

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE
MID-LEVEL LEADERS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by
MELANIE FLANDERS

Dr. Glenn E. Good, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2008

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE MID-LEVEL LEADERS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION

presented by Melanie Flanders,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Glenn E. Good, PhD, Advisor & Committee Chair

Mary Heppner, PhD

Gregory Holliday, PhD

Andrew Knoop, PhD

Paul Pitchford, PhD

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank a number of people who helped support me throughout this research project as well as those who have provided me with support throughout my time in graduate school. First, I would like to thank Greg Holliday for his unwavering support over the last seven years. I likely would not have applied to a doctoral program without Greg's guidance and substantial contributions to my professional and academic development. Thank you, Greg for your advocacy and for all you have done for me over the years. I am abundantly grateful. I would also like to thank Glenn Good for being the "dream advisor" that all students hope to have. Glenn, you have been flexible but firm, amazingly responsive and continually provided me with great advice and encouragement. I am forever appreciative for your willingness to serve in this role.

Next, I would like to thank Ken Hutchinson and Blake Danuser, for their willingness to invest in me and for providing me with so many opportunities for growth and development over the past four years. Thank you for your support of this project from the very beginning. It has been wonderful to contribute to a project that hopefully will give back to a program and an organization I have really enjoyed working for over the last four years. I also want to show my great appreciation to Mary Heppner for her support of my research project. Mary's guidance and structured course truly helped propel this project to another level. I also want to thank all of my committee members for their flexibility even when my plans changed and their ongoing support throughout my journey.

Last but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family, Mom, Dad, Lindsey, Ryan and Pete for standing by me throughout this process. You have been extremely patient and understanding throughout my time in graduate school. I am so grateful for your love, encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	5
PART I: LEADERSHIP: CHANGES WORLDWIDE AND WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION.....	5
Contemporary Perspectives on Leadership.....	5
Human Capital in Today’s Organizations: The Primary Asset.....	5
Changes in Higher Education.....	8
Climate and Context of Leadership in Higher Education.....	10
The Future of Higher Education.....	10
Definitions of Academic Leadership.....	11
Lack of Training for Mid-Level Leaders.....	12
PART II: LEADERSHIP THEORY.....	17
General Overview.....	17
Theories of Leadership.....	17
Leadership Can Be Developed.....	23
Professional Development.....	24
Competency-based Leadership.....	25
PART III: LEADERSHIP & LOMINGER INTERNATIONAL.....	26
Views of Lombardo and Eichinger.....	26
The Leadership Architect Assessment Suite.....	28
Success Profiles.....	28

PART IV: COMPETENCY MODELING.....	31
Historical Progression from Job Analysis to Competency Modeling.....	31
Competency Models vs. Job Analysis	34
Job Analysis and Competency Modeling Task Force (JACMTF)	35
Definitions of Competency Model	36
Leverage Competencies	38
Why Create A Competency Model?.....	39
Growing Use of Competency Models.....	41
Competency Models as a Component of Organizational Training Efforts.....	41
Criticism of Competency Modeling	43
How to Create a Competency Model.....	46
Use of Focus Groups.....	47
Existing Competency Models and Programming for Mid-level Leaders	48
Conclusions and Research Goals.....	50
Chapter 3: Methods	52
Participants	53
Instruments	56
Procedures	60
Data Synthesis and Statistical Analyses.....	64
Chapter 4: Results	66
Most Important Competencies	66
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	71
Understanding the Most Important Competencies	71

Linking the Findings with Existing Theory	74
Limitations	79
Future Research	80
Summary and Implications.....	81
References.....	83
Appendix A: Letter to ALDP Alumni participants for phase I.....	93
Appendix B: Follow Up Email to Alumni Participants in phase I.....	94
Appendix C: Phase I Focus Group Informed Consent.....	95
Appendix D: Phase II - Letter to Subject Matter Experts.....	97
Appendix E: Phase II – Subject Matter Experts Informed Consent	98
Appendix F: Phase III - Email to Potential Survey Participants	100
Appendix G: Follow up Email	101
Appendix H: Survey Informed Consent.....	102
Appendix I: Demographic Section and Directions from Survey.....	103
Appendix J: Competency Glossary.....	105
VITA.....	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.....	67
Table 2.....	68
Table 3.....	69
Table 4.....	70

Chapter 1: Introduction

Our nation is rapidly changing in terms of demographics, stated values and economic behavior due to globalization (Clark & Clark, 1990; Morley, 2003). Leaders of today are faced with the many challenges of this ever-changing environment.

Organizations are realizing their biggest asset is their human capital. Michaels, Handfield-Jones, and Axelrod (2001) identify the current battle for intelligent leaders as the “war for talent.” Businesses note the need to not only select intelligent, creative, and expansive thinkers but also to recognize the importance of developing their high potential employees (Hill, 2005). Higher education is slowly beginning to implement employee development initiatives but still lags behind the current efforts of businesses and corporations.

These national and international changes have a major impact upon education. Indeed, some scholars describe the current climate of higher education as a “turbulent environment” (Middlehurst, 2002). Expectations from parents and students have increased while public confidence in higher education is lower than usual (Rhodes, 1998). The changing educational climate has a particularly large impact upon academic administrators. Academic administrators are scrambling to find outside funding sources due to the widespread decreases in state funding. These economic changes affect the amount of time spent interacting with the community outside of the university. Administrators are balancing their time with more constituents and juggling competing demands seeking to keep everyone content.

Nonetheless, only a few institutions have created and offered training or development opportunities for these individuals. A few organizations have been

identified that provide training and development programs to their administrative employees. For example schools such as the University of Missouri and the University of Minnesota provide training programs specifically focused on mid-level academic leaders (University of Minnesota, 2008).

A number of assessment tools are available to assist in training and development efforts. Recently, “360 degree” assessments have been developed that specifically focus on leadership skills as well as workplace or “on the job” behaviors and skills (e.g. Lominger’s VOICES 360 assessment tool). In 360 assessments, individuals are rated by their superiors, direct reports, peers, and clients (i.e., from all perspectives). In addition, individuals rate themselves. Results are compiled in such a way that confidentiality is protected for all of the rater groups. Individuals are then able to compare how they view themselves with how others view them. Additional tools such as card sorts or online assessments or surveys are also available to help leaders get feedback on a particular set of leadership skills, behaviors or competencies.

Leadership development initiatives are typically initiated by evaluating the current or prospective individuals’ leadership skills. After assessment, a trained professional provides feedback to the individual or organizational group. Next, ideally, individuals or organizations create a plan of action to strengthen their skills or to identify ways to compensate for skill deficits. Development initiatives often include workshops, seminars, training institutes, or one-on-one individual coaching.

The goal of this research study is to create a competency model that provides institutions of higher education with a set of competencies viewed as highly important for success for those employed in the position of director (director, assistant director,

associate director). The competency model for directors has been derived from the results of six focus groups with mid-level leaders, one focus group with upper level administrators serving as subject matter experts and a survey sent to approximately 500 individuals holding the title of director, assistant director or associate director across four campuses of a Midwestern university system.

The focus group participants in phases I and II were asked to rank Lominger's 67 positive competencies as "critical", "important", and "not important for success" for directors working in higher education. Because the Lominger list of competencies was mostly identified in the private/business sector, the present research team acknowledged there may be certain competencies required for success that are unique to higher education. Thus, focus group participants were invited to add any additional competencies they viewed as critical for success for a director in higher education. This process yielded two new competencies that were suggested by focus group members, discussed with other focus group members, and then refined by the research team.

Ratings of the competencies were compiled and analyzed. After the results were collected from the seven focus groups, a survey was created. This survey consisted of the top 32 (of 67 total) competencies rated most critical for success by all focus group participants from both phase I and II. The two new competencies identified by focus group participants were included for a total of 34 competencies in the survey.

The survey was created to examine the model created by focus group attendees. The survey was completed by 149 individuals within the Midwestern university system. The survey results were then compared with the focus group results to finalize the competency model. As has been the case with competency models for other positions, it

is hoped that beginning the process of creating a competency model for mid-level leaders will help institutions of higher education in succession planning, hiring, and in the development and delivery of effective professional development activities for directors.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Part I: Leadership: Changes worldwide and within higher education

Contemporary Perspectives on Leadership

Things are quite different today than they were decades ago. Our everyday workplace behavior has been greatly influenced by the use of technology. The internet has changed the way business is conducted and created possibilities many never knew would exist. International trade relations are changing and morphing into something we have never seen: a global marketplace. As globalization is occurring internationally, this drives change in the domestic economic behavior as well (Morley, 2003). The U.S. is rapidly changing in its demographics. Our nation is also demonstrating significant changes in many of its stated values (Clark & Clark, 1990). Not only is economic behavior affected but workplace behavior and practices are being driven to “think globally” in order to survive. Morley points out “While globalization appears to be isomorphic, it also means that the same systems and structures are being applied to a diverse set of local and organizational settings, with unequal outcomes and consequences” (p. 3). Two significant impacts of globalization are the widespread use of the internet and the increased speed and expansive reach of information flow. These international changes are also having a significant impact on academia.

Human Capital in Today’s Organizations: The Primary Asset

“All over this country, in corporations and government agencies, there are millions of executives who imagine that their place on the organization chart has given them a body of followers. And of course, it hasn’t. It has given them subordinates. Whether the subordinates become followers depends on whether the executives act like leaders.”

–John Gardner (Clark & Clark, 1990, introduction)

Leadership practice in contemporary organizations involves increasing complexity and uncertainty (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001). Leaders are continually challenged to develop innovative, authentic, and effective methods for improving organizational effectiveness. Often leaders face situations in which the organization presents contradictory imperatives (Margolis & Walsh, 2003), leaving the leader to sort out complex social and moral dilemmas (Dawes, 1980). Leaders who have the ability to act or react effectively to such challenging situations separate themselves from the crowd. Michaels, Handfield-Jones, and Axelrod (2001) have deemed the present state of competition for talented workers in today's market as a "War for Talent" (p. 165).

Theorists suggest that the challenges of contemporary work environments must be met with creative, expansive and authentic thinkers (e.g., Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004). Such individuals must be able to consider the impact of their decisions not only on themselves, those immediately surrounding them and within their organization, but also on the greater good of the society they work in (Sternberg, 1998). Many organizations recognize the need for developing such leaders within their organization but struggle to find an effective way to do so.

The challenges current leaders face are different from those encountered by leaders 20 years ago. In years past, young adults went to college, selected a field of study, graduated, and began their career. Currently, it is unusual for people to remain in one job throughout their working years. Few organizations and few employees are making long term commitments to one another. Hence, both need to focus on the continual development of their own and their employee's skills. Once a person is

working in an organization they would like to work in for awhile, they must consider the fact that seniority no longer provides security for the long term (Calabrese, 2000).

The United Kingdom (UK) has taken this idea and turned it into a nation-wide initiative. “Investors in People,” an initiative aimed at fulfilling the government’s learning and skills priority, was based upon the belief that: “employers must invest in the skills their businesses need by actively pursuing and supporting improved performance from their employees” (Thackwray, 2003, p. 92). The government’s goal is to encourage businesses to make effective investments in their human assets.

Investors in People appears to have become embedded in the culture of many organizations in the region. Research shows that 94 percent of the employees within the Investors in People-focused organizations are satisfied with their jobs as compared to 37 percent in the businesses who fall below the national Investors in People standard. Additionally, 80 percent of the Investor in People organizations have increased customer satisfaction and 70 percent have improved their competitive edge and productivity (Thackwray, 2003).

As illustrated by this example, more and more organizations are realizing the importance of investing in employees. Employees who are able to meet current organizational needs, while at the same time preparing for what will be needed from them on their future assignments, are highly desirable. Research shows that top performers can have up to 12 times greater productivity than average performers across a number of fields (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2005; Pfeffer, 1998). Employers who provide their employees with development opportunities decrease their organization’s turnover rates (Lombardo & Eichinger).

Changes in Higher Education

“There is no doubt that America’s universities are caught in a paradox: public expectations have rarely been higher, public confidence and support rarely lower.” (Rhodes, 1998, p. 4)

Higher education is operating within what some scholars call a “turbulent environment” (Middlehurst, 2002). Higher education is experiencing increased competition, increased expectations from students and parents, increased internet use, and a push for more flexible models of learning. Higher education is challenged by an increase in accountability measures as well as the “commercialization of higher education” (Middlehurst, p. 23). Due to decreases in state funding, there has been an increase in entrepreneurial activity and the generation of non-state income for many institutions of higher education (Middlehurst). A current burden within higher education is the increased competition for both funding and students (Tucker, 1992). Potentially driven by this trend, is the increase in pressure for efficiency in management of colleges and universities.

Middlehurst (2002) asserts that all universities need to take international developments into account because of the impact they will have on national policies and institutional practices. Most universities carry out a range of international activities such as teaching (bringing in students from other countries or exporting them via study abroad programs), research (international research collaborations), knowledge sharing, and cultural exchanges. In each of these different contexts, standards of practice may be set internationally (Middlehurst).

With the internet and widespread offering of online classes, students are increasingly demanding flexible teaching patterns. The internet also provides the

opportunity for increased “policy borrowing” across institutions thousands of miles apart (Morley, 2003). Leaders across the nation can exchange ideas and provide support for one another via blogs on the internet and website postings. As suggested by Rhodes’ (1998) earlier quote, institutions of higher education are caught in a tough position. More specifically, expectations for performance and advancement are greatly increasing while support in the forms of financial and the public’s confidence in the institution are greatly decreasing.

Public criticism of higher education focuses on many different areas. Many people complain that tuition is unreasonably high. With decreases in state and federal funding, students and their families have had to cope with tuition increases. Some people point out that undergraduate teaching on many campuses has been neglected, while research receives much more attention from faculty members (Rhodes, 1998). Other critics focus on visible conflicts of interest in university settings. While some people are concerned about the preaching of politics, there are just as many people that view “political correctness” as a major imposition in education. These many different complaints about higher education indicate the difficult climate within which university employees must operate.

Although criticisms abound, most people acknowledge the great value that institutions of higher education provide our nation (Rhodes, 1998). However imperfect the system may be, graduates walk away with substantial earning advantages that demonstrate the increased economic opportunities provided by higher education (Rhodes). Universities have improved their inclusivity and openness to a variety of programs of study and research. They demonstrate a deliberate commitment to equal

access and social mobility. Rhodes argues that universities are no longer “ivory towers,” instead they are embedded in the society that surrounds them and reflect society’s membership. Not only are faculty and administrators more involved in the community, but students are as well. Students are going to school while working in the community and often their academic programs include internships, practica, or field experiences that benefit society as well as the student.

Climate and Context of Leadership in Higher Education

This difficult climate and environmental context places numerous demands on university administrators and employees. Mid-level leaders must face the difficult challenge of trying to keep constituents happy while responding to constant organizational changes and challenges. These leaders must be able to navigate simultaneously through the political maze. It is a political environment because those in the position of director must work well with their own direct reports, faculty, students, as well as upper level administrators to get their work done. Around the globe, national governments are encouraging institutions to become more diverse while at the same time espousing policies for accountability which cultivate broadly convergent responses from institutions (Gordon, 2003).

The Future of Higher Education

The future of higher education is also important to examine when developing leaders within the institution. Lees (2006) forecasts that student recruitment and retention will continue to be a challenge for institutions of higher education. University administrators are pressured not only to fulfill their responsibilities for on campus activities but also to engage in off campus activities to improve their unit’s image and

productivity (Lees). In particular, Gordon (2003) notes that relationships with outside organizations are increasingly important due to reductions in government support.

Research indicates that administrators are more important than any other factor (such as structure, age, institution type) in their impact on organizational effectiveness (Whetten & Cameron, 1995).

An awareness of the current turbulent times in academia has combined with the need for continual professional development for advancement of one's career.

Pennington and Smith (2002) argue universities must become "learning organizations" which they define as "an infrastructure and culture which values and actively seeks out opportunities to enhance every employee's performance through a wide range of formal and informal mechanisms" (p. 265). Therefore, it is argued simply creating sporadic, disjointed professional development opportunities will not be sufficient for success.

Organizations must espouse value in continual learning and growth and create opportunities for employees that are sequential, connected and part of a larger learning vision.

