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The purpose of this study was to explore the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" as defined by Kouzes and Posner. Data collected using the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and assembled by James Kouzes and Barry Posner has consistently shown a significant difference between the leader scores on the LPI "self" and the subordinates scores on the LPI "observer". This study was designed to explore possible causes of this significant difference.

A multiple case study with embedded unit analysis was selected as the research methodology. Three sites were selected from departments or centers located within Colleges of Agriculture at Land Grant Universities from the midwest with strong leadership reputations. The data were collected by the primary researcher in a single entire day visit to each site composed of an introductory meeting, individual interviews, and general observation of the department or center. All data were analyzed upon return from the site. Three leaders and 21 subordinates were involved in this study. The embedded unit of the study was the appropriate LPI instrument.

Results from the study were very supportive of both the transformational theories of leadership and Kouzes and Posner's leadership practices. This support was drawn from
the detailed discussions of the individuals within the study. The study failed to reproduce the significant difference between "self" and "observer" commonly found in the leadership practice "enabling others to act" with the LPI. When analyzed the demographic data and embedded unit showed no consistent correlation. The study, individually using explanation building analysis and multiplicatively using analytical pattern building analysis, failed to generate any clearly identifiable relationships. An association between leader expectations and the subordinates perception of their ability to act was discovered; however, no clear relationship emerged.

The case study research methodology was found to be appropriate and efficient at studying the phenomena know as leadership. Leadership was defined as the ability to cause action in a group or individual to pursue a unified direction, purpose, or goal. The study concluded by suggesting that researchers continue the study of leadership until the intricate details of this phenomena are understood.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The curiosity of man with the phenomena of causing organized action within man and his organizations has long been a part of our history. Man has written about individuals that have possessed this ability and researchers have indulged in the study of the phenomena. Currently, our love affair with this phenomena still exists and is prominent within the popular and research press (Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich, 1985). This phenomena has also earned its place in business and industry through the prestigious Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, accounting for nine percent of the total points in 1992 (Bemowski, 1992).

This phenomena is commonly known as leadership.

Leadership is defined by Tucker as:

The ability to influence or motivate an individual or a group of individuals to work willingly toward a given goal or objective under a specific set of circumstances. (1984, p. 41)

Dwight D. Eisenhower stated:

Leadership is the art of getting someone else to do something that you want done because he wants to do it. (Ziglar, 1986, p. 31)

In his study of many schools of thought, Chris Lee (1991) composed the following definition:
An effective leader provides a vision, inspires others to commit to that vision, and creates strategies that move them toward the vision. (1991, p. 27)

Leadership is practiced by a variety of individuals in a variety of settings. Pfeffer (1977) contended that the study of leadership was ambiguous and other avenues should be taken to explain the causality of social phenomena. Others have continued forward and developed leadership theories centered around traits, behaviors, and the situation (McElroy and Hunger, 1988).

In 1983, two individuals began work on a research project to discover what leaders did to lead others when they were at their personal best. The result of the research was a book entitled The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations and an instrument called the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). As James Kouzes and Barry Posner (1987) continued their work they discovered some interesting things regarding leadership.

Kouzes and Posner, through looking at leaders, identified and labeled five common practices of exemplary leaders. Those practices were 1) challenging the process, 2) inspiring a shared vision, 3) enabling others to act, 4) modeling the way, and 5) encouraging the heart. Their research continued as they more finely defined each of these processes and developed commitments in each area common to
leaders. To further their research, Kouzes and Posner used their instrument to objectively evaluate a leader's performance in each of these five areas. The results of that evaluation and others have presented the problem which this study was directed.

In evaluating leaders, Kouzes and Posner commonly administered their instruments (LPI) to both leaders and others directly associated with the leaders. The instrument was modified to provide for a self evaluation of the leader and an evaluation of the leader by others. Upon comparison of the original data, a significant difference at the .01 alpha level was discovered between the responses of self and observer in the leadership practices of "enabling others to act" and "challenging the process" (Kouzes and Posner, 1987, p. 315). In 1990 during a study of Executive Officers in Agricultural Education Departments, Spotanski (1990) also discovered a significant difference between "self" and "observer" responses in the area of "enabling others to act" at the .01 alpha level (Spotanski, 1990, p. 63). After summarizing data from over 36,000 leaders and subordinates, Kouzes and Posner again showed a significant difference at the .001 level for the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" (1993, p. 4). In a phone conversation with Posner, he noted that it was consistent for a significant difference to exist between "self" and "observer" responses
for the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" (Posner, 1993).

**Statement of the Problem**

Studies using Kouzes and Posner's LPI have routinely shown a significant difference between the responses of "self" and "observer" in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". There has been no research conducted in an attempt to explain why a significant difference exists. This study explored the leadership practice "enabling others to act" as defined by Kouzes and Posner's work.

**Research Questions**

1. To describe the leadership practices of an individual within a leadership position.
2. To identify indicators of Kouzes and Posner's "enabling others to act" leadership practice.
3. To collect information related to indicators of Kouzes and Posner's "enabling others to act" leadership practice on an individual within a leadership position.
4. To relate collected indicator information to descriptive data of an individual within a leadership position.
5. To draw implications from case study analysis.
Significance of the Study

The results of studies using Kouzes and Posner's LPI consistently showed a significant difference between the results of self and observer responses in the area of "enabling others to act". If insight could be gained into why this discrepancy existed it might be possible to better prepare leaders in the future. The impact of this was twofold. The first impact would be to education. The information would lead to new developments within the leadership curriculum. Educators would be challenged to train individuals with the skills to make their students more efficient leaders. The second impact would be to organizations. Better prepared leaders would be more efficient and the result should be a more productive organization.

Definition of Terms

Leadership: The ability to cause action in a group or individual to pursue a unified direction, purpose, or goal.

"Enabling Others to Act": The segment of leadership concerned with a leader's ability to enlist the support of others to inspire work on their own accord for the betterment of the organization.
Case Study: "An empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context: when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident and in which multiple sources of evidence are used (Yin, 1989, p. 23)."

Limitations

The following limitations of the study have been identified by the researcher.

1. The study was conducted using qualitative, case study methodology which requires analytical generalizations. Based on the limited number of case studies conducted within this study, this study can only be used in analytical generalizations with the support of additional research. This study cannot be generalized on its own merit to any population.

2. The study relied upon the collection of data from individuals within an organization. The selection of the individuals within the organization was largely dependent upon variables that the researcher had little or no control over. Bias could have been
interjected by subjects that did and did not participate in the study.

**Assumptions**

In exploring and attempting to identify some possible causes of why a significant difference existed between "self" and "observer" responses to Kouzes and Posner's LPI, the researcher has made the following assumptions.

1. The individual within a leadership position did answer the questionnaire honestly and accurately reflected the leadership practices currently perceived as being used by the individual.

2. The individual within the leadership position did honestly portray their current leadership practices to the investigator during the interview.

3. The subordinates selected as observers did answer the questionnaire honestly and accurately reflected their perception of the leadership practices currently used by the individual within the leadership position.

4. The subordinates did honestly portray their perceptions of the current leadership practices used by the individual within the leadership position to the investigator during the interview.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To gain insight into the discrepancy found between leaders and others it was important to search out currently known information. To collect this information, a review of literature was conducted and directed at four specific areas. First, the review developed a basic understanding of the phenomena known as leadership through related historical and current literature. From this point, the review thoroughly examined the work of Kouzes and Posner to gain insight into their study and expertise of the phenomena known as leadership. The third area of inquiry was a detailed examination of the leadership practice "enabling others to act". Finally, since this was a qualitative piece of research, the researcher collected information related to the use and practices common to case study research. This review of literature provided the foundation upon which the research was based.

Leadership

Leadership became a major area of study within the areas of social psychology and organizational behavior in the 1930's (Bowditch and Buono, 1990). Leadership theories have evolved from the original trait theories, through behavioral
and situational approaches, to today's transformational theories. Focus has changed from the individual's attributes, to the individual's actions, to an examination of the relationship between the leader and follower.

The first leadership studies concentrated on the individual human traits that could be found in leaders. The results of these studies were known as the "great man" theories and emphasized that leaders were born not made (Koontz, O'Donnell, and Weihrich, 1982). These studies can be dated back to the ancient Greek and Roman era. Researchers studied physical, mental, and personality traits of various leaders. The most common results showed the average person that occupied a leadership position exceeded the average member of his/her group in intelligence, scholarship, dependability in exercising responsibility, activity and social participation, and socioeconomic status. The situation, in which the leader functioned, also dictated in a large extent, the qualities, characteristics, and skills necessary of the leader. Stogdill (1948) further defined the trait factors into six categories with the headings of capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, status, and situation. Jennings (1981) summarized the research by stating:

Research has produced such a variegated list of traits presumably to describe leadership that, for all practical purposes, it describes nothing. Fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or set of
qualities that can be used to discriminate between leaders and non-leaders. (p. 9-10)

In 1945, the Ohio State Leadership Studies began a study of leadership by examining and measuring performance or behavior rather than human traits because the trait approach had reached an impasse before the beginning of World War II (Shartle, 1957). The Ohio State Studies resulted in the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). Hemphill and Coons (1957) reported that the survey instrument evaluated leaders on ten domains as follows: Initiation described the frequency in which a leader originated, facilitated, or resisted new ideas and practices. The leader's frequency of mixing with group members was categorized as membership. Representation made up the domain involved with the frequency of the leader defending his/her group and their ideas and interests. Integration was concerned with the frequency of the leader working to promote good intra group relations. The structure of the group established by the leader was classified in the domain of organization. Domination described the frequency of the leader restricting actions of the group. Communication was divided into two domains, one concerned with communication from the group member to the leader, communication up, and the other with communication from the leader to the group member, communication down. The frequency of the acts of approving and disapproving the
group members created the leadership domain of recognition. The final domain was called production and it described the leaders frequency of setting levels of achievement and prodding group member effort. These ten domains resulted in the 150 item questionnaire. Results from the questionnaire identified three primary factors (Stogdill, Scott, and Jaynes, 1957). These factors were: administrative control, effective interpersonal relations, and public relations or representation.

As a part of the Ohio State Leadership Studies, John Hemphill (1957) specifically examined administrative reputations of college departments. In his study, Hemphill discovered that administrative reputation was reliably reported by faculty members; but, with the exception of size, no demographic or group characteristics were significantly related to departmental reputation. The study did discover that departments with the best reputations were lead by individuals with above normal scores on both consideration and initiating structure.

In evaluation of this research, Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) discovered variances in leader and subordinate evaluation on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. They discovered little or no relationship between leaders' self ratings and the ratings of the leader as evaluated by their subordinates. It was believed that this variance was
a result of contamination of the leaders' self rating by what was determined to be socially acceptable leader behavior.

This type of research led to the second major thrust in leadership into the area of behavioral and functional theories. Early theories were interested in the authority of the leader and how the leader chose to use this authority (Bowditch and Buono, 1990). Research identified the styles of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. Further work at Ohio State led Fleishman (1957) to identify two basic factors in industry as initiating structure and consideration for others. Studies at the University of Michigan, identified two different leader orientations directed at different aspects. The first orientation was directed at production and the other orientation was directed at employees (Bowditch and Buono, 1990).

McGregor (1960) introduced two landmark theories into the ideas of leadership and management with Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X assumed that: 1) the average person dislikes work and will attempt to avoid it, 2) people need to be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to maximize their performance for the organization, and 3) people primarily seek security, have little ambition, prefer to be directed, and avoid responsibility. Theory Y contrasts Theory X and assumed
that: 1) the expenditure of physical and mental effort by people was natural and not inherently disliked, 2) people did exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives if they were committed, 3) commitment to objectives was proportional to the size of rewards, 4) people did learn to accept and actually seek responsibility, and 5) the capacity to be creative in the solution of organizational problems was widely distributed among people.

Likert continued the Michigan Studies examining industry. In these studies he developed the Linking Pin Theory. In this theory he stated that a leader within an organization was really in two distinctively different positions. In one of these positions the leader was responsible for others and in the other position the leader was a follower actually responsible to another leader. Likert expanded upon this concept and stressed the importance of a good leader to be capable of effectively directing subordinates and also to be able to exert an influence on superiors (Bowditch and Buono, 1990). In subsequent studies, Likert developed four systems of management on a continuum based on participation of subordinates. These systems were identified based on interpersonal relationships and named: exploitative autocratic management, benevolent autocratic management,
consultative management, and democratic management (Koontz, O'Donnell, and Weihrich, 1982).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) concluded that it was important to know the characteristics of the situation before choosing the manner in which to involve the group. They established five styles ranging from very autocratic, "AI, AII," through consultative, "CI, CII," and ending in very group oriented, "GII". In Vroom and Yetton's "AI" style, the leader solved the problem alone based on information available to him or her. The decision was still made by the leader in style "AII" but the information was now collected from the group members. The "CI" style involved the group as individuals providing individual suggestions to the leader who solely made the decision. The "CII" style gave the group members more involvement as they did form alternatives in a group process but the leader still decided whether to use one of theirs or his or her own solutions. The final style was "GII" in which the leader portrayed more of a facilitator role and the group including the leader created alternatives and reached a decision as a group. Vroom and Yetton's Leader-Participation decision style model again brought to the forefront the idea of needing different leadership styles dependent upon the situation.

Leadership studies took another direction as Fiedler began his studies on the contingency approach to leadership.
This work primarily emphasized analyzing a leader's leadership style based on data collected using the Least Preferred Coworker instrument and its relationship with the group situation. According to Fiedler, there were three basic situational variables that influence the acceptance of a leader's behavior. These variables were: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power of the leader. Fiedler concluded that to maximize performance the concern cannot be on the leader's style alone but must also consider the organizational environment. Maximum performance can only be achieved when leadership style matches the organizational environment (Bass, 1981; Koontz, O'Donnell, and Weihrich, 1982; Bowditch and Buono, 1990).

House and Mitchell (1974) built on existing research and proposed the path goal approach to leadership effectiveness. This theory stressed the importance of a leader to clarify the means by which subordinates would reach organizational and personal goals. If the path to the goal was identified by the subordinate, the subordinate would have increased motivation and the result would be positive for the organization. A leader using the path goal approach concentrated on subordinate acceptance of goals and identification of how to reach those goals. This theory was similar to the expectancy theory of motivation.
These theories continued to develop and brought the idea of situational leadership into the forefront of leadership studies. A comprehensive model was created by Hersey and Blanchard (1988) and focused on three basic factors. The factors used in the Situational Leadership Theory were based on the amount of time a leader invested in task oriented behavior, relationship oriented behavior, and the relative knowledge of the organizational members in performing the task. The conclusion of Situational Leadership Theory was important because it did not recommend one best style of leadership for all situations; but incorporated the idea that a different style of leadership may be needed for each situation.

Blake and Mouton, continued looking in this direction and established the managerial grid (1964). The managerial grid was built around two contingencies, scaled 1 to 9 with 1 rated low and 9 rated high. One contingency was the concern for people and the other contingency was the concern for production. Titles for areas within the grid range from impoverished management (1,1), authority obedience (9,1), country club management (1,9), organization man management (5,5), and team management (9,9).

