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The purpose of this quantitative, descriptive study was to identify the self-perceived leadership styles of college academic advisors and to explore the variance in the perceived leadership styles based on demographic information such as academic advising approaches, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender. Participants were 225 college advisors from among 5,066 members of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) during the 2013-2014 academic year who met study criteria and whose email invitation to complete an online survey was presumably delivered, rendering a 4.44% response rate. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Version 5X (MLQ 5X) with five supplemental questions was used for data collection. The composite score for leadership style served as the dependent variable, and advising approach, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender served as the independent variables for the study.

Descriptive statistics, frequency distribution, and a factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used for data analysis. The descriptive statistics for this study revealed that college academic advisors represent all points along the entire spectrum of the full range model of leadership continuum employing different leadership behaviors based on the situation. The descriptive data were supported by the frequency distributions per case which identified transformational leadership as the perceived dominant leadership style for the college academic advisors in this study. A priori to conducting the factorial ANOVA, Leneve’s test for
homogeneity of variance indicated a statistically significant coefficient, thus violating the assumption of data normality and rendering the ANOVA findings uninterpretable.

An implication of this study is that transformational leadership is the most desired leadership style of the full range model of leadership for college academic advisors. If this is true, professional development activities for college academic advisors should focus on strengthening transformational leadership behaviors/techniques including with whom and when this leadership style should be employed compared to the other full range model of leadership styles.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Academic advising has, in some form, been a part of the higher education system in the United States since its origin (Gordon, 1992; Cook, 1999; Kuh, 2008); more important, its relevance and influence on student learning and achievement in higher education has increased steadily over the past 35 years (Creamer 2000; Light, 2001; Noel-Levitz, 2010; Tinto, 1994). In some studies (Light, 2001; Noel-Levitz, 2010; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Jordan, 2000; Hunter & White, 2004) academic advising in general and the advisor-student relationship specifically were identified as valuable teaching and learning strategies that affect student success. The teaching and learning relationship that occurs in academic advising is advantageous for student success considering the call for timely college completion by the U.S Department of Education (Center for College Affordability and Productivity, 2010).

In 1998, the Public Higher Education program at the Rockefeller Institute of Government surveyed institutions and found that several states--including Florida, Colorado, and Texas--were using or were anticipated to start using performance-based funding to demonstrate accountability to the their governing bodies (Burke & Serban, 1998). This could mean that institutions either are or will soon be funded based on retention and graduation rates in addition to enrollment. This revolutionary funding model is a result of the directive to increase timely completion. To answer the ‘call’ to action, colleges and universities must continue to undergo significant changes that emphasize learning in and outside of the traditional classroom to increase timely completion and fulfill the requirements associated with the proposed performance-based funding that has degree attainment as a core measure of student learning.
The priority of timely completion reinforces the position of teaching and learning in the advisement process and its contributions to student success in higher education (Noel-Levitz, 2012).

Habley (2000) addressed the idea of academic advising as a key contributor to student success in his work on the evolution of academic advising. According to Habley, there are three identified hallmarks of academic advising that include:

Hallmark #1: The inclusion of student success in the working definition of academic advising. This means expanding the definition to include student success/achievement shifted the focus from clerical tasks to a function of teaching/learning.

Hallmark #2: Intentionality of academic advisement as an enrollment and retention strategy during the late 70’s and early 80’s when enrollment decreased at most post-secondary institutions. Academic advisement was utilized to “better serve, satisfy and retain students who were enrolled” (Habley, 2000, p. 35). As the status of advising progressed, colleges and universities recognized the need to hire [more] professional advisors to assist students with enrollment and scheduling, educational planning and development of various student success programs.

Hallmark #3: Systematizing the profession by way of a (inter)national organization (National Academic Advisement Association-NACADA). NACADA is the first and (currently) only International organization for the advising community. The organization brought recognition to the profession by promoting scholarly research in the area of academic advising. This recognition drew attention to the importance of academic advising at post-secondary institutions, as well as strengthen the role (and importance) of college academic advisors
including professional and faculty advisors, academic counselors, advising administrators, and Deans.

As Habley (2000) stated, the function of academic advising and academic advisors is no longer clerical task but a profession that affirms the very essence of higher education institutions, which is teaching and learning; hence, it is important to understand the behaviors of college advisors. In light of the evolution and professionalization of academic advising, advising is often cited as the “only structured activity on the campus in which all students have the opportunity for one-to-one interaction with a concerned representative of the institution” (Nutt, n.d., para. 2). Moreover, the one-to-one interactions with a campus representative, specifically academic advisors “provide students with the needed connection to the various campus services and supply the essential academic connection between these services and students” (Nutt, para. 2). The frequent interactions establish a relationship between the student and advisor that provides structured opportunities beyond the classroom that support students’ knowledge acquisition and goal attainment (Kitchen, 1995) thereby reinforcing the role that college academic advisors play in the lives of college students.

Academic advisors are often the first point of contact for students, serving as frontline leaders at some college and universities. As frontline leaders, college advisors can establish working relationships with students that last the course of their academic journeys. Also, these frontline leaders can leverage the advising relationship to accomplish the shared goal of student success. As such, some researchers study the advising relationship to explore and define the dynamics of these interactions, and their influence on student success. For example, Cuseo (n.d.) defined the student success and the academic advising relationship as, “that helps
students become more self-aware of their distinctive interest, talents, values and priorities and sharpens their cognitive skills for making these choices, such as effective problem-solving, critical thinking, and reflective decision-making” (p. 15). Cuseo’s definition of the advising relationship echoes O’Banion’s (1972) explanation of developmental advising. O’Banion described the advising relationship as “a process in which advisors and advisee enter a dynamic relationship respectful of the student’s concerns. Ideally, the advisor serves as teacher and guide in an interactive partnership aimed at enhancing the student’s self-awareness and fulfillment” (p. 63).

While the research descriptions of the significance of the advising relationship were well-defined and the previously cited literature spoke to benefits of teaching and learning in the advisement process such as knowledge acquisition, the behaviors, specifically leadership behaviors, that college advisors demonstrate that purposely contribute to student success in the advisement process are ambiguous. An understanding of college advisors' behaviors, as frontline leaders is imperative to the advancement of the advising profession because of (a.) their frequent interactions with students, and (b.) their ability to influence student behaviors like motivation, autonomy, and self-efficacy that may lead to student success. As Hunter and White (2004) asserted, “advising can create a vital connection between students and their education, helping them become more reflective and strategic about the choices they are making and the learning they engage in” (p. 20). Hunter and White’s statement highlights the significance of college academic advisors, irrespective of their titles as full-time, part-time, faculty advisor, or counselor.
Research has consistently shown that college academic advisors play an integral part in student success which is in part due to their continuous interactions with students that may lead to higher retention and completion rates (Campbell & Nutt, 2008; Hones & Sullivan-Vance, 2007; McClellan & Moser, 2011; McGillan, 2003; Noel-Levitz, 2010; Varney, 2007). College advisors teach students about more than curriculum choice and registration, they also facilitate experiences that connect in- and out-of classroom learning opportunities for student success. As the definition of academic advising evolves to encompass leaders/leadership, teaching and learning, as well as student engagement (Kuh, 2008; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), there is a need to study the role of college advisors as frontline leaders including the behaviors that could influence student success. This study explored the leadership styles of college advisors in an effort to understand their leadership behaviors.

Statement of the Problem

At times it is difficult to articulate to others, particularly those not in the advising profession, the general responsibilities, roles, and importance of advisors’ presence at post-secondary institutions (Self, 2008). However, research confirms the importance and the impact of academic advising and advisors in college students’ experiences (Schreiner, 2009; Campbell & Nutt, 2008; Chickering, 1969; King, 1993; Lowe & Toney, 2000; NACADA, 2010). The problem is that little is known about the leadership styles and behaviors of those employed as college academic advisors, particularly their perceived leadership styles and advising approaches, which the study addressed. According to Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993), the first step in being a proficient leader is acknowledging your influence over others. The next step is vision with an intense focus on outcomes and results. In the case of advisors as leaders, the foci are:
Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this quantitative research study was two-fold: (a) to identify the self-perceived leadership styles of college academic advisors using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), and (b) to explore the variance in college advisors’ perceived leadership styles based on demographic information such as academic advising approaches, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender.

Significance of Study

The study should be of interest to those who are being studied, first and foremost, as well as the advising profession as a whole. Colleges and universities will also benefit from the results of the study; namely, advising administrators. The contents from the study may also be used to inform the CAS standards and guidelines, specifically leadership development as defined in the desirable student learner outcomes. Last but not least, tomorrow’s leaders---students-- could benefit from advisors knowing their own leadership styles and how they inform their advising approaches. Further research as to the role of the college academic advisor in retaining students and the factors causing and affecting student retention such as student learning and development are important (Tinto, 2012; Drake, Jordan & Miller, 2013); and it begins with an assessment of one’s leadership behaviors and styles (Day & Harrison, 2007). Little is known about the leadership behaviors and styles (including effectiveness) of advisors. Hence, this study has implications for both research and the advancement of advising practices.
Conceptual/Theoretical Framework

This study examined the self-perceived leadership styles of college academic advisors using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire based on the full range model of leadership. The full range model of leadership was derived from on 100 years of research that identifies leadership behaviors, and then scores the individual’s leadership style along a continuum from transactional, transformational, or passive/avoidant (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Leadership behaviors focus on leadership at the individual level, which is appropriate for examining academic advisors’ interactions with individual students. In the advising profession, there is a belief that academic advisors should modify their behaviors based on the individualized needs of students (NACADA Core Values, 2005). Supported by a review of the relevant research, I selected situational leadership theory as the relevant conceptual/theoretical framework for this study.

Situational leadership theory is an extension of contingency theories of leadership effectiveness (Seyranian, 2010). The contingency theories of leadership effectiveness declares that there is no one leadership style that works best for all. Within the context of contingency theories of leadership effectiveness, the notion is that an appropriate balance of task-orientation and people-orientation in combination with other variables impacts the follower’s perception of the leader’s effectiveness. This definition of leadership and effectiveness reflects that of situational leadership theory, which states that the leader selects their way of work based on variables related to the situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). Moreover, the leader selects the style and demonstrates leadership behaviors apposite for the characteristics of the followers, the task(s), as well as the level of authority held by the leader (Hersey & Blanchard,
1988; Yukl, 1999). These descriptions are supported by both Bass (1985) and Northouse (2004, 2012) who affirm that the choice of leadership style inclusive of variations in leadership behaviors is contingent upon the relationship between the leader (advisor) and follower (student). The intended outcome of situational leadership is that follower will be motivated and supported by the leader to perform the tasks necessary to achieve the identified goal.

According to Northouse (2004), there are three overarching categories of leadership behaviors and styles based on the presented situation: authoritarian, directive, and participative. Authoritarian leadership, also referred to as autocratic leadership, is exhibited when a leader dictates policies and procedures; determines the goals to be accomplished without input; and controls all activities without any meaningful participation by followers. In connection with the full range model of leadership, authoritarian leadership is parallel to transactional leadership in general and management-by-exception specifically. Behaviors associated with management-by-exception are enforcement of policies and procedures, and corrective or punitive action when followers disregard (unintentionally or intentionally) policies, procedures, and do not accomplish the specified goals.

Directive leadership is characterized by leaders that set clear expectations and boundaries, and more often than not identifies themselves as the expert, who knows what is best for the followers; instructs followers on how they will perform tasks including a timeline for completion of said tasks (Northouse, 2004). The leader may also incentivize this process by providing followers with rewards when they complete particular tasks or accomplish milestones outlined by the leader. This form of leadership may be helpful when there is uncertainty about the assigned task, or when a follower is having difficulty understanding the big picture;
consequently, displaying itself as what *may* appear to be a lack of motivation opposed to a need for clarity. This form of leadership is correlated, again, with transactional leadership; however, the leader’s behaviors resemble those associated with contingent reward (see Table 2).

Lastly, there is participative leadership. Participative leadership differs from both authoritarian and directive leadership behaviors in that it involves the creation of shared goals that exemplifies excellence, and the leader encourages followers to determine the best means to achieve the goals (Northouse, 2004). Participative leadership actively involves followers in the leadership process that includes decision making. The leader expresses a high degree of confidence in followers with proper guidance, as and when appropriate. In order for the leader to provide adequate and appropriate guidance based on the situation, the leader continuously seeking input from followers through one-on-one and group consultations that demonstrates their confidence in followers (as subject-matter-experts). Participative leadership mirrors that of transformational leadership style when viewed through the lens of full range model of leadership. An example is when a leader provides coaching that encourages followers to actively engage/participate in the leadership (and learning) process by forming a relationship that takes both parties’ perspectives into consideration.

The categories outlined above connect to both situational leadership theory and full range model of leadership. Leaders *may* employ a range of leadership behaviors from authoritarian to participative that are placed along a continuum in reference to the full range model of leadership which are essentially depending on the situation. Situational factors that influence the leader’s behavior include but are not limited to: characteristics of followers (i.e.,
maturity level), needs of followers, dynamics of the relationship between leader and follower, as well as the identified goals. It is also important to note that application of the selected approach could theoretically decide the effectiveness of the leadership style; and as a consequence, influence the follower’s perception of the quality of the relationship with the leader (Vroom & Jago, 1995).

Another significant factor related to situational leadership theory and full range model of leadership is organizational culture. Culture is a determinant of leadership style and must be taken into consideration when addressing specific challenges and goals (Blunt & Jones, 1997). Recognition of academic advisors/counselors as leaders is influenced by the organizational culture, the institution’s perceptions of advisors’ ability to lead, and academic advisors’ perceptions of themselves as leaders. Factors that influence the institution’s perceptions of advisors as leaders are content knowledge, experience, influence among colleagues, and most importantly, position within the institution’s hierarchy. The latter is pivotal to how others but more importantly academic advisors perceive themselves as leaders in higher education.

The conceptual/theoretical framework (situational leadership theory) for the study assisted with assessment of the relationship between academic advisors’ self-perceived leadership style using Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and full range model of leadership. Additional synopses on leadership theories are provided in Chapter 2.

Significance of Leadership

There is a wide range of definitions for leadership. Two of the most common proclamations about leadership in the literature are that leadership is a process and that leadership is a relationship between individuals. Kouzes and Posner (2007) maintained that
leadership is a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) acknowledged that “leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individuals or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation” (p. 84). However, Tannenbaum, Weschler and Massarik (1961) considered leadership to be “interpersonal influence” directed by clear communication of specific goal(s). In order for the relationship to be effective, leadership should be engaging and/or establishing a connection between the leader and followers.

The term educator implies that one is capable of not only the role of teacher but also the role of advisor, guide, counselor, mentor, researcher, coach and leader. Some of these roles are often disregarded within the context of advising/advisors--particularly, the role of advisor as leader. This is notwithstanding their growing list of leadership responsibilities such as championing strategic initiatives, leading student development/growth, and teaching/learning, and assessment of the advisement processes (Gordon, 1992; Habley, 2000; NACADA, 2010; Schuh, Upcraft & Associates, 2001; U. S. Department of Education, 2006; College Board, 2012). Of this burgeoning list of responsibilities, leadership of student growth and development is most valuable, yet the most often overlooked.

Based on 16 years of experience working at various post-secondary institutions, I have observed college academic advisors interacting with leaders at all levels. This is in large part due to the diversification of their roles within the context of higher education. For instance, advisors typically report to a director of advising about the advisement process. Generally speaking, there is a direct relationship between advisors/supervisees and the Director of Advising/supervisor. The Director of Advising communicates this information to a supervisor,
usually an Associate/Dean of Student Affairs, who is also part of the organizational administrative council. It is then the Associate/Dean’s responsibility to engage the Executive Cabinet and the campus at-large in advising processes such as policies and procedures. In essence, advisors are held accountable to institutional administration despite the formalized reporting structure. Based on my experience, this type of reporting structure coupled with the evolution of academic advising and the range of functions performed, affords advisors the opportunity to capitalize on their leadership abilities.

*College Academic Advisors as Leaders*

Historically, nearly all studies on leadership have focused primarily on figures of authority (Heifetz, 1998); however, college academic advisors hold expertise power that can instigate changes to policies and procedures but are often overlooked because the title lacks the positional or legitimate power to initiate change (Hayes, 2010; Hodge, Anthony & Gales, 2003). Furthermore, advisors are rarely consulted about changes to policies and procedures that either enhance or deteriorate the likelihood of institutional and student success, respectively (NACADA, 2010; Self, 2008). The idea of positional power is reinforced in the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) standards and guidelines for academic advising (CAS, 2012). For instance part three of CAS standards and guidelines addresses the importance of leadership and academic advisement. Institutions must appoint, position, and empower academic advising programs (AAP) leaders within the administrative structures to accomplish stated missions. Duly noted, AAP leaders must exercise authority over resources for which they are responsible to achieve their respective mission” (p. 6). Conversely, college academic advisors (non-appointed authority) are responsible for effective leadership development of
students as identified in the CAS standards and guidelines under interpersonal competence for student outcome domains (CAS Board of Directors, 2005). For the advisor to effectively teach leadership development as outlined in the desired CAS outcomes, the assumptions are:

1. Academic advisors know and/or can recognize diverse leadership styles;

2. Academic advisors know their (own) leadership style, and display such characteristics when working with students;

3. Academic advisors utilize their (own) leadership skills during the advisement process to teach students about effective leadership.

The aforementioned perceptions may be in part due to the formalized organization of the profession through NACADA (2013) and the loosely-coupled nature of higher education systems, in general that subside academic advising to the single task of nothing more than scheduling. So, who are the individuals hired and charged with leading the academic journeys of tomorrow’s leaders---students. How do these individuals perceive their roles as leaders?

Definition of Terms

Academic Advising: Academic advising is an interactive teaching/learning process designed to guide, motivate, and assist students with making the right academic choices for their unique life circumstances and needs (Kuhn, 2008; Marques, 2005). This systematic process endorses mutual respect based on a close advisee-advisor relationship (Ender, Winton, & Miller, 1984).

College Academic Advisor/Academic Counselor: Academic advisor/academic counselor refers to an employee of the institution who advises students. Advisors facilitate communication, coordinate learning experiences, and serve as a referral agent to other campus and external agencies as needed (Crockett, 1987).
Academic Advising Approaches: Academic advising approaches are the techniques college advisors employ while working with students. Advising approaches are also referred to as academic advising styles (Hemwell & Trachte, 2005; Drake, Jordan & Miller, 2013).

Leadership: Leadership is the ability of an individual to influence the behavior(s) of others through a relationship, in an effort to move the individual and/or an organization forward to accomplish identified goal(s) (Barnard, 1938).