Definitions of Academic Leadership

In the changing academic environment, a variety of definitions about the construct of academic leadership have been offered. Additionally, in recent years leadership and management have been defined as two distinct constructs. Leadership is often associated with creating vision, inspiring and motivating others, while management is associated with establishing systems and day-to-day operations to accomplish tasks efficiently and effectively (Gordon, 2003). Gold (2002) points out that "management," "leadership," and "administration" are used and defined differently in different countries (p. 91). When

defining academic leadership, some include administrative-type responsibilities and some do not. There is often an overlap among the definitions of leader, administrative and management roles. For example, in conceptualizing academic leadership, Yorke (2001) appears to include both vision-making and motivating others, as well as the day-to-day administrative duties as essential academic leadership skills. Gold defines a manager in higher education as “someone who works with other academics, researchers, and administrators to ensure that knowledge is produced, reproduced and disseminated effectively” (p. 91).

Lucas (1994) argues that transformational leadership used in academia presents significantly more potential than transactional leadership. An important distinction can be made: transactional leaders attempt to maintain the status quo while transformational leaders move the organization toward a shared vision (Lucas).

Bergquist (1992) contends that managers’ skill can be determined by how they operate within various cultural contexts, and identifies four dominant cultures of the academy: collegial, managerial, negotiating, and developmental. He proposes that managers need to have the ability to flexibly switch from one culture to another as circumstances dictate. In other words, administrators have to operate within each of these cultures at one time or another -- with more effective leaders assessing the situation accurately and determining which skill(s) most appropriately get the aim accomplished. Berquist contends that having this flexibility is the true sign of an effective academic leader.

Lack of Training for Mid-Level Leaders

“Since organizations today must continually revitalize and transform themselves to sustain success, there are simply too many change initiatives

required at any given time to leave change management to top and senior management.” (Hill, 2005, p. 27)

Not only are administrators within higher education dealing with constantly changing environments, they also often enter their leadership positions with little or no formal training in leadership or administrative functions (Lees, 2006). Many incoming mid-level leaders learn how to do their job by watching others in their unit and asking those who have done the job before them.

Rosser (2000) defines mid-level administrators as “either academic or nonacademic support personnel within the structure of higher education organizations” (p. 5). Mid-level leaders are not typically classified as faculty and thus often do not have the protection of tenure (Rosser). Their positions are often vulnerable to budget cuts. Employees in these positions typically report to a top-level officer, administrator or dean. Mid-level leaders are often identified by the units in which they work. Rosser (2000) reports that mid-level administrators make up approximately 28 percent of the full-time staff within postsecondary institutions while faculty make up 31 percent and 8 percent are executives (Rosser, 2000). While this population is very close in size to the number of faculty, they are often the overlooked “unsung heroes” of higher education (Rosser).

Many mid-level leaders are promoted into their positions because of hard work, technical skills, and interpersonal skills (Rosser). They often do not have career paths that are direct or structured as faculty positions. Mid-level leaders are often considered loyal, skilled, and critical to the institutions’ vitality. An especially frustrating aspect of most mid-level administrative positions is the fact that these individuals are expected to enforce, monitor and regulate policies and procedures, but they rarely have a voice in creating, adjusting or developing these same policies and practices.

Existing Training Initiatives for Mid-Level Positions

The following section presents a review of the current training programs available to mid-level leaders in higher education. Because few training programs were found that are focused solely on mid-level leaders in higher education, some programs that cater to the private sector are presented along with information pertaining to the specific competencies these programs address when seeking to develop mid-level leaders.

Mid-level leaders, such as directors, play an important role linking their direct reports (often called individual contributors in the private sector) and their bosses, typically called executives (in business) or upper-level administrators (in higher education). Mid-level leaders are often asked to translate organizational strategies and objectives into results critical to organizations' success (Personnel Decisions International (PDI), 2003). Mid-level leaders are often asked to do more with less, to empower team members, to think strategically, and to plan and implement changes (PDI, 2003).

In DeJongh's (2007) presentation of a leadership pipeline, specific positions are outlined throughout the pipeline. The mid-level leader is sandwiched among five other levels of employees. The sequence begins with the individual contributor who is followed by: front line leader, mid-level leader, business unit leader, senior executive, and chief executive. While parallels can be drawn to higher education, it is obviously a model more catered to those working in industries other than education.

The University of Wisconsin School of Business offers a Mid-Management Development certificate via their Executive Education Program. It does not appear that a competency model, a model that identifies the most important competencies necessary

for success in a given job, is used or has been created by this organization. Also, while the courses are targeted for mid-management positions, it does not highlight skills or competencies necessary for success specifically in higher education recruiting (Executive Education, 2008). The marketing for the program appears to focus on drawing managers from the private industry to the courses.

The Institute for Community College Development has recently created a 360 assessment tool for use with community colleges. This assessment has been created for use with the Gravitational Leadership program, a leadership development program that focuses on developing community college leaders' competencies in five core areas: communication, collaboration, project management, professionalism, and ethics (Institute for Community College Development, 2007). The Community College 360 Leadership Assessment is currently being pilot tested with a small group.

The Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) center provides workshops and resources specifically focused on the evaluation of academic administrators (IDEA Center, 2007). In sum, it appears that some evaluation of academic leadership is occurring on campuses as an internal initiative while other institutions are using external resources to aid in the evaluation of their academic leadership.

Hill (2005) points out that companies renowned for their managerial talent have moved from "selection of the fittest" to "development of the fittest" approaches (p. 29). This reflects the notion that strong leaders may be more effectively developed than selected. Nevertheless, Hill suggests that developing leaders is a daunting task for higher education. This sentiment may be responding in part to the lack of resources allocated for leadership development in higher education. The corporate business world has made

significant progress with its leadership development programs; most large corporations provide internal leadership institutes or programming for selection and development purposes (e.g., Best Buy, Target, Motorola). In essence, many corporations provide their new managers with an array of learning opportunities as well as informal coaching and formal performance appraisals (Hill). However, higher education has yet to offer their administrators a comparable “menu of options” for to development and leadership.

A professional network called The Chair Academy provides leadership training to post-secondary leaders (The Chair Academy, 2008). While the name may infer a focus on department chairs, the program advertises its offerings to a wide range of academic leaders in higher education. This organization offers a year-long leadership development program for academic leaders worldwide.

Lastly, there are a few institutions of higher education that are implementing research and development efforts for their employees at the mid-level. For example, the University of Missouri system currently offers an annual leadership development program focused solely on developing mid-level leaders. Started in 2004, upper-level administrators report it to be a great success. Similarly, the University of Minnesota has conducted research on academic leadership. Their Office of Human Resources provides numerous training and development workshops and seminars as well as leadership programming specifically focused on managers (University of Minnesota (UMN). (2008). Both of these university leadership programs are only available to employees of their respective university systems.

Part II: Leadership Theory

General Overview

“Leaders must become the chief critics of their own organization and the chief architects of needed change.” (Clark & Clark, 1990, p. 31)

Many scholars have sought to understand leadership and leadership development. Leadership theories have attempted to break down the concept into smaller, more understandable parts. However, for every leadership theory, there is a corresponding critique, with no widely agreed upon standard.

Theorists (Sternberg & Vroom, 2002; Zaccaro, 2007) continue to debate and discuss that two different perspective of leader studies exist and both are important. One perspective focuses on who the leader is and the other focuses on what the leader does to be effective. Recently researchers have identified traits that promote individuals’ ability to adapt their behavior depending on the situation. Therefore, situational behavior change is necessary and researchers contend that certain traits make people more capable of matching appropriate leader behavior to a wide-ranging scope of situations (McCrae & Costa, 1987; Zaccaro, 2001, 2002).

Theories of Leadership

Scholars differ in the ways that they define, operationalize, and study leadership. This section provides an overview of some of the major approaches to leadership. The discussion includes an overview of schools of leadership such as trait school of leadership, behavioral school of leadership, contingency school of leadership, relational school of leadership, skeptics of leadership, information-processing school of leadership, and transformational school of leadership. While most leadership scholars would argue that an exact formula to describe a perfect leader has not been deduced, large strides have

been made in identifying different key pieces of the leadership puzzle. The discussion of these theories or approaches to leadership is intended to provide a synthesis of ideas of the main schools of leadership and to provide an overview of the various perspectives.

Trait School of Leadership. The trait school of leadership began in the early 1900s. This school is based on the “great man” perspective (perhaps less sexistly referred to as the “great person” perspective in current times), which held that “certain stable characteristics or traits differentiate leaders from non-leaders” (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004, p. 6). Researchers using this perspective focus on personality traits associated with leadership. However, reviews conducted in the 1940s and 1950s were critical of this approach (Secord & Backman, 1974; Stogdill, 1948). Pessimistic interpretations of the data from these reviews concluded that trait theory might not be the most accurate way of differentiating leaders from non-leaders with few stable differences found between leaders and non-leaders (Secord & Backman; Zaccaro, 2007). In addition, the traits and characteristics identified were not stable across situations (Van Wart, 2005). However, a later reanalysis of the original data conducted in the 1980s found intelligence to be strongly correlated with leadership, therefore supporting a resurgence in interest in the trait theory of leadership (Antonakis et al.).

Recent perspectives on trait theory have moved away from the notion that traits are purely heritable personality characteristics, instead conceptualizing leader traits as cognitive abilities, social and problem-solving skills, expertise, motives, values and some personality characteristics (Zaccaro, 2007). In an interesting twist to the trait theory, findings suggest that models that integrate combinations of traits and attributes in conceptually meaningful ways are more likely to predict leadership than are the

independent contributions of multiple traits (Zaccaro). Most contingency researchers acknowledge the great impact situational context has on leader behavior and effectiveness. As a result, while some theorists still contend that leaders' traits account for a considerable amount of variance in leaders' effectiveness, most theorists also acknowledge the importance of the situation and its impact on leaders' success (Zaccaro).

Behavioral School of Leadership. During the same era in which the trait theory of leadership was (temporarily in some people's views) discredited, a behavioral school of leadership developed. The broader behavioral emphasis of the 1950s heavily influenced this theory of leadership. Researchers studied leader behaviors, often in laboratory settings, or by having leaders' subordinates describe their leaders' behaviors (Likert, 1961; Shartle, 1951). Researchers categorized leader behavior into two main categories: (a) people-oriented or considerate behaviors and (b) task-oriented or initiating structure behaviors (Van Wart, 2005). These categories proved useful when training leaders. However, as more data was collected and further studies completed, inconsistencies were again found in the results. As with the trait theory, studies yielded contradictory findings and leadership theory was once again in flux (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004).

Contingency School of Leadership. In the 1960s, the contingency school of leadership emerged. This perspective viewed the effectiveness of leaders as being determined by leader-member relations, task structure, and the leading position of power. Fiedler (1978) was credited with developing the main contingency theory within this school. He felt that the leader-member relationship was much more important than the task structure (Fiedler). The contingency model predicts that:

leaders who are more relationship oriented will be more effective than task-focused leaders in moderate situational control, whereas leaders who are more focused on task than on interpersonal relationships will be more effective in both high- and low-control situations (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004, p. 155).

Unlike models reviewed earlier, this model has been supported across many empirical studies. The model has been studied mostly at the group level of analysis, yet its design also allows versatility at the individual level of analysis. Furthermore, independent lines of research have reached a similar conclusion (e.g. Bales, 1958; Stogdill, 1948). Thus one current view is that the quality of management can be determined by (a) behavior focused on task accomplishment, and (b) behavior centered on relationships. Scholars supporting this theory argue that both sets of these behaviors are important to be an effective leader (Lanyon & Goodstein, 1997). This model continues to expand and evolve today.

Relational School of Leadership. The relational school of leadership was the next movement within leadership theory that generated substantial research. Based on the leader member exchange (LMX) theory, this movement focused on leader-member interactions and the relations of leaders with their followers (Antonakis et al., 2004). Trust and mutual respect were found in high-quality leader relations while low-quality leadership was rooted in “satisfaction of contractual obligations” (Antonakis et al., p. 8).

Skeptics of Leadership. During the 1970s and 1980s, leadership research was widely criticized. Much of the research up to this point had been derived from questionnaires in which individuals rated leaders or leadership traits and behaviors. This

method of data collection was challenged by skeptics who argued that responses to questionnaires may be tainted by the implicit leadership theories of raters (Antonakis et al., 2004). It was also argued that the actual outcomes of the performance of groups may skew the outcomes of a leaders' effectiveness. For example, if a soccer coach is leading the team into a tournament, the soccer players may rate the coach poorly in leadership skills just because the team lost the tournament. The coach may have actually led quite well, but the outcome was hampered by having a team with comparatively little athletic talent. However, if given questionnaires, skeptics of certain leadership research might argue that the ratings may not be rating the coach's true leadership skills. In other words, it may be too difficult to tease out the variable influencing the actual performance of the team. These skeptics also argued that evaluations of leaders may reflect individuals' desire to assign causes to organizational outcomes rather than actual leadership skills (Antonakis et al.).

Many arguments of the skeptics school have been countered by more recent leadership research. Nevertheless, this perspective advanced the study of leadership by pushing researchers to use more rigorous methods. It also helped researchers focus on the attitudes of followers (Antonakis et al., 2004). These studies provided a strong foundation for the next school, information processing.

Information Processing School of Leadership. This area of leadership theory emerges from the information processing theory of cognitive development, which focuses on cognition and how minds acquire, retrieve, and store information (Shaffer, 1999). In the same light, the information processing school of leadership focuses on how individuals recognize and attend to these processes (acquisition, retrieval and storage) to

function and adapt to their current context. This school of thought defines leadership in terms of influence, yet it also focuses on examining the cognitive mechanisms that have an impact upon process. This school examines the ways in which leaders and followers construct their reality and how they make decisions based on their perceptions of reality (Antonakis et al., 2004).

Transformational School of Leadership. Burns (1978) introduced the theory of transformational/transactional leadership in relation to political leadership. However, his theory was used in the field of psychology to evaluate and better understand leaders. Bass (1985) and others built upon this concept of transformational/visionary leaders who transcend their personal interests for the greater good of society. The concept of transformational leaders was illustrated by placing them in juxtaposition to transactional leaders. Specifically, many of the descriptions of leadership up until this point were argued to be describing more transactional or some would say managerial leadership (Van Wart, 2005).

Burn's (1978) book on transformational leadership pushed leadership analysts to expand their theories and studies to leaders at the top of large organizations. Prior to this point, many leadership studies were conducted in experimental contexts employing small-group and simplified-variable models (Van Wart, 2005). The transformational theory helped people identify factors that contributed to executives or national political leaders being effective in their influence over the masses.

Throughout the development and analysis of these theories, some important conclusions have emerged. First of all, leaders do not exist in a vacuum. However badly a person wants to lead, they will not become a leader until they have an adequate group

of followers (Bennis, 2007). This consensus of followers often shape or are shaped by the situation at hand. While a situation is not the only factor needed to create strong leadership, it is definitely one among many that needs to be considered. While the situation can drive leaders to act in certain ways, some personality traits or characteristics predict a portion of the variance in leadership effectiveness. Rather than condense leadership into a trait model or a situational model, many theorists are creating system models that incorporate elements of many of the previous models. For example, Sternberg's (2007) WICS model of leadership argues *wisdom, intelligence and creativity* are the three important components of leadership, and they must be *synthesized* in order to create effective leadership. In other words, the WICS model is founded on the notion that an individual must have these three components working together in order to be an effective leader (Sternberg, 2007). In discussing wisdom, Sternberg (2004) states "an individual is wise to the extent he or she uses successful intelligence and experience, moderated by values, to (a) seek to reach a common good; (b) balance intrapersonal (one's own), interpersonal (others'), and extrapersonal (organizational/institutional/spiritual) interests over the short and long term; and (c) adapt to, shape, and select environments" (p. 112). Sternberg (2004) emphasizes that wise leaders do not just consider their own interests but they also skillfully balance the interests of their followers, their organization and their own interests.

Leadership Can Be Developed

In order to create effective leaders who thrive in challenging and diverse organizational settings, organizations must find innovative approaches to develop individuals who are capable of addressing problems from multiple perspectives,

effectively communicating with those around them, wholeheartedly engaging themselves in the work they do, and working collectively to face challenges. Ruvolo, Peterson and LeBoeuf (2004) share several conclusions from the 2001 Global Leadership Conference:

First, leader development activities are critical to organizational success. Second, leader development programs must be grounded in a framework of developmental theories and principles. Third, an organizational culture that reinforces leader development is crucial for such initiatives to succeed (p. 10).

Within the US, billions of dollars are spent each year on leadership development programs in businesses, government agencies, universities, and within the public and private school systems. The national and international focus on leadership development provides strong support for the notion that leadership is something that can be taught.

While a great amount of energy and financial resources are being devoted to leadership development, few organizations conduct it in the same way. There are self-help books on how to become a leader, leadership institutes, leadership coaches, leadership assessments and so on. One doesn't need a certificate or license to write a book about "how to become a leader," therefore, a wide spectrum of quality is also represented in the training materials currently available.