Through development, Blake and Mouton (1982) rose to challenge the situational or contingency approaches to leadership in favor of a one best style of leadership. They
claimed that the situational or contingency approach treated leadership as if it were in a mathematical relationship between two variables such as task and relationship as used by Hersey and Blanchard. In this mathematical relationship, it should be possible to increase input with one variable and decrease the input of another variable while maintaining the same level of leadership. Blake and Mouton claimed that the variables of leadership were not dependently related as proposed by situational and contingency theories, but were independently related. If they were independently related there should be a one best style of leadership as was proposed in Blake and Mouton's managerial grid. This 9,9 leadership style, as proposed by Blake and Mouton, was a one best leadership style and could be consistently employed in ways that were appropriate for each situation.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) reacted to Blake and Mouton's position of one best leadership style by highlighting that the Managerial Grid concentrated on attitudinal dimensions, concern for people and concern for production, while the dimensions of Situational Leadership, task behavior and relationship behavior, were observed behaviors. They agreed that the Managerial Grid tended to identify appropriate attitudes for people; however, the Situational Leadership helped managers determine the appropriate behavior for the situation because of the always
changing environment. In conclusion, they stated that they believed no single style solved all the problems but both the Managerial Grid and the Situational Leadership could contribute to helping managers become more effective and could improve the productivity and contribution to the quality of working life.

Today, the study of leadership has advanced from the study of transactional leadership into the arena of transformational leadership. Transactional leadership was concerned with the usually short term leader and the process of exchange that occurred between the leader and follower. A transformational leader was more as this leader had the ability and charisma necessary to motivate and energize followers in a common vision that identified super ordinate goals for the organization (Bass, 1981; Bowditch and Buono, 1990). Tichy and Devanna (1986) identified seven characteristics that differentiated these transformational leaders from the transactional leaders. A transformational leader was identified as a change agent, because of their image to make a difference, and a visionary, because of their ability to translate their dream to the organization. These leaders were also known to be outspoken and had the courage to stand against the status quo. A belief in people was a necessary characteristic of a transformational leader along with a strong set of known values. Transformational
leaders believed in life long learning and had the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty. These transformational leaders had much more impact on an organization and did lead to both the organizations prosperity or downfall.

Burns (1978) stated that leaders made followers aware of unconscious feelings. The result was a symbiosis between leader and follower. Burns further described the occurrence of transformational leadership as:

when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out separate but related, in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. Power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for common purpose. Various names are used for such leadership: elevating, mobilizing, inspiring, exalting, uplifting, exhorting, evangelizing. The relationship can be moralistic, of course. But transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and the led, and thus has a transforming effect on both....Transforming leadership is dynamic leadership in the sense that the leaders throw themselves into a relationship with followers who will feel "elevated" by it and often become more active themselves, thereby creating new cadres of leaders. (Burns, 1978, p. 20)

Transformational leaders were not blinded by power, but instilled purpose into the activities of the followers by arousing, engaging, and satisfying their motives.

In 1991, Mmobuosi challenged many leadership studies by claiming that too much emphasis had been placed on the leader as if the leader functioned in isolationism.

Historically, if a leader failed, research had typically
placed the fault on the leader. Mmobuosi claimed that even the best and most highly trained leaders may have failed, at no fault of the leader, if the followers were uncooperative with the leader. Mmobuosi suggested that in cases of ineffective leadership, the researchers should not have failed to examine the behavior of the followers.

Lee (1991) wrote an article entitled "Followership: The Essence of Leadership". In this article, he proposed that the ultimate litmus test of leadership was to see if anyone was following. Effective followers were engaged in participation to reach an organizational goal with enthusiasm, intelligence, and self reliance. It was also important to note that, every leader, regardless of position, also played the role of follower.

Organizations with effective leaders often tended to develop effective followers. Effective followers were partners, took responsibility, took initiative to fix or improve the process, and questioned leaders when they thought they were wrong. Kelley (1988) created a two dimensional grid using one axis as the degree of independence and critical thinking and the other axis as the degree of passivity or activity. This grid was useful at classifying the types of followers. Kelley classified followers: 1) sheep, low on both, 2) yes people, active but uncritical, 3) alienated followers, critical and independent
thinkers but did not act, 4) survivors, balanced in the middle, and 5) effective followers, thought for themselves and carried on with enthusiasm. It was the effective followers obligation to share his or her best counsel with the leader. The leader should not have punished dissent but rather accepted it and punished silence. Lee stated:

Perhaps the ultimate irony is that the follower who is willing to speak out shows precisely the kind of initiative that leadership is made of. (Lee, 1991, p. 30)

Effective followers had: 1) personal integrity that demanded loyalty to both the organization and self, 2) understood the organization and their contribution to it, 3) versatility and adapted to the changing environment, and 4) took the responsibility for their own careers, actions, and development (Lee, 1991).

Lee (1991) continued on the idea of empowerment or as he stated should it have been enabling? His rationale was based on people already had the power and was it not the action of enabling people to act by simply getting the organization out of their way? Empowerment has often been thought of as delegating and sharing power with followers, when empowerment really implied the motivation of people through a sense of personal efficacy.

Lee (1991) concluded by identifying ownership as the integral concept of effective followership. The relationship between leader and follower should be
symbiotic. Lee suggested creating an environment in which followers could develop their own goals and provide the training necessary to develop follower competence. A leader must have sensed where his or her followers wanted to go, aligned their goals with the goals of the organization, and invited them to follow.

Petrini (1992) assembled a group of articles on the subject of empowerment. Kirkpatrick (1992) discussed empowerment and identified four ways in which decisions by managers were made. Management could have decided without any input from subordinates. Management could have asked for and considered subordinate input and then made a decision. Management could have conducted a problem solving meeting with subordinates with a decision then made by group consensus. Or finally, management could have empowered the subordinates and allowed them to make their own decision. To answer this question as to which way to reach the decision, a manager must have considered the culture of the organization, the need for assistance, the amount of risk involved, the qualifications of the employees including their desire to participate, desire to help the organization, and knowledge and skill, the training and decision making, the urgency, and the management's reluctance. Betof and Harwood (1992) continued by listing five ideas that leaders engendered to empower people: 1)
People were part of the management and could improve the organization. 2) Good ideas they had were implemented. 3) Suggestions they made were appreciated and rewarded, even if they were not accepted. 4) People could be trusted with responsibility. 5) People were respected for their ideas and judgment. Betof and Harwood warned that empowerment must be genuine because false empowerment was disastrous. Betof and Harwood stated:

Paying lip service to empowerment without adequate follow-through demoralizes the organization. (Betof and Harwood, 1992, p. 34)

The goal of personal empowerment was a sense of commitment and alignment. In conclusion, Petrini stated that an empowered management saw mistakes as opportunities for coaching and guidance rather than opportunities to punish. Management's role changed from dictating acceptable behaviors to establishing a set of acceptable behaviors from which employees could choose.

Shelton (1991) claimed that empowerment was needed for an organization to survive and succeed in the 1990's and the taproot of empowerment was trust. With empowerment, people needed access to information, support, and resources. The benefits of empowerment included commitment, quality, speed and responsiveness, synergy, and management leverage.

Manz (1992) identified participative management, employee involvement, and self managing work teams as the
frequently occurring banners of contemporary leadership practices. At the heart of any one of these empowerment efforts should have been an emphasis on employee self leadership. Unfortunately, many times this was not the case. Self leadership was involved in redesigning the work place to enable one to bring out their best qualities and reach their fullest potential. Manz identified three distinctive approaches to self leadership: 1) behavioral focused approaches, 2) natural reward approaches, and 3) constructive thought pattern approaches.

Penzer (1991) noted that empowerment meant giving workers the knowledge, confidence, and authority to use their own judgment to make decisions. As a result of this empowered worker, the organization should expect a charged, dynamic, motivated, and happy work force.

Early (1991) identified that empowered organizations had several characteristics. These characteristics involved people, values, vision, and commitment. Early noted that manipulation and empowerment were not compatible and management must have believed that people were trustworthy, honest, and an investment, not a cost.

Batten (1991) stated that tough-minded leaders achieved unusual entrepreneurial and managerial success. In identifying the tough-minded leader, Batten identified them by their: 1) ability to have provided a crystal clear focus
of all strengths in the organization in order to expect and reinforce the best, 2) commitment to service, innovation, quality, and empowerment of people because this commitment was liberating and enriching to all, 3) inspired example, 4) assurance that all compensation was related to results and that total integrity was rewarded.

Vanderslice (1988) challenged the hierarchical relationship that existed between leader and follower. In a case study method, Vanderslice identified that an organization performed without the traditional roles associated with the hierarchical leader follower relations. The purpose was not to demonstrate that leaders were unnecessary, but that it was possible to create a comprehensive set of intersecting structural components capable of carrying out the leadership functions of an organization. Vanderslice contended that by removing the labels placed on positions, such as "boss" and "worker", each member of the organization felt more as equals and resulted in increased performance and motivation. The greater the discrepancy in perception among group members was, the more those with low perceptions withdrew from the decision making process. It is also noted that the individuals with perceived higher status received more communication and more of this communication was positive in nature. Responsibility issues were successfully solved
using basic equity theory and it was deducted that all leadership roles were filled. As a result, the organization did not lack leadership but was filled with leadership from all individuals. In conclusion, Vanderslice asked whether leadership implemented through static leader roles was really intended to motivate workers creativity, develop their skills, and use all of their personal resources for their own and the organizations good or were workers being asked to enthusiastically limit their behaviors to those that people with legitimate authority have deemed useful? Vanderslice stated:

if we redefined motivation as a willingness to take responsibility, think creatively, and develop processes that benefit both individuals and organizations, we might be less inclined to uncritically accept the need for leader-follower power differentials. (1988, p. 694)

Kotter (1990) continued the idea of transformational leader in his discussion of the differences between management and leadership. Kotter described the traditional approach to management as encompassing the activities of planning and budgeting, organizing and staffing, and controlling and problem solving. He contrasted these activities with those of leadership which included the activities of establishing direction, aligning people, and motivating and inspiring. This description was very similar to the previous discussion of transactional versus transformational leadership.
In establishing direction, Kotter emphasized that the primary function of leadership was to produce change. The process of establishing and setting direction as described by Kotter was not planning because planning was deductive in nature and was designed to produce orderly results, not change. The leadership activity of establishing direction has been designed to provide the focus upon which the necessary activity of planning was directed toward. It should be the responsibility of the leader through establishing the direction to have produced the change within the organization that was needed to make the organization a viable institution in the future environment.

The second activity of a leader was to align people behind the established direction. When change did occur it was vital that the followers all understood where they were going to avoid traveling in different directions and running into each other. Kotter differentiated aligning from the management function of organizing because organizing was concerned about how to arrange people, equipment, and structure to maximize performance. Aligning challenged the communication process as individuals had to be brought together behind the leader in a uniform and united direction.

Finally, Kotter suggested that a leader must be able to motivate and inspire the followers. During the process of
change, obstacles were going to occur and it was the leader's responsibility to have provided the motivation and inspiration necessary to overcome those obstacles. The management functions of control and problem solving was different because of their design to have minimized deviation from the plan and to have produced predictable results. Kotter identified four activities to satisfy the very basic human needs for achievement, belonging, recognition, self esteem, and a sense of control over one's life. These activities were articulated again and again through a vision in a way that stressed the key values of the people being communicated to, involved those people in deciding how to achieve that vision or some portion of the vision, supported their efforts with coaching, feedback, role modeling and a lot of enthusiasm, and sincerely recognized in public and rewarded all of their successes.

To carry out these activities, Kotter identified a much different structure from those of traditional management. Traditional management has worked within very formal member roles and networks. In leadership, the formality disappeared as leaders performed multiple roles and collected information through a very informal network. Formal systems have been efficient at producing predictable results, however, in a changing environment, Kotter
suggested that the leader must be able to change both roles and networks as the situation dictated.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) observed that the paradigm in which organizations were functioning was changing. To meet these changes, Bennis and Nanus challenged leaders to incorporate four keys of effective leadership into their positions as will be discussed in the following paragraphs. They further challenged managers to provide the leadership and change necessary for their organizations by concentrating less on efficiency and concentrating more on effectiveness. Bennis and Nanus stated:

Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing. (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 21)

The first key of Bennis and Nanus was "attention through vision". A leader must have possessed a mental image of a possible and desirable future for the organization. This image was called a vision and must be firmly based on a thorough understanding of the past, present, and future for the organization. This vision must be efficiently communicated and believed by all followers to be capable of having provided the focus necessary for the future of the organization.

Leaders were required to be social architects in the second key as established by Bennis and Nanus, "meaning through communication". In these activities, the leader
must have provided a unified meaning to the confusion within the organization. The organization must have also emerged with an institutionalized vision. Three specific types of social architecture were identified by Bennis and Nanus and were formalistic, collegial, and personalistic. Each of these social architecture's did prove to be effective when used correctly.

"Trust through positioning" was the third key. The leader and his or her vision positioned the organization in the environment in which the organization existed. Trust provided the glue that held the follower and leader together. Bennis and Nanus summarized by stating:

In the end, trust, integrity, and positioning were all different faces of a common property of leadership - the ability to integrate those who must act with that which must be done so that it all comes together as a single organism in harmony with itself and its niche in the environment. (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 186)

The final key in Bennis and Nanus strategies for taking charge was the "deployment of self". The crucial element of this strategy was the ability and willingness of the leader to learn. Leaders must have learned through the reinterpretation of history, experimentation, analogous organizations, analytical processes, training and education, and finally unlearning that which was no longer applicable. Leaders were required to be like a conductor, creating no music themselves but providing the vital role of
coordination insuring that the right music was played by the 
right group member at the right time.

In conclusion, Bennis and Nanus laid to rest five myths 
of leadership. Leadership was not a rare skill. Everyone 
had some leadership potential. Leaders were not born, but 
made. Leadership skills have been successfully learned. 
Leaders were not required to be charismatic. Some leaders 
were charismatic but all were not and many may have become 
charismatic because of being an effective leader. 
Leadership did not exist only at the top of an organization. 
In effective organizations, leaders were found throughout 
the organizational structure. Finally, leaders did not rely 
upon controlling, directing, prodding, and manipulating. 
Effective leaders did not exercise so much power itself but 
instead attempted to empower others.

Ziglar (1986) explained some ideas necessary to lead and 
become a top performer. He instructed leaders to look for 
the good, expect the best, and be loyal. He emphasized the 
importance of motivation, communication, and recognition. 
He recommended beginning by managing yourself first and 
being proactive in nature. He challenged individuals by 
stating:

You can have everything in life you want if you will 
first help enough other people get what they want! 
(Ziglar, 1986, p. 10)
Peters and Waterman (1982) identified eight attributes that characterized excellent and innovative companies. These companies had a "bias for action". They had the ability to act and were not addicted to the status quo. The companies were "close to their customers". They learned from the people that they served and generally offered extremely high levels of quality, reliability, and service. "Autonomy and entrepreneurship" were given to individuals within these companies. People were allowed and encouraged to be creative. These companies achieved "productivity through people". They believed in and respected the individuals within their company and realized that they were important assets to the corporation. These companies were "hands-on and value driven". A strong corporate culture existed and management was not isolated from the people of the company. These companies were known for their ability to "stick to the knitting". They knew what business they were in, they were good in it, and they stayed close to it.

A "simple form, lean staff" type of structure was common in these companies. Their underlying structures were amazingly simple and they did not have an excessive corporate staff. Finally, they had "simultaneous loose-tight properties". They all rallied around the central corporate mission but provided autonomy down to the individual working on a specific project.
Gardner (1990) proposed nine tasks that appeared to be the most significant functions that leaders carried out. The first task was that of envisioning goals. Goal setting should be accomplished in various ways and different time frames but it must point the followers in the direction in which the leader planned on taking the organization.

Affirming values was another task of leaders. The leader must have portrayed the shared assumption, beliefs, customs, and ideas that made an organization unique, in other words their values. Gardner stated all values would decay when exposed to time so a leader must be involved in the process of regeneration of the values.

Leaders were effective motivators of their followers. Gardner suggested leaders had accomplished this not by creating new motives but by unlocking and channeling the existing ones held within their followers. Leaders must have understood the needs of their followers and allowed them to see that those individual needs could be met using their own efforts by following the direction presented by the leader.