Leadership Styles: Leadership styles are both explicit and implicit methods leaders choose to provide direction, implement plans, and motivate individuals towards a common goal/purpose (Newstrom & Davis, 1993; Northouse, 2012).

Professional Advisor/Academic Counselor: Professional advisors are individuals whose primary and/or sole responsibility is advisement of students. These professionals do not have a full-time teaching load (Crockett, 1987; Frost, 1991; Appleby, 2008).

Research Questions

In an effort to learn more about the individuals who are leading the leaders of tomorrow, this study is designed to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the dominant self-perceived leadership style of college advisors completing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form 5-X short?

RQ2: Is there a statistically significant difference in the composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style according to the independent variables of academic advising approach, gender, institutional type, age group, and years of experience group?

RQ3: If a statistically significant difference exists, between which independent variables does the difference exist according to post-hoc test?
Limitations

A limitation of the study was that leadership styles were defined based on the self-perception of college academic advisors. A related limitation was academic advisors’ understanding and acceptance of their role as leaders. A third limitation was the matter of research design. The research design was non-experimental, and participants were not assigned to a control group for the study. Researcher bias was the final limitation for the study. With a strong interest in academic advising, and a current advising administrator and former academic advisor these biases may have affected both the collection and analysis of data for the study. I recognized this as a potential problem and made a conscious effort to maintain objectivity.

Delimitation

The sample selected to participate in the study consisted solely of professional college academic advisors/academic counselors affiliated with the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) through membership in 2014. Due to the selective nature of the research sample, the results may not be applicable to all categories of advisors including non-NACADA professional academic advisors/academic counselors.

Assumptions

It was assumed that college academic advisors recognized their leadership styles, and viewed themselves as leaders. It was also assumed that college academic advisors fully acknowledged and practiced in accordance with CAS standards and guidelines; particularly, leadership development since it is considered a desirable student learner outcome of student
achievement for the advisement profession. Lastly, it was assumed that participants understood the statements on the self-assessment instrument.

Summary

Academic advising is an integral part of the college experience (Drake, 2011). The leader’s style influences the relationship between leader-follower or for this study, advisor-advisee, and the relationship impacts the follower’s willingness to move towards change and goal attainment that is student learning, development, and timely completion for academic advisement in higher education. Likewise, leadership development of students can be facilitated through the advisement process, notably if advisors know and used their leadership behaviors to inform their advisement approach. This section presented background information on the study, which included a statement of the problem, the purpose and significance of the research including the significance of leadership, the definition of terms key terms and phrases relevant to the study, research questions to be addressed, and limitations and assumptions consisted of the researcher’s biases.

Organization of Study

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, definition of terms, theoretical framework, research questions, limitations, and delimitations. Chapter 2 includes a review of literature, including the history of academic advising, with specific emphasis on the formalization of the profession; NACADA’s core values on the profession and student learning; academic advising approaches; academic advising professionals; and discussion on the different types of leadership. Chapter 3 is focused on methodology, specifically quantitative methods, includes
selection of participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data analyses. Chapter 4 contains the findings from this study, including descriptive statistics of the sample and results from the quantitative analyses. Chapter 5 provides a summary of the study and a discussion of the findings, including implication for practice, and conclusion with recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Academic advising is an integral part of the United States’ higher education system and has been since the establishment of the first postsecondary institution in the late 1600s (Kuhn & Padak, 2008). During this time in American higher education history, faculty led all advising activities (Frost, 1991) and informally served as teacher, advisor, mentor, and in loco parentis (Bush, 1969; Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997) to guide students’ academic and moral development. At many post-secondary institutions today academic advising programs do not rest solely on the shoulders of faculty but are a shared responsibility between academic and student affairs; who teach students in out-of-class situations to promote student learning and development (Creamer & Creamer, 1994).

This literature review is an exploration and synthesis of relevant research on: the history of academic advising including student learning, academic advising approaches, role(s) of college academic advisors, leadership theories highlighting the full range of leadership model, and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. For years, the literature on leadership has focused on figures of authority (also known as legitimate power/positional leadership). More important, the targeted population of these studies on figures of authority have been male participants; in that way, reinforcing the notion of male/masculine leadership traits over female leaders, inclusive of feminine leadership traits.

Often overshadowed by various works on positional leadership, most recently, authors have directed their attention towards female leaders, age/ generational differences (e.g., baby
boomers compared to GENEX) in leadership behaviors/styles, discerning the wide range of leadership theories and leadership from any position within organizations (Avolio, 1999; Cohen & Bradford, 2005; Garcia-Retamero, & Lopez-Zafra, 2006). For instance, Avolio (1999) insists that in order for leadership to be effective, it is necessary for it to take place at (least) two levels; the organizational and personal levels. Avolio’s suggested model of organizational leadership depicts executive and mid-level management as those who establish the organization’s culture and goals. A mutual understanding and agreement of the organization’s goals, in particular guides employees formally and informally with leading others towards goal attainment that is shaped by the organization’s culture. Nevertheless, to establish a culture of multi-level leadership within the setting of higher education in general and academic advising specifically, it is necessary to examine the past and current states of these matters.

To better understand the current state of academic advising, advisors, and their self-perceived leadership styles within the context of post-secondary education, this literature review will begin with an appraisal of the four historical periods that have formed the academic advising profession.

**History of Academic Advising**

*First Period of Academic Advising: 1600s to Early 1880s*

Kenyon College of Ohio introduced the first formalized advising system in the late 1820s (Cook, 1999); pairing students with faculty who would provide them with direction. Johns Hopkins University formalized its faculty advising system in 1876 (Rudolph, 1962), followed by Harvard College in 1891 (fifteen years after Johns Hopkins University), respectively. During this time at American higher education institutions, there was sameness to the type of students
attending post-secondary institution: white, male, from well-to-do families each pursuing
studies in ministry, law or medicine (Gordon, 2006). The homogeneity in student demographics
resulted in little (to no) attention given to the individuality of students; consequently, there was
no need for a formal academic advising system.

Second Period of Academic Advising: Late 1880s to Early 1910s

By the late-1800s advising was well underway at most American university systems
(Fenske, 1989); since advising was governed by faculty it was viewed as important as teaching
(Frost, 2000). Duly noted was the Morrill Act/Land Grant College Act of 1862, expansion of
course offerings and elective curricula (Kuh, 2008; Lucas, 1994; Nuss, 2003). The compounded
transformation of American higher education brought about a need for faculty to assist
students on an individual-basis, to focus on the student’s interests, talents and needs (Gordon,

Third Period of Academic Advising: Late 1910s to 1950s

At the start of the twentieth century, institutions of higher learning were the recipient
of “new money” because of the industrial revolution. The “new money” came with new and
greater expectations of faculty---faculty-based research. With the emphasis on research rather
than teaching, faculty members were pulled farther from the classroom and advising. The
relationship between faculty and students became less interactive and more impersonal (Frost,
2000) raising concern for some educational leaders.

Between World Wars I and II, academic advising programs continued to evolve; and it
was after World War II that student enrollment grew exponentially (Frost, 2000; Gordon, 1992;
Thelin, 2003) impacting faculty’s ability to advise adequately. Faculty did not have time nor
were there incentives for them to teach and advise. For the first time, faculty had to choose between teaching and advising; advising became second, and in some cases third to teaching and research. The prior mentioned elements weakened formal faculty advising systems and eventually, academic advisement became a function of student affairs personnel (Grites, 1979).

Fourth Period of Academic Advising: 1960s to Present

The fourth academic advising period was set apart from the other due to the 1965 Higher Education Act which authorized financial assistance for needy college students (Brubacher & Rudy, 2002). The beginning of this era was marked by record enrollments, and significant diversity among students entering post-secondary institutions. An increase in enrollment and diversification of the student body brought about a new term in advising: the undecided student. The undecided student was a new phenomenon in higher education, at this time and researchers (Brubacher & Rudy, 2002; Cook, 1999; Gordon, 1981; Tinto, 1994) studied the “troubled” undecided student, trying to make sense of their non-committal behaviors. Gordon (1981) concludes from her research that indecisive students are at different levels of developmental, and are not “troubled” or non-committal.

During the late 1970s and 1980s (fourth phase of advising continues) different researchers explored the correlation between advising and student retention (Beal & Noel, 1980; Crockett & Levitz, 1983); particularly, for those institutions with declining enrollment. Tinto’s (1994) argued that one of the most powerful and positive influences on student retention were individual attention and integration into the academic and social environment. In addition to the focus on retention efforts was the formation of NACADA, the first professional organization for academic advising. The first national conference on advising was
NACADA Statement of Core Values for Academic Advising

The National Academic Advising Association was founded in 1979 as a professional organization for academic advising and advisors to promote “quality academic advising on college and university campuses” (NACADA, 1994, para. 1). NACADA, the “global community for academic advising” (NACADA, 2013) is known for its dedication to “the support and professional growth of academic advisors and the advising profession” (NACADA, 1992, p. 80) with over 11,000 active members. In an effort to formalize the profession, members of NACADA with assistance from the Executive Board developed core values to support the professional growth of academic advisors and advising programs, which should be considered when establishing an academic advising program. The core values are a “framework against which those who advise can measure their own performance” (NACADA, 1994, para. 2), and should be used as reference points for institutions and advising professionals.

There are six core values reported in the declaration and exposition, with an additional 21 secondary values. The core values are based on the belief that students deserve dependable, accurate, respectful, honest, friendly, and professional service. In addition to the core values, a comprehensive definition for academic advising was developed in 2004 by a task
force for NACADA. There are four components to the comprehensive definition of academic advising: 1. academic advising is a multidimensional, intentional process; 2. academic advising is grounded in teaching and learning; 3. academic advising has its own purpose and content; and 4. academic advising has specified outcomes for student learning (NACADA, 2004b). This definition of academic advising is inclusive and applicable to all institutional types.

The core values and definition for academic advising are reviewed periodically by the Executive Board and appointed members to ensure that the values align with new practices and the latest nomenclature appropriate to the profession and higher education (NACADA, 2005).

**Figure 1** NACADA Statement of Core Values, 2005

While each core value and components of the comprehensive definition for advising are important for academic advising and advisors, the first and sixth core values as well as component two (teaching and learning) of the advising definition are of relevance to this research study. NACADA’s (2005) first and sixth primary values read as follows:

Advisors are responsible to the students and individuals they serve. These efforts include: maintaining regular office hours; giving accurate and timely information; teaching students perceptions of themselves and their relationship to the future; encouraging life management skills; modifying barriers to student progress; maintaining
awareness of government, institutional, and departmental policies that could affect students; respecting confidentiality; and, documenting contact with student to aid subsequent visits.

The last core value is that advisors are responsible for their professional role as an advisor and to themselves. Advising practices and the students they serve are continually changing, therefore advisors can maintain their professional role by participating in continuing education, professional organizations, conferences, reading, and research.

As previously stated the core values are intended to serve as a guide for advisors and advising programs to ensure the highest quality of advisement across higher education institutions.

*CAS Standards and Guideline for Academic Advising*

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) was the first national effort to develop standardized criteria and guidelines for assessing educational effectiveness to encourage continuous quality improvement of programs and services through self-study. To help prepare practitioners, CAS continually produces and disseminates standards and guidelines for all programs and services in higher education. The development and continuous improvement of the standards and guidelines involve individual professionals/practitioners, consultants, public-sector representatives, and professional associations such as NACADA (Council for Academic Standards and Guidelines, 2012).

NACADA has eight goals for academic advising; these goals were created in 1980 (and to date have not changed since 1980) by a task force convened by NACADA that was charged with providing information to CAS. The identified goals include:
1. Assisting students in self-understanding and self-acceptance.

2. Assisting students in considering their life goals by relating their interests, skills, abilities, and values to careers, the world of work, and the nature and purpose of higher education.

3. Assisting students in developing an educational plan consistent with their life goals and objectives.

4. Assisting students in developing decision-making skills.

5. Providing accurate information about institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs.

6. Referring students to other institutional or community support services.

7. Assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating progress toward established goals and educational plans.

8. Providing information about students to the institution, college, academic departments, or some combination thereof.

These goals were used by CAS to develop the CAS Standards for Academic Advising Programs (AAP), and the CAS Self-Assessment Guide for Academic Advising (Habley).

The CAS standards for AAPs are divided into 13 sections: ranging from mission/mission statement to leadership, and human resources to evaluation. CAS standards for academic advising (AAP) reflect the minimal requirement expected of all academic advising programs with recommendations for effective advising practices (NACADA, 2006; CAS, 2012). An additional component of CAS standards and guidelines are the student learning and development outcomes, which again includes all programs and services. CAS identified six
student outcomes domains: (a) knowledge, acquisition, construction, integration and application; (b) cognitive complexity; (c) intrapersonal development; (d) interpersonal competence; (e) humanitarianism and civic engagement; and (f) practical competence. Each outcome domain is designed to address teaching and learning in academic advising, and enhance the quality of each student’s advising experience; although, knowledge acquisition and interpersonal competence is of significance to this study because effective leadership is itemized as a dimension of this outcome domain. According to the CAS Learning and Development Outcomes: CAS Conceptual Statement (2005), “effective leadership development demonstrates skills in guiding and assisting a group, organization or community in meeting its goals; identifies and understands the dynamics of a group; exhibits democratic principles as a leader or group member; communicates a vision, mission or purpose that encourages commitment and action in others” (p. 3). Academic advising programs (AAP) and advisors are responsible for teaching, and helping students learn how to be effective leaders (NACADA, 2006).

Both the CAS standards and guidelines and NACADA core values are essential to the advising profession. Each speaks to the different functions for academic advising. The CAS standards and guidelines, including the student learning and development outcomes pertain to all aspects of advising; whereas, the NACADA core values concentrate on defining the roles and responsibilities of advisors (CAS, 2012; NACADA, 2006).

Academic Advising Approaches

As a profession and a generation of theory, academic advising is a relatively new field (Cook, 1999). The growing body of published reports (Beal & Noel, 1980; Lowry & Grites, 1985;
Walsh, 1979) on academic advising has advanced the importance of the profession at many colleges and universities. Noteworthy as well is the relatively small quantity of literature on advising, when compared to other areas of research in higher education. However, there are two pivotal and now considered classic publications on academic advising from the 1970s.

Two academic advising approaches have been the focus of the field for the past 39 years: prescriptive and developmental (Smith, 2002). Prescriptive advising is defined as the delivery of information, inclusive of institutional policies, procedures, and curricular requirements (Laff, 1994); thus, the advisor prescribes “advice” and the student is expected to behave in the way the advisor prescribed. Faculty advisors, formerly the sole party responsible for advising, carried large caseloads and often practiced prescriptive advising. For example, faculty advisors would aid students with course selection applicable to degree requirements, approve registration forms, and monitor student records (Trombley, 1984). Academic advising has traditionally been a responsibility of faculty advisors who help individual students select a schedule of course work that was applicable to degree requirements, approved registration forms, and monitor student records” (Trombley, 1984). Today, some advisors still use prescriptive advising techniques while others do not; yet, the advisors who do not practice prescriptive advising describe it as highly desirable because it is convenient, concise and orderly (Crookston & Levitz, 1983).

Both Crookston (1972) and O’Banion (1972) advanced the advising profession. In separate publications, the traditional method of academic advising was challenged. O’Banion (1972)
defined developmental advising as “a process in which advisor and advisee¹ enter a dynamic relationship respectful of the advisee’s concerns. The advisor serves as teacher and guide during this interactive partnership aimed at enhancing the student’s self-awareness and fulfillment” (p. 63). The interactive partnership is further defined, and divided into five steps:

1. An exploration of life goals
2. An exploration of vocational goals
3. Student choice of program/major
4. Student course choice
5. Scheduling of courses

The advisor moves beyond an authoritative signatory of the student’s schedule through these interactive steps to someone at the institution who guides the student through complex development.

Using O’Banion’s definition of developmental advising as his foundation, Crookston (1972) theorized the concept of developmental advising as teaching (see Table 2). He evaluated the characteristics of both advising approaches; concluding that developmental advising is a function of teaching (and thus learning occurs) which is much more than clerical duties which is a notable characteristics of prescriptive advising. In developmental advising “the advisor and the student differentially engage in a series of developmental tasks, the successful completion of which results in varying degrees of learning by both parties” (Crookston, 1972, p. 13).

¹ Advisee refers to the student being advised. Advisee and student are used interchangeably in this paper
In his analogy of prescriptive advising Crookston described the student as a patient visiting the doctor (advisor) for help with an ailment (problem); the advisor prescribed advice to fix the ailment (problem). While prescriptive advising is not necessarily “bad”, it does not provide the type of advising needed for the changing student demographics as stated by Crookston (1972), nor does it create space for structured learning opportunities to occur during the advising experience.

Table 1

Prescriptive and Developmental Advising Approach, Crookston, 1972 (p. 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prescriptive Advising</th>
<th>Developmental Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor tells student what he/she needs to know about programs and courses.</td>
<td>Advisor helps student learn about courses and programs for self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor knows college policies and tells student what to do.</td>
<td>Advisor tells student where to learn about policies and helps in understanding how they apply to him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor informs about deadlines and follows up behind student.</td>
<td>Advisor informs about deadlines, then lets student follow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor tells student which classes to take.</td>
<td>Advisor presents class options; student makes own selections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor keeps informed about academic progress through files and records.</td>
<td>Advisor keeps informed about academic progress through records and talking to student about academic experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor tells student what to do in order to get advised.</td>
<td>Advisor and student reach agreement about nature of advising relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor uses grades and test results to determine courses most appropriate for student.</td>
<td>Advisor and student use grades, test results and self-determined interests and abilities to determine most appropriate courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor specifies alternatives and indicates best choice when student faces difficult decisions.</td>
<td>Advisor assists student in identifying alternatives and weighing consequences when facing difficult decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor suggests what student should major in.</td>
<td>Advisor suggests steps students can take to help decide on major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor identifies realistic academic goals based on grades and test results.</td>
<td>Advisor assists student in identifying realistic academic goals based on grades, test results and self-understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor is concerned mainly about academic life of student.</td>
<td>Advisor is concerned about personal, social and academic life of student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor provides information mainly about courses and class schedules.</td>
<td>Advisor provides information about workshops and seminars in areas such as career planning and study skills, in addition to courses and class schedules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developmental advising is intentionally designed to promote growth as a shared responsibility of both parties. The developmental advising process teaches student’s rational thinking, interpersonal and environmental interactions, behavior awareness and life skills. Walsh (1979) affirmed this new way of thinking about advising. He suggested that all educational institutions examine (and redefine, as necessary) the significance of academic advisement in their research goals (p. 446). The redefining of advising should include practical guidelines for advisors to put into action; advisors therefore may take on new functions and play unaccustomed roles (Campbell & Nutt, 2008). In conclusion, developmental advising promotes skill development which is needed to meet the diverse needs of the twenty-first century student as [they] integrate into college life.