Professional Development

Contemporary organizations desiring to improve their leadership face the challenge of identifying a model or theory to drive their development efforts. A vast array of literature exists on how to become an effective leader. How does one discern the worthwhile from the trivial? As Wolfe (1980) stated, "Educating for professional competence has never been an easy, straight-forward process" (p. 13). High quality

professional development in educational settings has been defined by Speck and Knipe (2005) as “a sustained collaborative learning process that systematically nourishes adult learner-centered, job-embedded processes” (p. 4). Activities within a learning community must be a combination of concrete experiencing, reflective observation, and abstract conceptualization (Wolfe). Wolfe states, “These three processes provide a basis for understanding the phenomena with which one must deal in professional life” (p. 13). Wolfe emphasizes that understanding is not enough: “One must be able to act on that understanding, do something about the problems” (p. 13) that one encounters as a professional. One might describe this skill as competence. Competent leaders not only understand the nature of the problem and what action needs to be taken, but they also have knowledge and skill in executing that action successfully.

Competency-based Leadership

Competence is a multidimensional construct that is sometimes difficult to describe. One might say a person is competent in something when they perform well enough to meet designated standards for that particular task (Calabrese, 2000). However, life, tasks, and performance expectations are constantly changing -- thus what might have been considered competent five years ago, may very well be incompetent today. For example, consider employees who use a computer with a Windows 95 interface. In 1995, such individuals might have been considered the most competent on their computers as compared to all other employees in the organization. However, if these people continued to work for this organization and refused every offer of a new computer, they would soon be working on an outdated machines and would likely be considered incompetent in their organization’s computer system. This example illustrates how what is considered

competent today may be quite different in a couple months, or years depending on the organizational environment in which one is operating.

Calabrese (2000) suggests there are four action characteristics associated with competence: “(1) the action is relevant, (2) the action meets the standards set by a social group, (3) the action expresses itself publicly, and (4) the action is expressed through work-related relationships” (p. 4). One of the reasons that competence is carefully examined is that competence is the one characteristic true leaders are viewed as possessing. An additional connection between competence and leadership is they are both “other directed.” True leaders are not only looking out for themselves but also for the welfare of the common good (Sternberg, 1998).

Part III: Leadership & Lominger International

Views of Lombardo and Eichinger

As demonstrated by descriptions presented earlier, theories of what constitutes an effective leader are constantly evolving. Although the nuances of the various theories continue to change, a set of competencies has emerged that seems to apply to leaders over time and across settings. In particular, Lombardo and Eichinger (2005) argue that there are four constants that have changed little over time. These fundamentals include: (a) the competencies/skills that matter for leading in new and different situations, (b) how these skills are learned and developed, (c) who is equipped to learn these skills, and (d) what is required to make skill development work. The following section provides a brief review of these four fundamentals and the specific work of Lombardo and Eichinger.

Lombardo and Eichinger analyzed previous research and conducted new research to produce a list of leadership competencies/skills. They studied the different ways in

which people learn and have sought to incorporate evidence-based practice into their developmental resources and tools (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2005). For example, they have analyzed more than 50,000 individuals' results (including some longitudinal data) from their assessment tools in order to identify who learns the skills over time and across settings (Lombardo & Eichinger). Additionally, with decades of experience as organizational consultants, they have learned from applied development practices and ascertained what tends to work when it comes to professional development of skills and competencies (Lombardo & Eichinger). They have tested their hypotheses in the field with real-life organizations.

This brief summary of their research and applied work is not intended to imply that all the answers have been found. Instead, it is included to indicate the large amount of research that has been conducted searching for evidence-based practices that are effective, reliable and valid. While *some* methods have been found to be successful with *some* groups *some* of the time, nothing works for everyone all of the time.

Lombardo and Eichinger (2005) argue there are many research-derived lists of competencies from respected institutions (i.e., Center for Creative Leadership, Saville Holdsworth Limited, Development Dimensions International, Personnel Decisions, Inc.) and that they are all seeking to measure roughly the same core competencies. This means that there is a list that can be composed (using one or combining a few of the existing competency models) that encapsulates the competencies needed to be a good leader. Lombardo and Eichinger explain that many of the competency or skill-based models come from the same source – the study of human behavior. Specifically Lombardo and Eichinger (2006) state:

the Leadership Architect competencies come from a content analysis of many sources: the major and continuing studies at the Center for Creative Leadership; long term studies at AT&T and Sears; studies by Harry Levinson, Daniel Levinson, John Kotter, John Gabarro, Eliot Jacques, James Kouzes, and Barry Posner, Warren Bennis, Noel Tichy, and Bernard Bass's *Handbook of Leadership* – a compendium of empirical studies (p. I)

The Leadership Architect Assessment Suite

When seeking to do leadership and career development work, it is important to select a research-based competency model that provides a guideline for users as to which competencies on the list are more easily developed and how to develop those competencies. Such a model would provide users not only with assessment feedback, but also with a course of action to improve themselves and their ability to lead. The Leadership Architect reflects the current thinking regarding an effective leadership assessment and development package. Specifically, it provides a detailed 360 degree assessment, a comprehensive report (100 or more pages) of feedback for the individual, and connects that feedback with numerous development resources for further work and study. The process does not end when the report is delivered, as with some assessment tools, because the individual is then guided through a process to determine how they can improve the skills they need to be successful in their particular field.

Success Profiles

“If we cannot specify rather precisely the persons who deserve classification as leaders, then we cannot specify very well the life experiences that prepare one for leadership, nor the test scores that will predict, nor the character and personality that leadership requires. What the field needs is a predictable criterion that is also acceptable to most critical observers.” (Clark & Clark, 1990, p. 33)

The Leadership Architect Suite has been primarily developed in business organizations. “Success profiles,” also known as competency models, have been created for various positions in such areas as banking, insurance and information technology. If this assessment tool is going to be used with academic leaders, it would be most effective to have a version that has been developed and normed in an academic context instead of corporate settings. For example, differences might exist in the competencies necessary for an administrator of a university versus an administrator or manager within an insurance company.

While Lominger has created success profiles for many of their clients in corporate settings, some work has been done by two non-profit organizations. The first not-for-profit organization, INROADS, was founded with the goal of building a bridge between communities of color and the corporate world. INROADS used the Leadership Architect Sort Cards to create a list of competencies valued by employers for newly hired college graduates (Looney, n.d.). Another non-profit organization, Goodwill Industries International, used many of the Lominger assessment and development tools to create success profiles for management supervisory level positions within the organization, including the position of CEO (Huber, 2001).

To aid the readers in understanding what the proposed research plan may provide, a detailed description of the process undertaken by INROADS to develop their competency sets will be provided as an illustration. An explanation is also included to demonstrate why additional work is needed above and beyond that which currently exists.

INROADS is a not-for-profit that connects students of color with long-term internships to provide leadership development and management training (Looney, n.d.). INROADS goal is to see the students who intern with their organization be hired after graduation. INROADS sought to determine what companies across the country were looking for from INROADS graduates. Focus groups were comprised of representatives from over 60 companies and across a wide spectrum of industries. The Leadership Architect Card Sort was used to determine what competencies were most important to American companies when hiring recently-graduated college students. The results were compiled into a competency set that INROADS uses when determining the types of changes they will make to their development programs. This list of competencies provides INROADS with a clear picture of what characteristics or skills to develop in students to increase their employability. This competency set is currently undergoing empirical study by INROADS affiliates (Looney, n.d.).

The second case to be shared is one involving the non-profit organization Goodwill Industries International (from here forward simply referred to as Goodwill). Goodwill is one of the world's largest networks of privately owned workforce development and employment organizations. Each Goodwill agency is a separate, autonomous organization with its own CEO. Goodwill recognized an impending massive CEO turnover (estimated around 75%). Goodwill used many of the Lominger assessment and development tools to redesign their executive development program. As of 2001, 12 graduates had completed the program and the company reports continued use across management levels and success with the results (Huber, 2001).

Returning to the present study, the competencies needed for newly hired college graduates or Goodwill managers and CEOs might be very different from what is expected of academic leaders in higher education. The two non-profit organization examples demonstrate that organizations outside the corporate business world are finding the Lominger assessment and development tools applicable and useful. However, the differences that might exist between success profiles in higher education and not-for-profit organizations might be quite great. The potential differences in success profiles for effective academic administrators will not be known until further research has been conducted.

Part IV: Competency Modeling

Historical Progression from Job Analysis to Competency Modeling

Early methods of job analysis incorporated similar tasks and goals as current day competency modeling efforts. While competency models are considered to be more tied to organizations' strategic initiatives, both job analysis and competency modeling require some basic level information to be collected. A brief overview the previous techniques and work leading to the development of competency models will be discussed.

Innovative techniques in job analysis emerged over the past six decades due to the difficulty in precisely defining the job of "manager." One of which is called the critical incident technique. Critical incident techniques involve asking individuals to recall a particular incident in detail while the interviewer documents each detail that is being described. Shippman et al. (2000) highlight Flanagan's work in pioneering the critical incident technique:

Flanagan pioneered the classic ‘critical incident’ technique through extensive studies of critical incidents of effective and ineffective performance in Air Force officers. Flanagan identified six broad categories of performance behavior through analysis of critical incidents provided by 3,000 officers (p. 710).

In the 1970s, researchers such as Primoff (1975) used one aspect of job analysis called the job element method. The job element method examines whether certain knowledge, skills, or abilities (KSAs) can be measured and then used to distinguish between a superior and average worker (Sanchez, 2000). While organizations such as Hay-McBer are often credited for pioneering the competency modeling approach, Sanchez (2000) argues that Primoff’s research was investigating a similar approach many years earlier.

Over the last three decades, psychologists have recognized competency models could be a useful tool in their work with organizations (e.g. Boyatzis, 1982; McClelland, 1973; McLagan, 1980). McLagan predicted that competency models would be an integral part of organizational life and a major trend in the future of human resource development. Another researcher, Boyatzis (1982), wrote one of the first empirically-based books on competency modeling and identified behavioral event interviews (BEIs) as a key tool in competency model development. According to Stine (2003), a BEI involves “a thorough interview of an incumbent worker during which critical incidents are recalled and documented in detail” (p. 30). The use of BEIs appears to have grown from Flanagan’s work on the “critical incident technique” conducted during the 1950s. Critical incident techniques involve asking individuals to recall a particular incident in detail while the interviewer documents each detail that is being described. Boyatzis’ BEIs translated Flanagan’s critical incident technique into a replicable assessment that could be used by

researchers studying workplace behaviors.

The history of competency modeling can also be traced back to the work of David McClelland, founder of the McClelland Center (Hay Group, 2008). McClelland's research involved focusing on outstanding performers and comparing them with average performers to identify differences between them (Spencer & Spencer, 1993). He then created a list of competences predictive of success on the job. Based on his research, McClelland asserted that emotional competencies were twice as important for job success as cognitive competencies. Emotional competencies were also found to be more important as one rises into higher level positions in the organization (Militello & Schwalberg, 2002).

Daniel Goleman (1995) built on McClelland's research with further theories of emotional intelligence (Militello & Schwalberg). Goleman (1995) suggested that emotional intelligence is a set of key skills, abilities and competencies that, unlike traditional Intelligence Quotient (IQ), can be learned. Goleman proposes that emotional intelligence includes such skills as being able to motivate oneself, being persistent in facing obstacles and achieving goals, controlling impulses and delaying gratification, controlling one's moods, thinking rationally, empathizing with others and hoping.

Goleman views IQ and cognitive competence as threshold competences (see Appendix G). Threshold competences, as defined by Militello and Schwalberg (2002), are "basic competencies that are necessary for an individual to perform a given job" (p. 216). In other words, a certain level of these competences is necessary to get hired at certain organizations (Militello & Schwalberg). It is argued, however, that what individuals do in that organization may then depend more on their emotional quotient

(EQ) or emotional intelligence (EI) than on the threshold competencies. Some researchers feel that this EI or EQ may be what separates star performers from average ones (Goleman, 1995; Militello & Schwalberg, 2002).

Prahalad and Hamel's research (1990) on "core competencies" in the field of business strategy came shortly before the surge of competency modeling practices. Core competencies were considered design components of organizations' competitive strategy (Shippmann et al., 2000). Shippmann et al. suggest that their use of the word "competency" refers more to the "collective learning in the organization" than to individual-level attributes. On the other hand, Naquin and Holton (2006) point out that the identification and recognition of an individual's performance skills can help to operationalize organizations' performance objectives.

Competency Models vs. Job Analysis

Garman and Johnson (2006) argue that organizations are facing a rate of change that is much faster than it was in the past, and this fact has likely increased the use of competency modeling. They note that increased change is occurring even within individual jobs: "The notion of positions as a static set of roles and responsibilities was giving way to the idea that positions could be more useful if described in general terms, allowing greater flexibility for their adaptation to changing organizational needs." (Garman & Johnson, p. 13). Shippmann et al. (2000) highlight the growing concern that traditional job analysis procedures may be unable to sufficiently meet the diverse needs of the new and evolving human resources management environment. Because competency descriptions are more general than traditional job analysis and analysis methods, they are more easily tied to corporate strategy and more easily made universal

(Garman & Johnson, 2006). Traditional job analysis, while still useful, is seen as more static, whereas competency modeling may be more flexible and more concretely aligned with organizations' strategic missions.

Competency modeling has received some criticism for lacking scientific examination of the competencies purported as requirements of job performance. For example, Garman and Johnson (2006) propose that competency modeling is less rigorous than more traditional job design or analysis methods. Lievens, Sanchez and DeCorte (2004) note that the possible lack of rigor in competency modeling has potentially serious practical and legal implications. They highlight that it is of key importance to examine procedural interventions that might enhance the quality of the inferences made by raters in competency modeling (Lievens et al., 2004). After researching the issue, Lievens et al. (2004) argue that the lack of methodological rigor can be overcome by implementing methodological safeguards. They state that combining some of the elements of job analysis with the competency modeling process can improve inter-rater reliability and the subject-matter experts' (SME's) ability to discriminate among jobs. Lievens et al. concluded the benefits derived from a combination of job analysis and competency modeling methodology deserves further research.

Job Analysis and Competency Modeling Task Force (JACMTF)

The increase in use of competency modeling brought with it confusion about appropriate practices. The Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists (SIOP) responded by commissioning a task force to investigate and review the practice of competency modeling and to provide additional guidance and clarity to psychologists and organizations using this technique (Shippmann et al., 2000).

The SIOP-sponsored task force was titled the Job Analysis and Competency Modeling Task Force (JACMTF) (Shippmann et al., 2000). The goals of the task force were to identify what a competency is, what is the difference between competency modeling and job analysis, why is competency modeling so appealing to consumers in business and industry, and what future may there be for competency modeling (Shippmann et al.). The task force identified six different perspectives that could be brought to bear on the competency modeling discussion and thus, interviewed a sampling from each of these different perspectives. These various groups included individuals such as human resource consultants, industrial and organizational (I-O) psychologists (traditionally oriented more toward a job analysis perspective), I-O psychologists that had been involved in both job analysis and competency modeling, previous SIOP presidents, and visible “thought leaders” in the area of competency modeling from both pro and con perspectives. One of the initial findings was that these different groups of people holding different “perspectives” often defined the word *competency* differently. Unfortunately, their efforts did not result in identifying one specification of an optimal standard; instead, they highlighted the breadth of definitions being used.

Definitions of Competency Model

A review of literature shows that there is a wide range of definitions for the word competency, even when the results were limited to a somewhat narrow expert population (as found in the JACMTF research) (e.g., Garman & Johnson, 2006; Militello & Schwalberg, 2002; Shippmann et al., 2000). Definitions ranged from those including the traditional “KSAOs” (knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics) in the definition to those including a clause about competencies being what “differentiates high

performers from average performers” (Militello & Schwalberg) to the following statement “It [competency modeling] is a construct that helps ‘define level of skill and knowledge’ ” (Shippmann et al., p. 706). Frequently used terms in industrial and organizational psychology are the concepts of KSAs (knowledge, skills and abilities) and KSAOs (knowledge, skills, abilities, other characteristics).