Managing was the fourth task performed by leaders. Managing, in Gardner's context, involved five aspects that were associated with leadership. They were: 1) planning and priority setting, 2) organizing and institution building, 3) keeping the system functioning, 4) agenda setting and
decision making, and 5) exercising political judgment. He also emphasized that leadership and management were not the same thing. However, the roles of leaders and managers often overlapped and there was a place for a third group classified by Gardner as leader/manager.

Leaders must have achieved a workable unity. Gardner stated that organizations were made up of many different elements and conflict was natural among differences. Conflict in itself was not necessarily bad but if it resulted in an unwillingness to cooperate a grave problem existed. The leader must have provided this unifying function to the organization. A key to maintaining this workable unity was the element of trust within the organization.

Explaining was another task required of leaders. Leaders needed to have the ability to have explained to their followers what they were facing and why. Leaders must also have been able to teach their constituents what had happened and how to, through a unified effort, reach the goal that they all desired.

Leaders have served as a symbol of the organization. Gardner identified that the leader was looked upon to share the common ideas and unified vision of the organization. The leader was expected not only to share the values of the organization but to practice these values before the
followers and public. The leader's individual identity was the source from which the organizational identity must come from.

Leaders also represented the group. In today's times, the leader has been called upon to express the ideas of the organization to external individuals. Unfortunately, much of a leader's time will be spent with individuals external to the organization and not within the confines and environment of the organization.

Renewing was the last of the nine tasks that leaders were required to perform. Five specific purposes have been identified by Gardner for renewal.

Leaders need to: 1) renew and reinterpret values that have been encrusted with hypocrisy, corroded by cynicism or simply abandon; and to generate new values when needed, 2) liberate energies that have been imprisoned by outmoded procedures and habits of thought, 3) re energize forgotten goals or to generate new goals appropriate to new circumstances, 4) achieve, through science and other modes of exploration, new understandings leading to new solutions, and 5) foster the release of human possibilities, through education and lifelong growth. (Gardner 1990, p. 122)

With these tasks to perform identified, Gardner (1990) listed some attributes that were necessary for leaders. These attributes were; 1) physical vitality and stamina, 2) intelligence and judgment-in-action, 3) willingness to accept responsibility, 4) task competence, 5) understanding of follower/constituents and their needs, 6) skill in dealing with people, 7) need to achieve, 8) capacity to
motivate, 9) courage, resolution, and steadiness, 10) capacity to win and hold trust, 11) capacity to manage, decide, and set priorities, 12) confidence, 13) ascendance, dominance, and assertiveness, and 14) adaptability and flexibility of approach.

Blanchard and Johnson (1981) introduced a book called the One Minute Manager. In it they presented in a simplistic manner several key points to people in positions of directing other people. They identified three secrets to success. The first secret was one minute goal setting. These goals must be agreed upon by both leader and follower and should not have been long complex statements but simple precise statements. The second was one minute praising. People needed to know and have been recognized for actions done right. They then needed to be encouraged to continue on this success. The last secret was one minute reprimand and the reprimand came in two parts. The first part was immediate and specific. It told the individual exactly what behavior they did that the leader was not pleased with. The second part followed the first and reaffirmed the competence the leader had in the individual, allowed the individual to realize that the reprimand was over, and encouraged the individual to return to the one minute goal setting. In summary, the one minute manager set goals, praised and
reprimanded behaviors, encouraged people, spoke the truth, and laughed, worked, and enjoyed.

Bennis (1989) attempted to explain some of the reasons why leaders in appointed academic positions have had problems leading their followers. Bennis's First Law of Academic Pseudo Dynamics stated:

Routine work drives out non routine work and smothers to death all creative planning, all fundamental change in the university - or any institution. (Bennis, 1989, page 35)

This led to Bennls's Second Law of Academic Pseudo Dynamics:

Make whatever grand plans you will; you may be sure the unexpected or the trivial will disturb and disrupt them. (Bennis, 1989, page 36)

Bennis continued by identifying four competencies of leaders: 1) management of attention, 2) management of meaning, 3) management of trust, and 4) management of self.

In conclusion, he stated: "empowerment is the collective effect of leadership" (Bennis, 1989, p. 38). Evidence of empowerment was found in four themes: 1) people felt significant, 2) learning and competence mattered, 3) people were part of a community, and 4) work was exciting (Bennis, 1989).

In his keynote address to The Planning Forum's International Conference, Dr. Warren Bennis made three observations from his years of research on leadership (Norris, 1992). Bennis observed: 1) leadership was the key determinant in the success or failure of any human
institution, 2) effective leadership must have been related to the times in which it had functioned, 3) almost all organizations were presently caught between two paradigms in how they organized themselves and how they were led. Bennis created an analogy by stating that:

He challenged individuals who talk about leadership as surfing. They would say: "A good leader catches the wave at the right time and manages to ride in with it." Bennis says "Great leaders make waves." ... He continued by stating that the current mind set of bureaucracy is control, order, and predictability and that "for the most part, failing organizations tend to be over-managed and under-led". (Norris, 1992, p. 13)

Bennis continued through an explanation of the death of bureaucracy. He challenged bureaucracy to adjust their mind set to alignment, creativity, and empowerment. They must unlearn behaviors that have made them successful in the past like speaking rather than listening, valuing people like yourself rather than people of diverse origin, doing things yourself rather than collaborating, and making decisions individually rather than asking others for their perspective. Bennis identified three traits that future leaders must have: 1) a deep sense of purpose, 2) trust, and 3) optimism. He then expanded upon the concept of trust with the identification of four "Cs", caring, constancy, competence, and congruity, and the tripod of basic forces necessary for executive character: 1) ambition or drive, 2) competence and expertise, and 3) ethics, morality, and integrity. In conclusion, Bennis stated:
the challenge for leadership is to build a corporate culture that builds self esteem, sustains trust, preserves the dignity of work, develops human bonds, fosters open communications while allowing for dissent, and encourages growth and learning. (Norris, 1992, p. 15)

Kouzes and Posner

In 1983, James Kouzes, director of the Executive Development Center, Leavey School of Business and Administration, Santa Clara University, and Barry Posner, director of graduate programs, Leavey School of Business and Administration, Santa Clara University, began a research project. This research was designed to identify what leaders did when they did their personal best at leading not managing others. The project led to the creation of the "Personal Best Survey". The survey then led to an article entitled "When Leaders are at their Best" Santa Clara Magazine (1984), the book The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations (1987), and the Leadership Practices Inventory (1988).

The "Personal Best Survey" consisted of thirty seven open ended questions. These open ended questions explored questions like: Who initiated the project?, What identified the projects completion?, What did the leader learn along the way?, What strategies were used?, and Why did the leader believe in the project? Kouzes and Posner also used in-depth personal interview to add to the data collected. A short form of the "Personal Best Survey" called the
"Personal Best Leadership Experience" (Appendix A) was also developed and used to seek additional information. In all, the input from almost 2,000 managers was used during this research project.

Posner and Schmidt (1984, 1992) conducted a cross-sectional survey of members of the American Management Association to determine the current values of American managers. In both surveys, it was important to note that honesty and competence were the most valued personal qualities necessary in a leader from a followers position. In the 1981 survey, to improve the nation's quality of life, managers saw the solution as returning to the basic values in an individual sense. In 1991, this approach changed to a value system promoting cooperation and the idea of the total community. Another change occurred in the increased importance on home and personal considerations and the addition of quality and customer service deliberately inserted into the corporate values. Managers in both surveys felt clear about their own values and were optimistic about the future.

Posner, Kouzes, and Schmidt (1985) examined shared values and corporate culture. They discovered that the strength of congruence between the values of an organization and its employees affected both the quality and character of managerial commitment and the direction of energy and effort
on behalf of the organization. Strong shared values provided individuals with a sense of success and fulfillment, a healthy assessment of the values and ethics of others within the organization, and a greater regard for organizational objectives and significant constituents. These studies suggested the importance of strengthening values within an organization. The most useful ways to strengthen these values were identified as: 1) programs to clarify and communicate values, 2) recruitment, selection, and orientation, 3) training, 4) reward systems, and 5) counseling support.

In 1987 (Kouzes and Posner), the book The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations was released. In this book, Kouzes and Posner shared what they had learned in their research. Their research was directed at both the leader and the follower. They identified five practices that they discovered as common among leaders personal best experiences.

The leader was only half of the story and would be nowhere without the other half, the follower. The follower determined who would be recognized as the leader. It was realized that leadership only existed in the eye of the follower. Kouzes and Posner identified four characteristics that a majority of us admired in a leader and they will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Other
characteristics that did not make the top four included areas on intelligence, ability and openness to consider the whole picture, ability to work with people, and personal dedication.

Honesty was the most often selected characteristic to be at the top of the list. To choose a person as a leader, the follower must have been sure that the leader was worthy of their trust. Over eighty percent of American managers wanted their leaders to be honest. Unfortunately, over half of us believed that business leaders were dishonest. The most common way for followers to have evaluated honesty was through the behaviors of the leader. They looked for consistency in the leader, especially between words and actions. The other determining factor was the leaders display of trust in others. Trust was a two person event and the follower looked to the leader to lead.

The second characteristic looked for in a leader by followers was competence. Followers must have believed that the leader knew what they were doing before they were willing to enlist and follow. This did not mean that the leader necessarily had the technical expertise in the core technologies, but that the leader understood the business and would be able to get things done for the organization. Exact competencies varied between situations, but the
followers must have believed that the leader had something of value to add to the organization.

To be forward looking was the third common characteristic identified. In this they were not necessarily looking for a prescient visionary, but followers did expect the leader to have the ability to set or select a desirable destination for the organization. Followers wanted to know what the organization would look like and feel like at measurable distances in the future.

The final characteristic was inspiration. Followers expected their leader to be enthusiastic, energetic, and positive about the future. A leader must have explained their future for the organization and have had the ability to convince followers to join the organization for the duration of the journey. Leaders must have inspired followers' confidence in the validity of the organizational goal.

Together these characteristics gave the leader something known as credibility. High credibility and strong philosophy when perceived in management resulted in employees who: 1) were proud of their organization, 2) talked up their organization, 3) set their own personal values close to those of the organization, and 4) felt a sense of ownership in their organization. The perception of
credibility by their followers was an important concern leaders needed to have.

When examining leadership practices common to leaders in their personal best experience, challenging the process was the first practice identified. This practice provided for the opportunity of greatness. Greatness could only occur when there was a chance for change. In this practice the two commitments identified were searching for opportunities and experimenting and taking risks.

Searching for opportunities involved leaders in the act of confronting and changing the status quo. Leaders were challenged by the possibility of change. Change came through innovation and resulted in the creation of something new or a new way of doing the same thing. Leaders needed to be agents of change but generally not entrepreneurs or intrapreneurs. The actual ideas for change, generally came from people other than the leader, but the leader became the agent of change. Leaders did not always seek the challenges they faced but challenges did seek leaders. Opportunities to challenge the status quo and introduce change often opened the door for a leader to excel to his or her personal best. Leaders also quite often discovered skills and abilities that people did not know they had when challenged by opportunity. Kouzes and Posner suggested seven ideas on how a leader should search for opportunities for change: 1)
treat every job as an adventure, 2) treat every new assignment as a turnaround, even if it isn't, 3) question the status quo, 4) go out and find something that is broken, 5) add adventure to every job, 6) break free of the routine, and 7) make the adventure fun.

In challenging the process, leaders became innovators and with the spirit of innovation leaders experimented and took risks after realizing that learning did occur from both mistakes and successes and the organization would benefit. As a leader, the first challenge arose at collecting innovative ideas. The secret here was communication, both internal and external, and the avoidance of becoming encompassed in their own internal world and losing sight of the dangers emerging in the ever changing external environment. People needed a hardy attitude to handle the stresses that came. Leaders attempted to build commitment, a sense of control, and an attitude of challenge. In conclusion, Kouzes and Posner offered eight suggestions in which people could take charge of change and turn uncertainty into an opportunity for experimentation, risk taking, and learning: 1) institutionalize processes for collecting innovative ideas, 2) put idea gathering on your own agenda, 3) set up little experiments, 4) renew your teams, 5) honor your risk takers, 6) analyze every failure,
as well as every success, 7) model risk taking, and 8) foster hardiness.

In their 1993 work, Kouzes and Posner offered suggestions for improving leader performance in the leadership practice of "challenging the process". These suggestions were:

- Treat every job as an adventure.
- Provide challenging assignments (beat the system).
- Question the status quo.
- Find something that is broken and fix it.
- Break free of daily routines.
- Institutionalize processes for collecting innovative ideas.
- Set up little experiments.
- Honor risk takers.
- Foster psychological hardiness.
(Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 14)

Inspiring a shared vision was the second of Kouzes and Posner's five leadership practices. Every leader must have been able to look to the future and hold in their mind what was uniquely possible for the organization if everyone would work together for the common good of the organization. This vision was not enough on its own, but must be effectively communicated to enlist the support of every follower. The practice of inspiring a shared vision was divided into two behavior commitments: envision the future and enlist others. Envisioning the future: imagining ideal scenarios challenged leaders to take off their blinders and imagine what could be if they all worked together. Leaders had a vision that allowed followers to chart the course on how to get there.
Kouzes and Posner defined vision as: "an ideal and unique image of the future" (1987, p. 85). A vision required the four attributes of: 1) future orientation, looking forward, 2) image, seeing the future, 3) ideal, a sense of the possible, and 4) uniqueness, pride in being different. Visions came from a mysterious and complex process that was best known as intuition and intuition was defined as the process where knowledge and experience meet to produce new insights. Kouzes and Posner suggested eight activities to assist a leader in envisioning the future: 1) think first about your past, 2) determine what you want, 3) write an article about how you have made a difference, 4) write a short vision statement, 5) act on your intuition, 6) test your assumptions, 7) become a futurist, and 8) use mental rehearsal.

The next commitment necessary of leaders in the practice of inspiring a shared vision was to enlist others: attracting people to common purposes. Followers must be drawn to the leaders vision and once there they must accept it and be motivated to attempt to fulfill it. The challenge here lied in the leaders ability to communicate. Leaders must look for a common purpose that both leader and followers shared which allowed the vision to become alive. The leader must have made the vision manifest itself within each follower through choice of language, a positive
communication style, a non-verbal charisma, and an unwavering personal conviction. Kouzes and Posner stated that leaders must have enlisted others in a common vision by appealing to their values, interests, hopes, and dreams and offered the following suggestions to enlist others: 1) identify your constituents, 2) find the common ground, 3) take an effective presentations course, 4) write a five minute speech, 5) be positive and optimistic, and 6) remain genuine.

Suggestions were again made in their 1993 work for actions that could be implemented to improve leader performance in the leadership practice of "inspiring a shared vision". These suggestions were:

- Learn from the past.
- Act on your intuition.
- Test assumptions.
- Know your followers.
- Appeal to a common purpose.
- Communicate expressively.
- Believe in what you are saying.
- Develop a stump speech.
(Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 16)

The third leadership practice identified by Kouzes and Posner was enabling others to act. In enabling others to act leaders must have built teams that had the spirit and cohesion necessary to carry out the vision. Collaborative goals and cooperative relationships must have been established between leaders and colleagues. Leaders needed to develop an atmosphere of trust and human dignity. To
accomplish this practice, Kouzes and Posner have developed two commitments, foster collaboration and strengthen others. This practice will be discussed in detail later.

