along with each individual’s corresponding job title and institution. Because some institutional websites did not provide relevant information, phone calls were made to human resources at each necessary location in order to obtain the appropriate lists.

Instrument and Analysis

The HELC survey instrument developed by Smith and Wolverton (2010) is comprised of three sections: demographic information, professional information, and the HELC inventory. Section one included personal information, namely gender. Part two sought professional information (including institution and employment classification). Part three was the HELC inventory.

To examine the four-component model, scores based on a five point Likert-type scale from each question was examined as part of principal component analysis (PCA). Each item within the HELC inventory was rated (1-5) with the following criterion: 1-Unimportant, 2-Of
Little Importance, 3-Moderately Important, 4-Important, 5-Very Important. The concept behind PCA is to “reduce the dimensionality of a data set consisting of a large number of interrelated variables, while retaining as much as possible of the variation present in the data set” (Jolliffe, 2002, p.1). Such new variables (also called factors or constructs) are thus uncorrelated and help to inform understanding of the data considered.

The questionnaire as used by Smith and Wolverton (2010) did not delegate core competencies (individual questionnaire items) to their respective factor (latent construct). Therefore, the 59 items will be distributed in the survey in the same order as the original study. Questions are preceded by the following instructions: “Based on your own experiences, observations, perceptions, and/or beliefs, please rate the following competencies on their level of importance (1 = NOT IMPORTANT; 5 = VERY IMPORTANT) for effective higher education leadership.” Following the HELC inventory items, a page break took participants to the final questions regarding demographics. Below are two example HELC inventory statements:

   Item # 1   Develops partnerships with multiple constituent groups.
   Item # 2   Learns from experience.

To examine whether or not there are differences in level of importance by variables of employment classification and/or gender, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used. The MANOVA was suitable for testing because this study used an independent variable with more than one dependent (gender and classification) variable. In other words, MANOVAs account for the relationship among several dependent variables when comparing groups (Portney & Watkins, 2000). Thus, the logic of MANOVAs can be seen as an extension of bivariate analysis (Babbie, 2010). Since there is more than one dependent variable being examined,
MANOVA is used as opposed to a single analysis of variance (ANOVA). A primary difference between ANOVA and MANOVA is controlling for a Type 1 error.

To test for the internal reliability of the scores, data were examined using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. One of the most commonly used measures of internal consistency, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha “evaluates the items in a scale to determine if they are measuring the same construct or if they are redundant, suggesting which items could be discarded to improve the homogeneity of the scale” (Portney & Watkins, 2000, p. 72).

Finally, to ensure that the tests correctly identify whether or not there is actually a difference between groups, analysis will examine power and effect size. Power can be determined by sample size and effect size. Stevens (1996) says that when a sample size is large (over 100), ‘power is not an issue’ (p. 6). If this research were to have yielded responses under 100, alpha levels could be adjusted to compensate, changing the traditional .05 level to a cutoff of .1 or even .15. Furthermore, to report the strength of association, or effect size, analysis will examine partial eta squared and Cohen’s $d$. Partial eta squared effect size statistics indicate the “proportion of variance of the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variable” (Pallant, 2010, p. 210). Here, values will range from 0 to 1. Cohen’s $d$ shows the difference between groups by way of standard deviation. Cohen’s (1988) guidelines will provide the framework for analyzing effect size. In step with Smith and Wolverton’s parameters, this study sought a ratio of 5:1 for participant to variable; meaning, with the HELC inventory of 59 items, the target response rate is $n=295$ (Bentler & Chou, 1987).

As researchers consider administering surveys and analyzing results therein, studies must consider validity and reliability. Validity “refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration” (Babbie, 2010, p. 153).
The measure here is the HELC survey instrument and the concept is leadership competencies. The foundation laid by McDaniel (2002) gave researchers general ‘content validity,’ referring to the range of meanings included in the concept of leadership competencies. Then, for the HELC survey (or, inventory), Smith and Wolverton (2010) strengthened content validity by gathering a group of educational leaders (professors, researchers, and a survey design professor) to review and provide feedback for the newly developed HELC survey. “In some cases, McDaniel’s (2002) statements were rewritten for clarity, maintaining the essence and meaning of the competencies” (Smith & Wolverton, 2010, p.63). Furthering the validity measures, Smith and Wolverton created a nomological network to help point to sources where logical theoretical relationships existed among the competency indicators.

Reliability can be defined as the extent to which a measurement is consistent and free from error (Portney & Watkins, 2000). In other words, can researchers expect consistent results under already provided conditions? Babbie (2010) says that for an instrument to be reliable it should produce the same data in repeated observations. Survey research tends to be high in reliability considering once a survey is constructed it often does not change, meaning it can be used repeatedly knowing the consistency of questions and available responses (Babbie, 2010). More specifically, this study proposes a replication using ‘established measures.’ Often seen in standardized tests at the k-12 level, established measures use instruments that have “proved their reliability in previous research” (Babbie, 2010, p. 153). For the previous study, Smith and Wolverton reported Cronbach’s alpha to indicate the level of internal consistency with scores; scores of .7 and higher were retained as ‘acceptable.’
**Procedures**

The survey was created and distributed using my account with Qualtrics through Concordia University Wisconsin (CUW). The survey was tested within CUW using ten (10) non-qualifying individuals to determine accuracy and efficiency of survey completion. The average time to complete the survey was approximately 18 minutes. An informed consent prompt was administered as part for the pre-survey. In this study specifically, an informed consent prompt outlined participants’ voluntary agreement in the survey, purpose of the survey, expected time to complete the survey, and encouragement to participate. Participants were able to click a link, which indicated they had read the terms of the study and agreed to participate in the survey.

Each recipient received the survey in an initial email, followed by a reminder email a week after the initial distribution. For emailed surveys, Schirmer (2009) notes that there are growing ethical concerns over multiple reminders, while a single reminder remains generally acceptable. The survey remained active for a total of three weeks. All participants who completed the survey will be provided with an executive summary of the study results as a form of compensation upon the final submission of this study.

When the surveys were completed, Qualtrics exported the data to SPSS for analysis. Along with cloud storage through Qualtrics, data was copied to an Excel spreadsheet where it will be stored in multiple locations. Data analysis was conducted and exported using IBM’s SPSS 22. All identifiable information of participants and pertinent information will be stored in a password protected computer storage system (Qualtrics). Data will be stored for approximately one year (Fall 2015- Fall 2016). Saved computer data files will be deleted at the completion of the study.
Conclusion

This chapter examined the methodology used to study leaders at CUS institutions using the Smith and Wolverton (2010) HELC inventory. This study has replicated measures by Smith and Wolverton (2010), examining leadership competencies within the Concordia University System (CUS) institutions of higher education, and to extend their study by exploring whether or not there are differences in scoring based on the variables of gender and/or employment classification (i.e., an individual’s role within the institution). The following chapter will discuss results and findings of the data analysis.
Chapter 4 - Results

The preceding chapter explained the methodology used in this study. This chapter includes the results used to examine the McDaniel (2002) Higher Education Leadership Competencies model within the aforementioned context. This chapter will examine response rate, the participant profile, component analysis, and item analysis. This study replicated Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) questions of (1) model fit, and (2) differences between groups. This study extended existing research by (1) selecting a very different and unique population (Concordia University System institutions), and (2) examining potential differences in perception by gender. Thus, the research questions were as follows:

1. Do HELC, as developed by McDaniel (2002) factor into four groups of context, content, process, and communication at CUS institutions?
2. Is the perception of HELC items level of importance different between variables of: (a) employment classification and/or (b) gender?