The Job Analysis and Competency Modeling Task Force (JACMTF) pointed out that across many contexts such as legal, clinical psychology, vocational, educational, and industrial psychology, “the term ‘competence’ defines ‘successful’ performance of a certain task or activity, or ‘adequate’ knowledge of a certain domain of knowledge or skill” (Shippmann et al., p. 707). A brief list has been provided (see appendix G) to provide the reader with information to differentiate the various terms used to describe competency and competency models by various researchers. As demonstrated in the mentioned list, a number of types of competencies have been specifically delineated. Threshold competencies are considered those necessary to be hired for a job, while leverage competencies help one to excel in his/her job. In a study specifically focused on financial executives, foundation or threshold competencies were found to be necessary for financial executives to attain minimal levels of job performance, with leverage competencies being identified as critical for reaching true leadership in a finance organization (Militello & Schwalberg). Emotional competencies are those that are often connected to Daniel Goleman’s (1995) research on emotional intelligence.

Landy and Conte (2006) urge that competencies are broader than KSAOs. Knowledge and skills are argued to be more surface characteristics and tend to be more readily developed (Militello & Schwalberg, 2002). Militello and Schwalberg propose

“motive, trait and self-concept competencies run deeper, or are more core to one’s personality” (p. 7). They state that self-concept competencies take more time and energy but can be developed, while motive and trait competencies “are most core to one’s personality and it may be more cost-effective to select for these competencies rather than develop them” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 7).

Leverage Competencies

In their research with finance executives, Militello and Schwalberg (2002) also studied a number of “leverage competencies.” They define leverage competencies as “competencies that differentiate superior from average job performance. (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 214). For the population they were working with, they describe leverage competencies as: “those behaviors that tend to increase the influence and leadership role of finance executives throughout the business lives of their organizations” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 5).

Militello and Schwalberg (2002) found that most of the leverage competencies that research participants highlighted in their study were easily placed within Goleman’s emotional competence framework. These included competencies such as [self-awareness], [self-regulation] or self-control, conscientiousness, trustworthiness & integrity, motivation, [empathy] awareness of the feelings, needs, concerns of others, service orientation, and [social skills] communication, influencing skills, conflict management, collaboration and cooperation, team capabilities (bracketed words are the terms used by Goleman). A few additional leverage competencies that emerged were cognitive competencies such as strategic vision or risk management. Although cognitive competencies were considered threshold competencies, some individuals who were

interviewed viewed strategic vision as a leverage competency. It was also mentioned that strategic vision would not hold much weight alone, but must be coupled with other competencies to lead to individual success (Militello & Schwalberg).

As mentioned earlier Militello and Schwalberg define leverage competencies as those specifically necessary for finance executives to attain to reach “true finance leadership in an organization” (p. 5). Therefore, when considering the implications of this research, we must be mindful that it was specifically focused on finance executives. While it was not explicitly stated, there are parallels that can be drawn to the broader population than simply those working in finance.

Why Create A Competency Model?

At the individual level, competency models can help clarify roles, expectations, and plans for development for specific positions within the organization (Garman & Johnson). Competency models can assist with communicating the behavioral implications of organizations’ strategic visions at the organizational level (Garman and Johnson). Organizations may find determining whether or not their employees have the competencies necessary for success quite difficult (Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999).

As argued by researchers such as Hunter, Bedell-Avers and Mumford (2007), the context in which leaders are working is often not addressed in typical leadership research. When creating a competency model, there is typically not an explicit focus on the context within which leaders are working. However, in such circumstances, it is generally understood that leadership conditions must be considered when analyzing and rating competencies for specific positions. Competency modeling completed within one institution may personalize the model to the specific context within which individuals

work. In this research study, the context was explicitly stated in the directions. Therefore participants considered each competency within the specific context of higher education. In effect, specifying the context of the ratings incorporated an additional aspect of leadership theory into the process of creating the competency model.

After conducting an extensive three year project that involved the creation of a competency model embedded in a comprehensive training and development initiative, Naquin and Holton (2006) point out that the identification and recognition of individuals' performance skills can help to operationalize the organization's performance objectives. Naquin and Holton argue that it is quite understandable why managerial and supervisory competency-based training initiatives have become commonplace in business and industry.

Antonioni (2000) argues that the traits that get mid-level managers promoted may not be the same traits or skills that will help them to be successful once in their new positions. Therefore, he highlights the necessity of incorporating leadership and coaching activities into the repertoire of middle managers. Antonioni (2000) argues that most mid-level managers "spend little time creating a shared vision with their direct reports, even though this is one of the main responsibilities of a leader" (p. 28). Additionally, mid-level leaders must work with change agents to implement new strategies (Antonioni). Lastly, a fear of risk-taking is mentioned as a dividing force between managers and leaders at the mid-level (Antonioni). Creating a competency model for mid-level managers can lay a foundation upon which subsequent training, development, and coaching activities can be built.

Growing Use of Competency Models

Lucia and Lepsinger (1999) point out: “Many companies have begun using competency models to help them identify the essential skills, knowledge, and personal characteristics needed for successful performance in a job and to ensure that human resource systems focus on developing them” (p. 1). According to Lievens, Sanchez and DeCorte (2004), an examination of the ABI/INFORM database showed that the number of articles on competency modeling increased from 87 during the period 1985 - 1995 to over 500 articles during the period 1995 – 2003. However, Lievens et al. point out “Contrary to the flourishing popularity of competency modeling among practitioners, the scientific community has regarded competency modeling with some degree of skepticism” (p. 882).

The American Compensation Association conducted a survey of 426 organizations in 1996. The results indicated that 75 percent to 80 percent of the responding companies have some sort of competency-driven applications currently in place (American Compensation Association, 1996, as cited in Shippmann et al., 2000). According to Landy and Conte (2006), organizations are increasingly trying to identify “core competencies” that are required for all jobs. Additionally, training needs analysis is an important part of the process of identifying and developing such competencies (Landy & Conte). Competency training does not have to be implemented independently but can instead be included as a supplement to existing training programs.

Competency Models as a Component of Organizational Training Efforts

Competency models help make the skills an organization needs to be successful transparent at all job levels (Hay Group, 2008). A strong competency model reflects the

complex realities of performance and it helps explain how these competencies interrelate in specific business situations (Hay Group). A competency model includes a set of competencies that interact in complex ways. Job analysis can be used as an initial effort in developing a competency-based training program. Job analysis identifies the specific tasks for the job and then the skills necessary to perform each task must be identified as well.

In creating a competency-based training program, job analysis can be used to identify specific tasks and in turn, the skills necessary to perform each task. An evaluation can clarify which skills should be measured and at what level an employee must demonstrate each skill in order to demonstrate a competency. Assessments can also be used to identify individual and group-level skill gaps. Training initiatives can be focused on existing gaps. Employees may go through a process of training and testing until they reach a desired level of competency. Job applicants can be pre-screened to determine their initial levels of competency. It is then up to the employer to determine whether or not they are a qualified candidate for the position

Numerous researchers (Burger, 1975; Dunn & Mitchell, 1979; Leonard & Utz, 1974; Tromley, 1998) agree on a number of characteristics that should be included in competency-based training programs such as:

- (a) Employees' knowledge and skills are certified through competency testing rather than credits (courses) taken.
- (b) Competency-based training is centered on behaviorally-stated and measurable objectives.
- (c) Trainee assessment or evaluation of learning is criterion referenced rather than

norm referenced.

(d) Assessments can take the form of written exams, oral exams, or skill practice demonstrations.

(e) In the event of failure, trainees have the opportunity to retake competency-based tests.

(f) Trainees receive immediate feedback on assessments.

(g) Various forms of media are used in the instructional process to meet trainees' individual learning needs (as cited in Naquin & Holton, 2006).

Criticism of Competency Modeling

Some researchers believe that competency modeling is no different than job analysis, a technique fine-tuned years ago (Sanchez, 2000). In a critique of Lucia and Lepsinger's book, *The Art and Science of Competency Models*, Sanchez (2000) argues that the benefits of competency modeling listed by Lucia and Lepsinger are quite similar to the professed benefits of job analysis.

Many large corporations are using competency modeling techniques. Some companies are creating them internally while others are hiring outside help to create customized competency models for their organizations. Some of the well-known providers of competency modeling services include Lominger (Korn/Ferry), Hay-McBer, and Personnel Decisions International (Shippmann et al., 2000). Sanchez (2000) states "The examples from corporations using competency models were impressive" (p. 509). However, Sanchez questions the ways in which these corporations have evaluated the success of such models. Some argue competency modeling demands a complex inferential leap from identifying specific job tasks to what knowledge, skills, and abilities

(KSAs) are needed. Lievens et al. (2004) argued that competency modeling falls in the direct estimation category because competencies are typically inferred from broad job descriptions as well as information about organizations' strategies.

Hollenbeck and McCall contend that leadership competency models hinder more than help businesses seeking to improve leadership effectiveness. (Hollenbeck, McCall, & Silzer, 2006). On the other hand, Silzer contends "...competencies help individuals understand how effective they and others are as leaders" (Hollenbeck et al., 2006, p.403). He proposes that competency models can help people to take some personal responsibility and independent action for their own development. Silzer also argues that competencies can be valuable in teaching people how to observe and evaluate the leadership effectiveness of others. Additionally, he argues that competency models have helped to raise the performance evaluation skills of many managers across dozens of organizations (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). Silzer points out:

Organizations have also benefited from the use of competency models.

Competencies help organizations by:

- Openly communicating which leader behaviors are important,
- Helping to discriminate the performance of individuals,
- Linking leader behaviors to the strategic directions and goals of the business, and
- Providing an integrative model of leadership that is relevant across many positions and leadership situations (Hollenbeck et al., 2006, p. 403).

Silzer makes an important point: "It is a general map to leadership effectiveness, providing alternate ways of reaching a destination, but it is not a trip ticket that dictates very specific and rigid directions" (Hollenbeck et al., 2006, p. 403). Silzer argues a

competency model must be viewed as a guiding framework not an end in and of itself. One must not think that because a competency model has been created, one's work is done. One must use the competency model and be mindful in how it is implemented within the organization in order to utilize the model to its full potential.

Silzer argues that most competency models architects assume that the competencies are interactive (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). Silzer mentions a few others who have tried to create complex leadership models but have not been successful in his eyes:

It would be great to have a model of leadership behavior that includes not only relevant KSAs, but also critical situational variables and the interactions between KSAs and situations. However, no one has produced such a comprehensive model beyond the attempts of Fiedler (1967), Vroom (2000), and a few others—which are too simplistic to accommodate the complexity of variables that a leader must consider (Hollenbeck et al., p. 404).

Silzer goes on to say that if someone did create a model that was comprehensive enough, it would be too complex to actually use (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). While many scholars call for a comprehensive model, there is also the juxtaposed desire for models used to be simple and easy to use. As indicated by the lack of an existing model that meets both wishes, this is a very difficult task. An important point in this argument is not only the quality of the competency model but how effectively it is implemented. Silzer points out that how an organization chooses to implement a competency model has a greater impact on the system than the underlying model.

While Hollenbeck and McCall contend there is growing demonstration of widespread leadership failure, Silzer argues that all in all there have been many examples

of great leadership in business recently (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). Silzer comments that if a leader is highly effective in the first three years in a position and then fails in the fourth year, that does not mean the person was an ineffective leader. Silzer points out we must view each new situation a leader handles independently from the last (Hollenbeck et al., 2006). Therefore, leaders may be good at handling 99 percent of the varying situations in which they are called upon to lead. In general, such leaders are effective in *most* situations. Silzer cautions that we cannot require leaders to have to be successful in every situation in order to deem them effective leaders. He comments that very few people have been seen as effective leaders across a broad range of situations.

Hollenbeck and McCall emphasize that competency models may not push organizations toward excellence, but instead be used more as minimum standards for performance:

...we do not argue that competencies cannot be useful in a minimum standards approach to leadership development. Schein (1996) argues for just such an approach—that there are minimum competencies that any leader should have. But minimum standards are not what we seek in our leaders, nor can they explain what differentiates minimally effective leaders from the excellent ones. Most organizations at least aspire to leadership excellence (Hollenbeck et al., 2006, p. 400).

How to Create a Competency Model

Boulter, Dalziel, and Hill (1998) describe the multiple steps necessary to creating competency models. These steps include: identifying performance criteria and a sample population, collecting data, data analysis, validation of the model, and finally application

of the model in human resource activities. This research project will proceed through all of the recommend steps. The performance criteria are being adapted from a model already established in the private sector. A new competency model will be created using a lengthy list of pre-defined competencies. In the present study, this list is not assumed to be comprehensive, and therefore participants were asked to add KSAs to the list that are important to the job that was not included on the list. The model will be altered to fit the results of the study and then the new model specifically adjusted for education will be validated.

Use of Focus Groups

Focus groups have been used in exploratory or descriptive research. Some problems in using focus groups for exploratory research include “(a) using too limited a sample of participants and (b) not using other data collection approaches to provide additional supportive evidence on the findings” (Kress & Shoffner, 2007, p. 193). Both of these challenges will be addressed in the current study by getting data from large, more diverse samples of mid-level leaders in phase III of the study. An additional challenge highlighted by Kress and Shoffner is the interpretation of the content of the discussion from focus groups. This challenge will not be as significant in this particular study because the primary form of data will be quantitative ratings collected from focus group participants. Therefore, it is argued that this research design combines the benefits of in-person, interactive discussions, with the more concrete, clear-cut nature of quantitative data collection and analyses. It is hoped that the focus group discussions provide rich examples and encourages participants to reflect more deeply about each of their answers

prior to rating each competency. However, in the end, participants will be providing numerical ratings that are efficient and unambiguous to statistically analyze.

Lezaun (2007) proposes that focus groups have become a widespread way of generating useful knowledge. Lezaun points out that a potential challenge of the focus group format is that it pushes a group to stimulate authentically individual opinions. He states “Moderators are in charge of resolving this tension: they must make the conversation conducive to the expression of private and idiosyncratic views, while preventing the focus group from rising to the status of a ‘collective’ ” (Lezaun, p. 130).

The idea behind the focus group method is that group processes can help people explore and clarify their views in ways that would be less easily accessible in a one to one interview (Stewart, Shamdasani, & Rook, 2007). One professional focus group moderator described one of the skills of a good moderator as being able to reach out to the group members and help them to vocalize the internal dialogue that each one of us has so often internally and subliminally, that we forget it is going on (Goebert, 2002). Group discussion is particularly appropriate when the interviewer has a series of open ended questions and wishes to encourage research participants to explore the issues of importance to them, in their own vocabulary, generating their own questions and pursuing their own priorities. When group dynamics work well the participants work alongside the researcher, taking the research in new and often unexpected directions (Stewart et al., 2007).

Existing Competency Models and Programming for Mid-level Leaders

The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) developed the Leadership Effectiveness Survey (LES), which is a statistically-validated competency model for

supervisors and managers (Naquin & Holton, 2006). This model was validated with approximately 10,000 federal executives, managers and supervisors. This project enabled the U.S. OPM to identify competency requirements across the supervisory, managerial and executive employment levels. Ultimately, this led to the development of the OPM competency model known also as the Leadership Effectiveness Framework (Naquin & Holton, 2006).

Personnel Decisions International (PDI) created a specific assessment specifically tailored to mid-level leaders. They also claim to have a competency model for mid-level leader positions. While their entire list of competencies is not available to the public, a few of the competencies they explicitly state are addressed in this assessment include: dealing with the challenges created by trends such as downsizing, increased demand for quality and customer focus, and heightened competition. Throughout PDI's description of their assessment, they describe the client group as "companies" lending a very private sector oriented flavor to their offerings. A specific competency model created for mid-level leaders in higher education was not found throughout an extensive review of the literature.

Development Dimensions International (DDI; 2008) has created a "workforce development system" that includes competency-based programs specifically targeted at front-line to mid-level leaders. Specifically the Tactics for Effective Leadership program is promoted as a tool that "helps leaders assess their evolving role and learn how to enhance working relationships" (p. 6). DDI's program is advertised as proven to build specific, job-critical competencies but the competencies specific to mid-level leaders are not listed.

An assessment found online called the Mid-Level Leader Assessment published by Human Resource (HR) Directions assesses knowledge, skills and other characteristics (KSOs) clustered around the following five sub-headings: strategic thinking, planning and implementation, leadership, interpersonal skills, and communication. Within the sub-heading of strategic thinking, problem solving, decision quality, and business knowledge are assessed (HR Directions, 2008). Under the sub-heading planning and implementation, strategic planning and driving execution are assessed. The leadership subheading includes leadership impact, coaching and development, empowering and motivating and team facilitation. The sub-heading interpersonal skills includes builds strategic working relationships and empathy. Within the communication sub-heading, speaking effectively and listening are assessed. Within the sub-heading of personal orientation, initiative and flexibility are assessed. Definitions for all of the knowledge, skills and other characteristics listed here can be found online (HR Directions, 2008).