Modeling the way was the fourth leadership practice identified by Kouzes and Posner. Modeling the way explained how leaders must have developed within the organization a unique and distinctive philosophy with high standards and a set of values. In accomplishing this leaders planned how to reveal such a philosophy and more importantly leaders exposed themselves to inspection by followers and built credibility into the philosophy. Kouzes and Posner identified two commitments to modeling the way and they were set the example and plan small wins.

In set the example: leading by doing, leaders realized that their actions would speak louder than their words. Followers were not willing to go anywhere where the leader himself or herself was not also willing to go. The first challenge to leaders was identification of this basic philosophy and set of values that were vital to the organization. The values addressed the here and now beliefs that the organization held. After the values were identified it was the leaders responsibility to profess these values not only by words and statements but by his or her actions. The only way that leaders made values tangible to followers was by their own personal actions. Leaders
were regularly presented with moments of truth upon which followers evaluated the leader. These moments typically centered around: 1) how the leaders spent their time, 2) the questions leaders asked, 3) the leaders reactions to critical incidents, and 4) what leaders rewarded. Kouzes and Posner offered several suggestions for leaders to set the example for others: 1) write a tribute to yourself, 2) write your leadership credo, 3) write a tribute to your organization, 4) publish your credo, 5) audit your actions, 6) establish routines and systems, 7) be dramatic, 8) be a storyteller, 9) find teachable moments, and 10) be emotional.

Plan small wins: building commitment to action was the second commitment to modeling the way. Leaders must have realized that to minimize the complexity of the total it needed to be broken down into many small wins. In managing small wins Kouzes and Posner suggested the following four ideas: 1) experiment continuously, 2) divide tasks into small chunks, 3) reduce items to their essentials, and 4) don't push people into change. For obtaining commitment leaders first made certain that they themselves were committed and built that commitment into the followers. People were most likely to be committed to a course of action when they experienced a sense of choice about their decisions, their actions were made visible to others, and it
was difficult to back out of their choices. Additional commitment was obtained by practices that provided public positive recognition and insured that individuals were being given significant pieces of the project. In conclusion Kouzes and Posner suggested six strategies for planning small wins and building commitment: 1) make a plan, 2) make a model, 3) take one hop at a time, 4) reduce the cost of saying yes, 5) use the natural diffusion process, and 6) give people choices and make choice highly visible.

In their 1993 work, suggestions were made to improve leader's performance in the leadership practice of "modeling the way". Kouzes and Posner's suggestions were:

- Do what you say you are going to do.
- Walk the halls.
- Publicize your "rules of the road".
- Talk with others about your values and beliefs.
- Be expressive (even emotional) about your beliefs.
- Spend time on your most important priorities.
- Get started; build on your successes.
- Build commitment by offering choices.
- Make people's choices public and visible to others. (Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 20)

The final leadership practice identified by Kouzes and Posner was encouraging the heart. To get extraordinary things done in organizations was hard work and leaders must have encouraged others to continue the quest. Leaders gave visible recognition to followers for their contributions to the common vision. Leaders were proud of their teams and what they had accomplished in the organization. Leaders knew how to celebrate the accomplishments of the
organization with the individual followers who made it possible. Recognizing contributions and celebrating accomplishments were the two commitments identified by Kouzes and Posner to the leadership practice of encouraging the heart.

The first commitment to encouraging the heart was to recognize contribution: linking rewards with performance. Leaders established high expectations for their followers. With high expectations, leaders often offered more input and feedback to the follower. The high expectations brought out the best of the followers and often this belief resulted in a self fulfilling prophecy. Leaders also used care in ensuring that followers received recognition and rewards for outstanding performance. It was important that followers understood for what action they received the recognition and reward. Three key criteria identified for integrating a performance reward system were: 1) make certain that people know what is expected of them, 2) provide feedback about performance, and 3) reward only those who meet the standards. Rewards worked best when they were variable and could be measured accurately and objectively. Rewards could be intrinsic or extrinsic but all should have resulted in an increased follower courage to continue the quest. In recognizing individual contributions to the success of every project, Kouzes and Posner offered seven suggestions: 1)
develop tough measurable performance standards, 2) install a formal systematic process for rewarding performance, 3) be creative about rewards, 4) let others help design the non monetary compensation system, 5) make recognition public, 6) go out and find people who are doing things right, and 7) coach.

The final commitment, while encouraging the heart, offered by Kouzes and Posner was celebrate accomplishments: value the victories. Cheer leading and celebrating were important processes of honoring followers and celebrations were based off of three central principles: 1) focusing on key values, 2) making recognition publicly visible, and 3) being personally involved. As a leader it was important to know what you were cheering about and it should have been those key values that the organization held dearly. Leaders should have held their celebrations in public to maximize the effect both for the followers being recognized but also to reinforce organizational values to the other followers. To make these celebrations successful they must have involved the leader. If the leader failed to be present the credibility of the activity was lost. When leaders encouraged followers through recognition and celebration they inspired them with courage through the giving of love. In summary of encouraging the heart, Kouzes and Posner offered the following suggestions for celebrating team
accomplishments regularly: 1) schedule celebrations, 2) be a cheerleader, your way, 3) secure your social network, and 4) stay in love.

Suggestions for improving performance in the leadership practice of "encouraging the heart" were again made by Kouzes and Posner in their 1993 work. These suggestions were:

• Foster high expectations.
• Make creative use of rewards.
• Say "thank you".
• Link performance with rewards.
• Provide feedback about results.
• Be personally involved as a cheerleader.
• Create social-support networks.
• Love what you are doing.
(Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 22)

Kouzes and Posner concluded their book by challenging their readers to become a leader who cares and makes a difference. Leaders typically were seen to possess: 1) a higher degree of personal credibility, 2) a more effective nature of handling job related demands, 3) a more successful record of representing their divisional concerns to higher management, and 4) a higher performance team. Followers of outstanding leaders also felt significantly more satisfied with their practices and strategies, more committed, and more influential and powerful. Kouzes and Posner emphasized that from their experience, leadership was a set of learnable competencies. Leaders were learners; however, leaders did not just learn from the classroom but from the
sum total of life experiences. These experiences included job experiences and assignments, people relationships, and formal education and training. Leaders took advantage of the fullest possible ranges of opportunities. Leaders developed best when they were participants enthusiastically involved in the process of change. Leadership development was really the development of self.

Kouzes and Posner (1990) later expanded upon the credibility factor. Again, they identified honesty, competency, forward looking, and inspired as the four most admired attributes of leaders by followers. The remainder of the top twenty included intelligent, fair minded, broad minded, courageous, straightforward, imaginative, dependable, supportive, caring, cooperative, mature, ambitious, determined, self-controlled, loyal, and independent. Followers must have believed that their leaders were capable and effective. The credibility factor involved communication and researchers had identified trustworthiness, expertise, and dynamism as the criteria for assessing the believability of sources of communication. Kouzes and Posner identified five fundamental actions that helped a leader build credibility and they were: 1) know your constituents, 2) stand up for your beliefs, 3) speak with passion, 4) lead by example, and 5) conquer yourself. Leadership was a reciprocal process that occurred between
people; not a process done by one individual to another individual. For people to choose a leader they must have believed the leader to be credible.

In today's world the idea of ethical leadership was emerging according to Kouzes and Posner (1992). They explained ethical leadership within the leadership practice of encouraging the heart and stated that it was really an affair of being in love. If leaders were in love, the love created the desire within leaders to see others grow and reach their personal best. Without those feelings, leaders fundamentally were taking advantage of their constituents. Kouzes and Posner stated:

Ethical leadership accesses the healing and energizing powers of love, recognizing foremost that leadership in a reciprocal relationship with constituents. (Kouzes and Posner, 1992, p. 481)

Kouzes and Posner identified four ideas that seemed to exist between leaders and followers when this loving relationship existed. These ideas were: 1) followers choose leaders, 2) passion came from compassion, 3) true leaders served and supported, and 4) leaders were honest. This idea of ethical leadership was just a continuation of the idea of transformational leadership.

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was developed in 1987 and revised in 1993 by Kouzes and Posner (1987, 1993) to empirically measure the conceptual framework discovered by Kouzes and Posner in their personal best
surveys of managers. The LPI was composed of thirty questions, six of which came from each of the five leadership practices. The instrument was available in two forms, one for "self" and one for "observer", and both used a five point Likert type scale. The revision involved the renaming of "other" as "observer" and several other minor grammatical changes in the wording of the questions. These changes did not change the context or increase the number of questions found in the instrument. Data from both the original and revised instruments is identical and possesses no problem for the combination or comparison of data. The purpose of the LPI was for both personal self improvement feedback and research purposes. Care should be taken when interpreting results from LPI "self" data without including LPI "observer" data.

The LPI has sound psychometric properties with acceptable reliability and validity. The LPI consistently has internal reliability coefficients greater than .80. (Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 79) The LPI has also performed well in test-retest reliability studies (Table 1). Experts from many fields have documented in their research the validity of the LPI. The instrument has been effectively used in predictive type studies building validity for the instrument. Face validity can also be established in the number of experts that have chosen to use the LPI in their
Table 1. LPI Results
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Indices
Posner and Kouzes, 1992, p. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Internal Reliability</th>
<th>Std. Combined</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Retest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>22.38 4.14</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>20.44 4.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>23.90 4.35</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>22.12 4.14</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>21.96 5.17</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts. Finally, factor analysis has also supported the LPI's validity (Table 2). Differences have been discovered between "self" versus "observer" responses. Traditionally, the LPI "self" score will be greater than the LPI "observer" score. In Kouzes and Posner's latest summative analysis of the LPI, a significant difference at the .001 level was only found in the leadership practices of "enabling others to act" and "challenging the process" (Table 3). It is important to note that both "self" and "observer" rank the order of the leadership practices in the same order.

The LPI has been proven to be a useful tool for evaluating leadership practices. The LPI has been used for personal improvement, leadership workshops, and a measurement tool for research projects. Both sexes,
Table 2. LFP Results
Factor Structure (Factor Loading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouraging</th>
<th>Enabling</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Challenging</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>a Shared</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heart to Act</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. LPI Results
T-Tests of Differences
Posner and Kouzes, 1992, p. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>LPI-Self Std</th>
<th>LPI-Observer Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td>Mean  Dev.</td>
<td>Rank Mean  Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>22.70 3.19</td>
<td>2  22.33 4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>20.49 3.90</td>
<td>5  20.43 5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>24.79 2.90</td>
<td>1  23.75 4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>22.15 3.21</td>
<td>3  22.12 4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>21.90 3.94</td>
<td>4  21.97 5.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

different cultures, and most functional areas have experienced the precision measurement of the LPI. The LPI has become a valuable measurement tool for the study of leadership.

"Enabling Others to Act"

For extraordinary things to be accomplished, leaders understood that they could not do it alone. Leaders realized the importance and need of others for this phenomena called leadership to be effective. Leaders were involved in activities that built spirited teams that acted and behaved as a single entity and not a collection of individuals. Leaders defined goals from the collaborative efforts of this team. Leaders instilled an atmosphere where individuals did not feel isolated but felt empowered by the trust and human dignity available within the group.
environment. In effective groups, individuals did not accomplish pieces, but the entire group accomplished the whole. To promote this self esteem with its feelings of strength and capability, Kouzes and Posner (1987) identified two commitments. These two commitments were fostering collaboration and strengthen others.

In fostering collaboration the key was to get people to work together. Fostering collaboration required the we not I philosophy. Success was the result of the combined effort of everyone and not just a few key individuals. In fostering collaboration leaders developed cooperative goals, sought integrative solutions, and built trusting relations. Without fostering collaboration, leaders would not have been able to enable others to act.

Getting individuals to work together on a regular basis was a challenge of leaders. To obtain this togetherness, followers cooperated and had to strive for common goals. These goals provided the unity in direction necessary to have enabled the followers to proceed in an identical direction. This direction bound followers together in collaborative pursuits. Leaders realized the importance of this cooperation within the group. Cooperation was the only way the leader could insure an all win situation. Cooperation and competition worked at different purposes. In cooperation, everyone celebrated a victory by anyone. In
competition, others felt threatened when someone else had success. Competition should be saved for activities external of the group where the entire group could cooperate together to meet the challenge of competition. To promote and maintain this cooperation, leaders recognized and encouraged ongoing interaction between followers. Leaders emphasized the long term payoffs of cooperation by aligning with long term type activities and discounting short term gains that may have been achieved through non-cooperative efforts. Finally, leaders should have set an example of cooperation and reciprocity.

In seeking integrative solutions, leaders fostered the idea of positive solutions through working together. Negotiations were minimized and when they did occur the emphasis was on what was to be gained by both sides not lost by either promoting. People needed to be clear about their needs and interests to avoid distractions caused by others attempting to determine hidden agendas and negotiation strategy. The following five strategies were proposed for promoting integrative solutions: 1) seek many inputs, 2) meet one on one, 3) keep your management posted, 4) seek specific rather than broad support, and 5) generate alternative currencies.

The final challenge in fostering collaboration was to build trusting relationships within the group. Trust was
the central issue in human relationships in any situation. Without trust, any organization failed to experience maximum efficiency. Trust required a leader to become vulnerable; because a follower's subsequent behavior, which the leader had no control over, would be used to evaluate the leader. Leaders who have established a trusting relationship felt comfortable within their group and allowed members of the group to influence them through alternative views and understood their expertise. For a leader to have received trust, the leader must first have been believed to be trustworthy. Some individuals have given leaders trust freely until they have proven unwilling while other individuals have made the leader prove deserving of their trust before giving it. The foundation upon which a trusting relationship was built was believing the other person had integrity which was demonstrated by meeting commitments and keeping promises. Trusting relationships provided for the open environment which was necessary for extraordinary things to be accomplished.

In conclusion, Kouzes and Posner suggested six things that could be done to foster collaboration and trust. The first suggestion was to always say we. This built upon the we not I philosophy common of leaders. The leader should have created interaction. Just as the leader could not have done it alone, neither could any individual group member so
these interactions were critical. Third, a leader needed to create a climate of trust. To create this climate it was important for the leader to be predictable so the followers felt confident about the leaders intentions. The leader should have also used delegation techniques and insured that the authority went with the delegation. Kouzes and Posner emphasized that a leader focused on gains of everyone and avoided looking at losses. Also remember leaders created win win situations, involved people in planning and problem solving activities, and used participative programs such as quality circles, employee survey feedback, job enrichment, work teams, union management quality of work life programs, gainsharing, and new design plants. Fostered collaboration through active involvement by selecting people with a working knowledge of the situation, clearly articulated the outcomes and standards to be met, provided the resources and authority necessary to do the job, set up a timetable for the planning and problem solving, enabled information to travel both upwards and downwards, periodically reviewed progress with the groups, and tied rewards to performance and made sure the rewards were valued by the groups doing the work. Leaders should have been the risk taker when it came to trusting others. Leaders demonstrated to others that the leader trusts them until they had proven otherwise and then trusted them again. Leaders must have sown the
seeds of trust to enable the followers to have produced the fields of collaboration.

The second commitment to enabling others to act was to strengthen others through sharing power and information. For an organization to have reached its fullest potential, the leader must have been able to empower others. With followers feeling strong, they were enabled to take responsibility for their team success. Leaders really believed that their most valuable resource was people and knew how to use their people. In using their people leaders allowed those individuals to grow and transformed them from followers to leaders.

Traditional philosophies promoted the idea that power was a fixed sum quantity. Leaders who believed in this philosophy were not willing to share their power because in doing so they would have had less. In this situation people felt powerless and would cling to any piece of power that they received. In this type of organization, political skills became essential and people would become entrenched in protecting themselves and passing the buck to others. In contrast, it was known that people who believed that they could influence and control the organization, had greater effectiveness and member satisfaction within the organization. In reality, power was an expandable pie. If power was shared by the leader to followers, power was not
lost by the leader but expanded as it was shared with the follower. As a result, the amount of energy that could be released by strengthening others was enormous. This expandable pie concept resulted in greater reciprocity of influence. The leader and follower were willing to be mutually influenced by one another. This synergy between leader and follower resulted in a power base greater than the sum of the individual.