To examine the four-component model, scores based on a five point Likert-type scale from each question were examined as part of principal component analysis (PCA). The concept behind PCA is to “reduce the dimensionality of a data set consisting of a large number of interrelated variables, while retaining as much as possible of the variation present in the data set” (Jolliffe, 2002, p.1). Such new variables (also called factors or constructs) are thus uncorrelated and help to inform understanding of the data considered.

To examine whether or not there are differences in level of importance by variables of employment classification and/or gender, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used. The MANOVA was suitable for testing because this study used independent variables
(employment classification and gender) with more than one dependent variable (each HELC item). In other words, MANOVAs account for the relationship among several dependent variables when comparing groups (Portney & Watkins, 2000). Thus, the logic of MANOVAs can be seen as an extension of bivariate analysis (Babbie, 2010). Since there is more than one dependent variable being examined, MANOVA is used as opposed to a single analysis of variance (ANOVA). A primary difference between ANOVA and MANOVA is controlling for a Type 1 error.

**Results**

Each recipient received the Higher Education Leadership Competencies (HELC) survey in an initial email, followed by a reminder email a week after the initial distribution. The day before the closing of the survey, a final reminder was sent. The survey remained active for 3 weeks and 1 day. Data were collected.

The survey sent to CUS leaders included a possible 632 respondents, 147 completed the survey in full for a response rate of 23.2%. In order to include all possible available data, particularly including surveys with partial missing data, estimation maximization was utilized to include missing data, thereby yielding 172 available cases for analysis. Estimation maximization is a procedure within SPSS that uses an iterative process of multiple regressions to produce the most likely value of each missing item (Dempster, Laird, & Rubin, 1977). With this procedure in place, survey response rate was 27.2%. Participants were asked to identify their employment based on the classifications included in the survey (74% academic; 7% athletics; and 19% student affairs/campus ministry); which institution they were currently employed at (4% New York; 8% Ann Arbor; 8% Chicago; 8% Irvine; 7% Nebraska; 10% Portland; 14% St. Paul; 10% Texas; and 31% Wisconsin); and their gender (male 49%; female 48%; no answer 3%).
To accomplish the principal component analysis (PCA), items were loaded into SPSS 23. Various authors (Pallant, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Stevens, 1996; Bartlett, 1954) suggest a series of initial steps to examine the strength and workability of the data. Specifically for PCA, two statistical measures are accessible via SPSS to check for the factorability of the data: Bartlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy. Pallant (2010) notes that the KMO index ranges from 0 to 1 with .6 as the suggested minimum value for a good factor analysis; and Bartlett's test of sphericity should be significant ($p<.05$). When analyzed, the data showed a KMO value of .833 and a Bartlett's value of .000. Thus, initial screening showed the data to be appropriate for PCA.

**Research question 1.**

Research question 1 asks, do HELC, as developed by McDaniel (2002) factor into four groups of context, content, process, and communication at CUS institutions? To examine the four-component model, scores based on a five point Likert-type scale from each question were examined as part of principal component analysis (PCA). Participants were able to select items on a 5 point Likert scale within the HELC inventory was rated (1-5) with the following criterion: 1-Unimportant, 2-Of Little Importance, 3-Moderately Important, 4-Important, 5-Very Important.

Initially, data were analyzed using an open extraction method, which indicates that the data were not forced into the theorized 4 component model, rather left open to Eigenvalues greater than 1.0, also known as the Kaiser criterion. An Eigenvalue is a, "measure of variance, indicating how well the discriminant function discriminates between groups" (Portney & Watkins, 2000, p.606). In other words, this process selects the survey items that help to explain the greatest portion of total variance. This is where the factor extraction is most valuable,
selecting specific items that help make sense of the larger group. Using the Kaiser criterion, 15 factors loaded above a value of 1.0 accounting for 69% of the total variance, far beyond the theorized 4 component model presented by McDaniel (2002).

Following the open extraction method, a forced factor solution was examined using similar techniques in SPSS. Here, as opposed to leaving the factor solutions open, the researcher "forces" a fixed factor solution into the equation. Portney and Watkins (2000) explain that making sense of factors or components is a difficult and very subjective task; they note, "The researcher should look for commonalities and theoretical relationships that will explain the statistical outcome" and "When the factor labels are not so obvious, it may be necessary to reexamine [the data]" (Portney & Watkins, 2000, p.613). In the forced factor solution, there were no clear commonalities linking the included variables; while groupings were produced, individual variables within the factors did not relate to one another in any observable way.

Building on the open extraction, Portney and Watkins (2000), Williams, Brown, & Osman (2010), and Pallant (2010) note that factor loaded scores of .4 and above indicate a positive relationship (within a given component). Additionally, Spector (1992) suggests that the lowest number of retained items per construct is 3, with a recommendation to keep constructs only showing 5 or more items. With this in mind, additional analysis using Varimax rotation was conducted to examine what the open-ended 15 component findings might look like with additional constraints. With such constraints in use, data revealed, not only a workable 5 component model, but also a model in which clear communalities existed within each latent construct. To accomplish this, only variables with a factor loading of .4 or above were kept for analysis, leaving the data with 33 variables (items) instead of 59. Table 4.1 shows the reduced variables within their rotated factor scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple units in decision making</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple perspectives in decision making</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands impact on others</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to effective teamwork</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates negotiation skills</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of planning</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of legal issues</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the U.S. system of higher education</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of complex issues related to higher education</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns from self-reflection</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates resourcefulness</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of student affairs</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies analytical thinking to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraces institutional culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers institutional culture in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes aspects of institutional culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions consistent with institutional goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts consistent with core values and integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents self well professionally as a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates unselfish leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies listening skills to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive to emerging trends in higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates courage for educated risk-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately assesses the costs and benefits of risk-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters the development and creativity of learning organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates the change process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, results showed an open component analysis yielding 15 initial factors, reduced to 5 within the parameters outlined above, while retaining 33 itemized competencies instead of 59. It should also be noted that this study sought a ratio of 5:1 for participant to variable (Bentler & Chou, 1987). With the reduced available variables (33), the ideal response rate for this study would have been $n=165$. This survey meets this criteria using the aforementioned EM procedures, with $n=172$.