Conclusions and Research Goals

Research is needed to create competency guides or “success profiles” for individuals working in settings beyond those that have been studied. There are a vast array of organizational settings in which further research could be conducted. For this study, the research team focused on the skills and competencies needed for mid-level leaders within higher education. This population is currently facing some difficult challenges and has not received nearly as much attention from leadership experts and researchers as have comparable employees in the business world.

Although often overlooked, mid-level leaders are a critical component of every college or university and therefore, are an important set of employees in whom to invest.

Simply stated, institutions of higher education would not function without them. Mid-level leaders are often asked to do more with less resources, are asked to empower team members, and are faced with the challenge of translating organizational strategies and objectives into results that are critical to the organization's success (PDI, 2003).

The resources and research found in this review of the existing literature have been mostly geared for mid-level managers in business or the private sector. Specifically, mid-level leaders in higher education will be studied due to the lack of development initiatives for individuals in these positions. The following research study is an initial effort to customize leadership development materials to the context of higher education. While some variability in job requirements is to be expected, the specific goal of this research study is to create a competency model that delineates an explicit set of competencies viewed as necessary for success in the position of academic mid-level leaders in institutions higher education.

Chapter 3: Methods

The following methods section is comprised of four subsections. The first subsection describes characteristics of the participants of phases I, II, and III of the study. The second subsection provides a brief review of the Leadership Architect Suite. Specifically, the Leadership Architect sort cards were used to assess the competencies needed for success as an academic leader within public institutions of higher education. The third section describes procedures for data collection and analysis. The fourth section describes the statistical analyses used to identify the most highly rated leadership success competencies for mid-level leaders.

Phase I of this study focused on adapting the 67 Leadership Architect competencies and adding a few new competencies to produce a competency model for mid-level leaders in higher education using current individuals who are alumni of a university leadership program. Phase II participants experienced a similar process as the Phase I participants; however these participants were members of the leadership program advisory committee. Research with these academic administrators is important because the existing Lominger competency models have not been created to focus on individuals within higher education. Phase III focused on examining evidence regarding the validity of the new competency model. A survey was sent via electronic mail to all individuals with the title of director, assistant director or associate director across the four campus university system. Responses from the survey were analyzed to see how they compare to the focus group findings.

Participants

Participants for all three phases were academic leaders employed at one of four campuses within a Midwestern state university system. Each of the three phases of data collection involved a different subset of the university employee population. The three different participant populations will be described in detail in the following section.

Specifically, mid-level leaders that had participated in a university system-wide leadership program were contacted to participate in Phase I of this research study. These mid-level leaders will be referred to as the alumni group from here forward. The alumni group is composed of individuals who were selected to participate in a leadership program by a committee of senior administrators within the university system. The leadership program selects 30 to 35 individuals to participate in a year-long program each year. The alumni group is composed of participants from the two previous years of the program. The leadership program administrators agreed to allow their alumni to be contacted to participate in the research project. The research team agreed to provide the leadership program administrators with a report of the results of this study. Only aggregate data will be shared with anyone outside the research team.

The list of academic leaders that are considered alumni of the university leadership program consists of approximately 65 individuals. Thus, the individuals on this list are employed across the four campuses of the university system. The distribution of academic leaders from each campus is representative of the percentage of the total university system employees at each campus. The mean age of the 33 participants of the mid-level leader focus groups was 46.14 years of age, with participants' ages ranging from 29 to 57 years. Forty-one percent females and 59 percent males participated in these

focus groups. Participants of phase I focus groups identified themselves as 14.8 percent African American, 74.1 percent European American, 7.4 percent other, and 3.7 percent did not respond to this question. The mean number of years in their current position was 7.6 years, with participants ranging from less than one year to 20 years in their current position. These mid-level leaders were sent an email requesting their participation in the study.

Participants for phase II of the study were members of an advisory committee of the leadership program. These individuals are upper level administrators from across the four campuses (with titles such as Vice Chancellor, Vice President, and Assistant Vice Chancellor) and were considered to serve as subject matter experts (SMEs). These individuals served as subject matter experts who have supervised, hired or helped develop individuals in the position of director, assistant director, and associate director. Phase II focused on gaining the SMEs' perspective on the competency model. Thus, these individuals provided an additional perspective and offered a subject matter expert review of the competency model. The mean age for participants of the subject matter expert focus group was 58.36, with participants ranging from 51 to 65 years old. This group was made up of 27 percent females and 73 percent males. Phase II participants identified themselves as 82 percent European American and 18 percent African American. The mean number of years in their current position of an upper-level administrator was 10.36, with a range from 2 to 20 years.

The participant pool for phase III included approximately 500 mid-level leaders employed at one of four campuses within a Midwestern state university system. These individuals were identified by the positions they held with the university. The titles

specifically targeted for this study were director, assistant director, and associate director. The participant pool for this study was similar to the participant pool for the leadership program. The leadership program was created to specifically target mid-level leaders in positions similar to “director” within the organization.

Phase III was undertaken to increase the generalizability of the competency model created from phases I and II of the study. Phase III entailed emailing approximately 500 academic leaders and requesting their participation in an online survey. Phase III participants were mid-level leaders employed at one of the four campuses within a Midwestern state university system. All participants held a position titled director, assistant director or associate director. The age group selected most frequently by participants completing the survey was 41 to 50 years of age, with a range from 21 years to over 61 years of age. Less than one tenth of a percent of participants in phase III were 21 or less years of age, 4.9 percent were 22 to 30 years of age, 14.3 percent were 31 to 40 years of age, 34.1 percent were 41 to 50 years of age, 34.6 percent were 51 to 60 years of age, and 11.5 percent were 61 years of age or more. This group was made up of 48.9 percent females and 51.1 percent males. This phase III group of participants identified themselves as: 0.5 percent African American, 0.2 percent Asian American, 80.7 percent European American, less than 0.1 percent Latino(a), 0.1 percent Native American, and 0.8 percent identified as “other” (with “Caucasian”, “American” and “Irish/German American” written in when asked to specify). The mean number of years in their current position was 7.45, with a range from 5 months to 36 years.

According to the Midwestern state university system human resources department, the entire population of individuals with the term “director” in their title

across that state university system consisted of 46 percent females and 54 percent males. Within this group of academic mid-level leaders, less than one percent identify themselves as American Indian, 2 percent identify themselves as Asian, 6 percent identify themselves as Black, less than one percent identify themselves as Hispanic, 89 percent identify themselves as White and less than one percent chose not to specify their ethnic group. The average age of the total population of employees with the term “director” in their title is 49.81 years old, with a range from 27 to 80 years of age. The participant pool was as representative of this overall population as possible.

A diverse group of leaders was targeted across all phases of the study. Phase III of the study was included to improve generalizability of this research study by obtaining feedback from a large number of people with varied experience level in the position and coming from various units, backgrounds, and campuses.

Instruments

The Leadership Architect Suite (LAS; Lombardo & Eichinger, 2003) was first published in 1991 (Lominger International, n.d.), and is designed to assess several leadership-related areas. The LAS includes a variety of assessment-related tools, including books, software, the Leadership Architect sort cards, and development guides (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2004c). These materials provide various methods for utilizing the 86 Leadership Architect competencies to help individuals or organizations assess and improve their leadership skills and competencies. The LAS provides assessment tools that can serve a number of functions. The LAS can be used by employers to create competency models that can then be used to assist in hiring, selection, performance assessment, and training or development initiatives. The VOICES 360 degree assessment,

also offered by Lominger, is a tool for those seeking comprehensive feedback on their current leadership skills. The VOICES 360 assessment also utilizes the 86 Leadership Architect competencies.

The theory that most of the Lominger assessment tools (e.g. LAS materials, VOICES 360, Career Planner) are based upon includes 356 behavioral aspects grouped into 86 competencies. The VOICES 360 assesses these 86 competencies related to job performance and behaviors, and consists of 67 positive and 19 negative competencies. The Leadership Architect sort cards can be used in several different individual and group card sorts to assist in the creation of competency models, development plans, and performance feedback (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2004c). Lominger suggests using the card sorts to identify importance of competency, skill level, performance level (as compared with job expectations), and relative performance. Typically, respondents are directed to sort the cards into three to five piles corresponding to three to five rating levels (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2004b).

The 86 Leadership Architect competencies are grouped into 26 clusters, which can be clustered into eight factors (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2003). These eight factors include six positive factors and two negative factors. More specifically, the six positive factors are strategic skills, operating skills, courage, energy and drive, organizational position skills, and personal and interpersonal skills (called “skills and competencies”), and the two negative factors are trouble with people and trouble with results (called “Stallers and Stoppers”; Lombardo & Eichinger, 2003).

Confirmatory factor analyses provided support for the six positive factor solution using the 67 positive competencies (random sample group # 1, $N = 3,149$; random sample

group #2, $N = 3,160$). Additionally, confirmatory factor analyses provided support for the two negative factor solution using the 19 negative competencies (random group #1, $N = 4,694$; random group # 2, $N = 4,562$; Lombardo & Eichinger, 2003).

Evidence supports the temporal stability of the Leadership Architect competencies. More specifically, overall test-retest reliability is .75 for self-raters ($n = 49$), and is .82 for other raters ($n = 45$) over a 30-day period. Coefficient alpha internal consistency estimates for each factor were: .88 (strategic skills), .89 (operating skills), .83 (courage), .76 (energy and drive), .77 (organizational positioning skills), .93 (personal and interpersonal skills), .87 (trouble with people), and .74 (trouble with results) (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2003).

Lombardo and Eichinger (2003) report “The competencies and stallers and stoppers have been related to current performance, long term performance, actual promotion, potential, bonus, stock options, retention and profit” (p. 14). Data analyses also indicate that men and women show similar assessment results (Lombardo & Eichinger), supporting the validity of their use with both women and men.

In 2007, Lominger published the results of the 2006 VOICES Norm study for North America (Dai & De Meuse, 2007). The data for their study was collected from approximately 2,100 employees in 11 organizations nationwide. Among other information, the report includes normative data for both the “skill” ratings and the “importance” ratings. Additionally, raters who completed this assessment on their colleagues were also asked to provide ratings of how important each of the 67 competencies is for success in the workplace. In essence, the 2006 North American report provided normative data for each of the competencies for North American

employees (as rated by their colleagues on 360 assessments). The report also provided normative data regarding which competencies North American workers view as most important for success in the workplace across various industries.

Therefore, the 2006 North American Norm study provides a more recent collection of data on over time, or learners have generally improved their skills across 66 of the 67 competencies (Dai & De Meuse). They also reported that importance ratings have increased over time. Therefore, raters are both rating the learners as more skilled and rating the importance of each skill as greater than they were four years ago.

Dai and De Meuse (2007) report that there was, in general, much stability in importance rankings and ratings over these specific competencies and how well they are being performed and how much they are valued. Dai and De Meuse (2007) report that the 2006 skill competency ratings were very similar to the 2002 norms. However, they reported that 66 of the 67 skill ratings increased over time, indicating that either raters have generally raised their ratings of the individuals time. Due to copyright restrictions, the results of this study will not be listed in full here but can be found in the 2007 Dai and De Meuse publication titled *The 2006 North American VOICES norms* (which can be found at http://www.lominger.com/research_resources.php). The top ten competencies according to “importance” rankings in North America in rank order are: “*integrity and trust, customer focus, ethics and values, decision quality, functional/technical skills, drive for results, problem solving, priority setting, intellectual horsepower, and directing others*” (Dai and De Meuse, 2007, p. 25). This list of competencies, rated most important across industries, across organizations in North America, can be used for comparison with the results found in this study.

The Leadership Architect Suite can be used to help groups define which competencies are needed for particular positions they are trying to fill or assist organizations in more clearly defining which competencies are needed for people to perform well at a certain job or position. Lominger (as described in Lombardo & Eichinger, 2004b) provides directions for facilitators to guide individuals or groups through the card sort process in a variety of ways.

More specifically, a focus group worksheet was created that listed the 67 positive competencies and provided space for recording additional “write in” competencies that participants considered critical for success as a director in higher education (that were not already on the worksheet). This worksheet was used in phases I and II of the study. In phase I of the study, participants were given the worksheet to complete before the focus group meeting in order to expedite the meeting. In phase II, participants rated each of the 67 competencies in the meeting and completed the worksheet to document their ratings. The worksheet provided the research team with written documentation of individuals’ ratings of the competencies. Note, because the worksheet created for this study included descriptions of all of the Leadership Architect competencies, it is not included in this dissertation due to its inclusion of property right protected information.

Procedures

For both phases I and II, potential participants were contacted via email to solicit their participation in the focus group activity. Specifically, this email: (a) described the study and its potential benefits to society, (b) clearly stated the confidentiality of the data collected in the focus groups, (c) described what participation in the study would entail, and (d) requested their participation in the study. The six focus groups in phase I were

scheduled for one hour and the focus group in phase II was scheduled for two hours. Participants from phase I, attending the one-hour meeting were given materials to review prior to the meeting in order to expedite the meeting. Participants in the focus group in phase II (comprised of subject matter experts) were not given materials ahead because the meeting was scheduled for two hours and it was anticipated that they would have sufficient time to complete all tasks during the meeting.

Potential phase I participants who agreed to participate were scheduled for focus group meetings on their campus via email. Six focus groups were conducted with a total of 33 participants (an average of 5.5 participants per focus group). Four scheduled participants were unable to attend their focus group for a variety of reasons that included illness, conflicting meetings, and a last minute change in their schedule. No systematic pattern of reasons for not participating was noted among non-attendees. All participants in phase II were members of a university system advisory committee. These 11 participants attended a single focus group that directly followed a previously scheduled (non-study related) meeting. All 182 phase III survey participants were university employees with the title of Director, Associate Director or Assistant Director. Participants did not receive incentives or compensation for their participation in the study.

Participants were informed that focus group sessions would be videotaped, and provided their consent. The videotape was used to record the discussion and to provide a supplement to the moderator's written notes. Additionally, videotaping enabled the moderator to focus more closely on the process and less on documenting comments during the focus group. Participants' comments about the competencies were excerpted

from the videotapes and included in the notes. Additionally, transcripts of the videotapes provided specific language to develop additional competencies that participants suggested be added to the competency model.

As mentioned earlier, participants were directed through the process recommended by Lominger to create Success Profiles or competency models within organizations. In this process, participants categorized each of the 67 positive competencies as “critical”, “important”, and “not important” for success as a director in higher education; these categories were quantified into ratings from 3 to 1, respectively.

Following sorting the competencies into three categories, participants shared their results with the group. An aggregate group profile was created that incorporated all participants’ sort results. Once a group profile was tabulated, the competencies with the largest range of ratings were identified. For example, competencies for which two or more participants rated it as “critical” while two or more other participants rated it as “not important” were highlighted. A list of these competencies was compiled on the poster at the front of the room indicating the competencies the group would discuss. Participants were encouraged to discuss why they rated certain competencies the way they did. Participants were encouraged to ask questions and listen to one another to help build a broader understanding of why participants viewed each competency as important or not important. One goal of the focus group meeting was to have the rating process be fluid and therefore, participants were told they could change their ratings of any of the competencies at any time throughout the meeting. At the end of each focus group meeting, participants were asked to write down their final ratings with these final ratings, being collected. In essence, the phase I and II focus groups served to identify the most

important competencies and to reduce the number of competencies to be examined in subsequent phases of the study by approximately 50 percent.

And additional discussion focused on whether there were additional competencies specifically related to working as an academic leader in higher education that needed to be added to the 67 positive leadership competencies in the Leadership Architect (which were developed for businesses in the private sector). Two competencies were suggested by participants as possible additions to the list. The focus group moderator asked participants to indicate how they would rate suggested new competencies in order to gauge if other participants agreed that competency was critical for success as a director in higher education.

To protect confidentiality, participant identification numbers were assigned and used when storing any data to protect the participants' identity from being associated with any research documents. Additionally, focus group attendees granted permission for each of the focus group meetings to be video-recorded. The research team has password protected all documents stored for this study.

Phase III of this study was undertaken to improve the generalizability of the study. In phase III, approximately 500 academic leaders were emailed with a request that they participate by completing an online survey. The email (a) described the study and its potential benefits to society, (b) clearly stated the anonymity of the data collected through the survey, (c) described what participation in the study will entail, (d) requested their participation in the study, and (e) included a link to the online survey. Two follow up emails were sent to encourage participation among those who had not yet completed the survey.