Power was something that leaders were understood to have, but the best leaders knew how to make followers feel strong. In making followers feel strong, leaders used people. Leaders preferred to work with people. Leaders listened to people. Leaders built people up. Leaders shared control with people and involved them in the decision making process. Leaders did not use the power for personal power but shared the power in service of others. Many people were successful at motivating themselves or another single person, but leaders must have known how to effectively motivate the group. Leaders needed to use their power to provide the self confidence and assertiveness necessary to organize and direct the groups activities. Because of this orientation to building organization commitment, leaders were likely to have involved peers and subordinates in planning, gotten teams fully enrolled into projects, delegated responsibility to others with full trust
and confidence, developed team spirit, caused people to believe that they could do more than they personally thought they could, and found ways to reward accomplishments.

Leaders were believed to have power because of their control over resources. The key for a leader was to get the followers to value the resources which the leader controlled. If the followers increased the value of the leaders resources, the leader was seen to have more power. The leader could increase the value of the resources possessed by their ability to perform critical tasks or the degree of discretion and visibility associated with the job. Power was increased when resources were seen to perform critical tasks that others needed. Discretion was the ability to take non routine actions independent of the superior's decision making process. Visibility was simply the calling of attention to the accomplishment.

Leaders were found to give power away to followers and strengthen those followers through many actions. Leaders gave power to followers by assigning important tasks to them. By having provided autonomy and discretion to the followers, the leader was seen as efficiently strengthening the follower. Leaders strengthened others by assisting them in building strong relationships. These relationships helped provide the communication channels necessary to accomplish the extraordinary task. Finally, leaders
established means that insured visibility and recognition to group accomplishments. By empowering others, the leader was able to enable the followers to act.

Kouzes and Posner suggested seven ideas to strengthen followers by sharing information and power and increasing their discretion and visibility: 1) get to know people, 2) develop your interpersonal competence, 3) use your power in service of others, 4) enlarge people's sphere of influence, 5) keep people informed, 6) make connections, and 7) make heroes of other people.

In their 1993 work, Kouzes and Posner expand on the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" by offering suggested actions to improve leader performance. These suggestions were:

- Always say "we".
- Delegate.
- Focus on gains, not losses.
- Involve people in planning and problem solving.
- Keep people informed.
- Give people important work on critical tasks.
- Be accessible.
- Give people the opportunity to be autonomous and seek to use their discretion.

(Kouzes and Posner, 1993, p. 18)

Case Study Research

A problem long associated with the study of leadership has been how to study it. Stogdill (1948) discovered that the most fruitful studies of leadership were those in which the behavior was described and analyzed through direct observation or analysis of biographical and case history
data. Much of the existing leadership research was based on quantitative research methodologies. Much of the disillusionment with leadership research was a growing unease regarding the reliance on questionnaire measurement of leader behavior and the problematic nature of those predominately quantitative research strategies. Bryman, Bresnen, and Beardsworth (1988) continued by arguing that the introduction of qualitative research methods into the study of leadership could improve the study of leadership.

Yin (1984, 1989) classified case study research as qualitative in nature and designed to answer the questions of "how" or "why". Bryman, Bresnen, and Beardsworth (1988) determined a qualitative method of research was appropriate for the study of leadership because of its ability to facilitate a wider range of contextual variables. Even with this wider range of variables, there will still be a place for quantitative research; however, the two, qualitative and quantitative, should be allowed to work together in a synergistic effort to better study the area of leadership.

The basic thrust of qualitative research was the interpretation of action, events, and perspectives through the eyes of those being investigated. This was in contrast to quantitative research which imposed meanings since the investigators sorted people out in terms of preconceived conceptual schemes. Consequently, Bryman, Bresnen, and
Beardsworth (1988) suggested that a qualitative approach to the study of leadership may be fruitful, not simply because it took the actor's viewpoint as a central focus, but because, in so doing, it may bring to the surface issues and topics which were important yet which were omitted by relying on the researcher as the source of what was relevant. It might also be anticipated that the deployment of qualitative research strategy will lead to a focus on leadership practices from the perspective of leaders themselves and to a greater sensitivity to the diversity of contexts in which leadership takes place.

Yin (1989) stated when used as a research endeavor, the case study contributes uniquely to the knowledge of individual, organizational, social, and political phenomena. The case study has provided the researcher with the ability to retain a holistic and meaningful examination of the characteristics of complex social phenomena. By following the predetermined procedures, the case study has been proven as a recognized method of investigating an empirical topic.

According to Borg and Gall (1989) case study research was based on the premise that a case could be identified that was typical of many other cases. Upon in-depth evaluation of this single subject, group, or phenomenon, the researcher could provide insight into other situations similar to those from which the case was identified. To
protect against bias introduced by the selection of the single case, multiple case study designs have been developed.

Case study research provided for the interpretation of the situation to come from different perspectives. Kofodimos (1990) identified three different kinds of perspectives to use during the inquiry process. They were those of the subject, of acquaintances of the subject, and of the researcher themselves.

Yin (1984, 1989) has identified several methods of doing social science research each with particular advantages and disadvantages. To determine which method to use, the researcher should have examined three areas: 1) the type of research question, 2) the control an investigator has over the actual behavioral events, and 3) the focus on contemporary as opposed to historical phenomena. Case study research was preferred when the research questions of how or why were being asked, the researcher had little or no control of the situation, and the concern was with a contemporary phenomena. As a result, case study research has proven well suited for exploratory, explanatory, and descriptive type of studies.

A two by two matrix has been identified by Yin (1984, 1989) to identify the types of case study research. Case studies have been classified as either singular or multiple
in nature. Multiple case studies provided the researcher with additional information upon which to strengthen analytical generalizations; however, it will not always be possible and singular case studies must be conducted. Singular case studies were determined to be essential for phenomena that were unique and Yin identified three specific situations for single case studies. These three situations were the critical case, the extreme case, and the revelatory case. The second dimension of case study research was classified as either holistic design or embedded units of analysis. In a holistic design, the researcher investigated the entire situation avoiding examination of any specific phenomenon in detail. Potential problems with this design have been identified as the abstract nature of the research and potential shift of the study unbeknown to the researcher. With the embedded units of analysis the researcher has identified specific subunits with the phenomenon to pay particular attention to. The problem with this design rested in the ability of the researcher to return to the whole picture and not become embedded in a particular subunit.

Yin (1989) presented case study research as generalizable to populations but only using analytical generalizations. Analytical generalizations were not the same as statistical generalizations which were based on
mathematical formulations. Analytical generalizations were based on logical interpretation of the results of case study research. Yin stated:

In analytical generalization, the investigator was striving to generalize a particular set of results to some broader theory. (Yin, 1989, p. 44)

What occurred in the case study logically either supported or did not support the predetermined theory. If the case study supported the theory, it may be appropriate to generalize the theory to a population.

Quality research remains expected to maintain free from bias. To protect from acquisitions of bias the case study researcher has identified concern about four criteria known as construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability. Specific tactics can be employed to secure against these threats to quality research (Yin, 1989).

Construct validity is defined as the appropriateness of the means to measure the concepts that were being studied. In case study research the researcher must select the types of change that were to be studied and then demonstrate that the selected measures of these changes accurately reflected the change. Construct validity can be protected by using a well defined set of research questions for the study, securing multiple sources of data collection, developing a logical chain of evidence, and having collected data reviewed by key informants for accuracy.
The establishment of the causal relationship established in explanatory case studies raised the concern of the threat to internal validity. This threat challenged the researcher to insure that the logic used to develop the proposed relationship was complete and did take into consideration all possible causes of the change. Several specific analytical tools such as pattern-matching and time series analysis have been made available to the researcher to protect against internal validity.

External validity has highlighted the concern about the possible error in generalizing the research conclusions to inappropriate populations. Many attempted to minimize this problem by following the same sampling logic that was used in statistical generalizations. This was an incorrect notion in that case study research was not generalizable through statistical means but through analytical means. Analytical generalizations depend upon the logic that was used by the researcher in reaching the conclusions. The best protection against external validity in case study research has been the application of replication logic. This can be accomplished by replication of the study through multiple case studies and separate independent studies.

The final threat to case study research was identified as reliability. Reliability was defined as the concern that the study could be repeated with the same results. It was
important to note that reliability was concerned about repeating the same case study with the same results, not conducting another case study and reaching the same conclusions. The key to protecting reliability within case study research has been the development of and the religious use of a case study protocol. This protocol should document the exact and specific procedures carried out by the researcher. A second device to protect reliability was the development of a case study data base. This data base acted as a record keeper recording the specific findings from the case study as it progressed. These tools will help protect the reliability of case study research.

Yin (1989) has identified specific skills required of case study researchers who serve as the investigator. The individuals will be required to ask good questions and interpret the answers. The individual must be able to listen and avoid being influenced by their own ideologies or preconceptions. An adaptive and flexible position must be taken by the individual to maximize the opportunities presented through the data collection process. The individual must have a thorough understanding of the subject matter upon which the case study was developed. Finally, the individual must be unbiased to make an honest assessment of the situation and be sensitive and responsive to contradictory evidence. The investigator in case study
research should be a highly trained and knowledgeable individual with complete understanding of why the study was being conducted, what evidence was being sought, what variations could be expected, and what constituted supportive or contradictory evidence for each proposition.

When conducting a case study, Yin (1989) stressed the importance to follow three basic principles of data collection to maintain the integrity of the study. These basic principles were: 1) use multiple sources of evidence, 2) create a data base for the case study, and 3) maintain a chain of evidence. Case study research has six avenues upon which to collect evidence. These six sources of evidence were: 1) documentation, 2) archival records, 3) interviews, 4) direct observation, 5) participant observation, and 6) physical artifacts.

The principle guide in conducting the actual collection of data within a case study has been identified by Yin (1989) as the case study protocol. The protocol was the major tactic in increasing reliability and was essential in a multiple case design. The protocol should have included: 1) an overview of the case study project, including objectives, issues, and relevant readings, 2) field procedures, 3) case study questions, both specific questions and a shell for collecting data, and 4) a guide for the case study report. The case study protocol will have reminded
the investigator what the case study was about and force the investigator to anticipate problems that lie ahead.

Data analysis of case study research was determined to be difficult because of the lack of well defined strategies and techniques; however, the examining, categorizing, tabulating, or otherwise recombining of the evidence to address the initial research questions was vitally important (Yin, 1989). Three dominant techniques were the basis upon which case study evidence was analyzed whether a single or multiple case study. Pattern matching used logic to compare an empirically based pattern with a predicted pattern. If the empirical based pattern was the same as the predicted pattern the theory was supported. Explanation building was the second technique in which the researcher attempted to logically build a theory using the chain of evidence to explain the occurrences. Theories developed through explanation building became excellent candidates for pattern matching in subsequent case studies. The third technique was time series analysis and involved examining the evidence through the passing of time. The researcher paid particular attention to the order and passing of time between the events when using this technique of analysis. Other lesser modes of analysis such as embedded units, repeated observations, and case surveys, have been found suitable for supplementation to one of the dominant techniques. Embedded
units involved analyzing a subunit of the case study generally through traditional statistical methods. In a multiple case study the embedded units should be examined in each individual case and was seldom found necessary to be combined for cross study evaluation. It was found important for the researcher to remember that the embedded unit was just a segment of the entire study and should not have become the major portion of the analysis. Repeated observations attempted to detect differences caused within the case study through time and/or different cross sections of the case study. The creation of a case survey attempted to bring many case studies together into a quantitative format. Once in this quantitative format the researcher could turn to traditional statistics for analysis of the evidence. This was found to be an extremely helpful and powerful tool in large multiple case studies that involved many investigators. The analysis of case study research was found vitally important and should have a strong foundation plan prior to the collection of any evidence.

The final segment of case study research was the composing of the case study report (Yin, 1989). Case study reports have been found to take both written and non-written forms. It was recommended that case studies report actual names and locations of individuals and organizations whenever possible; but anonymity could be used where
necessary. The reporting of actual names and locations enabled other researchers to more effectively replicate the study or use the study in larger multiple case projects. Yin (1989) identified six possible structures for reporting case study research. These six structures were: 1) linear-analytic, 2) comparative, 3) chronological, 4) theory building, 5) suspense, and 6) unsequenced. In conclusion, Yin (1989) identified significance, completeness, considerate of alternative perspectives, sufficient evidence, and engaging composition as the key components of an exemplary case study.

Summary

The review of literature has highlighted many of the beliefs concerning the area of leadership throughout this century. Through this examination, a foundation has been built to provide the researcher with an understanding of the beliefs of leadership from many different perspectives. It was important to note that not just one perception on the field of leadership has emerged, but many that the researcher may need to relate to. These perspectives on leadership will be important as the researcher attempts to identify key components of evidence as the case study data collection process proceeds.

The second segment of the review of literature thoroughly examined the work of James Kouzes and Barry
Posner with particular attention directed at their Leadership Practices Inventory. It was the discrepancy found within the "self" and "observer" examinations in the area of "enabling others to act" that this research project was directed. The review of literature documented the discrepancy commonly found between "self" and "observer" evaluation of the practice of "enabling others to act" in Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory. The review of literature has provided the researcher with a solid understanding of Kouzes and Posner's work that will provide the researcher with the insight necessary to identify those key pieces of evidence during the case study.

Finally, the review of literature provided the support necessary to justify the use of a case study and the direction necessary for conducting a case study for this research project. Many researchers have commented on the need for a qualitative type of research effort to examine and explore abstract social phenomena such as leadership. Robert Yin provided a detailed description of how to properly conduct a case study research effort such as the one to be conducted by this project. The review of literature has provided both the foundation and direction necessary to undertake this research project.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The design of this research was a multiple case with embedded unit analysis case study. In each case, the researcher directly and indirectly observed and collected data concerning the interaction between a leader and their followers. Particular attention was paid to discrepancies between leader and follower interpretation of Kouzes and Posner's leadership practice of "enabling others to act". This research was interested in exploring possible explanations of why a discrepancy between leader and follower commonly exists in Kouzes and Posner's leadership practice of "enabling others to act".

The research project was submitted to, reviewed, and approved by the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research (Appendix B). The committee reviewed the proposal, informed consent form, survey instruments used in the embedded unit, case study protocol, and procedure for maintaining confidentiality. It was in the opinion of this committee that this research project met the standards established by Iowa State University to insure
the rights and welfare of human subjects and protect their confidentiality.