*College Academic Advisors*

College academic advisors are among the first resources and content experts on college life with which that students interact and for this reason, Kelley (2008) a supporter of the philosophy “advising as teaching” believes that college advisors can utilize some of the same
methods that teachers use in the classroom such as learning objectives to promote student learning. For example, advisors are responsible for knowing and communicating current institutional rules, procedures, timetables, policies, as well as curricular and co-curricular activities (Pettress, 1996). To effectively communicate this information, the advisor must assess the student’s learning and personal needs, interests, values, potential major, and career choices (Fiddler & Alicea, 1996; Frost, 1991) using a developmental framework to ensure that each plan is tailored to the student. And by personalizing the advising experience, students can learn how to become actively engaged in the higher education system by thinking critically about their roles as students and learners.

Accordingly, the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA, 2005) identified six main responsibilities of academic advisors. They are responsible:

- To the individuals they advise
- To their institutions
- To the higher education community at-large
- To the educational community
- For their professional practices and themselves personally
- For involving others when appropriate in the advising process

While NACADA proposed the aforementioned as responsibilities of academic advisors, there remains a lack of consensus around the major responsibilities of advisors (Frost, 1991; V. Gordon, 1992). For example, Dunham (1981), in explaining what academic advisors actually do, offered the following as a working definition:
Academic advisors should be impartial but enthusiastic in their commitment to make available to advisees the maximum amount of accurate and relevant factual information bearing on academic matters, on the basis of which accurate and relevant information students should be encouraged to make rational academic decisions and accept full responsibility for them. (p. 9)

Before defining what academic advisors do, first there should be general descriptions of advisors. In 2009, NACADA established criteria for three types of advising classifications with the profession. The classifications distinguish specific responsibilities, include: full-time professional academic advisor, faculty advisor, and advising administrator. However, there may be others within the institution who temporarily serves as academic advisors. A part-time advisor is someone who assists with registration or new student orientation days and is considered a temporary advisor, for instance.

Professional College Academic Advisors

Academic advisors are often the first and most important point of contact that students have with the college (McGillin, 2003). The role of a professional college academic advisor is direct delivery of advising services to students. Because one of the primary functions of advisors is direct service to students, for instance course selection, it is imperative that the advisor adequately assess the student’s readiness for college life, both academically and personally. Advisors should facilitate learning experiences that engage students (Tinto, 1994; Trombley & Holmes, 1981), in carefully constructed interactions. McGillin (2003) claims that proper advisement can increase students’ resilience and promote retention because the
advisor serves as a guide, teacher (Appleby, 2008; Hunt, McCalla-Wriggins, & White, 2007), and, most importantly, a leader for the student (McClellan, 2007).

Faculty Academic Advisors

The primary responsibility of faculty is teaching. Most faculty spend less time providing advising services to students (NACADA & Noel-Levitz, 2010). Consequently, the role of faculty academic advisors in higher education has changed over time. Faculty members are charged with multiple responsibilities, one of which may be academic advising. Faculty’s involvement in advising is important because [they] understand the importance of arranging non-traditional² learning experiences. According to Pascarella (1980), student-faculty interactions, such as those experienced during advisement have a significant and positive effect on student persistence.

Faculty members play a critical role in the advising process (Upcraft & Kramer, 1995), regardless of the type of institution. There are national and local efforts to re-engage faculty in the advisement process (Yarbrough, 2002). Yarbrough operationalized faculty (re)engagement as a “mentoring relationship” between faculty members and students. Faculty engagement benefits the university in a number of ways. When faculty members are actively involved in students’ academic the quality of education in all areas increases, not merely within the faculty’s specific-academic division (Yarbrough, 2002). An increase level of contact between faculty members and students results in greater student persistence towards degree completion (Lucas & Murray, 2002; Mastrodicasa, 2001; Tinto, 1994).

---

² Non-traditional is used in lieu of out-of-the-classroom
Challenges for Today’s Advisors

While the number of advisors (and NACADA members) has risen over the last few years (Self, 2008), so has the number and diversity in the types of students entering tertiary institutions which is a challenge for advisors and advising programs. One of the greatest and constantly changing challenges is how higher education is funded. As federal and state funding decreases and tuition costs increase, greater emphasis is placed on learning, persistence, and completion. Murray (2010) cautioned that while more students enroll in college, there is no guarantee that colleges are meeting students’ needs. Retention is a big challenge for most post-secondary institution, as budgets decline and important services such as academic advising are curtailed. Bottom line is that increased pressure is placed on college academic advisors as they are tasked with leading, serving, and retaining (the greatest number of) students seeking college degrees in a timely manner.

In a study by Allen and Smith (2008), students were asked to rate their advising experiences; the purpose of this study was to understand the importance and satisfaction of advising from the recipient’s perspective. While the importance of advising was rated favorably, students’ satisfaction with advising was unpromising. And this is a second challenge for today’s advisors. Ashburn (2007) uncovered similar results in a follow-up survey to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. More than half the students did not discussion educational goals with their advisors within the first month of their college experiences; thereby, impacting their satisfaction rating of their advisors’ knowledge and skills. Approximately 89% of students surveyed (2007) said that academic advising was important to their success, but were unwilling to visit their advisor (again) after their first encounter. Similar
results were revealed in national survey reports (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2009; Schreiner, 2009). Overall, students are dissatisfied with [their] advising experiences; yet, the rate of importance for advising continues to rise (Schreiner, 2009). Students’ (and advisors’) perceptions on the importance and satisfaction of advising are significant to the future of the profession, because as Hunter and White (2004) contend, “academic advising can create a vital connection between students and their education helping them to be more reflective and strategic about the choices they make and their engagement in learning” (p. 20).

Perceptions on Academic Advising

Academic advising is perhaps the most heavily-used student service (Boyer, 1987), and because of this many advising programs across the country are transforming to meet the completion challenge. However, several academic advising programs do not adequately assess the practices or perceptions of academic advising and advisors. Assessment of advising has not been practiced consistently and is lacking at all levels. The perceptions of students, advisors, and administrators are important to enhancing advising and advisors’ functions. Differences in perceptions and notable gaps in practices are considered important for the future of the field. Furthermore, improving academic advising is frequently cited and recommended to increase learning and student success, which will offset the future challenges advisors face (Beal & Noel, 1980; Lenning, Beal, & Sauer, 1980; Noel, 1985). In Noel-Levitz’s 2006 report, for instance, over 75% of institutional respondents reported that their institution viewed academic advising as retention initiative. An increase in retention led to monetary gains; thus, advising can lead to better retention rates which impacts timely completion and the possibility of increased funding.
Lowenstein (2005) addressed the perception of advising as form of teaching and learning. Lowenstein identified three dominant models of academic advising that included prescriptive, developmental, and learning-centered. Prescriptive advising is simply telling students what courses they should take, while developmental advising is an interactive process that both the student-advisor engages in to cultivate students’ development. The learning-centered approach according to Lowenstein builds upon the developmental advising approach to accomplish specific student learner outcomes. For example, an advisor who employs a learning-centered approach would not only help students develop their curriculum of study but also create structured learning opportunities during the advising experience to teach students the benefits of what, why, and how the individual pieces of the curriculum are interrelated to their overall education. This approach to advising engages students in meaningful conversations about their cognitive learning and behavioral intentions to accomplish their goals.

Eddy and Essarum (1989) administered the Academic Advising Needs Questionnaire (AANQ) to students to examine and assess what should happen in academic advising programs. The AANQ includes fifteen statements using Lickert scales to evaluate advising functions, including what should be done compared to what advisors actually do. The results indicated that academic advising programs needed improving. Students reported that advisors needed professional development in the area of career advisement, helping students’ select a major/program of study, and providing references to employers and graduate schools, as needed. When students are unaware of their educational options and the pathways are not
clear to help them, many students will drop out. This hinders many students from moving to the next level and/or towards their career goal (Kiker, 2008).

Hester (2008) analyzed student evaluations of advisors over a five-year period, which the research stated was often limited to student ratings of advisors’ advising skills. The results showed both positive and negative relationships between student characteristics and evaluation items that traditionally reflect good advising. Given the importance of academic advising to the institution, the examination of students’ perceptions of academic advisors and advising is critical (Davis & Cooper, 2001).

In 2005, Tillman and Jackson used the Adjective Check List (Gough & Heilbrum, 1983) to assess students’ perceptions of the (characteristics of) ideal academic advisor. The ACL scales include: nine measures of personality and social dispositions, and 15 measurable descriptions of personality relevant to normal population from observable behaviors. The results indicated traits patterns of the/their ideal academic advisors. According to the 114 students who completed the survey, the perceived ideal academic advisor is: logical, organized and dependable. Also, the ideal academic advisor has the ability to form “close relationships” with advisees by being assertive, talkative and warm.

Perceptions of academic advising vary based on who is examining and assessing the system that may include students, advisors, advising administrators, executive management, as documented in the literature. Nonetheless, quality advising is linked to positive perceptions (including advisor’s skills). Hunter and White (2004) described academic advising, when well developed and appropriately accessed, as the only structured campus activity that is intentionally designed to establish meaningful one-on-one interactions. Advising, when done
well, includes advisors’ assessment of students, and their [students] academic needs. Other studies (Collado, Gardenhire-Crooks, & Ray, 2006; Matus-Grossman & Gooden, 2002) found that the quality of advising and the individualized relationship students have with their advisors has a positive impact in the effectiveness of the advising process.

Quality advisement is rooted in the advisor’s ability (Hester, 2008) to lead students in successful academic and life planning activities. Such activities involve outlining what is expected including rewards for accomplishing objectives, frequent and timely feedback, empowering students to conduct realistic (self) assessments to inform goal setting and decision making just to name a few (Tillman & Jackson, 2005). Likewise, it is important to exercise positive reinforcement when the student does not initially attain his/her goal(s). Finally, advisors can help students with successful integration into the college environment. For example, advisors can inform students of college services and enrichment activities for personal and professional growth.

Leadership

The word “leader” is found in the English language as early as the year 1300 (Wright, 2005); however, it was not until the beginning of the twentieth century that scholarly research was conducted on leadership. There are over 130 definitions of leadership (Stogdill, 1974; Burns, 1978). The most common terms associated with leadership are: traits, behaviors, influence, interaction, relationships, and management or administrative positions. Cashman (1998) declares that leadership should be examined from the inside first, and then outside; meaning, the external materializations of leadership is merely a reflection of the leader’s foundation.
Three themes emerged in a review of the literature on leadership: (a) leadership involves influence and trust, (b) leadership encompasses behaviors and can be learned (Crosby, 1997), and (c) leadership is a collective process because both leaders and followers must co-exist to complete the identified tasks. Leadership, therefore, includes behaviors, processes and a combination of characteristics. Despite the ranging definitions, Northouse (2012) outlines leadership as an influential process that is based on relationship building or relation-based interactions that assists individuals and groups in the direction of goal attainment.

**Importance of Understanding Self**

According to Day and Harrison (2007) leadership begins with self. A leader should strive to differentiate self before attempting to lead others. Before an individual distinguishes him/herself as a leader, initially individuals (i.e., advisors) should view themselves through the generic definition of leadership including how they would handle various situations using (their) similar methodology. Similarly, these individuals must understand leadership from the perspective of the leader’s qualities as outlined in trait theory. Day and Harrison (2007) found that individuals’ maturity as leaders impacts their leadership methodologies meaning their leadership behaviors like relationship/relational-based approaches become less general and more context-dependent. As the leader’s cognitive understanding of leadership develops it expands to include individuals and groups, and leadership is viewed differently at each level. At each level of the leadership development process the definition changes: from positional power (autocratic leadership), to influential/expertise power (situational leadership) that includes other individuals, to a shared power that includes interdependencies of individuals, teams and organizations at all levels (transformational leadership). The leadership development process
shifts the focus away from self to include the perspective of others (Day & Harrison, 2007). In the end, a relational/relationship-based leader comprehends the importance of leader-member exchange that encompasses their influential power (e.g., motivation) on the outcomes of those situations.

Kouzes and Posner (2007) stated that leadership is a relationship between individuals who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow. An effective relationship require the leader to be self-aware (Covey, 1989), and an examination of self affirms the foundation of a leader. Leadership is not always giving things but offering oneself and one’s spirit (Bolman & Deal, 1991); leaders should practice behaviors such as modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, and empowering others through encouragement of the heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). The better a leader understands self, the more likely the leader is to adapt their behavior(s) to the situation, and according to Hersey & Blanchard (1988), increases their likelihood of influencing others.

The ability to influence others is instrumental to the leadership process. Leaders have to understand what needs to be done, and use their influence to get other to agree to what needs to be done, as well as how to get it done most effectively. Hersey and Blanchard’s (1988) situational leadership theory posits that leadership should be based on the needs of followers that may change over time. There are two main components to situational leadership theory: task-direction and relation-behaviors. Leaders are charged with assessing followers’ readiness or “how ready a person is to perform a particular task” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, pp. 174-175). For example, a student’s readiness will influence their perception of an ideal advising approach, and as leaders, advisors should be self-aware (Covey, 1989) to address the student’s
ideal state of advising by adapting their behaviors/practices. In the case of student’s readiness, advisors should understand the correlation between how student development while in college and the need for variation in advising styles to provide adequate guidance to students.

Building trust is essential to leadership and establishing effective relationships. Gardner (1993) reported that leaders must be capable of inspiring trust, which is required of both leader and followers. Advisors rely on personal interactions during the advisement process to inspire trust (between them and students) which is based on individualization of the relationship. Trust implies accountability, predictability and reliability (Bennis, 1989). When high levels of trust are visible followers are empowered to act and follow through on assigned tasks (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). Empowerment is effective and most often exhibited when “solid” leaders are at all levels of an organization (Tracey, 1998).

Gender, Age, and Leadership

Several research studies have explored differences in leadership by gender and age. Historically, the majority of studies on leadership have focused on figures of authority (Cohen & Bradford, 2005) also referred to as positional leadership; and male/ masculine leadership characteristics more so than female/feminine traits (Carli & Eagly, 2001; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Garcia-Retamero, & Lopez-Zafra, 2006; Mitchell, 2000; Sturges, 1990; Young 2004). There is also substantial evidence on how leadership differences are expressed between genders. In two separate research studies, for example (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Robinson & Blumen, 2003), the findings revealed that male leaders are more transactional in nature, while female leaders are described as transformational leaders (for more detailed information on transactional and transformational leadership style (see Table 2).
Gender

In 2003, Robinson and Blumen studied managers’ achieving styles based on gender with 4,139 (2,371 males and 1,768 females) upper and middle-level managers in the United States. The following comprise achieving styles: intrinsic direct, competitive direct, power direct, personal instrumental, social instrumental, entrusting instrumental, collaborative relational, contributory relational and vicarious relational. The average age of participants for this study was 43 years. Employing agencies were both public and private educational institutions. The researchers hypothesized that males and females would exhibit similar leadership behaviors with the exception of competition direct. The researchers posited that males would display more competitive behaviors than females. Results from the study showed no statistically significant difference between genders in six of the nine achieving styles. There was, however, a statistically significant difference in competitive direct based on gender; males scored higher than females in this area, therefore accepting the researchers’ hypothesis that male displayed more competitive behaviors than females.

The influence of gender on leadership roles has been studied extensively with supporting evidence suggesting there are differences in leadership styles based on gender (Druskat, 1994; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Moran, 1992). Eagly and Johnson studied task-oriented and interpersonal-oriented leadership styles using five male and five female participants. The results of Eagly and Johnson’s meta-analysis leadership studies uncovered that there were no significant differences in task-oriented and interpersonal-oriented leadership based on gender. However, during the follow-up lab study it was found that these behaviors aligned with stereotypical expectations of leaders based on gender.
In a 2003, Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen conducted a second meta-analysis of 45 leadership studies on transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. The study examined gender and leadership styles; particularly, the intrinsic application of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles based on gender. Results of the meta-analysis support the use of transformational and contingent reward leadership styles more often by females when compared to males who were most likely to demonstrate laissez-faire and management by exception leadership. The overall findings of their study confirmed differences in leadership styles based on gender, although the differences were considered small based on further analyses.

Young (2004) examined leadership and gender within the context of higher education. Young assessed the perceptions of leadership using Bass and Avolio’s (2000) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire with supplemental open-ended and demographic questions. In addition to the MLQ, the researcher used Gray’s (as cited in Young, 2004) male and female paradigms to measure gender identification. The researcher discovered that males employed at higher education institutions associated more closely with female paradigm, and women related more closely with male paradigm. Females perceived themselves as more formal, objective, and disciplined; while men characterized themselves as more collaborative, developers (of others), and team players all of which are described as female characteristics according to Gray’s paradigms. These findings suggest that both males and females alike are most likely to use feminine leadership characteristics in higher education settings.
Age

Fewer research studies have been published on the impact of age and leadership, consisted of leadership styles too. In recent years, several researchers have started to explore the impact of generational differences and the workplace (Kupperschmidt, 2000; Smola & Sutton, 2002; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2008). However, there is less literature on this topic when compared to the topics of gender and leadership.

Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, and Marx (2007) researched the relationship between leadership, gender, education and age. Fifty-six leaders and 234 followers were surveyed using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Participants varied in age, with an average age of 43. They came from a cross-section of government agencies, educational institutions, and other public and private organizations. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test for behavioral differences by leaders’ age, educational background, and gender; this included an examination of an intersection between the three variables. There were no significant differences on the rating of transactional and transformational leadership styles based on the leader’s gender. There were, however, significant differences in the followers’ ratings of leadership behaviors and influence based on the leader’s gender and educational background. Duly noted was the statistically significance of leadership behaviors and age. Seasoned leaders, 46 years of age and older, were rated higher on transformational leadership style by their followers compared to leaders in the age range of 36-45 years who received the lowest ratings for transformational leadership behaviors. This was particularly true on the sub-scale areas of intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.
Garcia-Retamero and Lopez-Zafras (2006) learned that expectations of people did influence perceptions of gender and the work environment. The researchers surveyed 705 individuals—326 males and 379 females—with an average age of 36. Participants were asked to evaluate male and female applicants for leadership positions with an organization. Based on the results using analysis of variance (ANOVA), participants had higher expectations for male candidates than female candidates; particularly, in industries associated with masculine or unspecified leadership positions. Also, female candidates were identified as using transformational leadership styles more than male regardless of the industry by participants in age groups 18 to 25 and 30 to 50. However, older participants (65 years and older) did not rate female and male differently in regards to expectation, but they did rate male candidates as more transactional than female candidates. The researchers concluded that participants, regardless of age, had a bias against female leaders with the exception of those positions within traditional feminine leadership industries.