All data was collected anonymously (without names or identifying information) in phase III. Survey results were stored online without identifying information and downloaded to a password-protected computer. The online survey took less than 20 minutes to complete, with participants not receiving incentives for their participation.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analyses

Quantitative data was collected from participants across the focus groups through their ratings of all 67 competencies, which were recorded on the focus group worksheet. The data collected in phase I and II included ratings for all 67 Leadership Architect competencies. The data set from the phase III, the on-line survey, consisted of the 34 competencies (32 Leadership Architect competencies and two new competencies). Descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation and range, were calculated for each of the 67 competencies. Means were used to create rank order competency lists for each participant group.

All of the data from the focus groups with mid-level leaders were grouped together as one set of data, from here forward referred to as the focus group data set. The ratings from the single focus group with subject matter experts were grouped as another data set, from here forward referred to as the SME data set. Finally, the ratings from the survey were grouped as a third data set, from here forward referred to as the survey data set. Descriptive statistics were run for each data set separately.

All focus group meetings were recorded by videotape. Qualitative data was transcribed from the video recordings of the focus groups specifically when the participants were asked if they had any additional competencies to add to the list. If a participant suggested a competency, the moderator asked the rest of the individuals

present what they thought of the competency. This section of the video recordings of all of the focus groups was analyzed and the research team transcribed the conversation of those in favor or opposed of adding the new competency to the list and participants' explanation of why they agreed or disagreed. The research team discussed the new competencies and used quotes from the transcription to guide the creation of a definition for each new competency. The research team aimed to mirror the style and format of the definitions of the established competencies in the definitions of the new competencies.

Chapter 4: Results

This section presents the competencies rated most highly across each phase of the study. The top ten most highly rated competencies were compared across all three data sets (see Tables 1, 2, and 3). A number of similarities and differences were observed between the phases of this study.

Most Important Competencies

The competencies that received the highest ratings from the mid-level leader phase I focus groups appear in Table 1. The most highly rated competencies from highest to lowest are: *integrity and trust, ethics and values, building effective teams, conflict management, managing vision and purpose, composure, customer focus, dealing with ambiguity, informing, and listening*. When asked for additional competencies to be added to the list, participants suggested *fiscal responsibility* and *creates organizational collaboration*.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Top Ten Competencies from Focus Groups (n = 33)

Rank	Competency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
1	Integrity and Trust	2.818	0.392	2 - 3
2	Ethics and Values	2.667	0.479	2 - 3
3	Building Effective Teams	2.667	0.479	2 - 3
4	Conflict Management	2.606	0.556	1 - 3
5	Managing Vision and Purpose	2.582	0.546	1 - 3
6	Composure	2.576	0.502	2 - 3
6	Customer Focus	2.576	0.614	1 - 3
8	Dealing with Ambiguity	2.515	0.566	1 - 3
9	Informing	2.455	0.564	1 - 3
9	Listening	2.455	0.506	2 - 3

The competencies that received the highest ratings from the subject matter expert phase II focus group were *integrity and trust, ethics and values, fairness to direct reports, interpersonal savvy, decision quality, listening, motivating others, conflict management, delegation, directing others, negotiating, and organizing*. The means, standard deviations, and ranges for these competencies appear in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Top Twelve Competencies from Subject Matter Experts (n = 11)

Rank	Competency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
1	Integrity and Trust	3	0	3 - 3
2	Ethics and Values	2.909	0.301	2 - 3
3	Fairness to Direct Reports	2.818	0.405	2 - 3
4	Interpersonal Savvy	2.818	0.405	2 - 3
5	Decision Quality	2.727	0.647	1 - 3
6	Listening	2.636	0.674	1 - 3
6	Motivating Others	2.636	0.505	2 - 3
8	Conflict Management	2.545	0.522	2 - 3
8	Delegation	2.545	0.522	2 - 3
8	Directing Others	2.545	0.688	1 - 3
8	Negotiating	2.545	0.688	1 - 3
8	Organizing	2.545	0.522	2 - 3

The competencies that received the ten highest ratings in the survey were *integrity and trust*, *ethics and values*, *organizing*, *decision quality*, *composure*, *strategic agility*, *motivating others*, *customer focus*, *dealing with ambiguity*, and *fiscal responsibility*. The means, standard deviations, and ranges for these competencies appear in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Top Ten Competencies from Survey (n =149)

Rank	Competency	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
1	Integrity and Trust	2.785	0.468	1 - 3
2	Ethics and Values	2.636	0.596	1 - 3
3	Organizing	2.542	0.578	1 - 3
4	Decision Quality	2.436	0.618	1 - 3
5	Motivating Others	2.407	0.655	1 - 3
6	Composure	2.386	0.657	1 - 3
6	Strategic Agility	2.373	0.691	1 - 3
8	Dealing with Ambiguity	2.373	0.643	1 - 3
9	Customer Focus	2.323	0.705	1 - 3
9	Fiscal Responsibility	2.306	0.686	1 - 3

Of the two competencies that the focus groups suggested be added to the survey, *fiscal responsibility* received sufficiently strong ratings to be included among the most highly rated competencies from the survey in phase 3. The other competency added to the survey in the focus groups, *creates organizational collaboration*, received a mean rating of 2.267 and ranked fourteenth in the set of 34 competencies. Table 4 lists of all the competencies rated most important across all three participant groups.

Table 4

Competencies Rated Most Important for Success

Competency	Phase of Study in which Identified Among Most Important Competencies
Integrity and Trust	I, II, III
Ethics and Values	I, II, III
Conflict Management	I, II
Composure	I, III
Dealing with Ambiguity	I, III
Customer Focus	I, III
Decision Quality	II, III
Motivating Others	II, III
Listening	I, II
Organizing	II, III
Managing Vision and Purpose	I
Building Effective Teams	I
Informing	I
Fairness to Direct Reports	II
Interpersonal Savvy	II
Delegation	II
Directing Others	II
Negotiating	II
Strategic Agility	III
Fiscal Responsibility	III

Chapter 5: Discussion

*“There is no such thing as a minor lapse in integrity.”
- Tom Peters (as quoted by Lombardo and Eichinger, 2006).*

The purpose of this study was to determine the competencies which are most critical for success as a mid-level leader in higher education. For this research, an existing list of competencies was selected and adapted for use in a different context. Specifically, while the set of 67 positive Leadership Architect competencies has been widely utilized in the private sector, it has received relatively little use in higher education. Therefore, one aim of this study was to examine how this list of competencies was relevant and applicable to the context of higher education. An additional goal was to identify possible additional competencies that might be considered unique to higher education and critical for success in this organizational context.

Competencies that were endorsed (ranked in the top ten) by at least two of the three participant groups are competencies that can likely be viewed as critical for success as a director in higher education. The five competencies, *integrity and trust*, *ethics and values*, *customer focus*, *composure*, and *dealing with ambiguity* were endorsed by at least two sets of sources.

Understanding the Most Important Competencies

Two competencies were consistently rated as most critical for success across all three data sets. More specifically, focus group participants, subject matter experts (SMEs) and survey participants all rated *integrity and trust* with the highest mean score and *ethics and values* with the second highest mean score. These two competencies were the only ones viewed by all three groups in this study as most critical for success as a mid-level leader in higher education.

Both of these competencies, *integrity and trust* and *ethics and values*, are grouped within the “Personal and Interpersonal Skills” factor by Lominger (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2006). More specifically, they fit within the “Acting with Honor and Character” cluster (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2006). Other than the top two competencies, there were no other competencies that appeared across all three groups’ top ten lists. Therefore, while they all agree on the two most important competencies, there is some degree of variation among mid-level leaders and SMEs about which competencies are most critical for success. In particular, while the mid-level leaders believe that certain competencies are most critical for success in the role of a director (i.e. *building effective teams, conflict management, managing vision and purpose, composure, customer focus, dealing with ambiguity, informing, strategic agility, fiscal responsibility*), the subject matter experts (i.e. supervisors of the mid-level managers) considered a somewhat different set of competencies (i.e. *fairness to direct reports, interpersonal savvy, delegation, directing others, negotiating*) as most critical for success in higher education. One potential reason for these differences is the difference in perspective of the mid-level leader and the SME. The mid-level leader may value what they view as important in the day-to-day experience such as relationships with colleagues and managing conflict, while the SME may prioritize competencies that are important for mid-level leaders to possess to assist in the unit’s or the upper level administrator’s goals for the organization. More specifically, the SMEs (upper-level administrators) may be most focused on competencies that help mid-level leaders’ work reach higher performance levels or meet supervisors’ goals for the unit. Mid-level leaders, on the other hand, may be more

focused on the quality of their day-to-day interactions or services provided and less focused on meeting their superiors' goals for the unit.

A closer examination of the three sources of information follows. The top ten competencies from the phase I focus group and the phase III survey five competencies in common. More specifically, in addition to *integrity and trust* and *ethics and values*, (which all three groups rated in the top ten), three additional competencies *customer focus*, *composure*, and *dealing with ambiguity* were rated in the top ten by both the focus group and survey participants. These three competencies may also be considered important in training and development efforts with individuals in director positions across higher education. In the phase I focus group data, *building effective teams*, *managing vision and purpose*, *informing*, and *listening* were ranked in the top ten (but not ranked in the top ten for the other two participant groups). In phase III survey, *strategic agility* and *fiscal responsibility* were the only competencies ranked among the top ten but that were not ranked among the top ten for either of the other two groups.

In the importance ratings from the 2006 national norm report, *integrity and trust* was rated as the number one competence and *ethics and values* was rated as number three competence in level of importance in the workplace (Dai & De Meuse, 2007). *Customer focus* and *decision quality*, which ranked in the top ten of two of the phases of research for this study, and *directing others*, which ranked in the top ten of one of the phases of research for this study, were also in the top ten most important competencies as rated nationally across industries in 2006 (Dai & De Meuse). However, many of the competencies that were included in the overall North American competency model (i.e. *functional/technical skills*, *drive for results*, *problem solving*, *priority setting*, *intellectual*

horsepower) differ from the competencies appearing among the top ten lists across all three phases of the mid-level leaders in present higher education study. Therefore, the results of this study provide support for the conclusion that there appears to be a unique set of competencies needed to be successful in higher education that are not the same as those needed in other industries or in the private sector.

Linking the Findings with Existing Theory

“Wise leaders do not look out just for their own interests, nor do they ignore those interests.” (Sternberg, 2004, p. 112)

Lominger’s list of competencies includes multiple competencies that are embedded within the theories of leadership discussed previously (in chapter two). In particular, the results of this study are compatible with Sternberg’s (2004) wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized (WICS) theory, the theory of emotional intelligence, the theory of relational leadership, and the theory of transformational leadership. In addition, some of the competencies rated highly may be better described as management skills rather than leadership skills.

Examining the connection between these findings and Sternberg’s WICS (2004) model more closely, the findings of this study indicate that ethics, values, integrity and trust are highly valued characteristics for leaders in higher education. These findings align with Sternberg’s conclusions from his work on leadership and wisdom. When effective leadership is being demonstrated, followers trust the integrity of their leaders and recognize that they are not only looking out for their own well-being, but they are also making decisions and taking actions demonstrating their commitment to values promoting the common good. A commitment toward the common good is dependent on ethical conduct. In other words, if leaders are operating unethically, they are not working

toward the common good. These two highly rated competencies (*ethics and values* and *integrity and trust*) are central to Sternberg's balance theory of wisdom and support his conclusion that wisdom is an essential component of effective leadership.

In his WICS model of educational leadership, Sternberg (2004) also describes the importance of creativity in leaders. He suggests that creativity enables these individuals to be more able to defy the crowd, stand up for what they believe in, redefine problems, take sensible risks and tolerate ambiguity. The *dealing with ambiguity* competency, rated as very important mid-level managers in this study, supports Sternberg's notion that tolerance for ambiguity is an essential characteristic of effective leadership.

The findings of this research also align with many of the domains Goleman (1995) identified as emotional intelligence, which he posited were critical to effective leadership. Goleman proposes that those who are emotionally intelligent are those able to develop and manage relationships with a keen understanding of other's emotions, needs and goals. Specifically, Goleman describes emotional intelligence as having five main domains: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivating oneself, empathy, and social skills. Goleman suggests that people with high emotional intelligence are able to control their impulses and delay gratification. They are able to control their needs, control their moods, think rationally, and empathize with others.

Emotionally intelligent leaders are aware of the interpersonal dynamics among their followers and this awareness helps them to effectively build teams that are productive and help the organization reach its goals. This aspect of Goleman's (1995) theory was supported in the current study by the high ratings of the competency *building effective teams and conflict management*. Because emotionally intelligent leaders are

also aware and sensitive to their followers' needs, they strive to treat their direct reports with fairness (*fairness to direct reports*).

Also central to the many of the five main domains of emotional intelligence is the ability to communicate effectively. Leaders cannot recognize the emotions in others or handle relationships effectively without strong ability to listen and communicate with their colleagues effectively, reflected in the *listening* and *informing* competency identified in this study.

Emotional intelligence also includes the Leadership Architect competency *interpersonal savvy*. This competence is defined as someone who relates well with people and is able to build relationships effectively with individuals at all levels of the organization. In order to do so, one must be aware of others' needs and emotions and have strong social skills, central skills of an emotionally intelligent leader.

Additionally leaders who have a strong customer focus, specifically individuals who are able to create and maintain relationships with customers, are also leaders who demonstrate competence in some of the main domains of emotional intelligence. These individuals have strong social skills and are able to relate and connect with others. Some additional competencies that were rated highly in this study include *motivating others*, *directing others* and *delegation*. All three competencies require leaders to have strong emotional intelligence in establishing relationships, reading the needs of the people they are working with and knowing how much and when to delegate to their direct reports.

Clearly, people with greater emotional intelligence will be strong in many of the competencies rated highly by leaders in higher education. In this regard, the results of this study support Goleman's proposition that the central domains of the theory of emotional

intelligence include competencies that are critical to effective leadership. While Goleman's model does not include all of the competencies rated highly in this study, all of Goleman's five domains of emotional intelligence can be found in one or more of the seven competencies identified as most important by in this study.

Another theory that this research supports is that of relational leadership, which proposes that strong leadership is based on the relations of leaders with their followers. In particular, some of the research conducted on relationship leadership, trust and mutual respect were found in high-quality leader relations (Antonakis et al., 2004). This theory emphasizes that trust and mutual respect are critical to high-quality leader relations, which are critical to effective leadership. Specifically, the high ratings given to the *integrity and trust* competency support the central tenets of the relational leadership theory.

As relational leadership theory is focused on relationships and interactions, it maintains that effective leaders must be good at *informing, listening, motivating others, directing others*, have strong *composure*, and be good at *building effective teams*, all of which were strongly endorsed in this study. A hallmark of relational leadership is communication, which can be broken down into effective listening skills and informing. Furthermore, interpersonally savvy leaders are better able to build these positive relationships in the workplace. The results of this study provide strong support for the theory of relational leadership.

Transformational leadership is also supported by the findings of this study. Central to this theory is the notion that effective leaders must be able to effectively communicate a vision and purpose to their followers. When one thinks of a

transformational leader, one often pictures a visionary who inspired individuals to “dream bigger” than what was directly in front of them. Transformational leaders set high expectations for their followers and for the unit they are leading as a whole. Therefore, transformational leadership theory posits leaders must have skill in *managing vision and purpose*. With this theory, there is also an assumption of integrity and trust. The follower assumes the leader is operating with integrity and trust or the follower wouldn’t believe in the leader’s ability to take the organization or group to a higher level. In fact, transformational leaders often espouse their values explicitly, moving the expressed values of the group to a higher level. When motivating followers, transformational leaders are not using fear tactics or transactional leadership. Instead they are motivating individuals through the intrinsic motivation of seeking a higher level experience.

Most leadership experts agree that many factors influence the strength and quality of leaders, and that no single approach (thus far produced) provides all of the answers. Most practitioners of leadership development agree that an eclectic approach must be utilized in order to develop effective leaders. In order to be effective at any given time and with any specific group, leaders must attend to variety of factors such as the history of the group or organization, the “followers” and their culture, the organization culture and subcultures, and the environmental context. Additionally, the skills and competency areas of the leader can be developed through training and experience leading groups.

It was not surprising to find that the competencies valued as most critical to success, those that differentiated mediocre leaders from superb leaders, happen to be competencies often considered more challenging to develop. Specifically, integrity, trust, ethics and values are competencies that might be more easily to select for than to

develop. Individuals who enter into leadership positions with little integrity and extremely different values from their colleagues in the organization are likely to be much more challenged in developing these skills or aligning their values with their team than those working to develop a competency that are more easily learned such as a technical skill. The assumption that integrity, trust, values and ethics are harder to develop is based on the view that these competencies are often tied into the way individuals see the world and their deeply embedded beliefs. As individuals' paradigms of the world often develop early in life, it may be difficult to change later.