**Subject Selection**

Being a multiple case embedded unit analysis case study, the researcher identified two populations to serve as major case studies and one population to serve as a pilot case study. Only populations with a reputation for outstanding leadership and cooperation with research efforts were considered for selection. One Department of Agricultural Education and one Center for Agricultural Business, Department of Agricultural Economics within Colleges of Agriculture at Land Grant Universities were identified for case study analysis. A single department within the College of Agriculture at Iowa State University was selected as the third population and to serve as the pilot case study. The pilot case study department was selected because of its leadership reputation, location, and similar faculty size to the other two departments selected for case study research. The Department of Agricultural Education and Center for Agricultural Business, Department of Agricultural Economics were selected because of their leadership reputation, willingness to participate in the project, faculty size, and location within the Midwest. It was important to remember that this study was not intended to be statistically generalizable to any population.
Demographic Data Instrument

The demographic data instrument (Appendix C and D) was used to collect basic demographic data on both the leader and each subordinate. The instrument attempted to determine similarities and differences between the departmental executive officer and each subordinate in the areas of age, leadership exposure, educational background, professional activities, and social activities. Educational background was determined through the use of a nominal scale. A ratio scale was used for leadership exposure. Individuals were asked the number of years under the leadership of the leader and the number of supervisors they have served under. Age was recorded using a five point Likert type scale evaluating the difference in age between the subordinate and the departmental executive officer. The number 1 represented considerably younger and 5 represented considerably more experienced. Professional activities and social activities were also evaluated using a five point Likert type scale with 1 representing no association in activities between the subordinate and the departmental executive officer and 5 representing significant association. This survey instrument was developed by the researcher for use with this study. The instrument was reviewed and approved by a panel of experts from the Agricultural Education and Studies Department of the Iowa State University.
The embedded unit instrument was The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) created by James Kouzes and Barry Posner (Appendix E and F). This survey instrument was developed to empirically measure the conceptual framework discovered by Kouzes and Posner in their personal best surveys of managers. The LPI is composed of thirty questions, six of which come from each of the five leadership practices. The instrument is available in two forms, one for "self" and one for "observer", and both use a five point Likert type scale. The LPI has sound psychometric properties with acceptable internal and external reliability and validity. Written permission was gratefully granted from Kouzes Posner International to duplicate and use the LPI instrument in this research project (Appendix G).

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was used for two purposes. The first purpose of the LPI was to determine basic leadership demographic data on each leader. This data was then used by the researcher to gain better insight into the characteristics of the leader being investigated. The second purpose of the LPI was to determine the magnitude of discrepancy between the leader's "self" and the follower's "observer" evaluation of each leader in the leadership practice area of "enabling others to act". It was the
purpose of this research project to explore why this discrepancy might occur and offer possible insight into methods to minimize the discrepancy.

**Case Study Protocol**

An individual protocol was developed for each individual field visit. For this study there were three such protocol developed. An example (Appendix H) of these protocols is found within this document; however, it does not include names and locations of individuals or organizations that would normally be included as this would breach confidentiality. The following discussion will explain the general contents of each individual protocol.

**Field Procedures**

The field procedures contained a tentative outline of activities, supplies needed, and individuals to contact for each case study site. The first piece of information included the name and location of the contact person, the departmental executive officer of the department. This individual had been contacted first by letter and had agreed to participate in the study. The individual also submitted names of subordinates, both faculty and support individuals, who would be present, their schedules, and willingness to participate in the study. This information was then used by the researcher to prepare the proper number of informed consent forms (Appendix I), data collection instruments, and
agenda for the data collection process. Upon arrival of the researcher at each site a short introduction to the research project was presented to all participants (Appendix J). Individuals were also given the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and a General Demographic Information survey to complete in private at their own convenience prior to their scheduled interview. Time was then scheduled for the interview of subordinates (45 minutes each), general observation (1 hour), and observation, collection of related memorandum, and interview with the department executive officer (1 hour). The field procedures concluded with an exit discussion with the departmental executive officer and procedures for the labeling and packaging of all data collected for the return trip to the researchers institution. A thank you letter was sent to the department through the executive officer several days after departure.

**Case Study Questions**

The second section of the case study protocol included the case study questions (Appendix K and L). These questions were unique to survey or interview questions in that they were posed to the investigator not the respondent. A different set, though logically highly related, of case study questions was proposed for each segment of the investigation including interviews, observation, and documentation. The case study questions presented the
investigator with challenges upon which to gain information. It became the investigator's responsibility to position the data collection procedure properly to obtain the important information in answering the case study questions. Under this type of guidance, the investigator was given much flexibility and could adjust the data collection procedures to information that was already discovered and to the situation that existed.

The primary source of information for this case study was the interview process. Specific, yet similar case study questions were posed for both the departmental executive officer and the subordinates. Information was also collected through observation and the collection of relevant memorandum. Specific, yet similar case study questions were prepared for each of these two areas also.

The case study questions for the leader attempted to gain knowledge in four different areas. The first area was to gain an understanding of the departmental organization including the organizational chart, communication channels, and committee assignments. This area was followed by an attempt to gain an understanding of both the department executive officer's greatest departmental and personal accomplishment while serving as the departmental executive officer. The third area to gain understanding was of both the departmental executive officer's philosophy and
perceived actions for "enabling others to act". Finally, the case study questions pointed the investigator in the area of determining the departmental executive officer's frustrations when attempting to "enable others to act" from both a personnel and bureaucratic perspective.

Questioning for the subordinates followed a similar logic with case study questions in only three areas. The first challenge of the investigator was to develop an understanding of the case study question of what was the greatest departmental accomplishment while under the administration of the current departmental executive officer and who played what roles within this accomplishment. The subordinate was also questioned in depth about their actions and understanding of their role in this accomplishment. The second area of case study questioning involved attempting to understand the subordinates view of the departmental executive officers philosophy and examples of actions toward enabling them personally to act. The final area of the case study questioning attempted to understand the frustrations of the subordinate when attempting to act as an individual within the department.

The observation portion of the data collection process attempted to answer case study questions in the area of accessibility of the departmental executive officer and existing communication channels. The investigator attempted
to determine if the departmental executive officer was accessible and to what degree subordinates took advantage of this accessibility. The observation also remained keen for actual examples of the leadership practice of "enabling others to act".

In investigating the related memorandum, the investigator attempted to discover actual examples of the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". The investigator also attempted to answer the case study question about the departmental operations including the type of organizational structure present, communication channels established, and any established committee structure.

Case Study Report

The final section of the case study protocol included information concerning the case study report. This section detailed how to properly assemble the information collected at the field site. The instructions included how to create the case study data base for each case study field site so that it would be in a standardized form. Once in this standardized form, the data was readily available for the researcher to conduct both the individual case study analysis and multiple case study analysis.
Data Analysis

Data from the case studies were first analyzed as an individual case study. Upon completion of the individual case study analysis the data were combined and analyzed in a multiple case study format. Raw data from the embedded unit and demographic data were analyzed only in the single case format and no combination of the raw data did occur for a multiple case analysis. Data from both the embedded unit and the demographic segment were used for the multiple case analysis in the single case analyzed form only.

Data from the demographic segment for each independent case study were used independently and then combined by calculating frequencies and standard measures of central tendency. Assistance in calculating the frequencies and measures of central tendency was provided by Microsoft Excel (1992). The combined data were used to represent the single case study in the multiple case study analysis. The demographic segment resulted in the creation of three separate data bases, one for pilot case study and one for each of the two major case studies.

Data from the embedded unit were immediately combined with assistance from Microsoft Excel (1992) for each single case study. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) observer instruments were analyzed by calculating mean, standard deviation, and internal reliability. The LPI self
was analyzed for internal reliability. A Z-test was then conducted to determine the difference and probability between the results of the LPI self and LPI observer. The combined data were then used to represent the single case study in the multiple case study analysis. Three embedded units were independently analyzed one for the pilot case study and one for each of the two major case studies.

Each of the three single case studies was individually analyzed using the explanation building analytical strategy. In this strategy the researcher attempted to build possible explanations for the discrepancies discovered within the case study in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". These explanations represented logical interpretations of the data collected during the case study.

Finally, the case studies were combined into a single research project. In this segment of analysis, the researcher used the analytical strategy known as pattern building. In pattern building the researcher attempted to identify similar patterns between each of the case studies. The purpose of this analysis was to develop a single common hypothesis as to why the discrepancy between "self" and "observer" Leadership Practices Inventory Instruments existed.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This section of this study will present the data collected during the research project. As defined in the methodology, three sites were selected and the data will first be reported as individual case studies. Each individual case study will be divided into demographic data, including observational information collected on the department as a whole, embedded unit analysis, relationships between demographic and embedded unit data, and discussion of the qualitative data collected during the individual interview, presentation of documentation, and observation. Qualitative data will be presented in two groups the first of which will be the leader. The subordinates will be discussed second in a compare and contrast style after being divided into two groups based off of LPI average scores. Following the individual case studies, the data will be presented in a total format representing the multiple case study combining data from all case studies.

This study consisted of three individual case studies. The protocol designed for this study was originally tested in the pilot study. Results from this pilot study revealed no significant problems in methodology and the original
protocol was used for the remaining studies. Because of the continued use of the original protocol, the pilot case study was included in the final combined analysis. Also to maintain anonymity, the pilot case study and other two case studies will be identified as X, Y, and Z in no particular order.

This research project successfully collected information from two individual departments and one center within a department from different Colleges of Agriculture located throughout the Midwest. The investigator collected data at each site during a single day visit during the months of July and October in 1993. Data was collected from two departmental executive officers, one center director, and 21 subordinates. To maintain autonomy the center will be referred to as a department and the director as a departmental executive officer from this point forward. Because of scheduling conflicts, all subordinates of a departmental executive officer were not included. The secretary of the departmental executive officer was responsible for the scheduling of the investigator at each case study site. All data collected was determined to be usable for this study. Subordinates did submit three incomplete instruments for the embedded unit analysis; however, the responses were complete for the leadership
practice of "enabling others to act" and therefore determined to be usable for this study.

Site X

Demographic Data

The department at site X was located in a multiple floor building with department operations centered around but not exclusively using a single floor wing. Approximately one half of the individuals with departmental appointments were involved in this study including members serving various roles and located outside of the central wing. The percentage of subordinates classified within each position is presented in Table 4. The departmental executive officer served in the capacity of a chair and was therefore elected by the members of the faculty and not appointed by the Dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current leader of the department at site X served in the capacity of a member of the faculty at site X prior to becoming the Departmental Executive Officer. The executive officer felt neutral on the question of whether their
leadership style was opposite or identical to that of their predecessor. This leader had the opportunity to serve under more than five different leaders in their career.

To further define the interviewed subordinates, several other demographic questions were asked (Table 5). The average subordinate had served three years under the leadership of the departmental executive officer with a range of one to four. Most subordinates had worked under the supervision of at least six other individuals. When asked to evaluate their relative age to their departmental executive officer it was discovered to be slightly to the senior. The subordinates felt moderately close to their departmental executive officer in a professional sense and moderately distant in a social sense. The departmental operations were centered around this wing in several office complexes, workroom, and classrooms. The departmental executive officer's office was located in a complex on this wing; however, most departmental activity centered around the workroom located outside of the departmental executive officer's complex. The workroom contained the break facilities, office equipment, and mail. Members of the department were observed openly traveling between office complexes and the workroom. A computer network did provide a linkage between most faculty and staff members and appeared to be regularly used.
Table 5. Demographic Data of Interviewed Subordinates
Five Point Likert Scale
Site X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Relationship</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 younger, 5 older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Relationship</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department had a formal written policy document. This policy provided in detail the procedures for the operation of the department. The policy was very complete and provided little flexibility to the departmental executive officer in the standard operations detailed in the policy document. The department was governed by the majority rule of the faculty. A structured standing committee organization was provided for in the policy. The policy was created prior to the current departmental executive officer term but was revised during the officer's term.

The department had several public display areas. These display areas provided recognition to scholastic achievement of students. The department also published a newsletter that was distributed to alumni. The newsletter provided recognition to faculty, students, and departmental activities.
Embedded Unit Analysis

The embedded unit for this case study was Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). Each member, whether leader or subordinate was presented with the appropriate LPI instrument during the introductory meeting. These instruments were then collected by the investigator at the beginning of the individual interview. The data were analyzed after the investigator left the case study site. Results will be presented in general and then for each of the five leadership practices, "challenging the process", "inspiring a shared vision", "enabling others to act", "modeling the way", and "encouraging the heart".

The general investigation revealed several important facts. The primary evidence to note was that the leader and observer each ranked the departmental executive officer's leadership practices in the exact same order (Table 6). This order is however different than the order reported by Kouzes and Posner in their work. The primary discrepancy is the high placement of the leadership practice of "encouraging the heart". Secondly, only one leadership practice was found to significantly different at the .05 level between "self" and "observer" and the leader's "self" score was significantly lower. Finally, the variances reported by this study were narrower than the work compiled by Kouzes and Posner (Tables 6, 7, 8).
Table 6. LPI Results  
General  
Site X  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>observer</td>
<td>std.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>avg.</td>
<td>dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.8750</td>
<td>2.7585</td>
<td>0.9792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.5556</td>
<td>2.0608</td>
<td>0.2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.5714</td>
<td>3.3320</td>
<td>0.8532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.1429</td>
<td>2.2315</td>
<td>0.9793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.0000</td>
<td>1.9272</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. LPI Results  
leader compared to Kouzes & Posner's work  
Site X  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Kouzes &amp; Posner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>std.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the practice of "challenging the process" no significant difference was found (Table 9). A significant difference at the .05 level was found in the response to the question, asks what can we learn when things do not go as expected, with the leader's score being significantly lower. The leader's "self" score of 25 placed the leader in
Table 8. LPI Results
observer compared to Kouzes & Posner's work
Site X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>observer average</th>
<th>Kouzes &amp; Posner observer average</th>
<th>std. dev.</th>
<th>percent -tile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. LPI Results
"Challenging the Process"
Site X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. seeks challenging opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
<td>0.5995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. stays up-to-date on developments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8889</td>
<td>0.3134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. challenges the current procedures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
<td>0.8570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. looks for new and innovative ways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. looks to learn in negative situations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>0.7071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. takes risks and experiments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>0.9035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.5714</td>
<td>3.320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approximately the eightieth percentile according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 7). In the five leadership practices the leader ranked performance was second with two other practices and the observer ranked performance was third (Table 6).

The leader ranking among the leadership practices of "inspiring a shared vision" was again tied for second position and ranked fourth by the observers (Table 6). The leader's "self" score of 25 in this practice placed the leader in the ninetieth percentile according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 7). In the leadership practice of "inspiring a shared vision" no significant difference was found (Table 10) in the practice as a whole or any individual questions.

In the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" a significant difference at the .05 level was discovered in the response to a single question. This difference, however, did not support the entire leadership practice of "enabling others to act" as significant (Table 11). The question of "gives people a lot of discretion to make their own decisions" was significant with the leader's score below the observer's. Again the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" was ranked in a tie for second by the leader (Table 6). The leader's "self" score of 25 placed this
Table 10. LPI Results
"Inspiring a Shared Vision"
Site X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. describes the future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. allows others to share dreams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. communicates a positive future</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. connects others to common vision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. forecasts the future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. is contagiously excited about future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.1429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. LPI Results
"Enabling Others to Act"
Site X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. involves others in planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. respects others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. allows others to make decisions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. develops cooperative relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. creates atmosphere of trust</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. creates a sense of ownership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.5556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practice around the fiftieth percentile according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 7).

The leadership practice ranked the lowest among the leadership practices by the leader at site X was the practice of "modeling the way" (Table 6). This leadership practice did however become the only leadership practice where a significant difference was discovered between the observers and the leader (Table 12). The leader's score was significantly below the score of the observers at a .05 level. Three questions were also identified as significant at the .05 level with the leaders score below the observers in all cases. The questions were, "makes certain that the projects he or she leads are broken down into manageable steps", "spends time and money making certain that people adhere to the values that have been agreed on", and "lets others know his or her beliefs on how to best run the organization he or she leads". The leader's "self" score of 21 placed the leader below the fiftieth percentile according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 7).