Oshagbemi’s (2004) study investigated the relationship between age and leadership style of managers. Participants were asked to select their age range from one of five categories (under 30; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; and 60+). The researcher hypothesized that age would be positively correlated with consultative, participative, and delegative leadership styles. A Likert-scale survey was administered to 409 leaders in the United Kingdom. Participants were asked to identify their daily leadership style from the following: consultative, delegative, directive, or participative. There were positive relationships between age and consultative, participative, and delegated leadership styles as the findings suggested. The data revealed that “age actually
influences the leadership styles, but not the behaviours of managers” (p. 26) and the overall differences in leadership styles based on age were not statistically significant.

Leadership and Academic Advising

There has been a lot of research on leaders and leadership models (Burns, 1978; Crawford & Strohkirch, 2004; Rosenbusch & Townsend, 2004; Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Most research on leadership at post-secondary institutions centers on executive organizational leadership styles or the advising administrators (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Cuseo, 2000; Gordon, Habley & Grites, 2008; Hester, 2008; NACADA & Noel-Levitz, 2010; Tuttle, 2002); conversely, very little research has been conducted on advisors as leaders at post-secondary institutions, as they lead the nation’s future leaders (students). Hashem’s (1997) asserts that any individual can develop into a leader, and establish a leadership identity by engaging in effective leadership practices.

The advisor-advisee relationship is vital to students’ success because academic advisors contribute to the socialization of students in college. Comparing the advisor-advisee relationship with that of leader-follower is one way of making the most of what is known about leadership to enhance advisors’ leadership behaviors and styles when working with students of the twenty-first century and beyond. In this case, emphasis is on educating the “whole” person, which includes leadership behaviors to give students a sense of belonging (Lowe & Toney, 2000). For this reason, it is important to search for those leadership characteristics that foster the development of followers/students. And effective leaders are those who possess the behaviors to engage in action primarily focused on the growth and development of the followers/students they lead.
To address the inconsistencies between students’ satisfaction with and preference for developmental advising, Kelly (2003) proposed a new advising paradigm using transformational leadership as the framework. He suggested that advisors focus on empowerment of students opposed to worrying about if they (advisors) are demonstrating prescriptive or developmental advising practices. The use of transformational leadership theory, he believes could enhance students’ academic achievement. Kelly (2003) recommended that college administrators draw attention to advisors who exhibit transformational leadership behaviors because these academic advising strategies could increase student success. He also recommends that hiring committees target these types of (leadership) characteristics in potential academic advisors.

McClellan (2007) discovered similar findings while exploring the relationship between servant leadership theory and academic advising. McClellan (2007) focused on the humanistic leadership characteristics of the advisor not necessarily the advising style. Servant leadership emphasizes growth and development of followers (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2004) exceeding organizational goals. In terms of academic advising, McClellan (2007) concluded that servant leadership would place students’ development at the heart of advising practices. At the same time, the advisor has to be self-aware and willing to adapt to meet the needs of the students.

Some advising researchers have attempted to link developmental advising practices to both situational and transformational leadership style. Kelly (2003) remarked that it is necessary for advisors to have transformational leadership qualities in order for them to adequately assist students as they develop while in college. Transformational leadership qualities increase the likelihood of a follower’s (student) commitment to the institution, along with the follower’s ability to attain his/her goal (Slack, 1997). Campbell and Nutt (2008)
addressed both student’s behaviors (follower) and institutional conditions (advisor’s leadership qualities) as required dimensions of the college experience; and meaning, through collective action [institutional condition] as transformational leaders, advisors empower and stimulate the individualized growth of followers [student behaviors].

Leadership Styles

Transformational Leadership Style

Northouse (2012; 2004) simply defined transformational leadership as “a process that changes and transforms people” (p. 171). Downton first coined the term transformational leadership in 1973; however, it was Burns’ (1978) research on leadership and followership that popularized the concept of transformational leadership. This became evident in the mid 1980’s when there was a surge of interest in transformational leadership. Studies suggest that transformational leadership produces the most desirable outcomes, often measured in terms of followers’ satisfaction and assessment of their leaders’ skill set (Avolio & Howell, 1992; Bass, 1985; Bass, 2000). Likewise, transformational leadership has been linked to greater individual commitment of followers to an organization, group and society in general (Barling, Weber, Kelloway, 1996; Bass, 2000; Howell & Frost, 1989; Neumann, 1992). Bass (1990) wrote that transformational leadership engages followers by appealing to higher-level needs of achievement; self-actualization is an example of a higher-level need (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002).
Transactional Leadership Style

Burns initially developed the concept of transactional leadership theory in 1978, but it was Bass (1985) who expanded this theoretical framework. Transactional leadership is known for focusing on interactions or an exchange process between the leader and follower(s) that is compliance-based to maintain the status quo (Bass, 1985; 2000). Bromley and Kirschner-Bromley (2007) described transactional leaders as individuals who, “specify explicit requirements and conditions of tasks, and provide rewards for fulfilling the identified requirements” (p. 54). Transactional leaders are efficient and process driven in an effort to avoid making mistakes and (taking) risks; and the exchange between leader and follower are designed to improve the performance of follower (Bryman, 1992; Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002).

Yukl and Lepsinger’s (2005) study on transactional leadership examines the communication process between leader and follower(s). This communicative process is direct and task-oriented with clearly outlined organizational resources and standards. The transactional exchange process, according to Yukl and Lepsinger, involves sound communication to ensure compliances with directives to obtain organizational expectations. However, Yukl and Lepsinger also reported that transactional leadership is less likely to increase followers’ enthusiasm unless there are agreed upon rewards for accomplishment of the outlined objectives.

Full Range Model of Leadership

Bass (1985) declared that current leadership theories focused on followers’ goals, role clarification, and the ways leaders either rewarded or sanctioned followers’ behaviors. Bass’
claim highlighted an element of transactional leadership that was missing from most all of the leadership theories---the need to understand how leaders influenced followers’ behaviors and performance. Bass referred to this type of leadership as transformational leadership. He and his colleagues, respectively, began researching the concept of transformational leadership in 1985 with a follow-up study in 1991.

In 1997, influenced by Avolio’s work on transformational leaders, Bass expanded his framework on transactional and transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The new model was entitled, full range of leadership model and includes diverse leadership theories from contingency to laissez-faire. According to Avolio and Bass (1998), full range of leadership model proposes that leadership is a dynamic process based on interactions between the leader and follower. There are three distinct leadership styles associated with the full range of leadership model: passive/avoidant (also referred to as laissez-faire), transactional, and transformational. Each leadership style has distinguishable characteristics, and laissez-faire style has been described as the less effective when compared to transactional and transformational leadership styles. There are also nine different behavioral components (or leadership subscales) associated with the full range model of leadership.

*Description of Full Range Model of Leadership Subscales*

Transformational leadership consists of four dimensions: idealized influence (attribute and behavior), inspirational motivation (charisma), intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (attention).

Idealized influence (attribute and behavior). Idealized influence describes the approach to leadership whereby followers wish to be like or be identified with a leader because of the
leader’s strong vision or moral values (Northouse, 2001). There are three characteristics for both attributed and behavioral aspects of idealized influence detailed by Bass and Avolio (1994). First, followers who identify with leaders who take this leadership approach want to be like them. Second, such leaders have high standards of morality. Third, risks are shared between such leaders and followers. Overall, this idealized influence approach to transformational leadership places the leader as the focus, unlike the remainder of the transformational approaches that place morals and goals, processes, and individualized consideration at the center of attention.

Inspirational motivation. These leaders are identified as inspirational by followers due to their ability to vividly express goals to strengthen and uplift followers (Bass, 1990). Gardner (1965), states that inspirational leaders conceive and articulate goals that lift people out of their petty preoccupations, carry them above the conflicts that tear society apart, and unite them in the pursuit of objectives worthy of their best efforts (as cited by Bass, 1990, p. 207). The leader assists followers with envisioning the future states (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 3). In the end, followers identify more with the goals of the leader than the leader themselves (Downton, 1973; McClelland, 1975a, 1975b), and for this reason these leaders often become symbols of belief and symbolic of specific goals to their followers (Bass, 1990, p. 206).

Intellectual Stimulation. Intellectually stimulating leaders encourage followers to be innovative in their approach to their work, even giving them the power and resources to be creative (Northouse, 2001). Graham (1987) noted that unlike charismatic leaders, intellectually stimulating leaders encourage the autonomy of subordinates so that their creative power can be unleashed to accomplish personal and organizational goals. In his factor analysis of the MLQ
descriptions of U.S. Army officers, Bass (1985) found a separate correlating factor for intellectual stimulation. Bass (1990) findings were supported by other researchers (Seltzer and Bass, 1987; Avolio, Bass, and Yammarino 1988a, 1988b; Keller, 1989) whom observed the influence of an unconnected factor on the leadership subscale---intellectual stimulation in their studies in various fields.

Intellectually stimulating leaders question assumptions, reframe problems, and approach old situations in new ways (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 3). Roberts (1986) described intellectually stimulating leaders as catalysts for the creative process through actively being involved in it. To conclude, intellectually stimulating behaviors of transformational leaders is seen when followers are given freedom to engage in creative processes and experimentation.

Individualized consideration. Individualized consideration approach of transformational leadership is concerned with recognizing each follower as being an individual, with unique needs and desires (Bass, 2008). Northouse (2012) describes the ability of these leaders as a coach and/or an advisor to his or her followers, assisting them toward self-actualization. Interpersonally competent leaders treat every subordinate/follower differently; each experience is personalized to meet the needs of subordinates/followers (Meyer, 1980 as cited by Bass & Avolio, 1994). Individualized consideration involves heightened awareness, insight, and the ability to give and receive feedback (Bass, 1990, p. 110). Overall, the individualized consideration approach to transformational leadership is concerned with meeting the needs of each individual follower. Bass (1985) conceptualized leadership as transformational, transactional, or laissez-faire contingent upon the style of leadership needed at that time.
Transactional leadership is about reinforcement, as either contingency reward or management-by-exception (Bass, 1990). Transactional leadership theory is rooted in the work of Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975) that describes leadership as conditions that involve transactions. Hollander (1986) describes transactional leadership as a contract between leader and follower. For example, leader and follower enter a relationship where obedience is exchanged for protection and power.

Accordingly, Bass (1990) defined transactional leadership as a social exchange where the leader gets something from the subordinate, and vice versa. Unlike transformational leadership, specifically individualized consideration, Northouse (2001) describes transactional leadership is that which does not individualize interactions or the assessment of needs of followers and is not concerned with the development of individuals. Bass (1990, 2008) and Northouse (2001) report that transactional leadership is more effective when coupled with transformational leadership. As modeled by Bass (1990; 2008), transactional leadership is composed of two fundamental dimensions: (a) contingent rewards and (b) management-by-exception (active and passive).

Contingency reward. Northouse (2001) described contingency reward as the exchange process between leaders and followers in which effort by followers is exchanged for specific rewards (p. 140). Bass (1990) cited numerous studies that point to the merits of approaching leadership through the use of contingency rewards (Hunt & Schuler, 1976; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Reitz, 1971). In this leadership approach, leaders look for good behavior and reward it (Bass, 1990, 2008; Northouse, 2001). Overall, this approach to
transactional leadership is positive, providing positive rewards for positive behaviors (Bass, 2008).

Management-by-exception. Management-by-exception leaders take corrective actions and intervene only when failures or deviations occur, where such intervention ranges from corrective criticism to negative feedback (Bass, 1990; Northouse, 2001). In the active approach to management-by-exception, the leader actively monitors for mistakes and breaches in standards and takes corrective action when necessary (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Corrective action in this active approach is often in the form of corrective criticism (Bass, 1990). In the passive approach to management-by-exception, the leader waits for problems to arise before addressing them (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Corrective action in this passive approach is often in the form of negative feedback and punishment (Bass, 1990). Overall, the management-by-exception approach to transactional leadership concerns itself with looking for mistakes (Bass, 2008).

Passive/avoidant leadership is commonly referred to as laissez-faire leadership. Laissez-faire leadership is the sole subscale for passive/avoidant leadership for the full range model of leadership.

Laissez-faire. Laissez-faire leadership is defined as non-leadership or the abdication of the responsibilities of a leader (Bass, 1990). Northouse (2001) describe these leaders as ones who do not take responsibility, delay decisions, give no feedback, and make little effort to help followers satisfy their needs (p. 141). Bass (1990) cited many researchers who indicated that laissez-faire leadership correlates negatively with productivity (Avolio, 1999; Bass & Avolio,
Avolio (1999) pointed out that any type of leadership is more successful and effective than non-leadership.

The full range model of leadership communicates that in practice leaders are more likely to display some, if not all of the transformational-transactional leadership characteristics; nevertheless, active leadership is more effective than passive leadership behaviors.

Table 2

Factors related to full range model of leadership, created by the author 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Related Subscale</th>
<th>Behavioral Description</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire (1 Factor)</td>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>Non-leadership; Avoidance from interventions</td>
<td>Passive &amp; Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional (3 Factors):</td>
<td>Management-by-exception (passive)</td>
<td>Use of contingent reprimand for corrective action</td>
<td>Passive &amp; Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual obligation/exchange of rewards for</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforces rules to avoid making mistakes</td>
<td>Somewhat Active &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplished performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>Use of incentives to influence motivation that includes</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Active &amp; Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clarification of work for the reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational (5 Factors): Proactive and</td>
<td>Individual consideration/attention</td>
<td>Provides support, coaching, mentoring, and encouragement to followers</td>
<td>*Active &amp; Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcendent of the collective good for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement of extraordinary goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>Increases followers’ awareness of</td>
<td>Active &amp; Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Burns (1978) brought attention to transformational and transactional leadership while describing leadership in the field of political science. However, the origins of transformational and transactional leadership can be traced back to Weber’s (1968) charismatic versus bureaucratic leadership studies (Bass, 1985). Charisma is an essential element of transformational leadership, according to Bass (1985), as charisma is likely to lead to emotional connections between leaders and followers. Burns (1978) describes transformational leaders as charismatic; and individuals often seeking to develop followers into leaders. Burns’ ideology was later supported by Avolio (2003) while describing the full range model of leadership. The main difference between charismatic and transformational leadership, Avolio asserts, is there are both positive and negative charismatic leaders; whereas, transformational leaders have only positive development/impact on their followers. Other research studies (Bass, 1990;
Lowe, Kroec, & Sivasubramianiam, 1996 for example) describe transformational leadership as positive interpersonal relationships that lead to positive individual and organizational outcomes strengthening Avolio’s statement on transformational leadership.

**Full Range Model of Leadership and Academic Advising**

Barbuto, Story, Fritz, and Schinstock (2011) conducted a study on academic advising using the full range model of leadership as the theoretical framework. The purpose of the study was to examine the advisor-advisee relationship using the full range leadership model to outline degrees of effective advising behaviors. The study took place at a land-grant university in the U.S. Midwest. The cohort of advisors were asked to complete a self-rater portion of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) online survey, as well as disseminate the link to an anonymous (similar) online survey for their advisees (total = 1,017). The MLQ has different components to it that includes a self-rater form for leaders and a multi-rater form for observers. Despite the high response rate (74%) among the participating advisors who completed the questionnaire, Barbuto et al. (2011) believed the N (37 out of 50) was too small; thus, the self-rater data were not included the study.

Advisees were asked to assess their advisors’ leadership behaviors using the MLQ 5X Short multi-rater portion of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Participants’ involvement in the study was voluntary and yielded an approximate 41% response rate. The study was reliant upon advisees’ responses to determine the effectiveness of advisors’ leadership behaviors. The focus was on a specific cohort of advisees at one university, which may or may not compare to that of other colleges and universities. For this reason, it is important not to over generalize the findings.
The results revealed that among the transformational advising behaviors idealized influence was the most observable, according to advisees’ responses. Likewise, the least identifiable (by advisees) transformational advising behavior was intellectual stimulation. Barbuto et al. (2011) suggest the use of various techniques to increase intellectual stimulation while working with advisees; especially, if the quality of academic advising is a priority (p. 667). There were positive relationships in transactional leadership, as well. All three of the advising outcomes showed a positive relationship in relation to contingent reward which is identified as transactional leadership according to the full range model of leadership. Barbuto et al. (2011) report that “these results indicated that students view advisors positively when expectations are clarified and rewards are based on meeting these expectations” (p. 667). The researchers concluded by encouraging others to test full range advising in various contexts.

Conclusion

There have been very few studies conducted on college academic advisors and their leadership styles, and most of the (current) literature on advising and leadership attempts to liken advising approaches to different leadership styles (Kelly, 2003; King, 2005). To the best of this researcher’s knowledge, Barbuto et al. (2011) research is the only study on academic advising using the full range model of leadership framework to examine advisors’ leadership behaviors. This study provided the initial impetus to examine college academic advisors’ self-perceived leadership styles using the full range model of leadership. Duly noted is the importance of full range advising, or an at least an interest in the concept to those in the profession similar to the sample population of college academic advisors, as expressed by the 74% response rate during the original study.
Summary of the Literature Review

Structured academic advisement programs allow students to personalize their education and match it to their specific goals, which is important for leaders of today and the future. The organization of these structured academic advisement programs vary according to institutional type (Habley, 1997), as does the classification of the individuals providing the advising services (NACADA & Noel-Levitz, 2010). The use of developmental advising practices as the norm stemmed from both O’Banion (1972) and Crookston’s (1972) works on the future of academic advising in higher education. Research findings over the years support the use of academic advising, in particular the use of developmental advising strategies in students’ persistence and completion (Frost, 1991; Habley & McClanhan, 2004; Noel-Levitz, 2006; Tuttle, 2000).