Reliability Analysis

To test for the internal reliability of the scores, data were examined using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. One of the most commonly used measures of internal consistency, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha “evaluates the items in a scale to determine if they are measuring the same construct or if they are redundant, suggesting which items could be discarded to improve the homogeneity of the scale” (Portney & Watkins, 2000, p.72). Generally, reliability coefficients are considered acceptable at the .7 level or higher (DeVellis, 2003). The analysis showed scores of .89 (Communication), .83 (Contextual Understanding), .78 (Mission Mindedness), .76 (Professional Development), and .72 (Change Leadership). Table 4.2 summarizes the results for Cronbach’s alpha analysis, each with a sufficient score above the .7 threshold.

Table 4.2 Alpha scores for each theorized component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Understanding</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Mindedness</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Leadership</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question 2.

Research question 2 asked, “Is the perception of HELC items level of importance different between variables of: (a) employment classification and/or (b) gender?” It is important to note that the analysis for each part of the second research question used only the variables resulting from the first research question. While there were initially 59 variables as part of the HELC inventory, this study suggests that only 33 items scored high enough for retention as part of the principal component analysis. Therefore, the following discussion regarding multivariate analysis (MANOVA) will be within the parameters met by the aforementioned analysis.

Initially, this research proposed a simple analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine whether or not differences in perception were present within variables of gender and employment classification. However, further research determined that MANOVA was more suitable for testing an independent variable with more than one dependent variable. MANOVAs account for the relationship among several dependent variables when comparing groups (Portney & Watkins, 2000). Thus, the logic of MANOVAs can be seen as an extension of bivariate analysis (Babbie, 2010). Since there is more than one dependent variable being examined, MANOVA is used as opposed to single analysis of variance (ANOVA). A primary difference between ANOVA and MANOVA is controlling for a Type 1 error. To aid in this endeavor, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) recommend using the Bonferroni adjustment. The recommendation calls for an adjustment of alpha levels (typically .05), divided by the number of items (or tests). For this study, to limit the possibility of committing a Type 1 error, and to further enhance reporting, the number of items used for each MANOVA are based on the number of retained items per factor. For example, since factor 1 retained 9 items, alpha levels will be adjusted (.05/9) to .005.
**Employment classification.**

The first variable examined as part of research question 2 asks if there is a difference in the perception of HELC items level of importance by employment classification. To answer this question, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine whether the reported scores (Tables 4.2 and 4.3) from the variable of employment classification were statistically different. In other words, were reported scores on the model different based on employment classification?

Specifically for the variable of employment classification, additional analyses were needed to fully understand where differences in perceptions were. To accomplish this, when significant differences were found within the MANOVA analysis, a follow-up ANOVA with a Tukey post-hoc test was run to determine which specific groups demonstrated the difference. Pallant (2010) describes, “When you have independent variables with three or more levels, it is necessary to conduct follow-up univariate analysis to identify where the significant differences lie. Within the one-way ANOVA procedure, [one can] request post-hoc tests for [the] variable with three or more levels” (Pallant, 2010, p.296). When analyzing MANOVAs, Wilks’ Lambda is the recommended test for significance, looking for p values of <.05 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The following sections refer to MANOVAs analyzed within each latent construct.

**Factor 1.**

Based on factor loadings (Table 4.1) Factor 1 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .004; this demonstrated that there is a statistically significant difference between those reporting in academics, athletics, and student affairs/campus ministry in terms of their overall perception of factor 1 items; this allowed for further investigation. As a result, three items met the new alpha level criteria for significance (.005). Pallant (2010) notes that the partial eta squared column
evaluates effect size and is important when considering such differences. Using Cohen’s (1988) criterion, all three of the significant differences for factor 1 can be reported as having a moderate effect based on employment classification. Table 4.2 represents factor 1 items (significant differences in bold).

Table 4.3 Factor 1 Competency Items Perception Difference by Employment Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple units in decision making</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</strong></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple perspectives in decision making</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands impact on others</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to effective teamwork</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrates negotiation skills</strong></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For two items, “Engages multiple perspectives in decision-making,” and “demonstrates negotiation skills,” a one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post-hoc was run to determine where the specific differences lie. Results indicated a significant difference at the .002 level in reporting between athletics and academics. For the third item, “Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives,” results indicated a significant difference at the .004 level, also between athletics and academics.
**Factor 2.**

Factor 2 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .069; this demonstrated that there was not a significant difference in reported scores for factor 2 items by employment classification. Therefore, no further analysis was conducted.

**Factor 3.**

Factor 3 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .003; this demonstrated that there is a statistically significant difference between those reporting in academics, athletics, and student affairs/campus ministry in terms of their overall perception of factor 3 items; this allowed for further investigation. One item met the new alpha level criteria for significance (.01). Using Cohen’s (1988) criterion, the item is reported as having a moderate effect based on employment classification. Table 4.3 represents factor 3 items (significance in bold):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embraces institutional culture</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers institutional culture in decision making</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes aspects of institutional culture</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions consistent with institutional goals</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts consistent with core values and integrity</td>
<td><strong>.004</strong></td>
<td><strong>.073</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post-hoc was run to determine where the specific differences lie. Results indicated a significant difference at the .037 level in reporting between student affairs/campus ministry and academics.
Factor 4.

Factor 4 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .093; this demonstrated that there was not a significant difference in reported scores for factor 4 items by employment classification. Therefore, no further analysis was conducted.

Factor 5.

Factor 5 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .095; this demonstrated that there was not a significant difference in reported scores for factor 4 items by employment classification. Therefore, no further analysis was conducted.

Gender.

The second variable examined as part of research question two asks if there is a difference in the perception of HELC items level of importance by gender. To answer this question, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine whether the reported scores from the variable of gender were statistically different or not. In other words, will reported scores be different based on gender? The following sections refer to MANOVAs analyzed within each latent construct (or, factor).

Factor 1.

Factor 1 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .002; this demonstrated that there is a statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of their overall perception of factor 1 items which allowed for further investigation. Next, 3 items met the new alpha level criteria for significance (.005). Using Cohen’s (1988) criterion, each of the three significant differences for factor 1 can be reported as having a medium effect based on gender (for example, “Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts” reported significant differences between male
and female respondents, meaning 12% can be explained by sex). Table 4.4 represents factor 1 items (significance in bold):

Table 4.5 *Factor 1 Competency Items Perception Difference by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple units in decision making</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>.001</strong></td>
<td><strong>.102</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple perspectives in decision making</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</strong></td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>.122</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands impact on others</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to effective teamwork</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates negotiation skills</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters the development and creativity of learning organizations</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2.**

Factor 2 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .173; this demonstrated that there was not a significant difference in reported scores for factor 2 items by gender. Therefore, no further analysis was conducted.
Factor 3.