"Encouraging the heart" is the final leadership practice and the leader's "self" score of 28 placed the leader above the ninetieth percentile according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 7). This leadership practice was also ranked number one among the leadership practices by the leader (Table 6). Statistical analysis revealed no significant
Table 12. LPI Results
"Modeling the Way"
Site X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score self observer</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>avg.</td>
<td>std. dev.</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. has leadership philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>0.4714</td>
<td>0.9772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. breaks down into manageable steps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
<td>0.7806</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. has people adhere to common values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>0.7071</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. discusses beliefs on operation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
<td>0.5995</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. consistent in values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>0.6285</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. requires clear goals and planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.7559</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total for practice</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.0000</td>
<td>1.9272</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. LPI Results
"Encouraging the Heart"
Site X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score self observer</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>avg.</td>
<td>std. dev.</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. takes time to celebrate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>0.6667</td>
<td>0.9977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. recognizes peoples contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>0.4330</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. praises people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
<td>0.7806</td>
<td>0.3359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. appreciates and supports members</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>0.6614</td>
<td>0.3359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. celebrates accomplishments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>0.6614</td>
<td>0.9987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. publicly recognizes good work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>0.4714</td>
<td>0.9772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total for practice</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.8750</td>
<td>2.7585</td>
<td>0.9792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
differences at the .05 level for any individual question or the leadership practice as a whole (Table 13).

**Relationship of Demographic Data to Embedded Unit Data**

At site X, when demographic data were correlated with the "observer" scores of the LPI for each leadership practice three relationships were identified with correlation coefficients greater than 0.60 (Table 14). Two relationship were discovered between the rating of professional relationship and the leadership practices of "challenging the process", and "inspiring a shared vision". The final relationship discovered was between the rating of age relationship and the leadership practice of "modeling the way". All of these variables were rated by the observer using a five point Likert type scale with 1 representing seldom or younger and 5 representing often or older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Qualitative Data of Leader

The leader at site X related the reconceptualization of the department as the major accomplishment during the leader's term as departmental chair. This reconceptualization involved change for the department as each of the three major components, teaching, research, and service were addressed. The impact of this reconceptualization would be felt by all subordinates of the department in their daily activities. The reconceptualization was defined by the leader as not the development of a new mission for the department but a change in thinking from functionality to programmatic.

This reconceptualization was leader directed. The leader instituted the change by interjecting ideas out to the faculty. The faculty then reacted to these ideas and incorporated some of their own thought. As this reactionary discussion continued focus was directed back at the model upon which it was based. The result of this was seen by the leader as a faculty created leader directed reconceptualization of the department.

The reconceptualization required a change in thinking by the faculty from being functional connected to other individuals and organizations to being connected on a programmatic basis. The leader's initial attempt involved clustering faculty based off of their faculty reports. This
attempt did not work initially; however, it started faculty discussion about collaboration and shortly after new synergistic collaborative teams began to emerge along programmatic areas within the department.

The leader at site X believed that the power necessary to operate the department was given to the leader from the dean and dean's staff. The dean's office was said to be very supportive of the department. A willing acceptance was given to the department and its reconceptualization. The college was currently going through a reorganization and the future looked good for the department. The department has been challenged to consider expansion as it attempts to meet its total mission.

A very formalistic procedure document was used within this department. This document made it very clear as to what the department chair could and could not do. The leader felt comfortable within the guidelines established by this procedure; however sometimes powerless. The chair of the department definitely served at the request of the faculty for the faculty. Most of the departmental power rested with the faculty. This faculty power was exercised in regularly scheduled faculty meetings under the governance of the policy document.

The leader used an elaborate committee structure. The committee structure was thoroughly defined within the
governance document. The document identified the standing committees, set the qualifications of members on the committee, and established a procedure for the election of members on to the committee. This document was recently revised under the leadership of the current departmental chair to more appropriately reflect the current environment that the department operates within.

In conclusion the leader made several comments on the operational strategy being used within the department. The leader saw three key components to the position as related to leading the faculty. The first position was to consistently throw ideas out to the faculty. These ideas should challenge their imagination, present opportunities, and keep them aware of their changing environment. Secondly, the leader should encourage the faculty members to do things and recognize them when they have accomplished something. Finally, the leader should throw cold water on people. In throwing cold water on people, the leader attempted to challenge the subordinates to perform at even higher levels, become even more directed, and consider even more perspectives.

Discussion of Qualitative Data of Subordinates

The subordinates will be identified in two halves based on their LPI average total scores. The upper half had an average "observer" score of 26.38 in total and 26.60 on the
leadership practice of "enabling others to act". In discussion of the leaders greatest accomplishment the ideas of a newly defined direction for the department and the nurturing of the repertoire between members of the department were suggested. The lower half identified the reconceptualization of the department and simple departmental survival and proliferation as the leader's greatest accomplishment. The lower half had an average LPI "observer" score of 22.85 in total and 24.25 in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act".

The membership of this department had a unique opinion toward the department. Both upper and lower halves rarely referred to their organization as "we". Their organization was commonly referred to as the "department". Each member believed strongly in this department and all believed they were an important member of the department. They were proud of departmental accomplishments and shared in the credit for it and recognized the other members of the department for their contribution. They did not see the department as the leader's department, but as their department.

The department at site X had excellent communications established. Members openly shared between each other and the leader. Communications were formal and informal and made through personal contact, letter, and electronic mail that was available to all faculty. Both halves agreed that
the leader played an important role in this open communication by personal example. Information consistently flowed from the leader's office concerning anything that could affect the department. The leader was also credited for taking time to do the little things, such as informally stopping by a subordinate's office just to say hi and how are things going.

A support structure was in place for all members particularly the newest members. It was appreciated that within the department individuals were given the opportunity to start small, challenged to increase their contribution, assigned a faculty support group, and required to participate in an annual review process. This faculty truly looked out for each other and the good of the department more than for self.

The formal committee structure at site X was complete and the leader routinely used this structure. Much of the decision making for the department had been formally assigned through the governance document to the existing committee structure. On issues related to this formal structure and other issues determined appropriate, the leader did use the committee structure efficiently. Delegation of tasks did occur within this department; however the decision making power would rest with the entire faculty during their business meeting. It was also noticed
that the committees would commonly ask for the leader's opinion on the issues that they were assigned. The committee would not necessarily produce the same result as indicated by the leader but it did consider the leader's position and often this position served as a major source of influence. Even with this powerful influence, little frustration was reported by the subordinates and most appreciated the leader's interaction.

The power situation in this department appeared to be unique. In comments made from both halves, some faculty members were not overly concerned with the leader. They greatly appreciated what the leader was doing, but the leader was not a powerful influence over them. It was as if the leader was just another member of the faculty, who had chosen to and was accepted to pursue this formal leadership role. At the same time, these faculty members had developed tremendous respect for the leader and had chosen to willingly follow the leader at this time.

Another issue of power that surfaced in both halves occasionally was the idea of equity. Many referred to the department in terms of senior, junior, and other members. Though highly respected, it was the opinion of several that the senior faculty occasionally dictated the direction of the department. All subordinates commonly talked highly of each other at all levels; however, the presence of a
hierarchical type society within the department appeared to exist. For departmental functions, all members were invited to participate and most did. No individuals reported any hard feelings or segregation at these functions and described the situation more as family. Official departmental decisions were always reached during faculty meetings, all members were always allowed time to present their opinions, all members opinions were respected, but occasionally, some members felt as if a decision had already been reached somewhere else without their input. These informal discussions, where it was perceived that some decisions were reached, caused some concern within the subordinates.

A very positive and excited atmosphere existed within the department at site X. Though maybe not in total agreement, the reconceptualization of the department was seen very positively by both groups. Members of this department believed in the future of the department through this reconceptualization and were excited about the challenges that it presented. It was seen as something different, but not too different, and an opening door for new possibilities if one chose to take them. The department felt as if they were ahead of most other departments and had the opportunity to excel beyond their traditional boundaries. The department saw themselves as a winner.
The members of the department were very supportive of the leader and how individual assignments were handled. Both members of the lower and upper halves saw their research projects as their own. They appreciated the support and counsel given them by their leader and greatly appreciated the autonomy given them in making specific decisions. A similar situation occurred in the teaching portion of members' responsibilities. In class visitations by the leader were seen as opportunities to gain feedback to improve performance and not threatening. The entire evaluation process though very formal was seen more as an opportunity for improvement than a threat to survival. The leader was seen as very interactive within the department, but more appreciation than frustration was the result of this interaction.

The area receiving the most praise by the subordinates of their leader was encouragement. It was stated continually by both groups of experiences where the leader took time from the leader's personal schedule to thank, congratulate, console, or encourage a subordinate. These actions could have been face to face, by electronic mail, by memo, or in a unscheduled departmental celebration. The actions could have been for professional or personal accomplishment, but were always received well by the
subordinates. Though very professional, the department had a unique feeling of family.

In conclusion, there were very little differences in the comments made by the two halves with respect to their leader. Both halves had high respect for the leader and truly believed in the department. It was commonly believed that the department ran in a true democratic method. Most acknowledged that the leader knew what was going on within the department and appreciated the interest and questioning of the leader related to their personal projects. No negative comments were received about the leader meddling in their projects. The department at site X operated efficiently and the leader was seen as a true "champion" of the reconceptualization of the department.

Site Y

Demographic Data

The department at site Y was in a single suite of offices located in a multiple floor university building. All departmental operations were carried out from within this suite. Individuals with major appointments within the department were all interviewed for this study and were located within this suite of offices. Space was at a premium within the office suite and all individuals were within close proximity of each other with some sharing office space. This department was lead by an appointed
individual and was therefore not elected by any group of individuals. The percentage of subordinates classified within each position is presented in Table 15.

The department at site Y has experienced significant growth. Since its creation eight years ago, the department has doubled in personnel size. The number and magnitude of educational programs has also grown at a rate greater than the increase in personnel. The department at site Y was expected to be financially self supporting through self generated funds. Any expansion in the department would also have to be funded by self generated funds. This department was unique in their dependence for external sources to maintain their existence.

The current leader of the department at site Y served in the capacity of a member of the faculty at site Y's institution prior to becoming Departmental Executive Officer. This departmental executive officer had no opportunity to compare leadership styles with the previous
administration as this executive officer was appointed at the definition and formation of the department. This leader had the opportunity to serve under the leadership of two other leaders in their career.

Other demographic information was collected on the subordinates (Table 16). The average subordinate had served just over five years with the executive officer's leadership with a range of two to eleven. More subordinates classified this executive officer as their first supervisor and the average for all subordinates was just over three. This staff generally evaluated themselves as younger than the departmental executive officer. In evaluating their professional relationship with the executive officer they felt neutral and moderately distant in their social relationship.

All departmental operations centered around this single office suite. External rooms were seldom used but were available for expanded workroom space with special equipment and break type activities. A central area was available for student assistants, both undergraduate and graduate, working on departmental projects within the office suite. The reception area was also located in this central area. This central area was cramped, located just outside of the individual offices, and was very active throughout the day. The departmental fax machine and mailboxes were also located
Table 16. Demographic Data of Interviewed Subordinates
Five Point Likert Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Y</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Relationship</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 younger, 5 older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Relationship</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this area. Each office did have a computer and was linked through the use of a network. Office doors were routinely kept closed; however, individuals regularly traveled between offices to talk with another member of the staff. The department had no direct control over classrooms and relied upon university officials to provide satisfactory classrooms found at various locations throughout the university.

This department was very conscious of their customer and attempted to maintain a very professional image. Individuals followed a professional dress code and set standards for greeting visitors and answering the telephone. Activities within the department strictly followed an activity timeline. Every effort was made to produce a high quality product in a timely fashion to meet and exceed the demands of the customer. To meet these demands, individual activity within the department operated at a furious rate.
Clutter located within the office suite was primarily the result of lack of other available space.

The department did have a written organizational chart and some procedures. Operations centered around a management team of three individuals including the departmental executive office, an associate, and an assistant. This team was responsible for the initiation of all programs and depended upon the remainder of the staff to develop and implement the program. The organizational chart and policies appeared to be very flexible and allowed the team to modify the structure to best suit the needs of the specific program as demanded by the customer. Decisions were generally reached by the management team with input from the other staff members.

The department did have access to limited public display areas. Within the complex a bulletin board was maintained with current students and business cards of past students. The department also published a bi-monthly newsletter which was predominately used to inform customers, students, of the coming programs. Extensive effort was made to promote the department and its products through individual product brochures, regular general and specific mailings, and other public media both as advertisement and informational articles.
Embedded Unit Analysis

The embedded unit for this case study was Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI). Each member, whether leader or subordinate was presented with the appropriate LPI instrument during the introductory meeting. These instruments were then collected by the investigator at the beginning of the individual interview. The data were analyzed after the investigator left the case study site. Results will be presented in general and then for each of the five leadership practices, "challenging the process", "inspiring a shared vision", "enabling others to act", "modeling the way", and "encouraging the heart".

The general investigation revealed several important facts. When analyzing the rank order of the "self" and "observer" scores, it was discovered that the rankings did not agree and were quite different (Table 17). The practices of "enabling others to act" and "encouraging the heart" were seen considerably differently by the subordinates and leader. When comparing the rank order presented by the leader with Kouzes and Posner's work, it was discovered that the order was identical except for the placing of the leadership practice of "inspiring a shared vision". A different scenario was discovered when examining the subordinate's rank order with Kouzes and Posner's work. These two rank orders appeared to show no similarities. A
significant difference at the .05 level was discovered for three of the five leadership practices. A significant difference was discovered for the practices of "challenging the process", "inspiring a shared vision", and "encouraging the heart" with the "self" score significantly below the "observer" score. It should also be noted how tight the variances discovered for the "observer" scores were as compared to Kouzes and Posner's work (Tables 17, 18, 19).

Table 17. LPI Results
General
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Score Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rank practice</td>
<td>self raw</td>
<td>observer raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;enabling others</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to act&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;challenging the</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.1667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference at the .05 level was discovered in the leadership practice of "challenging the process" (Table 20). The questions of "seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her skills and abilities", "challenges the way we do things at work", and "asks "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected" were all significant at the .05 level with "observer" scores.
Table 18. LPI Results
leader compared to Kouzes & Posner's work
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>self score</th>
<th>Kouzes &amp; Posner average self</th>
<th>std. dev.</th>
<th>percent tile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. LPI Results
observer compared to Kouzes & Posner's work
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>observer average</th>
<th>Kouzes &amp; Posner average observer</th>
<th>std. dev.</th>
<th>percent tile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significantly above the "self" scores. This practice was ranked first out of five by the observers and was tied for second by the leader (Table 17). The leader's "self" score of 23 placed the leader just over the fiftieth percentile (Table 18).
Table 20. LPI Results
"Challenging the Process"
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score self observer std. dev.</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. seeks challenging opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>0.3727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. stays up-to-date on developments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>0.6872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. challenges the current procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>1.0672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. looks for new and innovative ways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. looks to learn in negative situations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>0.4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. takes risks and experiments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>1.8930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>1.8930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Inspiring a shared vision" was the second leadership practice to show a significant difference at the .05 level (Table 21). The question "looks ahead and forecasts what he or she expects the future to be like" brought the subordinates to unanimous agreement on an "observer" score of four while the leader gave a "self" score of three. Two other questions were also seen as significant at the .05 level with the leader's "self" score significantly below the "observer" score on the questions, "appeals to others to share his or her dream of the future as their own" and "shows others how their long-term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision". A "self" score of 23 placed the leader near the upper quartile in this leadership practice according to Kouzes and Posner's work.
Table 21. LPI Results
"Inspiring a Shared Vision"
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question context</th>
<th>Score self</th>
<th>observer avg.</th>
<th>std dev.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>describes the future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>1.3437</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows others to share dreams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>0.3727</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicates a positive future</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connects others to common vision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>0.6872</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forecasts the future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is contagiously excited about future</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>0.3727</td>
<td>0.8413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.3333</td>
<td>2.1344</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 18). The leadership practice of "inspiring a shared vision" was ranked tied for second by the leader and third by the subordinates (Table 17).