Academic advisors of all classifications play a significant role in leading students towards reaching their potential and accomplish their goals. Advisors rely on personal interactions with students to form individualized relationships during the advisement process. Light (2001) emphasized that “part of a great college education depends upon human relationship” (p. 11), and a sense of genuinely caring is pivotal for the advisor-student relationship (Rawlins & Rawlins, 2005). Through these personal interactions, an individualized relationship is established that can lead to the development of personal qualities that will serve students throughout their lives (Ender & Wilkie, 2000). Guided by a genuinely caring academic advisor who is an institutional leader, the student can accomplish many tasks; from clarifying their purpose(s) for attending college to planning their futures consisting of [their] roles and responsibilities in a democratic society (Hunter & White, 2004).
Avolio and Bass (1998; 2004) created a cohesive and comprehensive theory of leadership that addressed many philosophical assumptions and diverse approaches. The full range model of leadership is a single, integrated perspective that after much research (and testing) has shown to be logically derived and valid. And while Burns and Bass (both leading theorists in leadership) agree on the definitions of transformational leadership; they hold contrasting views on the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership respectively. However, it is Bass’ (1985) statement, “transformational leadership is presented in a way to augment transactional approaches to management” (p. 27) that resonates today. Lowe and Kroeck (1996) uncovered in their research that leaders can be both transformational and transactional, and move along a continuum therefore confirming Bass’ position.

The literature supports the existence of differences in leadership behaviors and styles, although small, based on leaders’ gender and age. Female and seasoned leaders (46 years and older) were identified as transformational and democratic leaders. Duly noted, seasoned leaders are more likely to delegate in an effort to ‘teach’ others to lead (Oshagbemi, 2004). The various studies on leadership also pointed to the fact that effective leaders, regardless of gender and age should shift between leadership styles based on the situation, the present conditions, and anticipated outcomes.

The examination of leadership in the academic advising profession is a fairly new concept; despite that fact, the quantity of literature on the topic of leadership in general. Most of the research on leadership and academic advising in post-secondary education focuses on administrative and executive leadership. There has been little to no research on the role and leadership styles of advisors. There is, however, a need for research in this area because
academic advisors play such a critical role in student achievement including leadership development as noted in the CAS standards and guidelines (2005). This researcher’s study will add to the literature on leadership by assessing college academic advisors’ leadership styles in higher education. It will also add to the quantitative literature on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and the full range of leadership model.

This research study explored college academic advisors self-perceived leadership styles, which is an area that is lacking in the literature. Examining advisors’ leadership styles will:

- Support the shift to a more holistic view of academic advisement as an influence on the development of America’s future leaders
- Explore the most frequently used leadership behaviors and styles of advisors
- Identify content for future professional development trainings around leadership development for advisors
- Advance the profession and literature in the field of advising and leadership

It is important to examine the advising profession within the context of the institution it serves (Habley, 2004); nevertheless academic advising, in general should be studied often to observe the quality of relationships; uncover new theories; and establish innovative practices.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This quantitative study employed a cross-sectional research design to explore the relationships between leadership styles and academic advising approaches, as well as the influence of college advisors/counselors’ demographic variables and their self-perceived leadership styles using the online Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) leader form 5x-short. A quantitative methodology is appropriate for descriptive and inferential data analyses when the purpose is to examine relationships or differences among the identified variables that are observed and measured which this research study sought to explore (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003; Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). Moreover, Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) note that survey research can be useful by allowing researchers to make inferences about larger populations based on the responses from a small sample. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) also note that survey research can be used “to achieve the purposes of various research designs” (p. 230) such as descriptive, causal-comparative, and case study design. To address the purposes of this descriptive study, survey research was appropriate because it allowed for the collection of data across geographical regions to provide a snapshot from a sample of the larger population without affecting normal behaviors of college academic advisors, in an effort to learn more about their perceived leadership behaviors. And as previously stated, the results from the sample can be used to make inferences about to the larger population.
The following components are covered in this chapter: (a) research design, (b) research questions, (c) population and sampling, (d) instrument (e) survey administration, and (f) data analysis.

Research Design

A cross-sectional survey administration obtains data at one point in time from a population (or a subset of the represented population) to look at different groups (age or gender), and the assignment of subjects is beyond the researcher control, according to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007). Cross-sectional survey administration was appropriate for this study because the data collected were from a specific point in time from a random representation of the college academic advising population. Moreover, I examined differences of the five independent variables on the dependent variable of self-perceived leadership styles among the subjects using self-reported data from the MLQ and supplement questions. I did not ask participants to demonstrate their perceived leadership styles, but instead to provide personal observations to reveal their opinions about themselves, which is essential for self-reporting. As Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) stated, “self-reported measures do not ask individuals to perform but instead ask them to reveal whether they have the traits, thoughts, or feelings mentioned in the items” (p. 193).

Variables of Interest

For this study the variables of interest included self-perceived leadership style, academic advising approaches, institutional type, and demographic variables such as gender, age, and years of experience. The dependent as well as the independent variables for this survey research project are presented in Table 3.
Table 3

Independent and Dependent Variables by Name, Abbreviation, Scale, and Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising Approach (AAA; Nominal; 1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type (INST’L TYPE; Nominal; 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (GEND; Nominal; 1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group (AGE; Nominal; 1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience (YRS OF EXP; Nominal; 1-6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite of Self-Perceived Leadership Style Scores (Interval; 0-180)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style is the participant’s responses to the 45 leadership statements that comprise the nine leadership subscale constructs of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader form 5X short (MLQ). The nine leadership subscales align with the three leadership styles for the full range model of leadership. To identify the overall self-perceived leadership styles of college advisors, each participant’s mean responses on the nine subscale constructs are combined.

Each subscale construct consists of four questions from the MLQ that attempts to identify the respondent’s leadership behaviors related to idealization, inspiration, intellection, individualization, rewards/punishment, and passiveness/assertiveness. It is important to measure each of the subscale constructs for multiple reasons: (1) the subscale constructs assess a range of effective and ineffective, passive and active leadership behaviors (See section on reliability and validity for more information); (2) each construct corresponds to one
of the three leadership styles of the full range model of leadership (transformational, transactional, or passive/avoidant). Furthermore, previous studies (Sivasubramaniam, Murray, Avolio, & Jung, 2002) have connected the full range model of leadership to the expected performance outcome; and (3) in assessing each of the leadership constructs respondents receive a holistic view of their perceived leadership behaviors. For example, respondents can view and compare their perceived leadership behaviors for contingent reward and idealized influence attributes. The constructs and related survey questions are presented in Appendix I.

Self-perceived Leadership Style

Self-perceived leadership style was the dependent variable for this research, and was measured at the interval level with a range of 0-4. Self-perceived leadership style was measured using the MLQ Leader Form 5x-Short. The MLQ is composed of 45 leadership statements across nine subscales with a five-point Likert scale to measure perceived leadership behaviors. The nine subscales included passive avoidant; passive management by exception; active management by exception; contingent reward; individualized consideration; intellectual stimulation; inspirational motivation; idealized influence attributed; and idealized influence behavioral. The instrument measures leadership styles based on the calculated nine subscales, and the mean score per subscale. The subscale mean scores are then positioned along the leadership continuum of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. For this study, the mean scores for each subscale were examined to determine college academic advisors’ perceived leadership style; moreover, the nine subscales were used for statistical analyses.
Academic Advising Approaches

This independent variable described the advising technique advisors/counselors applied when working with students. Nominal scale was used for academic advising approach with five associated levels. The survey item stated: *Select the academic advising approach that best describes your primary advising style.* Respondents selected one of five options:

- Developmental advising coded as 1
- Prescriptive advising coded as 2
- Both (prescriptive and developmental) approaches coded as 3
- Neither approach coded as 4
- Other approach was coded as 5

Institutional Type

Institutional type was nominal scale as well, with six levels, to describe the type of institution the participant was currently employed with. The survey item asked participants to *Select the institutional type that best describes your current employing institution,* and response options included: two-year public, two-year private, two-year proprietary (for profit), four-year public, four-year private, four-year proprietary (for profit). Coded in SPSS:

- 2-year public was 1
- 2-year private was coded as 2
- 2-year proprietary coded as 3
- 4-year public university coded as 4
- 4-year private coded as 5
- 4-year proprietary (for profit) coded as 6
**Gender**

Gender describes the biological sex of the participant and was measured on a nominal scale with three levels for this independent variable. The survey read as *Select your gender* with Male, Female, or Prefer not to disclose as the response options. The coding in SPSS was as follows:

- Males were coded as 1
- Females coded as 2
- Prefer not to disclose as 3

**Age Group**

Age group was an independent variable for the study and defined the number of years the participant has been alive. Age group was measured on an ordinal scale with 5 levels. According to Bryman (2008), when interval/ratio variables, such as age, are grouped the variable is transformed to ordinal scale. The survey item read *Please select your age range* with the response options as: *under 20 years, 21-30 years 31-40 years, 41-50 years, more than 50 years*. Coded in SPSS:

- 1 for the under 20 years age group
- 2 for the 21-30 years group
- 3 for the 31-40 years group
- 4 for the 41-50 years group
- 5 for the >50 years group
Years of Experience

Years of experience were the number of years an individual has been employed as an academic advisor/counselor at the time of the study, and was measured at the ordinal level. There were six levels associated with this independent variable. The survey prompt stated

*Select the total number of years that you have been employed as an academic advisor/counselor.* Response options included: 5 years or fewer, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20, 21-25, and more than 25 years. The coding in SPSS included:

- 1 for the 5 years or fewer years of experience
- 2 for 6-10 years of experience group
- 3 for 11-15 years of experience group
- 4 for 16-20 years of experience group
- 5 for the 21-25 years of experience group
- 6 for the >25 years of experience group

Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the dominant self-perceived leadership style of college advisors completing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form 5-X short?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in the composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style according to the independent variables of academic advising approach, gender, institutional type, age group, and years of experience group?
3. If a statistically significant difference exists, between which independent variables does the difference exist according to post-hoc test?

Population and Sampling

The National Academic Advising Association’s (NACADA) membership total population/membership for 2014 was 11,610 that included various races, ethnicities, gender, institutional types, and years of experience for professional advisors, counselors, instructional faculty advisors, administrators, and students. To better understand the academic advising profession from college academic advisors’ perspectives as well as the evolving role of college academic advisors as leaders in the changing landscape of higher education, the population for the study included full-time college academic advisors only, numbering 5,110 (48.1%) of NACADA’s 2014 total membership.

For survey research, it is necessary to obtain a sufficient number of respondents for researchers to make reasonable inferences to the population from the sample. Many companies provide websites that calculate a minimum sample size based on the size of the population, as well as provide an estimated acceptable margin of error. For this study, I used Creative Research Systems’ (2014) online calculator to suggest a minimum of 359 survey respondents based on a population of 5,110 and a desired margin of error of +/-5%. Duly noted, some researchers (Hamilton, 2003; Quinn, 2002; Nulty, 2008; Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009) have suggested leaving online surveys open for two to five weeks. Hamilton (2003) notes that a longer timeline for online survey administration does not equal an increased response rate, as a matter of fact, the longer an online survey is ‘open’ the likelihood
of completion decreases. The online survey for the study was ‘open’ for five weeks, and 264 participants accessed the survey during that time.

Survey Instrument

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form 5x-Short (Bass, 2000) with supplemental questions was the instrument that was employed for data collection for the study. The questionnaire is produced by Mind Garden, Incorporated. I purchased services from Mind Garden, Inc. These services included the rights to reproduce and administer the online version of the MLQ by way of an online link, assurance of participants’ anonymity, and storing survey data on a secure server for a minimum of three years as outlined in the company’s privacy policy.

I was granted approval from NACADA’s Executive Office and Research Committee to survey its members. The organization serves as a co-sponsor (or backer) for research projects that are approved for survey administration of its members. Furthermore, researchers should seek to align their demographic questions with the organization’s list of questions/statements. For this study, I designed the supplemental questions and responses based on the organization’s list for institutional type, gender, years of experience, and age groups.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was originally produced in 1985, and continuous development of the instrument is ongoing (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The MLQ Form 5x is copyrighted and commercially available. According to Avolio and Bass (2004), “the latest version of the MLQ, Form 5X, has been used in nearly 300 research programs, doctoral dissertations, and masters theses around the globe in the nearly 10 years between 1995 and 2004” (p. 36). This includes a variety of settings such as education, business, and the military
(Avolio, 2003). However, based on a review of the literature, there is a void involving its use with college academic advisors, thus justifying the need for the current research project.

The MLQ is a self-rated questionnaire that uses a 5-point Likert-type scale to seek respondents’ level of agreement with various leadership statements. These leadership statements assess behaviors associated with laissez faire, transactional, and transformational leadership styles. The frequency scale for the MLQ range from 0 to 4 (0 = “not at all”, 1 = “once in a while”, 2 = “sometimes”, 3 = “fairly often”, 4 = “frequently, if not always”), allowing researchers to calculate average scores for statistical analyses. The results represent the self-perceived leadership style indicating how frequently each survey component is used by the respondent/leader (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The MLQ is composed of 45 leadership statements that acquire information for nine (9) leadership subscales, and takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. The instrument uses five subscales to measure transformational leadership factors, three subscales to measure transactional leadership factors, and one subscale to measure laissez-faire (Avolio & Bass, 2004). It is important to note that the MLQ captures interval data based on participants’ perceptions within the various scales, and then the data is categorized to measure respondent’s leadership style as laissez-faire, transactional, or transformational leadership.

Validity of the Instrument

The MLQ Form 5X was developed based on research and criticisms about the construct validity of previous versions like the MLQ form 5R. Several researchers (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Yukl, 1994; Yukl, 1999) uncovered challenges associated with scaling methods of the MLQ form 5R, and recommended modifications to future forms of the MLQ.
The most recent version of the MLQ was developed based on: (1) partial least squares analysis to identify inclusion in the MLQ 5X; (2) review of the most recent literature to distinguish charismatic from transformational leadership for selection of new items including combining charismatic leadership into two subscales (idealized influence attribute and behaviors) under transformational leadership; (3) recommendations from scholars (Yukl, 1999; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993) in the field of leadership to modify the full range of leadership model to encompass passive/avoidant leadership; and (4) a series of factor analyses such as Confirmatory Factor Analysis, to provide the best convergent and discriminate validities (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Other studies (Antonaskis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio, 1999; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993 as cited in Avolio & Bass, 2004) have confirmed the validity and internal consistency in identifying the effectiveness of the full range model of leadership using the MLQ 5X instrument based on the abovementioned recommendations. The structure of the current form (5X) was also studied for validity and cross-validation from 14 samples (from both the private and public sectors) by 14 separate researchers. In addition to validity, by testing the MLQ 5X form across various samples in different countries the researchers including Mind Garden, Inc. (2004) sought to reveal that the findings were generalizability to larger populations.

Findings from Avolio and Bass (1991), as well as Antonaskis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003) studies (as cited in Avolio & Bass, 2004) using various analyses, exposed construct validity of the Full Range Leadership Model and generalizability of the findings for the MLQ Form 5X. Construct validity is important for measurement procedures
because it assesses the validity of an instrument to ensure that it measures the identified
construct that is not usually “operationally defined” (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). In the case of
leadership styles and the MLQ 5X, researchers have examined the instrument to ensure that it
assesses the leadership styles including the nine leadership subscales that it purports to
measures based on recommendations for revisions to the MLQ form 5R for the MLQ form 5X.
For Antonaskis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam’s (2003) study, for instance, the researchers used
Confirmatory Factor Analysis to assess construct validity. The CFA of the MLQ for their study
found a significant improvement in the MLQ form 5X from the MLQ form 5R of (p<.001), and a
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation to be .05 and the Comparative Fit Index at .905.
These findings suggest that the revised instrument (more accurately) assessing the identified
leadership constructs.

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability refers to the accuracy of an instrument for data collection, and consistency of
the instrument for different populations; meaning, to what extent does an instrument
consistently yield similar results (Bryman, 2008). Additionally, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is a
significant factor for reliability because it measures the relationship between variables or sets
of data by computing the sum of X and Y per individual/survey respondent to examine the
consistency in the results (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). Based on the literature (as cited in
Avolio & Bass, 2004), the MLQ 5-X Self form is defined as stable and consistent. Avolio and Bass
(2004) presented data on the instrument’s intercorrelations and reliability across a large sample
(n = 3,755) of leaders in the United States. Data collection for the instrument was found to be
both accurate and consistent across different populations.
In a different study on the reliability and validity of MLQ, Muenjohn and Armstrong’s (2008) reported that the coefficient alpha for the MLQ Form 5X is .93, while the reliability the sub-scales ranged from .74 and .94 respectively. With a Cronbach’s alpha correlation level above .70, overall and per sub-scale, the MLQ Form 5X is considered a reliable instrument for measuring self-perceived leadership styles based on self-reported leadership behaviors (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Antonaskis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio, 1999; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993; Muenjohn and Armstrong. 2008).

In the case of the MLQ, the instrument is both consistent and reliable; thereby, measuring the perceived leadership styles based on self-perceived leadership behaviors of respondents.

Survey Administration

I submitted a proposal to NACADA’s research committee for approval to administer the survey to NACADA members. Upon approval from the research committee, a list of participants was generated by the Executive Office at NACADA based on the outlined criteria. Meanwhile, Mind Garden, Inc. created a special key login campaign for this study; meaning, only the identified participants could access the webpage to complete the survey. I drafted the invitation to participate in the online survey, which included a statement on the study being approved by the University of North Texas’ Institutional Review Board (IRB). To generate interest and display support for this scholarly research study, the invitation to participate was sent electronically from NACADA’s Executive Office to college advisors/counselors based on their position classification as noted on the participant’s NACADA membership application.
The invitation included both a description and purpose of the study, and encouragement to complete the survey in its entirety to increase validity of the findings. I did not provide any other information to participants about the instrument to avoid influencing their responses. Participants were also assured of their confidentiality in the invitation. Embedded in the invitation was a secure link to the online survey that included the supplemental questions. By clicking on the secure link, participants landed on the informed consent page. After reading and agreeing to the informed consent, participants were required to establish accounts using their email addresses and passwords prior to accessing the survey. Basic logon information was required of participants, which the hosting organization recommends to researchers to avoid multiple uses by a single individuals or mass dissemination of the survey link to non-targeted populations. Due to budgetary constraints, I closely monitored the number of participants because there was a cost to administering this instrument, yet another reason why Mind Garden, Inc. encourages researchers to include basic logon information.

Based on the invitation status report (see Appendix G) produced by NACADA and sent to me at the conclusion of week two, a follow-up message was sent to participants from NACADA at my request reminding advisors and counselors to complete the survey. At the conclusion of week five of the data collection process, the hosting organization, Mind Garden sent me the unrefined data for each of the respondent in an Excel file. Participant’s anonymity was ensured as the survey did not collect any personal identification data; furthermore, Mind Garden, Inc. suppressed the data prior to its release to me. Information beyond the 264 survey data was not passed to me. Data will not be used nor shared with third parties as outlined in the
company’s privacy policy. In addition, Mind Garden, Inc. maintains all records on a secure server for three years minimum.