Limitations

It is proposed that the results of this study may be helpful in guiding higher education organizations' decision making regarding training and development efforts. Most of the competencies in this model have already undergone extensive research by Lominger. The findings of this study have undergone an initial validation process through the phase III survey. However, these findings require additional research prior to being used for hiring or selection purposes. More specifically, Lucia and Lepsinger (1999) propose:

If the model is to be used for training and development only, face validity may be sufficient to ensure that the model contains the skills, knowledge and characteristics required for success on the job. But if the model will be used as the basis for selection, appraisal, or compensation systems, the additional step of validating the model is highly recommended (p. 104).

Therefore, Lucia and Lepsinger (1999) recommend that if a model is going to be used to make recommendations or decisions about how people behave, a thorough validation of

the model is necessary. Due to the exploratory nature of the study, the results found in this study may be appropriately applied to training efforts, but would be inappropriate for use for hiring and selecting without additional research. Another limitation of this research is that it was not a national or international study and therefore, future research must be undertaken in order for the results to be considered generalizable across institutions of higher education. In addition to validation across organizations, varying populations, and geographic regions, this study was limited in the number of participants involved. A larger and more diverse participant pool would strengthen these results.

Additionally, a few survey participants wrote in comments regarding the large differences in different director roles across their campuses. In this study, the role of director was selected with the intent to narrow the model to a specific position. However, even the roles of Director, Assistant Director and Associate Director vary widely across units within the university. Hence, while the results of this study may provide useful information, the study could be more narrowly focused to individuals working within one particular unit, perhaps, across several institutions.

Future Research

It is strongly recommended that individuals and groups that would like to use a competency model within their organization customize the model to the context within which the model will be applied. As mentioned earlier, the environmental context often has a strong impact on the behavior of leaders as well as the behavior of the subordinates. A competency model created in one context cannot be assumed to be generalizable to other contexts. Thus, the findings from this study are most applicable to the organization

where they were conducted; generalization to other institutions should be done with caution.

An additional step that could be taken in the future would be to compare the ratings of importance gathered in this study with actual performance ratings across these competencies for individuals in positions of mid-level leader in higher education. The research team for this study was not able to access performance reviews of these participants due to the sensitivity of such information. Due to the sensitive nature of the data, such a study should be undertaken with a high degree of protection for participants' confidentiality. In this study, participants may have been more comfortable rating the importance of certain competencies because it was emphasized it would have no impact on their personal performance reviews or employment status. Employees might provide different responses or be resistant to participating if they knew that both their views of what was important as well as their actual performance on those characteristics were being gathered.

Summary and Implications

In summary, a three-phase study was conducted with mid-level and upper-level academic administrators working in higher education. Each phase of the study gathered feedback from different sources with each source providing a potentially unique perspective. The goals of this research were to determine if 67 Leadership Architect competencies were an applicable and comprehensive list of the competencies needed for success as a mid-level leader in higher education. The competencies were rated in focus groups as well as by an online survey. Two competencies received the highest mean ratings from all three participant groups: *integrity and trust* and *ethics and values*. Three

other competencies, *customer focus*, *composure*, and *dealing with ambiguity*, fell within the top ten most highly ranked competencies according to mean scores. These five competencies that were endorsed by at least two sets of sources are important competencies to focus on in training and development efforts. The list of 17 competencies endorsed by at least one of the three groups of participants (see Table 4) provides a more expansive list of competencies important for leadership success in the role of director in higher education.

According to Lombardo and Eichinger (2004a), there are a number of specific activities one can engage in to practice using a competency and in fact develop one's skills in that competency area. Lombardo and Eichinger (2006) offer roughly ten pages of specific suggestions for each of the 67 competencies in their book titled *Career Architect Development Planner*.

Two competencies, *fiscal responsibility* and *creates organizational collaboration*, were added by focus group participants as additional competencies critical for success as a mid-level leader in higher education. These two competencies were added to the list of competencies that survey participants were asked to rate. *Fiscal responsibility* was ranked as one of the top ten most important competencies by the survey participants in phase III, thus this competency was considered a useful additional by the only group of participants that had the opportunity to rate it. *Creates organizational collaboration* was not ranked in the top ten highest ranked competencies by the survey participants. The results of this study provide support to the hypothesis that there is a unique set of competencies needed to be successful in higher education that are not identical to the competencies needed in the private sector.

References

- American Compensation Association. (1996). Raising the bar: Using competencies to enhance employee performance. Scottsdale, AZ.
- American Council on Education (ACE). (2007). *The chair as leader: Where can I find help for learning the job?* Retrieved March 7, 2007, from <http://www.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/index.cfm?section=1&subsection=7>
- Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A.T. & Sternberg, R.J. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Antonioni, D. (2000). Leading, managing, and coaching. *Industrial Management, September-October 2000, 27-33*.
- Atwater, L.E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F.J., & Fleenor, J.W. (1998). Self-other rating agreement: Does it really matter. *Personnel Psychology, 51, 577-598*.
- Atwater, L. & Yammarino, F. (1992). Does self-other agreement on leadership perceptions moderate the validity of leadership and performance predictions? *Personnel Psychology, 45, 141-164*.
- Bales, R.F. (1958). Task roles and social roles in problem-solving groups. In E.E. Maccoby, T.M. Newcomb & E.L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 437 – 447). New York: Hold, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world: Introduction to the special issue. *American Psychologist, 62, 2-5*.
- Bergquist, W.H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Boulter, N., Dalziel, M., & Hill, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Achieving the perfect fit*. Houston: Gulf.
- Bowen, W.G., & Shapiro, H.T. (1998). *Universities and their leadership*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). The competent manager: A model for effective performance. New York: Wiley.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Calabrese, R.L. (2000). *Leadership through excellence*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Church, A.H. (1997). Managerial self-awareness in high-performing individuals in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 281-292.
- Clark, K. E., & Clark, M. B. (1990). *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Dai, G. & De Meuse, K.P. (2007). The 2006 North American VOICES norms: How they have changed since 2002. *Lominger International*.
- Dawes, R.M. (1980). Social dilemmas. *Annual Review of Psychology, 31*, 169-193.
- DeJongh, M. (2007). Utilizing assessment for talent management. Personnel Decisions International Corporation. Presentation at the Human Resource Professionals of Minnesota's Spring Mini-Conference. Retrieved February 3, 2008, from <http://www.hrpmn.org/pdf/Utilizing%20Assessment%20for%20Talent%20Management.ppt>
- Development Dimensions International (2008). *IM: Tactics for effective leadership*. Retrieved February 3, 2008, from http://bcc.learnpoints.com/main/coursematerials/ddi-info/one-pagers/IM_Tactics_Effective_Leadership.doc.

- Executive Education. (2008). *Executive education*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin School of Business. (2008). Retrieved February 3, 2008, from www.exed.wisc.edu.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1978). The contingency model of the dynamics of the leadership process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 11, pp. 59-112). New York: Academic Press.
- Fleenor, J.W., McCauley, C.D., & Brutus, S. (1996). Self-other rating agreement and leader effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(4), 487 -506.
- Garman, A.N., & Johnson, M.P. (2006). Leadership competencies: An introduction. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 51(1), 13-17.
- Gold, A. (2002). The ethical manager: working with and through colleagues. In S. Ketteridge, S. Marshall & H. Fry (Eds.) *The effective academic*. London: Kogan Page.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goebert, B. (with H. M. Rosenthal) (2002). *Beyond listening: Learning the secret language of focus groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gordon, G. (2003). Leadership and management development: an overview. In R. Blackwell & P. Blackmore (Eds.) *Towards strategic staff development in higher education* (pp. 104-115) Berkshire, England: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Harris, M.M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 43-62.
- Hay Group. (2008). Retrieved February 3, 2008, from

<http://www.haygroup.com/ww/Expertise/index.asp?id=579>

- Hazucha, J.F., Hezlett, S.A., & Schneider, R.J. (1993). The impact of 360-degree feedback on management skills development. *Human Resource Management, 32*, 251-325.
- Hill, L. (2005). *Leadership development: A strategic imperative for higher education*. Harvard Business School Working Paper No. 06-023.
- Hollenbeck, G.P., McCall, M.W., & Silzer, R. F. (2006). Theoretical and practitioner letters: Leadership competency models. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 398-413.
- Huber, J. (2001). How Goodwill Industries is using the LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT Suite to develop future CEOs. Presented at 2001 Sedona Users' Conference. Retrieved April 4, 2007, from http://www.lominger.com/71_1137.htm
- Human Resources Directions. (2008). *Mid-level leader assessment: Sample report*. Retrieved on February 3, 2008 from http://www.hrdirections.com/Mid-Level_Leader.pdf.
- Hunter, S.T., Bedell-Avers, K.E., & Mumford, M.D. (2007). The typical leadership study: Assumptions, implications, and potential remedies. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*, 435-446.
- IDEA center. (2007). Retrieved March 7, 2007, from <http://www.idea.ksu.edu/index.html>
- Institute for Community College Development. (2007). Retrieved February 21, 2007, from <http://www.iccd.cornell.edu/iccd/glp/individualAssessment.html>
- Kress, V.E., & Shoffner, M.F. (2007). Focus groups: A practical and applied research approach for counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 85*, 189-195).
- Landy, F.J. & Conte, J.M. (2006). *Work in the 21st century: An introduction to Industrial*

- and Organizational psychology*. 2nd ed. Blackwell: Malden, MA.
- Lanyon, R.I., & Goodstein, L. D. (1997). *Personality assessment* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Lees, N.D. (2006). *Chairing academic departments: Traditional and emerging expectations*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Lievens, F., Sanchez, J. I., & De Corte, W. (2004). Easing the inferential leap in competency modeling: The effects of task-related information and subject matter expertise. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 881–904.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lombardo, M. & Eichinger, R. (2003). The Leadership Architect norms and validity Report. Edition 4.
- Lombardo, M. & Eichinger, R. (2004a). *FYI for your improvement*. (4th ed.). Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lombardo, M. & Eichinger, R. (2004b). The CAREER ARCHITECT[®] user's manual. Version 03. 1A
- Lombardo, M. & Eichinger, R. (2004c). The Leadership Architect Competency sort cards: Instructions for using the LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT[®] sort cards. Version 04. 1A-FULL.
- Lombardo, M. & Eichinger, R. (2005). *The leadership machine*. (3rd ed.). Minneapolis: Lominger.
- Lombardo M. & Eichinger, R. (2006). *The Career Architect development planner*. Minneapolis: Lominger.

- Looney, J. (n.d.) *Helping students from communities of color make inroads into the corporate world*. Retrieved April 4, 2007, from http://www.lominger.com/71_379.htm
- Lucas, A.F. (1994). *Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lucia, A. D. & Lepsinger, R. (1999). *The Art and Science of Competency Models: Pinpointing critical success factors in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Margolis, J.D., & Walsh, J.P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 268-306.
- Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organization. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 389-418.
- McClelland, D. C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than for "intelligence". *American Psychologist*, 28, 1-14.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1990). *Personality in adulthood*. New York: Guilford.
- McLagan, P. A. (1980). Competency models. *Training and Development Journal*, 34(12), 22-26.
- Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., & Axelrod, B. (2001). *The war for talent*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Middlehurst, (2002). The international context for UK Higher Education. In S. Ketteridge, S. Marshall, & H. Fry (Eds.) *The effective academic: A handbook for enhanced academic practice*. (pp. 13-31). London: Kogan Page.
- Militello, F.C. & Schwalberg, M.D. (2002). Leverage competencies: The key to financial leadership success. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall PTR.

- Moriarty, K.O. (2003). *Are multiple rater perspectives better? A test of two assumptions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida.
- Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in higher education*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- National Association of State Universities and Land-grant colleges. (2007). Retrieved April 4, 2007, from http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Land_Grant/Schools.htm
- National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved March 21, 2007, from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>
- Naquin, S.S., & Holton, E.F. III. (2006). Leadership and managerial competency models: A simplified process and resulting model. *Advances in developing human resources*, 8(2), 144-165.
- Pennington, G. & Smith, B. (2002). Career-long competence: Unattainable ideal or professional requirement? In S. Ketteridge, S. Marshall & H. Fry (Eds.) *The effective academic*. London: Kogan Page.
- Personnel Decisions International (2003). Mid-level leaders assessment.doc. Retrieved February 3, 2008, from <http://www.personneldecisions.com.sg/offerings/mid-level-leader.asp>.
- Pfeffer, J. (1998). *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Primoff, E.S. (1975). How to prepare and conduct job element examinations. (Technical Study 75-1) Washington, DC U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Personnel Research and Development Center* (NTIS No. PB84-148 163).

- Rhodes, R.A. (1998) *The university and its critics*. In W.G. Bowen & H.T. Shapiro (Eds.), *Universities and their leadership* (pp. 3-14). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ruvolo, C.M., Peterson, S.A., & LeBoeuf, J.N.G. (2004). Leaders are made, not born: The critical role of a developmental framework to facilitate an organizational culture of development. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 56(1), 10-19.
- Sanchez, J.I.(2000). The art and science of competency models: Pinpointing critical success factors. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(2), 509-511.
- Seashore, C. & Seashore, E. (1992). *The art of giving and receiving feedback*. North Attleborough, MA: Douglas Charles.
- Secord, P.F., & Backman, C.W. (1974). *Social psychology*. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Shartle, C.L. (1951). Studies of naval leadership, Part 1. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.) *Group, leadership and men* (pp. 119-133). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.
- Shaffer, D.R. (1999). *Developmental psychology*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Shippmann, J. S., Ash, R. A., Battista, M., Carr, L., Eyde, L. D., Hesketh, B., Kehoe, J., Pearlman, K., Prien, E.P., & Sanchez, J.I. (2000). The practice of competency modeling. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 703–740.
- Speck, M. & Knipe, C. (2005). *Why can't we get it right? Designing high-quality professional development for standards-based schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). *Competence at work: Models for superior performance*. NY, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Sternberg, R.J. (1998). A balance theory of wisdom. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(4), 347-365.
- Sternberg, R.J. (2004). WICS: A model of educational leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 68, 108-114.
- Sternberg, R.J. (2007). A systems model of leadership: WICS. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 34-42.
- Sternberg, R.J. & Vroom, V. (2002). The person versus the situation in leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 301-323.
- Stewart, D.W., Shamdasani, P.N., Rook, D.W. (2007). *Focus groups: Theory and practice: 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stines, A.C. (2003). *Forecasting the competencies that will define "best-in-class" business-to-business market managers: An emergent Delphi Hybrid Competency forecasting model*. Pennsylvania State University.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Thackwray, B. (2003). Just another initiative? Investors in people in higher education. In R. Blackwell and P. Blackwell (Eds.) *Towards strategic staff development in higher education*. Berkshire, England: SRHE and Open University Press.
- The Chair Academy. (2008). Retrieved February 17, 2008, from <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/community/chair/index.html>
- Tucker, A. (1992). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

- University of Minnesota (UMN). (2008). Retrieved on February 17, 2008 from
<http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/leadership/index.html>
- Van Wart, M. (2005). *Dynamics of leadership in public service: theory and practice*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Vroom, V. (2000). Leadership and the decision making process. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4), 82-94.
- Wallis, A.B. (2002). *Factors influencing the use of 360-degree feedback*. Unpublished dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Whetten, D.A. & Cameron, K.S. (1995). *Developing management skills*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Wolfe, D.M. (1980). Developing professional competence in the applied sciences. In D. Wolfe & E Byrne (Eds.). *Developing experiential learning programs for professional education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yorke, M. (2001). *Assessment: A guide for senior managers*. LTSN Generic Centre Assessment Series No. 1. York, England: LTSN.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2001). *The nature of executive leadership: A conceptual and empirical analysis of success*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2002). *Organizational leadership and social intelligence*. In R. Riggio (Ed.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. 29-54). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 6-16.

Appendix A: Letter to ALDP Alumni participants for phase I

ALDP Alumni:

I am writing to let you know about an important research study at the University of Missouri being conducted by the President's Academic Leadership Institute. The goal of the study is to create a competency model or success profile of highly valued success factors for mid-level administrators in higher education. This research will also serve as my dissertation research.

We recognize your experience in higher education and would be very appreciative if you would be willing to participate in a focus group. I will be traveling to all of the campuses sometime over the next few months to meet with small groups of approximately 6-8 people. Each group will rate a set of leadership competencies according to level of importance and then discuss the ratings of the competencies with one another. Ultimately, we will create a competency model that will incorporate the feedback received in the focus group sessions.