Factor 3 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .186; this demonstrated that there was not a significant difference in reported scores for factor 3 items by gender. Therefore, no further analysis was conducted.

Factor 4.

Factor 4 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .017; this demonstrated that there is a statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of their overall perception of factor 4 items which allowed for further investigation. Using the Bonferroni adjustment, new alpha levels were set to .008 for significance (.05/6). Two items fit the criterion for significant differences in perception of importance by gender: (1) Encourages professional development; and (2) attentive to emerging trends in higher education. Both items were rated as having a moderate effect size. Table 4.5 represents factor 4 items (significance in bold):

Table 4.6 Factor 4 Competency Items Perception Difference by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presents self well professionally as a leader</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourages professional development</strong></td>
<td><strong>.001</strong></td>
<td><strong>.092</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates unselfish leadership</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of leadership</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies listening skills to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attentive to emerging trends in higher education</strong></td>
<td><strong>.006</strong></td>
<td><strong>.069</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 5.

Factor 1 reported a Wilks’ Lambda of .849; this demonstrated that there was not a significant difference in reported scores for factor 2 items by gender. Therefore, no further analysis was conducted.

Summary

To address research question 1, “Do HELC, as developed by McDaniel (2002) factor into four groups of context, content, process, and communication at CUS institutions?” principal component analysis (PCA) was run with both an open extraction and forced factor design. Using the open extraction method and additional constraints as supported by the literature, a five (5) factor solution was observed and reported (a detailed discussion on each factor is presented in chapter 5). Thus, research question 1 was clearly addressed. To address research question 2, “Is the perception of HELC items level of importance different between variables of (a) employment classification and/or (b) gender?” multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were run to determine if differences existed. MANOVAs were run with variables based on factor groupings to limit the possibility of committing a Type 1 error. In addition, steps were taken to ensure statistical significance in each equation, including the use of the Bonferroni alpha level adjustment. Results were mixed, showing that some items were viewed differently, while others (most) were not. A more in-depth discussion on these results can be found in chapter 5.
Chapter 5 – Discussion

The preceding chapter explored the results and general analysis for the data in this study. This chapter includes a summary and discussion of the study which examines the research questions and their results and presents the findings, how they relate to the theoretical framework, and how they connect to existing literature. The chapter will conclude with implications for both practice as well as research.

The purpose of this study was to replicate measures by Smith and Wolverton (2010), examining leadership competencies within the Concordia University System (CUS) institutions of higher education, and to extend their study by exploring whether variables such as gender or employment classification (i.e., an individual’s role within the institution) predict one’s perception of leadership competencies. The survey distribution was extended from the original Smith and Wolverton (2010) population of “academics,” “athletics,” and “student affairs” to also include “campus ministry” persons as part of the student affairs classification.

The HELC survey was disseminated to leaders at 10 Lutheran universities within the CUS system. The survey was organized into three sections: personal information, professional information, and the HELC Inventory. The research questions are as follows:

1. Do HELC, as developed by McDaniel (2002) factor into four groups of context, content, process, and communication at CUS institutions?

2. Is there a difference in perception of HELC items level of importance by the variables of (a) employment classification or (b) gender?

The design of this study was a replication-extension of Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work. To examine the four-component model, scores based on a five point Likert-type scale from each question were examined as part of a principal component analysis (PCA). To examine
differences in perception based on variables of employment classification, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used.

It should be noted that the standard deviation values in Table 5.1 demonstrate consistent scores. Generally, standard deviations below 1.0 indicate scores are in agreement between respondents. Only one item demonstrated a standard deviation above 1.0, item 28, \textit{Tolerates ambiguity}. For item 28, no additional analysis demonstrated irregularities or inconsistencies which would otherwise give a reason for the item to be dismissed. Moreover, the consistently high mean scores in Table 5.1 should have been expected. Since the instrument used for this study has already been tested within higher education on a different population, its usefulness in the realm of higher education leadership has been demonstrated.

Finally, it is worth noting the individual competency items that rated the highest amongst respondents in this survey were as follows: consistent with core values and integrity (M=4.83); applies listening skills to enhance communication in complex situations (M=4.68); encourages professional development (M=4.67); demonstrates understanding of leadership (M=4.61); and presents self well professionally as a leader (M=4.58). Readers of this study and those making use of its findings should note these items as the highest rated by leaders at CUS institutions, demonstrating a need to emphasize such competencies with colleagues present and future. The following sections discuss specific findings for both research questions.

\textbf{Findings: Research Question 1}

Research question 1 asked whether or not the HELC Inventory factored into McDaniel’s (2002) schema of 4 latent constructs. Data were analyzed and revealed not a four component model, but rather a five component model that included clear communalities within each theorized component. Moreover, analysis called for the retention of items that scored at a factor
loading of .4 or higher, indicating this study retained 33 inventory items in lieu of the original 59 as theorized by McDaniel (2002). Appendix C shows the retained 33 items, rotated (ordered) and grouped within theoretical latent constructs.

The following sections discuss each of the latent constructs and the items within them. Here, emphasis is placed on the context of the study as it relates to Concordia University System (CUS) institutions.

**Factor 1: Communication**

When examining the first set of competency items, items reveal a connection based on human interaction/communication. Scores on factor 1 resemble McDaniel’s (2002) *Communication* competency. She writes, “Senior leaders in higher education possess core beliefs about teaching and learning, equity and fairness, and respect for the individual that they use as the basis of their decisions and communication in the communities in which they operate” (McDaniel, 2002, p.86). Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) work echoed these thoughts, “higher education leaders should be competent in both oral communication and writing and should engage multiple perspectives in decision making” (Smith & Wolverton, 2010, p.66). With this in mind, it is difficult to ignore the importance leaders place in communication skills; and as such, *communication* is an appropriate title for the first latent construct or factor.

Communication as a leadership competency is a supported construct by a variety of authors (Wolverton & Smith, 2010; Burns, 1978; and Bakker-Pieper & de Vries, 2010). Thus, it is no surprise that leaders at CUS institutions echoed the need for strong communication. Of the items grouped into the communication factor, “sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues” and “contributes to effective teamwork” rated as the highest. As CUS institutions are smaller in size when compared to larger division 1 institutions, it is
understandable that the level of effective teamwork and productive relationships remains a strong emphasis. Especially at the smaller CUS institutions, some academic departments number only a few people. Moreover, student life and campus ministry departments are often small, regardless of the size of their institution. Thus, effective teamwork amongst a smaller staff becomes all the more imperative for effective leadership. Table 5.3 shows the mean and standard deviation for Likert scale scoring by survey participants (note all scores rated between Important and Very Important).