Prior to organizing and analyzing the data, I did some preliminary screening of the data for the existence of outliers and missing data to ensure readiness for analyses. Missing data were left blank and not captured numerically by the MLQ. Missing data and methods for estimating the missing data or a decision to disregard it was made. For this study, I decided that for individual cases that had more than three missing survey items, the case would be removed from the study. No individual case had more than three missing items in the study. However, in cases were three or fewer items were missing; the missing item(s) was replaced with the mean score for that sub-scale. For the leadership factor subscales, there were no missing items; however, on the Outcomes of Leadership, namely subscale “Extra Effort” (EE) there was eight missing items/responses.

Pairwise was used for analyzing missing data for the study with the exception of “pending” cases. “Pending” cases for the study were defined as surveys that were not completed in their entirety. For instance, if a respondent clicked on the link to the online survey, established a Mind Garden, Inc. account using an email address, completed the informed consent, but did not complete the MLQ that case was considered “pending”; thus, such cases were removed from the further analyses and not included in the sample. For cases were participants did not answer three or fewer of the 45 leadership statements, the blank questionnaire items were replaced with the mean score for that leadership statement. Mertler and Vannatta (2013) noted that pairwise is most appropriate when the researcher “needs to maximize the number of participants within each analysis” (p. 38) not removing the case(s) but
merely the individual item. Pairwise was appropriate for the study because I identified a targeted sample size of 359 advisors to reach a plus or minus 5% margin of error as determined using the online sample size calculator; thus, for this study every case mattered.

Data Analysis Methods

The study employed a descriptive-quantitative research approach, where leadership style was the dependent variable with five independent variables as previously stated. The intent of this traditional form of inquiry is “to get a picture of a situation, behaviors, or attitudes before planning future research” (Kane & O'Reilly-De Brún, 2001, p. 34) that may provide insight into how college advisors/counselors perceive their leadership behaviors. The selected methodology was particularly suited for this dissertation because the objective was to begin the exploration into college advisors/counselors as leaders in higher education that starts with an assessment of their perceived leadership style including the influence of other variables. A detailed description of the data analysis process is presented below.

The identified leadership types are based on advisors’ responses to the 45 item questionnaire. The questionnaire items are clustered into nine subscales and each of the subscales are positioned along a continuum of the three leadership types. To assess the questionnaire items in relation to the research questions, I started by establishing an appropriate alpha level for determining statistical significance, which was .05 for this study. A .05 alpha level is customary in educational research (Bryman, 2008; Gay, 1996; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000; Hinkle, Wiersma, Jurs, 2003). The second step involved identifying statistical analyses to answer the research questions. For this research project, I used descriptive (measures of central tendency and measure of variability) and inferential statistical analyses
(Analysis of Variance) for data analysis running SPSS. These analyses provided a breakdown of the data for the three leadership styles.

George and Mallery (2013) describe data analysis as a process of testing data prior to inferring what the data represents. The identified methods of analyses were dependent upon the variables, and the objective was to apply the (most) appropriate statistical tests to best answer the research questions. Data analyses for this research study included frequency tables, descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and ANOVA.

After making the decision on how to manage missing cases, frequency distributions and descriptive statistics were generated to help identify a portrait of the sample. Frequency tables can be used to depict different variables of a sample (Bryman, 2008), and display the numbers and percentages of cases in each category (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). Frequency distributions show the number and percentages for the independent variables for the study’s sample.

Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) define descriptive statistics as a type of quantitative research that captures current educational phenomena using measured explanations; meaning, descriptive statistics provide organized summaries of the data measures for the sample. Both measures of central tendency (mean) and dispersion measures (standard deviation) were used for the study. Means are the calculated averages of scores in a distribution divided by the number of individual scores (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007), while standard deviations is a dispersion measure, and it is the most commonly used measured of variability because it is stable (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Calculations of means and standard
deviations were reported per subscale to determine the range (gathered or spread out) of data around the mean to measure college advisors’ leadership styles.

Next, the composite and mean scores for each case were calculated. The composite score for each case was used as the composite dependent variable for the analysis of variance. This analysis was used to identify the individualized self-perceived leadership style for each case; while the composite scores were used as the dependent variable for ANOVA. Following this analysis, I then employed analysis of variance (ANOVA) to study the effect that the independent variables had on the dependent variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013); for this research, specifically, ANOVA was conducted to explore the variances in college advisors’ self-perceived leadership styles and the five independent variables.

ANOVA is a widely used statistical method; particularly in the education and social science fields (Elmore & Woehlke, 1988). There are three basic assumptions associated with ANOVA (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003; Mertler & Vannatta, 2013), these are:

1. The observations are random and independent samples from the populations.
2. The distributions of the population from which the sample are selected are normal.
3. The variances of the distributions in the populations are equal. “Homogeneity of variance” is the most commonly used phrase for this assumption.

This statistical procedure divides the total sum of squares (SS) of a dependent variable into components (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). The analysis of variance evaluates the proportion of the difference within groups to the proportion of difference between the groups. For the proportion of within group difference it is assumed that the group variations are of a similar
magnitude for each group. However because of random sampling of participants, there are expected differences among the group means.

As stated by Mertler and Vannatta (2013), “ANOVA is appropriate when the independent variable is defined as having two or more categories and the dependent variable is quantitative” (p. 15). ANOVA is also suitable analysis method when the purpose of the research is to determine if categorical independent variables such as gender or age produces statistically significant differences in the means of a dependent variable such as the leadership style (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). As previously stated, the alpha was set at the .05 level for the statistical tests, which is a level commonly used in social and educational research examining attitudes, beliefs, opinions and self-reported behaviors. And the independent variables included academic advising approach, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender. ANOVA was conducted to study the effect that the independent variable had on the composite dependent variable, followed by post-hoc tests on the statistically significant ANOVA models to determine which groups differed from each other.

Limitations of the Methodology

A limitation of the methodology was the possibility that the responses from college academic advisors and counselors on the MLQ were influenced by testing or self-reporting bias, which occurs occasionally with the use of self-reported instruments. Hayes (1992) states that testing bias exists when participants are aware that they are in a testing situation and provide responses based on the expected response. Self-reporting bias, on the other hand, exists when participants of questionnaire/survey research attempt to hide their negative attitudes or
behaviors by providing inaccurate (or their true responses) information on the questionnaire/survey.

A second possible limitation of the study was the approach to sampling, which may affect the generalizability of the findings to academic advisors in general. Due to financial constraints associated with the cost of administering the MLQ, the research was delimited to NACADA members only, and of NACADA’s membership only those who self-identified as academic advisors and counselors were invited to participate. There is a possibility that an unknown variable exist among academic advisors and counselors affiliated with NACADA that may influence the study’s design and findings.

The final limitation in the methodology is the possibility of researcher bias. Researcher bias is identified as a potential limitation because the researcher may have influenced important elements of the methodological process based on pre-existing viewpoints. For example, I oversaw the entire process from scripting the research questions to data collection that includes interpretation of the results. The use of quantitative research methods, in this case helped reduce the effect of researcher bias because I did not interact directly with the participants during the data collection and data analysis processes.

Summary

This quantitative study used a non-experimental, cross-sectional research design to test the effect of institutional type, academic advising approach, as well as demographic variables such as gender, age group, and years of experience on the self-perceived leadership styles of college academic advisors as measured by the MLQ. The chapter outlined the purposeful sampling of NACADA’s membership who self-identified as college academic advisors and
counselors on their membership applications. Data collection involved the administration of the online MLQ survey composed of five supplemental questions that I created. The chapter also highlighted information on the validity and reliability of the survey instrument, followed by survey administration.

I purchased services from the hosting organization, Mind Garden, Inc. for data collection. Participants were provided an informed consent statement, to maintain confidentiality, the survey did not collect any personal data and no information beyond the survey data were passed to me or any third party, as outlined in Mind Garden’s privacy statement. Mind Garden, Inc. will store questionnaire data on its secure server for a minimum of three years; additionally, I will maintain these records on a secure database. The data were analyzed using frequency tables, descriptive statistics, and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The chapter concluded with limitations of the methodology for the study including researcher biases.

Chapter four (4) presents analyzes of the data gathered through the implementation of the methods described in this chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the influence of five independent variables on college academic advisors’ self-perceived leadership styles using the MLQ leader form 5x-short based on the full range model of leadership. This chapter reports the results of the study; specifically, the results from the data analysis are presented in relation to each of the research questions. Analyses of the data include frequency tables, descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and ANOVA.

Response Rates

A link to the online survey was embedded in the invitation to participate that was disseminated to academic advisors through the Executive Office at the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). Invitees were asked to complete the online MLQ leader form 5x-short that assessed their self-perceived leadership styles; additionally, five questions related to the participants’ demographics were included in the survey. The invitation was sent electronically to 5,111 academic advisors with 45 returned as undeliverable (see Appendix G). The invitation to participant reached 5,066 academic advisors and counselors, and of those invitees 1,171 opened the message from NACADA’s Executive Office, and 335 of the 1,171 invitees clicked on the link to the survey (see Appendix H).

As shared in chapter 3, to obtain a +/-5% margin of error for this study, the desired sample size was 359 college advisors. However, the obtained sample size was 225 college academic advisors, which equates to a +/-6.39% margin of error. Two hundred sixty-four of the 335 invitees accessed the survey, and 39 of the accessed surveys were deemed incomplete;
meaning, the respondent read and agreed to the informed consent, initiated an account with Mind Garden, Inc. to complete the survey but did not complete the survey in its entirety. Thus, the final sample was 225 of the 5,066 population who received the invitation to participate. The sample represents 4.44% of the 5,066 NACADA members who received the invitation to participate. The 4.44% also represents the overall response rate.

Description of the Sample

The sample included college academic advisors who were employed at various post-secondary institutions during the 2014-2015 academic year. The sample was heterogeneous in terms of participants’ age, years of experience, gender, and employing institutional type. Of the 5,061 college academic advisors who met my criteria and received the invitation to participate, responses were received from 225 academic advisors.

Age Range of Academic Advisors

There were five choices for participants to select from on the supplemental question about age. The respondents’ ages ranged from under 20 years of age \( (n = 1) \) to over 50 years of age \( (n = 55) \). Of the 225 participants, 31-40 years of age was the most frequently reported age range and largest percentage at approximately 32%. Additional information on academic advisors’ age range is presented in Table 4.

Academic Advising Approach of Academic Advisors

The majority, 61.3% of the respondents reported using a shared (between developmental and prescriptive) academic advising approach, while 10% of the respondents identified their primary advising approach as “other.” Some of the “other” responses included “intrusive/holistic,” “coaching,” “proactive,” “advising is teaching”; however, of the “other”
responses “appreciative advising” was cited most often as the academic advising approach of these respondents (see Table 4).

Surprisingly, developmental advising approach was second to last (before neither) with 3.1%. I was surprised by the figure for developmental advising because this approach has often been cited as the ‘ideal’ approach to advising when compared to prescriptive advising. Developmental advising promotes growth of students with self-actualization and self-efficacy as the outcomes.

Gender of College Academic Advisors

Female advisors comprised 84.4% \((n = 190)\) of the survey respondents, and male advisors with 15.1% \((n = 34)\) of the respondents (see Table 4). There was, however, one advisor who preferred not to disclose their gender. Of the 190 female advisors, the majority or 56.3% were employed at four-year public institutions; similarly, 55.88% of the male participants were employed at four-year public institutions. Male academic advisors employed at two-year public institutions accounted for 32.35% of the respondents.

Years of Experience for Academic Advisors

To communicate their years of experience, respondents had six choices: 5 years or fewer, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, and more than 25 years. The years of experience represented the total number of years the participant has served as a college academic advisor. Out of the 225 completed surveys, 58.7% selected 5 years or fewer, 24.4% 6-10, 8.4% 11-15 years, 3.6% 16-20 years, 1.8% 21-25 years, and 3.1% more than 25 years. As shown in Table 3, the majority (58.7%) of the respondents had five or fewer years of experience as college advisors.
Employing Institutional Types for Academic Advisors

The majority (56.4%) of respondents were employed at four-year public institutions, followed by 26.2% of the respondents who were employed at four-year private institutions. Two-year private and proprietary (for profit) institutions represented the smallest percentage of the sample both with .4%.

A comprehensive frequency distribution table for the five independent variables including percentages for the population is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

*Frequency Distributions for Independent Variables (n = 225)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 Years of age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years of age</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Years of Age</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 Years of Age</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50 Years of Age</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>20.1% (table continues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Population (continued).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>71.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Disclose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOE</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years or Fewer</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>*12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INST’L TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INST’L TYPE</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Public</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>*15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Proprietary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Public</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Private</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Proprietary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates the compilation of categories for the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). N/A indicates that NACADA does not provide these data in its mid and end of year membership reports.

College Academic Advisor’s Perception of Leadership Style

The first research question is: What is the dominant self-perceived leadership style of college advisors completing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form 5-X short?

To answer this question, an evaluation of academic advisors’ responses to the perceptions of their own leadership styles using the MLQ’s nine leadership subscales was conducted. The data
are displayed in Table 5, each corresponding to academic advisors’ results of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Leader Form 5x-Short.

College advisors perceived themselves as most often demonstrating transformational leadership behaviors with higher ratings, (i.e., 3’s and 4’s), on the leadership subscales IIA, IIB, IM, IS, IC (see Table 5). Results on leadership subscale contingent reward record their use of transactional leadership behaviors.

There were no missing (blank) items on the nine leadership subscales. However, there were eight missing (blank) responses to the outcomes of leadership subscale “Extra Effort” (EE) and one missing (blank) response to “Satisfaction” (SATF) outcomes of leadership subscales. The outcomes of leadership subscales are not leadership styles but these subscales relate to results of leadership behaviors (Avolio & Bass, 2004, p. 119), as previously stated. The outcomes of leadership subscales are important to how leaders perceive they interact with individuals at different levels of their organizations, as well as how satisfied raters are with their leaders’ methods of working with others.

Table 5

*Frequency Distribution for College Academic Advisors’ Responses to the MLQ 5-X (n = 225)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Leadership Subscale Constructs</th>
<th>Outcomes for Leadership Subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>IIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = “NOT AT ALL”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = “ONCE IN A WHILE”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = “SOMETIME”</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table continues*
Descriptive statistics for each of the leadership subscale constructs including the outcomes of leadership subscales were derived by finding the means based on the associated questionnaire statements on the MLQ related to that leadership factor subscale. For example, questionnaire statements 10, 18, 21, and 25 comprise the mean score for idealized influence-attributed (see Appendix I). Descriptive statistics for the 225 college advisor sample are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6**

*Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Factor (Subscales)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>2.927</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>3.105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>3.048</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Leadership Factor (Subscales) | Mean | Mode | Std. Deviation
--- | --- | --- | ---
**Transactional Leadership**
CR | 2.906 | 3 | 0.6156
MBEA | 1.586 | 2 | 0.7933
MBEP | 0.78 | 0 | 0.5607

**Passive/Avoidant Leadership**
LZ | .640 | 0 | 0.4944

**LEGEND:** Independent Variables: Academic Advising Approach; Institutional Type; Age Range; Years of Experience; Gender:
Leadership Subscales: IIA=Idealized Influence (Attributed); IIB=Idealized Influence (Behavior); IM=Inspirational Motivation;
IS=Intellectual Stimulation; IC=Individualized Consideration; CR=Contingent Reward; MBE-A=Management-by-Exception (Active); MBE-P Management-by-Exception (Passive); LF=Laissez-Faire

For the nine leadership factor subscales, the reliability of the MLQ for this study using Cronbach’s alpha was .746; an acceptable reliability as determined by previously established reliability scores of the MLQ ranging from .94 to 74, respectively. Leadership factor subscale individualized consideration (IC) had the highest mean score of 3.39 ($SD = 0.4819$) among the nine leadership subscales. The mean scores for the subscale related to transformational leadership ranged between 2.92 to 3.39 (on a 4-point scale); thus, college academic advisors who participated in this study perceived their leadership style as more transformational as demonstrated by their perceived leadership behaviors that were also supported by the higher mean scores on the outcomes of leadership subscales ranging from 2.75 to 3.24. Avolio and Bass (2004) reported that transformational leaders produce higher scores on the three outcome subscales of leadership.

Additionally, the mean scores for subscales related to transactional leadership ranged from 0.78 to 2.90. Leadership factor subscale contingent reward had the highest mean score of 2.906 ($SD = 0.6156$). The lowest results were reported for leadership style Passive/Avoidant. The sole subscale laissez-faire had a mean score of 0.64 ($SD = 0.4944$).
As stated above, the highest mean score among the leadership factor subscales was individualized consideration, indicating the importance that academic advisors place on personalizing the student’s experience. Personalization of students’ experiences is achieved through recognition and treatment of each student as an individual with unique needs and desires. “Coach and advisor” are the key terms Northouse (2012) used to describe the ability of these (individualized consideration) leaders.

Statistical Significance of Composite Dependent and Independent Variables

The second research question examined the statistical significance of the five independent variables of academic advising approaches, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender on the composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style. To determine the composite dependent variable, the responses to each leadership statement were summed per case. Of the 225 college advisors who participated in the study, the dominant leadership style for 223 (99.1%) of the cases was transformational leadership. The remaining two cases dominant leadership styles were represented by transactional leadership style \( (n = 1) \), and an equal split between transformational and transactional leadership styles \( (n = 1) \). The data for composite dependent variable was then analyzed using ANOVA in SPSS.

One of the first steps in utilizing the analysis of variance (ANOVA) is to test the related assumptions. The first assumption is of independence; meaning that the observations are random and independent samples that are representative of the populations (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). Independence is associated with the design of the study and is associated with how the samples were selected. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003), as well as
Mertler and Vannatta (2013) there is no way to use the study's sample data to test the validity of this (precondition) assumption.

The second assumption examines the distribution of the populations from which the samples were selected for normality. For this study, kurtosis and skewness were reviewed to assess if the dependent variable was normally distributed in each of the group. According to DeCarlo (1997), kurtosis reflects the distribution shape apart from the variance, also referred to as the “degree of peakedness” (Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs, 2003); while skewness indicates the shape of the distribution as uniform or nonuniform (Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs, 2003). As DeCarlo (1997) noted both are essential components to test assumptions.