We hope that all of you will consider participating in this event. Your input is very valuable as we conduct this research, which we will use to continually improve faculty and staff development efforts here at the University of Missouri.

Current dates I am considering for each of the campus focus group meetings:

UMSL - Nov 28th (anytime), Nov 30th (morning)

UMKC - November 20th (afternoon), November 21 (morning)

UMR - November 26th or 28th (morning or afternoon)

UMC - Nov 27th, Nov 29th, Dec 3, Dec 4, Dec 5

PLEASE EMAIL ME IF YOU ARE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE AND I WILL CONTACT YOU TO SCHEDULE A FOCUS GROUP MEETING ON YOUR CAMPUS.

Thank you!
Melanie Flanders

Appendix B: Follow Up Email to Alumni Participants in phase I

ALDP Alumni,

After conducting the pilot for our focus group meetings, we discovered the process takes a bit longer than expected. Rather than extend the length of the meeting and take up more of your time in person, I have created a worksheet for you to complete **PRIOR TO OUR MEETING**. If you can take a little time to print and complete this worksheet, we will greatly expedite our meeting. I know you all spend plenty of time in meetings so I want to make this one move as quickly as possible.

Please complete this worksheet before you come to our meeting. Print and bring the worksheet with you to the meeting.

I TRULY APPRECIATE YOUR HELP WITH THIS.

Melanie

Appendix C: Phase I Focus Group Informed Consent

Informed Consent

This form requests your consent to participate in a research study assessing the leadership competencies demonstrated by effective academic leaders. This is a research project conducted by Melanie Flanders, M.A. under the supervision of Glenn E. Good, Ph.D. The project has been approved by the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board.

Project description: Your participation involves a one hour focus group meeting with moderator from the research team. You will be asked to answer a few brief questions about yourself such as age, years in position, and previous positions held at your university. You will then be asked to sort 67 competencies found on the job or in the workplace. Once you have sorted these 67 competencies into three categories, you will be asked to discuss the results of your sort with the other participants. Your comments and responses to questions will be videotaped. This focus group meeting should last no more than 1 hour. There will be approximately 40 participants involved in the focus group phase of this study. In future months, a survey will be sent to over 600 mid-level leaders to validate the model that is created from the information participants provide in the focus groups.

Potential Benefits and Concerns: Potential benefits include increasing your awareness and providing a time for reflection on what competencies are needed to be an effective academic leader at an institution of higher education. There are no risks anticipated greater than those encountered in daily life for any individual who chooses to participate in this study.

Confidentiality: All information regarding your ratings and focus group discussion will be kept confidential according to legal and ethical guidelines. Your responses will be recorded onto a record sheet with a Participant ID number rather than your name. Therefore, your name will never appear alongside any written data. The focus group session will be video recorded. Transcripts will be created using participant ID numbers to identify comments from various participants. Once the transcripts are complete the video clips will be destroyed. After the project is complete, all data and demographic information will be aggregated, making it impossible to identify one person's individual responses. Names of participants will NOT be used in any published material that may result from the study.

Participation is Voluntary: Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can freely withdraw from the project at any time without negative consequences, and all data pertaining to you will be destroyed.

Questions? Please call Melanie Flanders at 573-884-1878 or Dr. Glenn E. Good at 573-882-3084 with any questions or concerns. If you have questions about your rights as a research project participant, you may contact the MU Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585.

PLEASE DETACH THIS PAGE AND GIVE TO THE PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE

Please check the appropriate line to indicate that you have read and understand this letter:

I give consent to participate in this project. I understand that I will participate in an focus group session with researchers from the President's Academic Leadership Institute (PALI).

I do not give consent to participate.

Signed: _____

_____ (Date)

Name Printed: _____

NOTE: Informed consent MUST be documented by the use of a written consent form approved by the IRB, and signed by you or your legally authorized representative. A waiver of this requirement can only be granted by the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, in accordance with 45 CFR 46. Also, you WILL be given a copy of this form for your records.

Appendix D: Phase II - Letter to Subject Matter Experts

President's Academic Leadership Institute
105 University Hall
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211

December 7, 2007

Dear Advisory Committee Members,

We are writing to bring your attention to an activity that we would like to undertake at the upcoming Advisory Committee Meeting. We are planning an important research study at the University of Missouri to be conducted by the President's Academic Leadership Institute. The goal of the study is to create a competency model or success profile of highly valued success factors for mid-level administrators in higher education.

We will take some time at our upcoming meeting to discuss our research endeavor in further detail. After that discussion, we would be very appreciative if you would help us by participating in a card sort activity, aimed at getting your feedback on what it takes to be an effective mid-level academic administrator. This information will be compiled with the results of other focus group meetings, to create a success profile for effective mid-level leaders. The research study will also serve as Melanie Flanders' doctoral dissertation and will be analyzed in succession planning, hiring and professional development activities.

We believe this research will help us to strengthen the leadership of the University of Missouri, specifically through our PALI - Administrative programming. Thank you for your interest and support.

Sincerely,

K. Blake Danuser, Associate Vice President of Human Resources
Melanie Flanders, Intern for the President's Academic Leadership Institute
Greg Holliday, Director – President's Academic Leadership Institute – Administrative

Appendix E: Phase II – Subject Matter Experts Informed Consent

Informed Consent

This form requests your consent to participate in a research study assessing the leadership competencies demonstrated by effective academic leaders. This is a research project conducted by Melanie Flanders, M.A. under the supervision of Glenn E. Good, Ph.D. The project has been approved by the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board.

Project description: Your participation involves a one hour focus group meeting with moderator from the research team. You will be asked to answer a few brief questions about yourself such as age, years in position, and previous positions held at your university. You will then be asked to sort 67 competencies found on the job or in the workplace. Once you have sorted these 67 competencies into three categories, you will be asked to discuss the results of your sort with the other participants. Your comments and responses to questions will be videotaped. This focus group meeting should last no more than 1 hour. There will be approximately 40 participants involved in the focus group phase of this study. In future months, a survey will be sent to over 600 mid-level leaders to validate the model that is created from the information participants provide in the focus groups.

Potential Benefits and Concerns: Potential benefits include increasing your awareness and providing a time for reflection on what competencies are needed to be an effective academic leader at an institution of higher education. There are no risks anticipated greater than those encountered in daily life for any individual who chooses to participate in this study.

Confidentiality: All information regarding your ratings and focus group discussion will be kept confidential according to legal and ethical guidelines. Your responses will be recorded onto a record sheet with a Participant ID number rather than your name. Therefore, your name will never appear alongside any written data. The focus group session will be video recorded. Transcripts will be created using participant ID numbers to identify comments from various participants. Once the transcripts are complete the video clips will be destroyed. After the project is complete, all data and demographic information will be aggregated, making it impossible to identify one person's individual responses. Names of participants will NOT be used in any published material that may result from the study.

Participation is Voluntary: Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can freely withdraw from the project at any time without negative consequences, and all data pertaining to you will be destroyed.

Questions? Please call Melanie Flanders at 573-884-1878 or Dr. Glenn E. Good at 573-882-3084 with any questions or concerns. If you have questions about your rights as a research project participant, you may contact the MU Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585.

PLEASE DETACH THIS PAGE AND GIVE TO THE PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE

Please check the appropriate line to indicate that you have read and understand this letter:

I give consent to participate in this project. I understand that I will participate in an focus group session with researchers from the President's Academic Leadership Institute (PALI).

I do not give consent to participate.

Signed: _____ (Date)

Print Name: _____

NOTE: Informed consent MUST be documented by the use of a written consent form approved by the IRB, and signed by you or your legally authorized representative. A waiver of this requirement can only be granted by the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, in accordance with 45 CFR 46. Also, you WILL be given a copy of this form for your records.

Appendix F: Phase III - Email to Potential Survey Participants



**Office of Vice President
Human Resources**

215 University Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65211
Telephone (573) 882-8279
Fax (573) 882-6809

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SYSTEM

I am writing to inform you of an important research study at the University of Missouri to be conducted by the President's Academic Leadership Institute. The goal of the study is to create a competency model of highly valued success factors for mid-level administrators in higher education. As a Director, Assistant Director or Associate Director working for the University of Missouri, you have the knowledge to provide us with some important information on what it takes to do your job successfully. The results of this study will be used by the President's Academic Leadership Institute for future training and professional development programming.

I sincerely hope you will be willing to provide us with your feedback by completing this short survey. The survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes of your time. Please click on the below link to begin the survey:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=27PP2O_2b_2b5ZJoosZPejmpyg_3d_3d (If this link is not "clickable" on your computer, just cut and paste the entire link into your internet browser. Press enter and the survey should appear.)

Thank you for your interest and support.

K. Blake Danuser
Interim Vice President for Human Resources

Appendix G: Follow up Email



**Office of Vice President
Human Resources**

215 University Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65211
Telephone (573) 882-8279
Fax (573) 882-6809

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SYSTEM

**A FRIENDLY REMINDER TO PLEASE READ THE MESSAGE BELOW AND
CLICK THE LINK TO COMPLETE OUR SURVEY.**

**Thank you to those of you who have already completed the survey!
We appreciate your feedback.**

I am writing to inform you of an important research study at the University of Missouri to be conducted by the President's Academic Leadership Institute. The goal of the study is to create a competency model of highly valued success factors for mid-level administrators in higher education. As a Director, Assistant Director or Associate Director working for the University of Missouri, you have the knowledge to provide us with some important information on what it takes to do your job successfully. The results of this study will be used by the President's Academic Leadership Institute for future training and professional development programming.

I sincerely hope you will be willing to provide us with your feedback by completing this short survey. The survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes of your time. Please click on the below link to begin the survey:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=27PP2O_2b_2b5ZJoosZPejmpyg_3d_3d (If this link is not "clickable" on your computer, just cut and paste the entire link into your internet browser. Press enter and the survey should appear.)

Thank you for your interest and support.

K. Blake Danuser
Interim Vice President for Human Resources

COLUMBIA KANSAS CITY ROLLA ST. LOUIS

Appendix H: Survey Informed Consent

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a research project that is investigating the competencies needed for success as a mid-level leader in higher education.

Your participation involves completing this online survey, which we estimate will take you approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. In the survey, you will also be asked to answer a few brief demographic questions. Then, you will be asked to answer some questions in regard to leadership competencies found in the workplace.

Potential benefits include increasing your awareness and providing a time for reflection on what competencies are needed to be an effective academic leader at an institution of higher education. There are no physical risks or discomforts associated with taking this survey.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Your participation will not affect your relationship with the university. You may choose to answer all or some of the questions.

Your responses to the questions will be kept confidential. Your name and computer identification information will not be collected. All data collected for the study will be stored in a secure location for three years by the principal investigator. The results of the study will not individually identify any survey participant. Results will be reported in broad patterns only to both the university and the higher education research community.

If you have questions or concerns about the study, please call Melanie Flanders at 573-884-1878 or via email at admlpd@umsystem.edu or Dr. Glenn E. Good at 573-882-3084 or via email at goodg@missouri.edu. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at each of the four campuses of the University of Missouri. Any questions or concerns about human subject participation may be directed to University of Missouri-Columbia's Campus Institutional Review Board, at 573-882-9585, umcresearchcirb@missouri.edu.

If you wish to complete the survey, please continue by clicking "Next" below. If you do not want to complete the survey, please exit this screen.

PALI Leadership Survey (screen 1)

What is your current age?

- 21 years old or younger
- 22-30 years old
- 31-40 years old
- 41-50 years old
- 51-60 years old
- 61 or more years old

Please select your gender.

- Female
- Male

Please select your ethnicity.

- African American
- Asian American
- European American
- Latino(a)/Hispanic
- Native American
- Pacific Islander/Inuit
- Bi-/Multi-Racial
- Other: Please specify in the box below.

How many years have you been in your current position?

*Survey questions have not included because they included intellectual property right information.

PALI Leadership Survey (screen 2)

DIRECTIONS

Please rate the following competencies according to how critical for success you feel the competency is for a Director working in higher education. Our goal is to create a shorter list of the competencies most critical for success as a Director, Assistant Director or Associated Director. As you give each competency a rating, please try to distribute your ratings across all three columns. We recognize that the entire list is made up of positive competencies and they may all be helpful in the workplace at one time or another.

However, we need your help identifying only those that are truly critical for success in this position. We recognize this list may not be comprehensive. When reading through the competencies, if any traits, characteristics, or skills come to mind that you feel are critical for success as a Director, please write them down on a piece of scratch paper. You will be given an opportunity to type in a name and description of any additional competencies (not already listed) you think are essential for success in a Director role.

PLEASE TRY TO DISTRIBUTE YOUR RATINGS ACROSS THE THREE COLUMNS EVENLY. This means we would like you to rate about 11 competencies as Less Important, about 11 as Important, and about 11 as Critical. We don't expect you to keep track exactly, but just be mindful of the fact that you will need to give out just as many "Less Important" ratings as you do the other two categories. You can use the back button at the bottom of each page to glance through your previous ratings.

Please read through the competency names and their descriptions. Please rate each competency according to how critical for success the competency is for a Director, Associate Director, or Assistant Director working in higher education.

*Survey questions have not included because they included intellectual property right information.

Appendix J: Competency Glossary

Glossary of Competency-related Terms

Cognitive Competencies: “competencies or skills that specifically refer to intellectual capabilities. Such competencies are assumed to be an expression of one’s underlying intelligence or intelligence quotient (IQ). IQ represents one’s potential for acquiring cognitive competencies. These may be as simple as reading or performing arithmetic, or they may be more complex competencies, such as analytic thinking.” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 213)

Competencies: “characteristics of employees with behavioral implications that are thought to be associated with successful performance of their job” (Garman and Johnson, 2006, p. 14)

“personal characteristics or sets of habits that are related to effective job performance. These traits or sets of habits involve stable, enduring patterns or styles of behavior, thought, and emotions.” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 213)

Competency Model: “a collection of competencies associated with successful performance” (Garman and Johnson, 2006, p. 14).

“a model that identifies the competencies important for successful or superior performance in a given job, profession or organization” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 214)

- Competency Modeling:** “a systematic process for identifying and articulating competencies at either the individual or organizational level” (Garman and Johnson, 2006, p. 14)
- Core Competencies:** “competencies thought to be associated with the success of an organization” (Garman and Johnson, 2006, p. 14)
- Emotional Competencies:** “characteristics and capabilities based on underlying emotional intelligence. These learned capabilities include thoughts, feelings and behaviors. Emotional competencies represent the great majority of competencies that have been identified as distinguishing superior from average work performance” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 214)
- Foundational Competencies:** “competencies that are necessary but not sufficient for superior job performance” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 214)
- Job analysis:** “a set of procedures designed to identify and describe those aspects of performance that differentiate most sharply between better and poorer workers” (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997 as cited in Shippmann et al., 2000, p. 710)
- KSAs or KSAOs** “knowledge, skills, and abilities” or “knowledge, skills, and abilities and other characteristics” (Shippmann et al., 2000, p. 706)
- Leverage competencies:** “those behaviors that tend to increase the influence and leadership role of finance executives throughout the

business lives of their organizations” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 5)

“competencies that differentiate superior from average job performance” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 214)

Threshold Competencies: “basic competencies that are necessary for an individual to perform a given job. Such competencies, such as being able to read or do arithmetic, must be present for minimal job performance but will not distinguish average from star performers (similar to foundational competencies)” (Militello & Schwalberg, p. 216)

VITA

Melanie Wynne Flanders was born and raised in Fairway, Kansas. After graduating from high school, Melanie moved to Missoula, Montana to pursue an undergraduate degree in Psychology at the University of Montana. While living in Montana, Melanie enjoyed snowboarding, hiking and biking in the Northern Rockies. Melanie also loves to travel. Melanie studied Spanish while on an extended stay in Salamanca, Spain in 2001 and continued her study of the Spanish language in Costa Rica throughout the Summer of 2004.

In 2003, Melanie returned to the Midwest to begin graduate school at the University of Missouri in Columbia, Missouri. She has interests in several sub-specialties of psychology including school psychology, industrial and organizational psychology and consulting psychology. Melanie is currently pursuing a doctorate degree in School Psychology. She is an active member of the Society of Consulting Psychology, Division 13 of the American Psychological Association. She has presented four papers, two posters, and moderated a panel at national professional conferences. Melanie currently serves on the Governance Board of the Society as graduate student representative, listserv moderator and conference co-chair for the annual 2009 conference. Melanie plans to relocate in Denver, Colorado and begin work as an organizational consultant in June of 2008.