Table 5.1 Communication Competency Items with Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple units in decision making</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple perspectives in decision making</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands impact on others</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to effective teamwork</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates negotiation skills</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Contextual Understanding

A look into the second set of grouped variables reveals a slightly more complex arrangement of variables. While items range from the U.S. system of higher education to learning from self-reflection, one can draw conclusions in this construct as they relate to Contextual Understanding. On “Leadership Context Competencies,” McDaniel wrote that, “Senior leaders must understand the issues, principles, and players or context of higher education” (McDaniel, 2002, p.83). Here, contextual understanding is not limited to systems or institutions, but also include human resources and the self. Each item in the Table 5.4 includes
either internal or external functions/entities that are required understandings for leadership in higher education.

CUS institutions benefit from leadership with effective contextual understanding as they interact with a variety of issues within and outside of the university. Often times, leaders at CUS institutions who are experts in one area are called upon to provide guidance in areas that may not necessarily be within their respective area of expertise. As is the case at many small colleges and universities, departments often double-up duties or roles as they seek to fill in gaps in employment. For example, an employee within student life may act as a Dean of Students and also double as a Title IX Coordinator; perhaps even as the Women’s Senior Administrator. Because various governmental programs and/or regulations from the NCAA call for such oversight, smaller schools like CUS institutions may be required to hone their skills as they relate to contextual understanding.

Table 5.2 *Contextual Understanding Competency Items with Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of planning</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of legal issues</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the U.S. system of higher education</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of complex issues related to higher education</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns from self-reflection</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates resourcefulness</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of student affairs</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies analytical thinking to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 3: Mission Mindedness**

The third factor’s connection to CUS institutions is clear. Aforementioned literature explains that the Christian college is a community whose intellectual and social life is influenced by one another from a Christian point of view (Holmes, 1987). The survival of Christian institutions means a firm foundation built on a strong mission, with a sovereign sphere (Dockery,
2012) built on mutual faith. Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) findings addressed some of the mission-related items as they related to Content competencies. They write, “Content competencies also hinge on a leader’s understanding of strategic planning and how it relates to the mission and goals of the institution” (Smith & Wolverton, 2010, p.62).

Connected to CUS institutions, the content and understanding for leaders in the surveyed population is key. Institutional content, which can and should be immediately tied to the aforementioned mission, should essentially dictate the decisions, agendas and priorities set by those in leadership positions and those on the governing board (Mortimer & Sathre, 2007). It is then the responsibility of such leaders to see that the institution’s best interests are served as board members adhere to a mission-centered agenda. In a sense, the mission is both the governance and institutional ‘rudder.’ Without a meaningful mission, governance can drift, go awry, and cease to have a guiding light in dark times (Orlikoff, 1995).

This study finds that several of McDaniel’s “Content” competency items group together, but also bring along items of culture, value, and integrity. With this in mind, the third latent construct implies a sense of Mission Mindedness as a competency for senior leadership. Table 5.5 outlines the items and strong scoring affiliated with Mission Mindedness.

**Table 5.3 Mission Mindedness Competency Items with Mean and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embraces institutional culture</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers institutional culture in decision making</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes aspects of institutional culture</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions consistent with institutional goals</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts consistent with core values and integrity</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 4: Professional Development

At the outset, the fourth latent construct appeared as a challenging analysis. Competency items in factor 4 range from a leader’s presentation to emerging trends. The individualized items from factor 4 closely connected with Smith and Wolverton’s (2010) behavioral competency. They write, “A category of behavioral leadership competencies also grouped together. This category is defined by exhibiting lighthearted, unselfish behavior, with a strong focus on and interest in the actual people within the organization who contribute to successful organizational outcomes. In short, a leader’s behavior is important” (Smith & Wolverton, 2010, p.66).

While the McDaniel (2002) “behavioral” competency title could be considered as a general approach to how leaders behave, HELC items in this grouping transcend personal actions and illuminate organization-wide needs. The complex situations and emerging trends call for development and the need for the leader to be in a constant state of improvement. Other items do indeed call for personal betterment, but are grouped with other, less salient items on the survey. Thus, professional development offers a clear unpacking of this construct – leaders work to improve themselves while being attentive to the needs of the complexity of the institution.

Within CUS institutions, a theme of professional development works well with the existing mission, especially as each institution continues to grow. With the ever-expanding nature of higher education, remaining distinct by way of Christian mission is important. Glanzer (2013) writes that many Christian institutions in North America have expanded from their original theologically-based majors and programs and have expanded to additional, more technical programs. CUS institutions must be “attentive to emerging trends” and communicate effectively as they branch out into new areas. Doing so within the missional context helps to expand the reach and scope of institutions. Glanzer writes, “In light of the professional/technical
emphasis of most global universities, Christian universities will stand apart by offering additional courses, as well as instruction within the basic courses in the field, that address larger theological, philosophical, and ethical issues (Glanzer, 2013, p. 339). Moreover, keeping up with the market demands of higher education poses a potential threat to maintaining the additional coursework required at Christian institutions (e.g., ethics, philosophy, theology, etc).

Table 5.4 *Professional Development Competency Items with Mean and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presents self well professionally as a leader</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional development</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates unselfish leadership</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of leadership</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies listening skills to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive to emerging trends in higher education</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 5: Change Leadership**

In organizations there are perhaps no greater times to display leadership qualities and effectiveness than in times of change. Today higher education revolves around a world of accountability, assessment, globalization, and competition (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Leadership during change means vision and implementation, the ability to motivate others, to take risks, and be a guiding force. Competent management is critical for sustainability in times of uncertainty. Gilley, McMillan, and Gilley (2009) showed that effectively leading change may be predicated on the leader’s ability to motivate others, communicate effectively, and build teams.

In the fifth construct, variables retained support the competency of change leadership from a variety of angles. Risk-taking, creativity/development, and the change process are all clearly associated with change. It is worth noting that a possible outlier in this construct is item
28, “tolerates ambiguity;” this item scored second lowest in overall mean rating along with the largest standard deviation of 1.01. While this does not preclude the items inclusion on the construct, it does offer insight into CUS leaders approach to the competency. By their very nature, colleges and universities are organizations with ambiguous goals and purpose, complete with diffused power and decentralized systems (Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006). Research noted in chapter 2 indicates a need for leaders to be adaptive to the change around them, often acting as the drivers of change themselves – even if they are not the originators of the change. Leadership during change includes the ability to motivate others (Kezar, 2009); even when such change is uncertain in their own eyes.