The null hypothesis for the assumption of normality is that there is no significant departure from normality for each of the groups. To test the assumption of normality, the Shapiro-Wilks test in addition to the descriptive statistics of skewness and kurtosis were examined. Based on the a priori alpha level of .05 for the study, the Shapiro-Wilk’s tests, standard scores, and visual illustrations (i.e. histograms, normal Q-Q plots, and box plots) indicated that the composite dependent variable was normally distributed for each of the five independent variables (p>.05) meaning that the dependent variable was normally distributed in each of the populations. Data from the test for normality are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

| Test of Normality: Skewness and Kurtosis for Composite Dependent and Independent Variables |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|------|-------|
| AAA Developmental               | 99.71 | 7.973| .357 | -1.164| 7     |

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurt</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>(continued).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>108.33</td>
<td>17.256</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>108.01</td>
<td>15.125</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>26.000</td>
<td>-1.721</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>109.57</td>
<td>13.744</td>
<td>-.633</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INST’L TYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Public</td>
<td>112.27</td>
<td>15.699</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.666</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Private</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Proprietary</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Public</td>
<td>106.21</td>
<td>14.781</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Private</td>
<td>109.80</td>
<td>15.447</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Year Proprietary</td>
<td>110.25</td>
<td>25.552</td>
<td>-1.206</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 YRS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 YRS</td>
<td>108.78</td>
<td>15.936</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 YRS</td>
<td>106.32</td>
<td>16.091</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 YRS</td>
<td>107.26</td>
<td>14.758</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>-.535</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 YRS</td>
<td>109.40</td>
<td>14.874</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YRS OF EXP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 YRS or Fewer</td>
<td>108.04</td>
<td>15.527</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 YRS</td>
<td>105.67</td>
<td>16.183</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 YRS</td>
<td>110.95</td>
<td>12.136</td>
<td>-.440</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 YRS</td>
<td>106.63</td>
<td>15.023</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>-.609</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 YRS</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>15.811</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>3.031</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25 YRS</td>
<td>119.86</td>
<td>14.916</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>-1.155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>107.32</td>
<td>12.535</td>
<td>-.564</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>108.16</td>
<td>15.914</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to Disclose</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third and final assumption is the test for homogeneity of variance that assumes that the variances of the distributions in the population are equal. The parametric Levene’s $F$ Test for Equality of Variances was conducted. As previously stated the level of significance set $a$ priori for was .05, and the null hypothesis is that there are no differences in the groups’ variances. Results of the test of homogeneity of variances are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Homogeneity of Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style, the Levene’s test for equality of variances was found to be violated, $F(1, 112) = 1.656, p = .004$. The null hypothesis was rejected for the homogeneity of variances because there was difference in at least one of the group’s variances. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not met. When the homogeneity of variances is violated, a common approach to handle the unequal variances is to transform the data to equalize the variances across the groups, and then perform a non-parametric $F$-test on the transformed data (Keselman, Huberty, Lix, Olejnik, Cribbie, Donahue, Kowalchuk, Lowman, Petoskey, Keselma, & Levin, 1998; Weerahandi, 1995; Krutchkoff, 1988; Glass, Peckham, & Sanders, 1972).
Through transformation of the data it is assumed that the violation of homogeneity of variances would no longer exist but that was not the case for this study. Two variance-stabilizing approaches were applied (logarithmic and square root transformations); nonetheless, tests for the homogeneity of variances were still violated. For the composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style, using the logarithmic transformation, the Levene’s test for equality of variance was found to be violated, $F(1, 112) = 1.573$, $p = .009$ (see Table 9); while the homogeneity of variances for the square root transformation, the Levene’s test generated, $F(1, 112) = 1.622$, $p = .006$. Thus, it was concluded that there was heterogeneity of variances in the groups, and the ANOVA results are considered uninterpretable. And therefore, post hoc tests were not performed on the composite dependent variable and the independent variables.

The logarithmic (Table 9) and square root (Table 10) tests of homogeneity of variances are presented in Tables 9 and 10, and the ANOVA results are shown in Table 11.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Homogeneity of Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Homogeneity of Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Factorial Analysis of Variance with Composite Dependent Variable and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1390.432</td>
<td>347.608</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST’L TYPE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1980.242</td>
<td>396.048</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>264.938</td>
<td>88.313</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS of EXP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1062.566</td>
<td>212.513</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.369</td>
<td>32.369</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA*INSTL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2629.190</td>
<td>438.199</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA*AGE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>884.460</td>
<td>126.351</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA*YRSEXP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>474.621</td>
<td>59.328</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA*GEND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140.240</td>
<td>70.120</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTL*AGE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>983.577</td>
<td>163.929</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTL*YRSEXP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1396.531</td>
<td>174.566</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTL*GEND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162.125</td>
<td>81.062</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE*YRSEXP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1408.715</td>
<td>234.786</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE*GEND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.296</td>
<td>22.148</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRSEXP*GEND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>367.711</td>
<td>122.570</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA<em>INSTL</em>AGE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1511.115</td>
<td>251.852</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA<em>INSTL</em>YRSEXP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99.760</td>
<td>33.253</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA<em>INSTL</em>GEND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.346</td>
<td>30.346</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA<em>AGE</em>YRSEXP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>541.442</td>
<td>270.721</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA<em>AGE</em>GEND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>183.903</td>
<td>183.903</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA<em>YRSEXP</em>GEND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275.208</td>
<td>275.208</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTL<em>AGE</em>YRSEXP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.094</td>
<td>12.524</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTL<em>AGE</em>GEND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>553.060</td>
<td>184.353</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTL<em>YRSEXP</em>GEND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>522.722</td>
<td>522.722</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE<em>YRSEXP</em>GEND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159.253</td>
<td>159.253</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA<em>INSTL</em>AGE*YRSEXP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/table continues/
Summary

This research study sought to explore the influence of different variables, e.g., years of experience on college academic advisors' self-perceived leadership styles. If influenced, the self-perceived leadership styles of college academic advisors would vary based on the independent variables, academic advising approach, institutional type, age range, years of experience, and gender. Two hundred and twenty-five college academic advisors participated in the study. The majority (84.4%) of participants identified their gender as “female”, and 58.7% indicated that they had five or fewer years of experience as a college academic advisor. Over 50% worked at four-year public institutions, and the largest percentage (61.3%) identified their academic advising approach as “both” developmental and prescriptive in nature.

The data for this research study suggest that college academic advisors perceived their leadership styles as more transformational, implying that college academic advisors perceive themselves as most often demonstrating transformational leadership behaviors than those associated with transactional or passive/avoidant leadership behaviors. This finding was further supported when each participant’s responses to the 45 leadership statements were
reviewed and calculated independently. With the exception of two cases, 99% of the college advisors’ self-perceived leadership style was transformational.

Prior to performing the ANOVA, the three assumptions were tested. The standard scores and Shapiro-Wilks test indicated that sample data had been drawn from normally distributed populations. As such, there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis for the test of normality. The parametric test of homogeneity of variances, however, did indicate significance at the .05 level, and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) noted that “violations of homogeneity usually can be corrected by transformation of the DV scores” (p. 80). Based on Tabachnick and Fidell’s recommendation, scores for the dependent variable were transformed, and Levene’s tests were conducted to verify the equality of variances in the sample. The levels of significance for the two additional tests of homogeneity were less than the set .05 level. When the transformation results do not yield homogeneity, there is a decrease in the effectiveness of the analysis (i.e., factorial ANOVA) to accurately detect the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003); thus, findings of the factorial ANOVA were not interpreted in the findings.

The data presented in chapter 4 provided me with information for conclusions to be drawn about the influence of different independent variables on college academic advisors’ self-perceived leadership style. Chapter 5 will present a summary of the findings, discussion, and implications for possible future research.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

In previous chapters, the study was introduced, supporting literature was presented, the research methodology was outlined, and the survey results were provided. This chapter is a discussion of the findings including interpretation of the results. The chapter will start by restating the purpose for this study, as well as reintroduce the research questions with a brief overview of the instrument. The chapter includes a discussion of the results for this study, implications for practice, and an examination of the study’s limitations. This chapter concludes with recommendations for future researchers interested in this topic.

Purpose Statement

The purposes of this study were to identify the self-perceived leadership styles of college advisors using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) with supplemental questions. Moreover, the study sought to explore the difference in college advisors’ perceived leadership styles and demographic information such as academic advising approaches, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender on leadership styles.

Instrumentation and Research Questions

The MLQ provides an assessment of leadership based on nine leadership factor subscales (idealized influence [attributed], idealized influence [behavior], inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception [active], management-by-exception [passive], and laissez-faire leadership) and three leadership outcomes (extra-effort, effectiveness and satisfaction). There are five
subscales associated with transformational leadership also known as the 5 I’s (idealized influence [attributed], idealized influence [behavior], inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration) that assess the transformational dimension of leadership.

The 5 I’s describe leadership behaviors that inspire, motivate, stimulate, and are considerate of others’ higher potential. Avolio and Bass (2004) describe transformational leadership as an expansion of leadership (p. 1), while transactional leadership emphasizes the transaction or exchange between the leaders and the followers. The components of transactional leadership relate to rewards or disciplines in which performances are positively or negatively handled by leaders, and include three subscales on the MLQ. Additional information on the instrument was provided in the literature review and methodology chapters of the study.

Research Questions

The study was designed to investigate the following research questions:

1. What is the dominant self-perceived leadership style of college advisors completing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form 5-X short?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in the composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style according to the independent variables of academic advising approach, gender, institutional type, age group, and years of experience group?

3. If a statistically significant difference exists, between which independent variables does the difference exist according to post-hoc test?
Discussion of the Findings

*College Academic Advisor’s Self-Perceived Leadership Styles*

As expressed in the first research question, the study’s findings suggested that academic advisors perceived their dominant leadership style as transformational, which was supported by the overall mean score and each of the mean scores on the transformational leadership factor subscales, (also referred to as the 5 I’s (Idealized Influence [Attributed], Idealized Influence [Behavior], Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration). This finding was also supported by the calculation of the mean scores for each participant’s responses to the 45 leadership statements. Leadership subscale *individualized consideration* had the highest mean score for college academic advisors. Duly noted were the high scores on the outcomes of leadership subscales, and as Avolio and Bass (2004) report transformational leaders produce higher scores on the three outcome subscales of leadership.

In examining the other leadership subscales, contingent reward (transactional) received a relatively high mean score; especially, when this mean score is compared to leadership subscale idealized influence attributed (transformational). Conversely, the mean scores for both laissez-faire (passive/avoidant) and management-by-exception passive (transactional) were significantly lower than the other subscales. Therefore, college academic advisors do not perceive themselves as demonstrating these leadership behaviors as often, if at all (MBEP = .078; LZ = .640), according to the four-point Likert scale.

Due the nature of college advisors work including the diverse student populations they lead and Kelly’s (2003) study on academic advising and leadership, I was not surprised by the findings of research question one. The data revealed that college academic advisors employ a
wide range of leadership behaviors and academic advising approaches. This may be in part due to the fact that most college academic advisors work with students throughout their educational journeys helping them to establish interpersonal competencies (CAS Board of Directors, 2005), which requires different leadership behaviors/techniques of college academic advisors as students transition through different phases of development while in college.

Comparison of the percentage for academic advising approaches and mean scores for the leadership styles were warranted. The majority (61.3%) of the participants reported “both” (developmental and prescriptive) as their primary academic advising approaches; implying that college academic advisors modify their advising approach based on the unique needs of students. This finding was supported by the mean score for Individualized Consideration, which was the highest mean score (3.93) of the nine subscales. Individualized consideration requires leaders to recognize that each person has unique needs and desires (Bass, 2008), and it is the leader’s role to assist them (students) toward self-actualization through coaching (Northouse, 2012; Kelly, 2003). This requires a heightened sense of awareness in order for the leader to give and receive feedback (Bass, 1990), which is essential to the work of college academic advisors.

I was surprised by the imbalance of participants’ who perceived their leadership style as transformational (n = 223; 99.1%) compared to the number of non-transformational leadership styles (n = 2; .08%); particularly, when these figures were evaluated in conjunction with the 61% (n = 138) of college advisors’ who identified their primary academic advising approach as “both” (developmental and prescriptive). Based on the fact that the majority of college advisors’ primary academic advising approach was “both”, I conjectured that the quantity of
college advisors’ with both or split leadership styles would have been larger than two (or .08%). This supposition was based on descriptions of the two academic advising approaches, and the three leadership styles associated with the full range model of leadership outlined in the literature review. For example, according to Crookston (1972), academic advisors who employ prescriptive advising techniques focus on task and the delivery of information such as policies and procedures (refer to Table 1). Duly noted, various researchers (Bass, 1985 & 2000; Bromley, 2007; Yukl & Lepsinger, 2005; Northouse, 2012) described transactional leadership as task-oriented with a communicative process that emphasizes the exchange of information between leader and follower. Thus, on the surface, there appeared to be similarities between developmental advising and transformational leadership behaviors/techniques, as well as prescriptive advising and transactional leadership behaviors/techniques.

It is also important to note that none of the college advisors who participated in this study perceived their leadership style as passive/avoidant. This could be based on the fact that passive/avoidant leadership is perceived as ‘bad’ or a negative, or it perhaps the negative/‘bad’ leadership behaviors were easily recognizable in the instrument. An example of a question from the MLQ associated with passive/avoidant leadership is “I avoid getting involved when important issues arise”. In most situations, college advisors would not view themselves as individuals who avoid involvement when important issues arise; especially when the issue is related to students and student success, because that behavior (or the lack thereof) may be perceived as negative or ‘bad’ in contrast to their position as advocates, teachers, and mentors to students. Since the MLQ 5-X is a self-reporting instrument, however, it is plausible that the participants may have selected the perceived positive behavior and as such provided inaccurate
responses on the survey (Hayes, 1992). If self-reporting bias did occur then it explains the quantitative disparity in college advisors’ perceived leadership styles between transformational v. transactional along with passive/avoidant.

Statistical Significance of the Variables

The second research question addressed statistical significance in the composite dependent variable of self-perceived leadership style and the independent variables of academic advising approach, gender, institutional type, age group, and years of experience group. To answer this research question, a factorial ANOVA was performed. The first step, however, was to test the three ANOVA assumptions because as stated by Erceg-Hurn and Mirosevich (2008), violation of the normality and homogeneity assumptions can have a substantial influence on the Type I and Type II error rates from the classic parametric tests. Likewise by performing traditional procedures such as ANOVA without testing the assumptions, researchers may be unknowingly filling the literature with non-replicable results (Keselman, Algina, Lix, Wilcox, & Deering, 2008).

ANOVA Assumptions

The results of most statistical analyses such as ANOVA assume normality and homogeneity, and the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances are required to be met for the t-test for independent group, ANOVA, and regression (Hoekstra, Kiers, & Johnson, 2012). The ability of researchers to make valid inferences from the results of inferential statistics is contingent upon the sampling technique and data of the population characteristics (Nimon, 2012) implying that the assumptions were met. For this reason, the assumptions were tested before interpreting the ANOVA results of the study.
Assumption of Normality

Normality of variables consists of skewness and kurtosis, and can be measured either statistically or graphically (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As displayed in chapter four, the assumption of normality was assessed statistically for this study. A Shapiro-Wilks was performed to test the assumption of normality (refer to Table 7).

The descriptive statistics were evaluated in addition to the p-value (or Sig.) of Shapiro-Wilks. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the Shapiro-Wilks test is considered conservative; as a result the test of normality included an examination of skewness and kurtosis. The skewness and kurtosis statistics were divided by its standard error to determine if the standard scores (z-value) deviated significantly from normality of +/-1.96 at the .05 significance level (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001 & 2007). These results concluded that the levels of the independent variables were normally distributed (see Table 7); meaning, the sampling distribution of the means were normal. Therefore, the assumption of normality was met for the samples.

Assumption of Homogeneity of Variances

The homogeneity of variances assumes that the change of the dependent variable is the same or similar at all levels of the independent variables of academic advising approaches, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender (Nimon, 2012). As mentioned above, the independent variables were normally distributed across the sample; however, the tests of homogeneity of variances were violated indicating that the variances at all levels of the independent variables were not the same or similar. In general there are three primary causes for heterogeneity: 1. non-normality of at least one variable, 2. the change in one variable is
related to the change in another variable, and 3. greater error of measurement at some levels of at least one of the independent variables (Louis, 1991; Li & Reynolds, 1995; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). An example of greater error of measurement from the study could be academic advising approaches and perceived leadership style. College academic advisors who identified their primary advising approach as “developmental” may be more cognizant of how their developmental advising practices relate to how they demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors/techniques than college advisors who identified their primary advising approach as “prescriptive” \( (n = 54) \) or “both”\( (n = 138) \). As such college advisors who identified their primary advising approach as “prescriptive” or “both” may have provided less than reliable estimates on the 45 leadership statements of the MLQ about their perceived leadership style and thereby increased the variance of leadership scores for the levels of “prescriptive” and “both” advising approaches.

When the ANOVA assumptions are not met there is a change in the Type I error rate; thus, instead of a significance level of .05 the actual error rate may be greater or less than the set alpha level (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003; Osborne & Waters, 2002; Keselman, Huberty, Lix, Olejnik, Cribbie, Donahue, Kowalchuk, Lowman, Petoskey, Keselma, & Levin, 1998; Weerahandi, 1995). The change in the Type I error rate of F-test is of particular importance when it is due to unequal sample sizes (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003; Erceg-Hurn & Mirosevich, 2008), which was the case for this research. Take the example of academic advising approaches presented above. The independent variable, academic advising approaches had unequal sample sizes; “developmental” advising had 7 responses while “both” developmental and prescriptive advising approaches had 138 responses (refer to Table 4). Therefore, if the
larger variance was associated with the larger sample, “both” the alpha level would be too conservative; but if the smaller variance was associated with the larger sample, then the alpha level would be too liberal (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Nimon, 2012). Therefore, based on the results for the study it was concluded that the population variances were not equal.

ANOVA Results

Due to the fact that the various tests of homogeneity of variances were significant at .05, the factorial ANOVA results were deemed uninterpretable. For discussion purposes only, however, it is important to mention that the ANOVA results were not statistically significant at .05. This finding was interesting to me because none of the independent variables had an effect on the composite dependent variable, which does not reflect the findings from previous research studies on leadership styles and gender, or leadership style and age/years of experience.