Table 5.5 Change Leadership Competency Items with Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates courage for educated risk-taking</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately assesses the costs and benefits of risk-taking</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates ambiguity</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters the development and creativity of learning organizations</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates the change process</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Competencies: A Model for CUS Institutions**

Principal component analysis has revealed a five-component model for Concordia University System (CUS) institutions: (1) Communication, (2) Contextual Understanding, (3) Mission Mindedness, (4) Professional Development, and (5) Change Leadership. As noted earlier, the five-component model closely resembles that of the Smith and Wolverton (2010) work using larger, NCAA Division 1 institutions for the HELC instrument. In their findings, analytical, communication, student affairs, behavioral, and external relations all emerged as competency items. While some similarities exist, it appears that factor loadings for this study more closely resemble the makeup of CUS institutions as opposed to those of larger institutions.
Throughout the writings of Martin Luther, readers find a repeating theological question: What does this mean (Luther, 1925)? Luther maintained that the Bible should interpret questions or perceived gaps within other texts within the Bible; thus the phrase *scripture interprets scripture*. For this study, existing text from the literature helps to make sense of new data and information from this study.

Simmons (1998) says that the Lutheran tradition is characterized by paradox, by the dialectical tension between the finite and the infinite in the world, and the ambiguous nature of the world and human life. Rather than resolving to either the intellect or service, the Lutheran tradition attempts to keep them in simultaneous tension with one another (Simmons, 1998). Results of this study show a need to be, in a sense, in the world but not of it (John 17:16); it demonstrated that communication, contextual understanding, mission mindedness, professional development, and change leadership are all competencies that senior leaders need for effective leadership at CUS institutions. Managing Simmons’ (1998) “tension” means understanding the context of the world that students live in as academic leaders respond to changes in market trends. It means effectively communicating with peers, colleagues, students, and stakeholders how and why decisions are made within the institution. It can also be argued that a leader’s mission mindedness is the foundation from which these other competencies flow. Because of the rich foundation of CUS institutions, results from this study offer the potential to penetrate beyond basic professional development and arrive at a deeper understanding of mission.

**Findings: Research Question 2**

Making sense of the results from research question 2 is a bit more complex as opposed to the clarity demonstrated in the PCA from research question 1. Here, the study sought to find if differences existed, at an item level, between male and female respondents and also between
different classifications of employment within the institution. In this section, data are examined from perspectives of both employment classification and gender as a result of the multivariate analysis of variance.

**Employment classification.**

Within the employment classification variable, significant differences only existed within 2 of the theoretical constructs, factors 1 and 3. Within factor 1, items (24 and 39), “Engages multiple perspectives in decision-making,” and “demonstrates negotiation skills,” showed significant differences. A one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post-hoc was run to determine where the specific differences resulted. Findings indicate a significant difference at the .002 level in reporting between athletics and academics. For the third item, “Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives,” results indicated a significant difference at the .004 level, also between athletics and academics.

When examining differences in scores (noted on Table 5.8), academics scored both items higher than those in athletics at a significant level. All three items fall under the theoretical construct of *Communication* competency. At face value, both items refer to communication with other people, specifically dealing with differing opinions. Multiple perspectives implies hearing another side of a discussion, while negotiation implies working toward a unified agreement when differing opinions are at stake. With those in academics placing a higher value on such skills, one might conclude that leaders in athletics are more “set in their ways,” not as likely to discuss differences in opinions with others. Yet, both groups rated the items high enough to be retained as part of the communication competency. This may be attributable to the routine and structure that accompanies many athletic organizations – from practice to game planning – teams and groups often keep focused on singular goals with a set plan.
Factor 3 demonstrated that there is a statistically significant difference between those reporting in academics, athletics, and student affairs/campus ministry in terms of their overall perception of factor 3 items. A one-way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post-hoc was run to determine where the specific differences lie. Results indicated a significant difference at the .037 level in reporting between student affairs/campus ministry and academics for the item “Acts consistent with core values and integrity.” When examining differences in mean score (Table 5.9), results showed that those in academics reported a higher perception of importance for item 30 than those in student affairs/campus ministry. Yet, when examining mean scores for this item (30), it is important to remember that this item was the highest rated competency in the entire study. On the surface, one might assume that leaders in student affairs/campus ministry would rate “Acts consistent with core values and integrity” as high if not higher than those in academics. Such discrepancy may be due to the level of oversight required of many faculty under the direction of academic leaders. The review of curriculum, syllabi, department direction, and the like may encourage those in academics to be even more mindful of the institution’s core values as they are carried out in the classroom. Contrarily, those in student affairs/campus
ministry may have a more general approach to things like campus dining, entertainment, housing, etc that do not always inherently related directly to the institution’s mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts consistent with core values and integrity</td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Affairs / Campus Ministry</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the retained 33 items, only 4 were analyzed with significant differences between groups (12%). Of those 4, 3 showed some sort of explanatory reason for differences. Despite high confidence levels in all retained items, it would still appear that in general there is not much difference in perception of importance by classification level. The items of note (from factor 1) are worth discussion and possible future research. Particularly, the potential sensitive nature of items from factor 1 give reason to open additional dialogue with those involved in athletics on CUS campuses. Smith and Wolverton report, “leaders should be competent in both oral communication and writing and should engage multiple perspectives in decision making” (Wolverton & Smith, 2010, p.66). In addition, such differentiation supports theory put forth by Bakker-Pieper and de Vries (2010). In their study amongst leaders at public institutions, researchers found that both charismatic and human-oriented leadership styles are rooted in communication; and that communication is less regarded among task-oriented leadership which may be more managerial than leader. Athletics, it might be argued, is more task-oriented leadership arena than is academics or human-oriented.
Gender.

Within the gender variable, significant differences in perception of importance were found in 2 of the 5 factors (factors 1 and 4, Communication and Professional Development), and within 4 total items. Within the communication factor, significant differences were found in items “facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives” and “seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts.” Differences in scores are represented on Table 5.10. For each item, females reported higher scores than males. Scores here support theory put forth by Schreiner (2002). He notes that women continue to have perceptions about their position(s) in higher education, embracing a collaborative leadership style that can be misunderstood or disrespected, and at times, feeling out of sync with some male-dominated administrations.

Table 5.8 Differences in Perception of Importance by Gender for Items 45 and 54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</td>
<td>Male 4.29</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 4.66</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</td>
<td>Male 3.97</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 4.46</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within factor 4 (professional development) two items showed significant differences between genders, “encourages professional development” and “attentive to emerging trends in higher education.” Here again, females reported higher scores (Table 5.11) than their male colleagues. These 2 items proved difficult to analyze, but a reference by Bass (1990) may provide a modicum of insight. He notes that women are more likely than men to adjust or ‘modify’ their leadership characteristics as they move up or down the hierarchical leadership ladder. Within the professional development competency show that women favored items of
“development” and “attentiv[ness]” as higher than men. This may suggest that Bass’s findings continue to hold true, and that women are more readily accepting of changes needing to be made in order to advance or develop their career.

Table 5.9 Differences in Perception of Importance by Gender for Items 11 and 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive to emerging trends in higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations**

This study was limited to the perspective of leaders selected by the author as defined within this study. While there may be additional classifications of leaders at CUS institutions, this study replicated the selection criterion used by Smith and Wolverton (2010) and sought a similar group of recipients, only within the unique setting of CUS institutions. Moreover, with a somewhat low response rate of 27%, readers have a limited review of reported leadership competencies by CUS institutional leaders.

Additional specific limitations are as follows:

1. The study only sought to understand leadership competencies in Lutheran higher education, as assessed by the survey population. No claims were made regarding the leaders’ actions or behaviors that may relate to the assessed competencies.

2. The study did not test the relationship between competencies and actual institutional outcomes, but only defines those competencies that leaders from the survey population assess as important or frequently employed in the conduct of their work.
3. This study was limited to the self-reporting by survey recipients. The author of the study will follow appropriate procedure to ensure a maximum response rate.

4. This study did not seek to ascertain differences between the Smith and Wolverton (2010) study or the McDaniel (2002) study; rather, reported results only reflect data gathered from CUS leaders.

Implications

The implications of this study are practical as they inform leadership, both present and future, for those at Concordia University System (CUS) institutions. The purpose of this study was to replicate measures by Smith and Wolverton (2010), examining leadership competencies within the Concordia University System (CUS) institutions of higher education: to see whether or not competencies put forth by McDaniel (2002) factor in to a theoretical four-component model, and to explore whether or not variables such as gender or employment classification (i.e., an individual’s role within the institution) show significant differences in perception of leadership competencies.

The model put forth in this study for Concordia University System (CUS) institutions includes: (1) Communication, (2) Contextual Understanding, (3) Mission Mindedness, (4) Professional Development, and (5) Change Leadership. Any type of factor analysis can be scrutinized based on the subjective findings of the researcher, particularly on account of the naming of the latent constructs. Yet, with the specific factor loadings, especially those on component 3 (mission mindedness) a case can be made as to why each constructs works specifically with CUS institutions. Mission mindedness offers a strong relation to CUS institutions and their faith-based missions. Additionally, with items on this factor scoring with some of the highest means, this study can confidently state that attentiveness to institutional
mission is not simply a duty of governing boards, but also that of senior leaders at CUS institutions.

Existing literature did not include a leadership model that is specific to Lutheran institutions. By understanding a new, five-component leadership model for CUS institutions, leaders may be able to use the specific items and constructs put forth in this study to further develop existing leaders. Additionally, CUS institutions may choose to use the five-component model as a means to inform hiring practices throughout the classification groups used in this study. As an example, hiring managers may choose to frame interviews around the 5 components, asking questions about specific competencies needed to be effective at a specific position. Other analysis examining differences in perception of importance by classification and gender may also be of use in leadership development. Based on MANOVA findings, very few differences in perception of importance occurred at a significant level. Those that were significant seemed to make sense as they related to other literature, specifically among differences between those in athletics and those in academics. Overall, respondent shared perceptions more than they differed, and gleaning a cohesive competency set based on the data was clear.

**Future Research**

This study began with an interest in understanding leadership at CUS institutions. From the start, I had an interest in finding specific faith-based items that were necessary for effective leadership. When such a framework was not plausible, a strong model for leadership (HELC) was ultimately used to begin the process of understanding CUS leadership. The HELC model is rich, having been developed within the American Council for Education (ACE) by McDaniel (2002) and then quantified into a survey by Smith and Wolverton (2010). The groundwork laid
by these scholars gives researchers around the country a great starting point for understanding senior-level leadership at their own respective institutions. Yet, there are more questions that remain.

This study offers CUS institutions a framework for leadership within the theorized five-component model. It also offers some areas of specific differences between groups of leaders based on both employment classification and gender; differences this study deems worthy of conversation, but perhaps not action. Additional research may examine not simply differences between groups, but whether or not certain variables can also predict perception of leadership. This study began that work by identifying where differences existed.

Using the framework provided here, additional analysis may be suitable when examining the third component, mission mindedness. Even though a clear connection can be drawn to the faith-based nature of CUS institutions, specific faith-based items were not included in this study. Items often discussed at CUS leadership retreats such as fellowship, devotional life, prayer, etc. may need exploration as to how they connect with the items listed in this study.

It should also be noted that the HELC model provides a broad brush stroke when looking at the overall picture of the typical college campus. While attempts were made within the original and subsequent works to focus on specific department’s classifications, greater specificity is needed to truly examine independent areas. Using this study, future research might entail specific response items from classification groups. Additional qualitative analysis could be conducted within groups to determine if additional competencies not listed in this study are relevant for leadership at CUS institutions. It may come by such methodology that the desired faith-based competencies arise and could be added to the overall model for the CUS.
Other considerations for future research include the use of the HELC instrument within other faith-based institutions such as non-denominational Christian colleges, Jesuit universities, etc. Questions regarding differences in score reporting between institutional types or between faith-based and public institutions may also be considered, such as, how might existing HELC framework and findings compare to other religious systems?

Finally, such a leadership instrument – including the initial development as championed by McDaniel (2002) – may be suitable for different organizations as well as different levels of educational institutions. For example, at the time of this study the author’s role was a dean of students at an urban secondary school. One consideration for future research could be the development of a new set of competencies aimed at leadership of elementary or secondary school. It would also be important to keep in mind the mission of any schools being considered for such a study, as faith-based items may become an added component to the inventory.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to replicate measures by Smith and Wolverton (2010), examining leadership competencies within the Concordia University System (CUS) institutions of higher education: to see whether or not competencies put forth by McDaniel (2002) factor in to a theoretical four-component model, and to explore whether or not variables such as gender or employment classification (i.e., an individual’s role within the institution) show significant differences in perception of leadership competencies.

Research question 1 asked whether or not the HELC Inventory factored in to McDaniel’s schema of 4 latent constructs. Data were analyzed and revealed, not a four component model, but a five component model that included clear communalities within each theorized component. The model put forth in this study for CUS institutions included: (1) Communication, (2)
Contextual Understanding, (3) Mission Mindedness, (4) Professional Development, and (5) Change Leadership. Moreover, analysis called for the retention of items that scored at a factor loading of .4 or higher, meaning this study retained 33 inventory items in lieu of the original 59 as theorized by McDaniel.

Research question two asked if there were significant differences in perception of importance of HELC items by the variables of employment classification and gender. Of the retained 33 items, only four were analyzed with significant differences between groups (classification). Of those four, three showed some sort of explanatory reason for differences. Despite high confidence levels in all retained items, it still would appear that, in general, there is not much difference in perception of importance by classification level. Within the gender variable, significant differences in perception of importance were found in 2 of the 5 factors (factors 1 and 4, Communication and Professional Development), and within 4 total items. While challenging to analyze, results showed some level of differences that are supported by existing literature. Yet, with so few significant differences displayed, it is not reasonable to state that males and females view leadership, in general, differently.