Based on previous research studies on gender, age/years of experience and leadership, I believed that at least one of these variables would yield statistically significant results. The study’s lack of statistical significance based on age and/or years of experience was surprising to me because several studies have found that age/years of experience does effect leadership styles/behaviors (Garcia-Retamero & Lopez-Zafras, 2006; Oshagbemi, 2004). Furthermore, it assumed that seasoned leaders whether based on age or years of experience most often demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors and are more effective leaders (Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, & Marx, 2007). The lack of statistically significant findings for this study suggests to me that perhaps one of the supplemental questions should have addressed prior leadership
experience and/or prior leadership development trainings; due to the fact that years of experience and/or age are may not be as prevalent for the work of college academic advisors, more so than their ability to master the process of leadership. Northouse (2012) described leadership as an influential process where the leader supports an individual’s goal attainment. Duly noted situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988) outlined leadership as a process that is based on the needs of followers that may change over time. Both interpretations highlight how college advisors can use the process of leadership to serve diverse student populations regardless of age/years of experience. Although, it is also important to mention that the lack of statistically significant results may also be due to how the age groups were categorized, or maybe that the age should not have been categorized at all.

While the influence of gender and leadership has been studied extensively, the lack of evidence to support leadership differences based on gender was not as alarming considering the inconsistency of findings from different studies (Robinson & Blumen, 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Young, 2004). An example from the literature was Eagly, Johanneson-Schmidt, and van Engen’s meta-analysis of the 45 leadership studies on transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. The results of their study found that female leaders most often demonstrated a more transformational leadership style than male leaders. The results confirmed differences in leadership styles based on gender. However, Robinson and Blumen’s (2003) study on managers’ achieving and leadership styles based on gender indicated no statistically significant differences based on gender. The findings revealed that there were no differences in male and female leaders’ achieving (6 of 9 areas) and leadership styles but male leaders were found to
display higher results in the area of competitiveness. The findings from this study as well as other studies suggest the need for additional research in the area of gender and leadership or leadership traits based on gender.

Implications for Practice

This study explored college academic advisors’ self-perception of their leadership styles using the MLQ with supplemental statements. Leadership is more often than not still understood as an individual activity, so there is a need for college academic advisors to understand their leadership style because it is a critical factor for leading others in the changing landscape of higher education. Therefore, this study will contribute to the growing body of literature on college academic advisors and the full range model of leadership; namely, transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles.

This research met the first purpose of the study, which was to identify the self-perceived leadership styles of college advisors. Results for this study revealed that while college academic advisors perceive their dominant leadership style and behaviors to most closely resemble transformational leadership. The data (refer to Table 5) also indicated that college advisors employ a “full range” of leadership behaviors moving along the leadership continuum as necessary. Bass and Avolio (1999) insisted that transformational and transactional leadership styles are distinctive forms of leadership, and effective leaders employ aspects of both. The “full range” concept was also supported by the percentage of college advisors who identified their academic advising approach as both (61.3%) developmental and prescriptive. This signifies that college advisors can, and often do, move between merely delivering information to teaching. Just as no single academic advising approach works well for all
student populations, the same is true of leadership. For example, the use of incentives (contingent reward) to motivate completion of concrete tasks may be appropriate for first term students; while engaging in abstract learning theories (Intellectual Stimulation) may be appropriate for third year students. Effective leadership requires knowledge about various leadership behaviors, the organization or institutional culture (Blunt & Jones, 1997), followers, as well as self-awareness (Bennis, 1989). Therefore, college advisors should reflect on their own personal characteristics to identify their leadership style within the context of higher education, their respective institutions, in addition to the characteristics of the students they serve, because advisors are leaders on the frontline at most post-secondary institutions.

I assumed that college advisors viewed themselves as leaders, and understood different styles of leadership. It is unknown if this assumption was accurate; however, post-secondary institutions and the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) can assist with the advancement of academic advisors as leaders. For example, institutions could establish a leadership development academy or a series of leadership development sessions that focus on leading from your position using the full range model of leadership as the contextual framework.

In the changing landscape of higher education, it would behoove institutions to move toward an inclusionary model of leadership beyond the traditional hierarchy model of positional leadership. This notion is imperative to cultivating more effective leaders in higher education in an effort to attain the overall goal—student success. Post-secondary institutions and NACADA should seek to advise and assist frontline leaders like academic advisors to understand their leadership styles and behaviors to engage them in the advancement of their
institutions specifically, and the advising profession in general. This would require institutions of higher learning and NACADA to think outside of the (traditional) box of leadership and encourage college academic advisors to actively engage/participate in the leadership process by establishing innovative practices for the future; consequently, the advising profession and post-secondary institutions become transformational leaders themselves.

The second purpose of the study was to explore the variance in college academic advisors’ self-perceived leadership styles based on the five independent variables of age, gender, institutional type, years of experience, and academic advising approach. This purpose was not met due to a moderate to serious violation of the ANOVA assumption for the homogeneity of variance. The assumption findings (namely, the homogeneity of variances) for this study demonstrate the importance of performing these tests prior to interpreting the ANOVA results, because a classic parametric test may not be suitable and the findings may be inaccurately interpreted based on a violation of the ANOVA assumptions.

Limitations of the Study

The current research was based on self-reported data. This study assessed the leaders’ self-perceived leadership; thus, the research does not provide evidence on the students, or administrators’ perceptions of advisors and counselors’ leadership styles. This limits the empirical data since they are based on self-reported measurements, which may not reflect college advisors’ actual leadership style. Future research is necessary to explore how followers/students and supervisors perceived the leadership of academic advisors. By expanding the scope of participants for this research, it could further the leadership framework for college academic advisors; especially those who aspire to move up within the profession.
Along the same lines, I assumed that academic advisors viewed themselves as leaders, which may have resulted in self-selection bias. Therefore, there is a possibility that many academic advisors do not perceive themselves as leaders, frontline or otherwise, and, therefore choose not to respond to the survey.

Another limitation of the study was the inability to interpret the impact of the independent variables of academic advising approach, institutional type, age, years of experience, and gender on the dependent variable of composite leadership style, due to a lack of similarity or sameness in the variances (homogeneity) for the populations. The results of the classic parameter tests like the factorial ANOVA for the study could not be interpreted with accuracy when there is a moderate to serious violation of the homogeneity assumption in multiple Levene tests. Proceeding with the interpretation of the ANOVA results when variances are unequal increases the likelihood of a Type I error. For example, instead of a 5% chance that the null hypothesis was falsely rejected based on the set p-value of .05, the likelihood of falsely rejecting the null hypothesis would have been much greater, even as high as 30% (Wilcox, Charlin, & Thompson, as cited in Erceg-Hurn & Mirosevich, 2008). Consequently, the effect of each variable on the dependent variable is unknown.

This research was limited to academic advisors and counselors who were members of NACADA as of November 2014 which is the second limitation. In November 2014, the number of NACADA member who met my criteria was 5,110. The message was sent to this cohort of academic advisors, however, 45 of the sent messages were marked undeliverable; thus, 5,066 of the 5,110 members actually received the invitation to participate. The total number of college advisors and counselors who completed the survey in its entirety summed 225. This
figure was below my estimated target of 359 based on the established confidence level using a sample size calculator. The sample represents only 4.44% of the identified targeted population. While the study included a large population of advisors from various backgrounds and institutional types, sufficient representation of all types of advisors was not assured. Therefore, errors may have been introduced into the findings due to the limited sample size. In addition to the limited sample size, an in-depth discussion of the findings is also limited due to the exploratory nature of this study.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study assessed the self-perceived leadership styles of college academic advisors that included attempting to explore how well different variables explained the difference in their self-perceived leadership styles. Based on the current study, the following suggestions are recommended for future research.

First, the findings of this study are limited and not generalizable to NACADA’s members or other college academic advisors. Future research should address all members of NACADA to assess the differences in self-perceived leadership styles between advising populations such as faculty advisors or even advising administrators. Another area for future research should investigate the difference in leadership styles between NACADA and non-NACADA academic advisors. Likewise, to build on the current study, I would recommend a follow-up qualitative study with college advisors’ to discuss their perceived leadership styles, and the notion of leading from their position.

Speaking on one of the five independent variables (academic advising approach), a second recommendation for future research is a reduction in the number of variables (possibly
no more than three) considering the number of subscales associated with the MLQ. Future research should consider assessing academic advising approach, institutional type, and either years of experience or age but not both as variables of interest. An alternate third variable of interest may be college academic advisors’ race/ethnicity, and how that influences one’s responses to MLQ and the full range model of leadership. Additionally, future research should explore the relationship or variance of the independent variables on the nine subscales opposed to a composite dependent variable.

I assumed that college advisors understood leadership including various theories, and that college advisors viewed themselves as leaders within their respective institutions. As previously stated, many college advisors’ may not view themselves as leaders or have a working knowledge of the different leadership frameworks; thus, the third and final recommendation would be to conduct a qualitative research study by way of focus groups or individual interviews with college advisors on leadership including their perceived leadership styles. The majority of college advisors who participated in this study perceived their leadership style as transformational; however, there was no follow up or open-ended assessment to ascertain what behaviors they demonstrate as transformational leaders opposed to when they are employing transactional leadership behaviors.

Conclusion

The intention of this study was to contribute to the growing body of scholarly literature on academic advising and leadership. The study also sought to offer insight on academic leadership in higher education; specifically assessing the variance of the independent variables, age, gender, institutional type, years of experience, and academic advising approach) on the
self-perceived leadership styles of college advisors. The ANOVA results for this study were uninterpretable due to heterogeneity. In most research situations heterogeneity is considered a negative, while others view it as the “lifeblood” for gaining more information because it is as equally important to attempt to understand and explain the heterogeneity of variances in a population as it is the homogeneity of variances (Louis, 1991).

There are over 130 definitions of leadership including decades of studies by several individuals (Burn, 1978; Bass, 1985; Day & Harrison, 2007; Crosby, 1997; Northouse, 2004 & 2012) who have suggested that leadership is critical to the success of any organization. Before a leader can contribute to the success of an organization; however, leadership should begin within (Covey, 1989; Bennis, 1989) and then expand to include others and organizations (Day & Harrison, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2007). In higher education, the success of the organization is critical to not only those employed with the respective institutions but society as well. An example of the importance for organizational success at post-secondary institutions is accountability or performance-based funding, which is contingent upon completion/graduation rates; accordingly, all institutional personnel including academic advisors are expected to contribute to the organization’s success.

The results of this study found that college advisors’ perceived their leadership style to be more transformational than transactional or passive/avoidant. Transformational leaders focus on changing processes and people (Northouse, 2012) and are more likely to gain individuals’ commitment to the organization and society (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Bass, 2000). As frontline leaders, college advisors are often tasked with balancing the diverse needs and expectations of students with the organization’s success and societal expectations.
(student completion) reflecting their ability to be transformative leaders. Duly noted were college advisors’ relatively high mean scores on three of the five transformational subscales, individualized considerations (3.393), inspirational motivation (3.105), and intellectual stimulation (3.048). Theoretically speaking, college advisors’ ability to adapt their leadership styles or behaviors based on the individual (specific personal characteristics) will establish stronger relationships and strengthen (individuals’) commitment to the organization. Thus, the leadership of college advisors is significant to their organization’s success regardless of where they are positioned on their organizational charts.

Several factors influence how leaders including college advisors decide to lead, and as the role of college advisors evolve in the changing landscape of higher education, it is imperative that college advisors have an awareness of different leadership styles so that they can effectively lead from their positions. As transformational leaders college advisors should consider intentionally developing their leadership styles to include behaviors/techniques that address individual, organizational, and situational need. Most importantly, as college advisors embrace their leadership roles; recall Avolio, Bass, and Jung’s (1999) assertion that it is not transformational or transactional leadership, but the ability to exercise a full range of leadership behaviors that constitute an effective leader.
APPENDIX A

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS & MLQ
Please answer to the following questions:

1. Select the academic advising approach that best describes your primary advising style.
   Prescriptive
   Developmental
   Both (Prescriptive and Developmental)
   None of the above (Prescriptive and Developmental)
   Other

2. Select the institutional type that best describes your current employing institutional.
   two-year public
   two-year private
   two-year proprietary (for profit)
   four-year public
   four-year private
   four-year proprietary (for profit)

3. Select your age range.
   under 20 years
   21-30 years
   31-40 years
   41-50 years
   more than 50 years

4. Select the total number of years that you have been employed as an academic advisor/counselor:
   5 years or fewer
   6-10 years
   11-15 years
   16-20,  21-25
   more than 25 years

5. Select your gender.
   Male
   Female
   Prefer not to disclose
APPENDIX B

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Leader Form

My Name: ______________________________ Date: __________________

Organization ID #: __________________ Leader ID #: __________________

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word “others” may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts...

2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate...

3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious...

4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards...

5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise...
APPENDIX C
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE
Dear Academic Advisors and Counselors,

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas, and I have chosen to research the leadership styles of college academic advisors and counselors for my dissertation. The following information is being presented to help you decide whether or not you want to be part of this research study. As a researcher, I want to study the self-perception of academic advisors and counselors as leaders. The questions I seek to answer will help people understand how academic advisors and counselors view their work in a time of change in higher education; as well as the evolving role of academic advisors and counselors as leaders.

The research is considered to be minimal risk. That means the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study. If you take part in this study, you will be asked to complete the online version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) leader form 5x-Short with added questions, all of which takes no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete.

Participants are required to login to access the survey using their email address. However, at the time you submit your responses no identifying information (i.e., email address) is linked to your answers; thus, respondents will remain anonymous. As a result, the responses of specific individuals cannot be identified in the data. The findings may be published in an effort to share what is learned from this study; however all information will be reported as group not individually. There are no direct benefits to you for participation in this study, although information gathered from this study will contribute to scholarly research on the field of academic advising in a time of change in higher education.

I hope that you will participate in this very important research study, because your work in leading students toward success is essential. Below is the link to the MLQ survey:

http://www.mindgarden.com/login/key/d769-546e0b402857b

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chrsisy L. Davis Jones (ChrsisyDavis@my.unt.edu)
University of North Texas
Program in Higher Education
1155 Union Circle #310829
Denton, TX 76203-5017
APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT NOTICE
Title of Study: The Full Range Advising Experience: An assessment of college academic advisors’ self-perceived leadership styles.

Introduction: Before agreeing to participate in this study, it is important that the following explanation of the proposed procedures be read and understood. It describes the purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits of the study. It also describes the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. It is important to understand that no guarantee or assurance can be made as to the results of the study.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to assess academic advisors’ self-perceived leadership styles using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as represented in the Full Range Leadership Model.

Duration: Your participation in this study is estimated at no longer than 15 minutes to complete the online survey.

Procedures: You will be asked to respond to 45 statements about your leadership style as you perceive it, as well as five (5) additional questions about your academic advising approach, institutional type, age range, gender, and years of experience.

Benefits: You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study; however, your participation will help advance the profession in regards to the leadership role academic advisors play in influencing students to achieve their desirable outcomes (e.g., motivation to complete). As well as, the establishment of professional development sessions designed for academic advisors with an emphasis on leadership development.

Confidentiality: Your anonymous survey responses will be transmitted securely and stored on Mind Garden, Inc.’s server. The student investigator, Mind Garden, Inc. as co-sponsor, and the University of North Texas will have access to your data and your identity will not be recorded. These data will not be shared with third parties per Mind Garden’s privacy policy. The data from the study may be published; however, you will not be identified by name. Research data will be stored electronically for three (3) years after the end of this study by the student investigator, the University of North Texas, and Mind Garden, Inc. and then purged.

Right to refuse or withdraw: Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. The investigator has the right to withdraw you from the study at any time. Your withdrawal from the study may be for reasons related solely to you or because the entire study has been terminated.

Offer to answer questions: If you have any other questions about this study, feel free to contact Chrissy L. Davis Jones (student investigator) at ChrissyDavis@my.unt.edu or V. Barbara Bush, Ph.D. (supervising investigator) at Barbara.Bush@unt.edu.
**I have read the information provided above about completing this questionnaire. If you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, please click “I Agree”. You may use the print feature of your web browser to print a copy of this consent form for your information.**
APPENDIX E

REMINDER/FOLLOW-UP MESSAGE
Invitation to Participate in a Study on the Self-Perceived Leadership Styles of Academic Advisors

Dear Academic Advisors and Counselors,

The deadline for the study on academic advisors and counselors as leaders is quickly approaching, and I am looking forward to your response. If you have already completed the online survey, please accept my deepest appreciation. If not, please do so today, because your support by way of your responses will help ensure that the data is valid and an accurate depiction of the self-perceived leadership styles of college advisors and counselors.

I realize that your time is extremely valuable, especially as you transition into the 2015 academic term. Please know that your participation in this study is greatly appreciated! To access the online survey, please click on the link below.

http://www.mindgarden.com/login/127

Thank you again for supporting this research study on the self-perceived leadership style of college academic advisors.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chrissy L. Davis Jones (ChrissyDavis@my.unt.edu)
University of North Texas
Program in Higher Education
1155 Union Circle #310829
Denton, TX 76203-5017
October 27, 2014

Dr. V. Barbara Bush

Student Investigator: Chrissy Davis Jones

Department of Higher Education

University of North Texas

RE: Human Subjects Application No. 14-367

Dear Dr. Bush:

In accordance with 45 CFR Part 46 Section 46.101, your study titled "The Full Range Advising Experience: An Assessment of Academic Advisors' Self-Perceived Leadership Styles" has been determined to qualify for an exemption from further review by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB).

No changes may be made to your study's procedures or forms without prior written approval from the UNT IRB. Please contact Jordan Harmon, Research Compliance Analyst, ext. 4643, if you wish to make any such changes. Any changes to your procedures or forms after 3 years will require completion of a new IRB application.

We wish you success with your study.

Sincerely,

Chad Trulson, Ph.D.
Professor
Chair, Institutional Review Board

CT:jh
1155 Union Circle #305250 i Denton, Tens 76203-5017 | TEL 940.565.3940 1 FAX 940.565.4277 940.369.8652 http://research.unt.edu
APPENDIX G

NACADA INVITATION STATUS REPORT #1
APPENDIX H

NACADA INVITATION STATUS REPORT #2
APPENDIX I

LEADERSHIP SUBSCALE CONSTRUCTS AND ASSOCIATED QUESTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Type</th>
<th>Subscale Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive/Avoidant</td>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>5, 7, 28, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Management-by-Exception Passive</td>
<td>3, 12, 17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Management-by-Exception Active</td>
<td>4, 22, 24, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>1, 11, 16, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>15, 19, 29, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>2, 8, 30, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>9, 13, 26, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Idealized Influence Behaviors</td>
<td>6, 14, 23, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Idealized Influence Attributes</td>
<td>10, 18, 21, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX J

ACADEMIC ADVISORS’ MEAN SCORES CONTINUUM
**Academic Advisors’ Mean Scores**

- LZ = 0.640
- MBE(P) = 0.78
- MBE(A) = 1.586
- CR = 2.906
- IC = 3.393
- IS = 3.048
- IM = 3.105
- IIB = 2.988
- IIA = 2.927
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