This study has provided a cohesive model for higher education leadership competencies with CUS institutions and has drawn attention to the few distinct differences in perception of importance by job classification and gender. Still, this study is but one small step toward a closer analysis of CUS institutions, as such analysis has not existed before this time. Perhaps, leaders at the system level now have a starting point for a deeper look into the leadership of their senior leaders.
Appendix A

HELC Inventory Questionnaire and Demographic Questions

This survey has been designed to make responding to the items as easy as possible. You can change your responses to the items at any time before clicking on the "Done" button at the end of the survey.

If you are unable to complete the survey but would like to return to it at a later time, you may exit by clicking on the "exit this survey" button on the top right of any page. You may return to the survey by clicking on the link in your email at any time. PLEASE NOTE, YOU MUST USE THE SAME COMPUTER WHEN ACCESSING THE SURVEY FOR FUTURE COMPLETION.

OPENING PAGE:

The following questionnaire is part of a study on leadership competencies at Concordia University System institutions. This questionnaire is designed to identify competencies (knowledge, skills, and/or abilities) important for effective higher education leadership. Based on your current position as a higher education administrator or leader, please respond to the following questions.

Based on your own experiences, observations, perceptions, and/or beliefs, please rate the following competencies on their level of importance (1 = NOT IMPORTANT; 5 = VERY IMPORTANT) for effective higher education leadership

OPTIONS:
- Very Important
- Important
- Moderately Important
- Of Little Importance
- Not Important

Item #1. Develops partnerships with multiple constituent groups
Item #2. Learns from experience
Item #3. Relates well with governing boards
Item #4. Applies skills to affect decisions in government contexts
Item #5. Demonstrates understanding of advancement (e.g., fundraising, development, external relations, alumni relations, etc.)
Item #6. Fosters the development and creativity of learning organizations
Item #7. Demonstrates understanding of athletics
Item #8. Demonstrates understanding of technology
Item #9. Recognizes the values of a sense of humor
Item #10. Supports leadership of others
Item #11. Encourages professional development
Item #12. Presents self well professionally as a leader
Item #13. Demonstrates unselfish leadership
Item #14. Responds to issues and needs of contemporary students
Item #15. Learns from others
Item #16. Communicates vision effectively
Item #17. Demonstrates the capacity for lifelong learning
Item #18. Engages multiple units in decision making
Item #19. Demonstrates understanding of academics
Item #20. Builds effective teams
Item #21. Attentive to emerging trends in higher education
Item #22. Does not take self too seriously
Item #23. Demonstrates courage for educated risk-taking
Item #24. Engages multiple perspectives in decision making
Item #25. Embraces institutional culture
Item #26. Learns from self-reflection
Item #27. Demonstrates understanding of finance and budgeting
Item #28. Tolerates ambiguity
Item #29. Sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues
Item #30. Acts consistent with core values and integrity
Item #31. Applies listening skills to enhance communication in complex situations
Item #32. Communicates effectively
Item #33. Demonstrates inclusiveness in all environments
Item #34. Applies analytical thinking to enhance communication in complex situations
Item #35. Facilitates the change process
Item #36. Demonstrates resourcefulness
Item #37. Demonstrates understanding of student affairs
Item #38. Demonstrates ability to diplomatically engage in controversial issues
Item #39. Demonstrates negotiation skills
Item #40. Leverages institutional resources for maximum benefit
Item #41. Expresses views articulately in multiple forms of communication (oral, written, etc.)
Item #42. Works effectively with media
Item #43. Considers institutional culture in decision making
Item #44. Demonstrates understanding of the U.S. system of higher education
Item #45. Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts
Item #46. Demonstrates understanding of diversity
Item #47. Accurately assesses the costs and benefits of risk-taking
Item #48. Contributes to effective teamwork
Item #49. Demonstrates understanding of planning
Item #50. Understands impact on others
Item #51. Makes decisions consistent with institutional goals
Item #52. Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts
Item #53. Demonstrates understanding of legal issues
Item #54. Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives
Item #55. Demonstrates understanding of complex issues related to higher education
Item #56. Recognizes aspects of institutional culture
Item #57. Demonstrates understanding of leadership
Item #58. Responds appropriately to change
Item #59. Applies multiple skills to solve problems

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS:

Item #60. Which CUS institution do you work at?
   a. Concordia University – Irvine, CA
   b. Concordia University – Portland, OR
   c. Concordia University – Bronxville, NY
   d. Concordia University – Mequon, WI
   e. Concordia University – Seward, NE
   f. Concordia University – Chicago, IL
   g. Concordia University – Selma, AL
   h. Concordia University – St. Paul, MN
   i. Concordia University – Ann Arbor, MI
   j. Concordia University – Austin, TX

Item #61. Which of the following best describes your area/department of employment?
   a. Academics
   b. Athletics
   c. Student Affairs/Campus Ministry

Item #62. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

CLOSING PAGE:

Thank you. You have now completed the survey.
## Appendix B

### Retained Competency Items by Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fosters the development and creativity of learning organizations</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Encourages professional development</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Presents self well professionally as a leader</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Demonstrates unselfish leadership</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Engages multiple units in decision making</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Attentive to emerging trends in higher education</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Demonstrates courage for educated risk-taking</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Engages multiple perspectives in decision making</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Embraces institutional culture</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Learns from self-reflection</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tolerates ambiguity</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Acts consistent with core values and integrity</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Applies listening skills to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Applies analytical thinking to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Facilitates the change process</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Demonstrates resourcefulness</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of student affairs</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Demonstrates negotiation skills</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Considers institutional culture in decision making</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the U.S. system of higher education</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Accurately assesses the costs and benefits of risk-taking</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Contributes to effective teamwork</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of planning</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Understands impact on others</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Makes decisions consistent with institutional goals</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of legal issues</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of complex issues related to higher education</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Recognizes aspects of institutional culture</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of leadership</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

### Retained Competency Items with Factor-Loaded Scores and Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple units in decision making</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple perspectives in decision making</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustains productive relationships and networks with colleagues</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands impact on others</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to effective teamwork</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates negotiation skills</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of planning</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of legal issues</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of the U.S. system of higher education</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of complex issues related to higher education</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns from self-reflection</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates resourcefulness</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of student affairs</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies analytical thinking to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embraces institutional culture</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers institutional culture in decision making</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes aspects of institutional culture</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions consistent with institutional goals</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts consistent with core values and integrity</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents self well professionally as a leader</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages professional development</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates unselfish leadership</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of leadership</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies listening skills to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive to emerging trends in higher education</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates courage for educated risk-taking</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately assesses the costs and benefits of risk-taking</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates ambiguity</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters the development and creativity of learning organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates the change process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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