The leadership practice of "enabling others to act" was ranked first by the leader and third by the subordinates (Table 17). A "self" score of 26 placed the leader in the upper one third according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 18). This practice was not seen as significantly different at the .05 level, but did discover one significantly different question (Table 22). The question of "gets others to feel a sense of ownership for the projects they work on" was seen significantly lower by the leader at the .05 level.
Table 22. LPI Results
"Enabling Others to Act"
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Abbreviated Context</th>
<th>Score Abbreviated Self Raw</th>
<th>Score Observer Average</th>
<th>Statistics Std. Dev. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. involves others in planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.5774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. respects others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>0.7454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. allows others to make decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>0.4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. develops cooperative relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>0.6872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. creates atmosphere of trust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>1.1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. creates a sense of ownership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for practice</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the leadership practice of "modeling the way", the question of "is consistent in practicing the values he or she espouses" received unanimous results from both the leader and all subordinates on a score of four. This practice was also determined to show no significant difference at the .05 level for the practice as a whole or any individual question (Table 23). "Modeling the way" was ranked fifth by the subordinates and fourth by the leader. The leader's "self" score of 22 placed this practice around the fiftieth percentile (Table 18).

The leadership practice of "encouraging the heart" discovered a significant difference at the .05 level not only for the practice as a whole but for each of the six questions (Table 24). All questions were seen as
Table 23. LPI Results
"Modeling the Way"
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score self</th>
<th>observer avg.</th>
<th>std. dev.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. has leadership philosophy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>0.9428</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. breaks down into manageable steps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>0.7454</td>
<td>0.8413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. has people adhere to common values</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>0.4714</td>
<td>0.0569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. discusses beliefs on operation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.9873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. consistent in values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. requires clear goals and planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>0.5574</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.1667</td>
<td>1.2134</td>
<td>0.9996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significantly lower at the .05 level by the leader. The questions included: "takes the time to celebrate accomplishments when project milestones are reached", "makes sure that people are recognized for their contributions to the success of our projects", "praises people for a job well done", "gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions", "finds ways to celebrate accomplishments", and "makes it a point to tell the rest of the organization about the good work done by his or her group". The practice was ranked fifth by the leader and second by the subordinates (Table 17). A "self" score of 21 placed the leader below the fiftieth percentile in
Table 24. LPI Results
"Encouraging the Heart"
Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score self observer avg. std. dev. P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. takes time to celebrate</td>
<td>3 4.1667 0.6872 0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. recognizes peoples</td>
<td>4 4.5000 0.5000 0.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. praises</td>
<td>4 4.6667 0.4714 0.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. appreciates and supports</td>
<td>4 4.5000 0.5000 0.0127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. celebrates</td>
<td>3 3.8333 0.3727 0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. publicly recognizes</td>
<td>3 4.5000 0.5000 0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>21 26.1667 1.4625 0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

this practice according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 18).

Relationship of Demographic Data to Embedded Unit Data

Seven relationships were identified with a correlation coefficient greater than .60 when correlating demographic data with "observer" scores of the LPI in each of the five leadership practices (Table 25). A positive relationship was discovered when relating professional relationship with the leadership practices of "inspiring a shared vision" and "enabling others to act". A positive relationship was also found when relating social relationship with the leadership practices of "challenging the process" and "encouraging the heart". Professional and social relationship were rated on a five point Likert scale with 1 representing distant and 5
representing close. A negative relationship was discovered between the demographic variable of the number of supervisors and the leadership practice of "encouraging the heart". The variable of age relationship, as measured on a five point Likert scale with 1 representing significantly younger and 5 significantly older, also showed a negative relationship with both the leadership practices of "modeling the way" and "encouraging the heart".

Table 25. Observer LPI Scores & Demographic Information Correlation Coefficients Site Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>prof.</td>
<td>sprvsd</td>
<td>sprvsr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Qualitative Data of Leader

The development of a first class delivery system able to target specific customers with creative and high quality programs within the university structure was the primary accomplishment seen by the leader at site Y. The leader at site Y had been involved with this project since the departments creation eight years ago to meet this newly
identified challenge. This accomplishment has resulted in a department that has not only survived but prospered in the last eight years seeing staff size double and the number of programs increasing at a greater rate. The department was entrepreneurial in that it has been financially independent of the university, but exists within the university producing educational programs that regularly exceeded the clients expectations to a national and international audience.

The leader saw the key to success at the department in being the people associated with it. The department has been staffed with individuals that are emotionally involved with the department and believe in its mission. They have all been people oriented people that have learned to understand and respect their customer. They have been hard working people that work well together as a team and take great pride in the products they produce. The leader has been actively involved in the selection of each member of the department.

Within this department there was only one formally subdivided team. This team was known as the management team and was composed of three individuals. Each of these individuals served on this team as a result of position. These individuals were not elected by their peers. The leader was a member of and heads up this team. Many other
teams were developed for specific projects on an as needed basis that may encompass as many as the entire group. Policies within the department were less formal and very flexible.

The leader identified the leader's departmental role in two broad areas. The leader was expected to provide time to be used as a teacher of a portion of the material to be presented within the educational product. The leader was also expected to carry out administrative type of duties. The leader defined these duties as hiring, maintaining, and encouraging personnel and providing the creative vision of what the product should be. The leader believed in a style of management where the right people are hired and then given the freedom to do what they were hired for.

The leader did not believe in micro management but in facilitating the process. The leader freely presented ideas to the subordinates expecting them to develop and organize a finished product from them. The leader made it a point to be available to provide feedback and assistance to the subordinate when they felt it was necessary. The leader did not want to become engaged in the specific details required to produce a finished product; but, expected the highest quality in the product produced.

The leader clearly believed in and trusted the individuals that were assembled in this department. Because
of the busy schedule maintained by the leader there was a concern for not spending enough time in recognition type of activities. The leader did make efforts to regularly communicate with members of the department. Fax transmissions were common to individuals of the department from the leader's home or travel destination. The leader had a great amount of respect for the individuals assembled beneath the leader.

The leader was pleased with the current support of the department. Communication channels were maintained and active between the department and the Dean's office. The Dean and dean's staff were supportive of the current department and its mission. Given its unique status, the leader was concerned about what changes could be forced upon the department with an administrative shift within the College of Agriculture. The department was currently given relatively free rein over its future provided it could secure the funding necessary to finance it. The department had also established favorable relationships with other colleges within the university. The primary challenge of this department existed in manipulating this unique entity to navigate the policies, procedures, and systems found within the university bureaucracy.

The leader at site Y was very visionary in what the future of this department might be. The leader's vision
included not only where the department might go but how the department could involve the rest of the college and university as it traveled on its course. The leader demonstrated extreme knowledge as to the customer that the department currently served and could serve in the future. The leader served the department well as its figure head establishing networks throughout the customer base and suppliers of the latest knowledge necessary for their educational product.

In conclusion, the leader at site Y was very active in the department and its future. This activity, however, often took the leader outside of the office suite through which it operated. This activity mixed well with the leader's style of hands off management. The leader was not concerned with the detail of how the product got produced only that an exceptional product of the highest quality was produced. The leader did not spend time examining the progress of products and expected things to be progressing satisfactorily unless told different. The leader made every effort possible to be available to subordinates if they wanted it. The leaders schedule at site Y was no more less frantic and high paced than the rest of the department.

Discussion of Qualitative Data of Subordinate

The subordinates will be identified in two halves based on their LPI average total scores. The upper half had an
"observer" score of 26.0667 in total and 27.6667 on the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". They identified two accomplishments of the leader as their personal best. These accomplishments included the successful development and implementation of a National Conference and the success and growth of the department through its customer base and programs. The lower half had an average "observer" score of 23.2000 in total and 22.3333 on the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". They unanimously identified the personal best accomplishment of the leader as the growth of the department.

This department was in total agreement on whose department it was. Throughout the interviews all individuals within the department were consistently referring to the department as ours and the term "we" was used exclusively discussing all activities and accomplishments. The loyalty to this department was unbelievable by all individuals involved with it. No apparent segregation was observed or voiced by any individual within the department. Individuals referred to each other on a first name basis and space and equipment were freely used by all. Both halves made comments related to the similar values shared by all within the department. This department was composed of different individuals but
all possessed a very similar work ethic and commitment to the department.

Some discrepancy did exist in the exact organizational structure within the department. It was not possible to isolate this discrepancy between either of the two halves and some of the discrepancy could be a result of the flexibility of the structure. All members were in agreement that the leader was ultimately responsible and the leader relied upon the management team to assist in the direction and operation of the department. Some disagreement did exist in specific authority of the other members of the management team. It was apparent that this discrepancy was currently not causing any major problems as demonstrated by the interaction of all departmental members. Individuals within this department freely shared with each other regularly.

The departmental visionary was clearly seen as the leader. Each individual talked vividly of following the leader's vision into the future. One commented "I do not know exactly where we are going but I am going to be with this team". Even with this strong visionary power, the future was never defined as the leader's future but always as the department's future and that each individual was going to be a part of the team to take them there. The vision was never described in detail by any individual of
either half, but all individuals were all going to be there. Each individual also believed in their ability to have an important impact on where this team was going. All agreed that the leader was contagiously excited about the department and its future.

The leader was relied upon heavily by the department as their network into the customer base that they served. All members commented on the number of contacts in their customer base that the leader had established. The leader was relied upon for providing them with insight into potential customers and reacting to products as the customer could be expected to. Some frustration was felt in the leader's lack of detail. The leader was responsible for providing the link between the client served by the department and the department. The department also relied upon the leader to maintain relations between the department and both the college and university.

The department was unanimous in stating that their work schedule was too intense. However, the discussion never led to what they would be willing to give up to reduce their work load. All members of the department appeared to be extremely busy currently but rarely discussed a future that would be less demanding on their time. When discussing their current situation all individuals appeared very content and satisfied with their job. They were all proud
of what they were doing and enjoyed doing it. It also appeared that they had each made a conscious decision to be as active as they were within the department.

The individuals within the department at site Y each had different strengths and weaknesses. These strengths and weaknesses were realized by the different members and they were able to produce a symbiotic relationship within the department. It was unique that these strengths and weaknesses were never discussed as negatives but always as positives. The entire group of individuals regularly discussed things in a positive nature and had a tremendous amount of respect for each other. This team was able to maximize their performance by working together.

In conclusion, the department at site Y was a very strongly developed team. Members did not refer to activities of the department in any terms besides "we" and "ours". In examining the department there was an immense amount of pride in the activities that they were involved in, the products that were produced, and the results of these products. The department at site Y was a successful team involved in a concept that they all believed in.

Site Z

Demographic Data

The department at site Z occupies the majority of space located on a single floor in a multiple floor university
building. Operations for this department are predominately conducted and all controlled on this floor with operational exceptions being located at laboratory sites throughout the state. Approximately one half of the individuals with departmental appointments were involved in this study. The department is divided along two specific areas of study. The individuals involved with this study were biased toward one area of study. The percentage of subordinates classified within each position is presented in Table 26.

This department is led by a chair position and is therefore elected into the position by members of the faculty and not appointed by the dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current leader of the department at site Z served in the capacity of a member of the faculty at site Z prior to becoming the Departmental Executive Officer. The executive officer felt neutral on the question of whether their leadership style was opposite or identical to that of their
predecessor. This leader had the opportunity to serve under more than five different leaders in their career.

The subordinates involved in the study were further defined by additional demographic type of questions. The average subordinate had served over five years under the leadership of the executive officer with a range of 1 to 8. This leader was identified on average as the third leader under which the individual had served. The average age of the subordinates was discovered to be slightly to the junior of the departmental executive officer at site Z. The subordinates felt reasonably close to the executive officer in a professional sense and nearly neutral in the social sense. The study discovered a wide range in the evaluation of professional and social relationship between the subordinates and their leader.

The departmental operations centered around a main office complex. This complex contained secretarial support,

Table 27. Demographic Data of Interviewed Subordinates
Five Point Likert Scale
Site Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Relationship</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 younger, 5 older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Relationship</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mail, conference room, office equipment, and the departmental coffee pot. The departmental executive officer's office was located within this office complex. The departmental executive officer maintained an open door policy and was regularly interrupted by subordinates. Other offices were located within this complex for faculty and staff, but many of the offices were located independently off of the main hallway of the building. The departmental executive officer and others were seen regularly walking in this hallway and interacting. The department appeared to be very informal, had a casual atmosphere, and communication channels were open.

The department had some documented procedures. Faculty and staff members were each assigned to regular standing committees and procedures were established for departmental operations. The structure appeared flexible and adaptive to meet the needs of the current departmental situation.

The department was well equipped with means of public display. Newspaper clippings related to the department and industry which it served were displayed. Prominent displays were also used to display the department's student organization's activities and current research activities of the department's faculty. Pictures were displayed of faculty members, staff, and graduate students. Displays located throughout the department provided a visitor with a
sense of knowing and recognized all aspects of the department. The department also printed a newsletter to inform individuals of the current activities of the department.

**Embedded Unit Analysis**

The embedded unit for this case study was Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI). Each member, whether leader or subordinate was presented with the appropriate **LPI** instrument during the introductory meeting. These instruments were then collected by the investigator at the beginning of the individual interview. The data were analyzed after the investigator left the case study site. Results will be presented in general and then for each of the five leadership practices, "challenging the process", "inspiring a shared vision", "enabling others to act", "modeling the way", and "encouraging the heart".

The general investigation revealed several important facts. When analyzing the rank order of the "self" and "observer" scores it was discovered that the rankings did not agree (Table 28). The rank order is consistent for four of the leadership practices but the leadership practice of "encouraging the heart" placed last by the leader was placed third by the subordinates. The rank order by either the "self" or "observer" did not agree with the order discovered by Kouzes and Posner. A significant difference at the .05
level was discovered in two of the five leadership practices. A significant difference was discovered in the practices of "enabling others to act" and "encouraging the heart" with the "self" score significantly below the "observer" score. The variances discovered in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. LPI Results leader compared to Kouzes & Posner's work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Kouzes &amp; Posner standard</th>
<th>percen tile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self average dev.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>20 22.70 3.19</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>20 20.49 3.90</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>25 24.79 2.90</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>23 22.15 3.21</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>18 21.90 3.94</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30. LPI Results observer compared to Kouzes & Posner's work Site Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>observer average</th>
<th>Kouzes &amp; Posner</th>
<th>std. dev.</th>
<th>percen tile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;challenging the process&quot;</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;inspiring a shared vision&quot;</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;enabling others to act&quot;</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;modeling the way&quot;</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;encouraging the heart&quot;</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"observer" scores was also narrower than those reported by Kouzes and Posner (Tables 28, 29, 30).

In the leadership practice of "challenging the process" a significant difference was not found for the practice as a whole but two questions did prove to be significant at the .05 level (Table 31). The questions of "seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her skills and abilities" and "asks "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected" were both significant with the observer scores significantly higher. This practice was ranked tied for third out of the five leadership practices by the leader and fourth by the observers (Table 28). The leader's "self" score of 20 place the leader in the bottom quartile (Table 29).

"Inspiring a shared vision" was the second leadership practice tied for the third place ranking by the leader at
Table 31. LPI Results  
"Challenging the Process"  
Site Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score context</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. seeks challenging opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>0.7454</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. stays up-to-date on developments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>0.7454</td>
<td>0.1587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. challenges the current procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
<td>1.0672</td>
<td>0.3635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. looks for new and innovative ways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>1.0672</td>
<td>0.6365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. looks to learn in negative situations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>0.7454</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. takes risks and experiments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
<td>1.0672</td>
<td>0.3635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.8333</td>
<td>3.9756</td>
<td>0.1512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

site Z (Table 28). The observers ranked this practice fifth. This practice also did not produce a significant difference at the .05 level as a whole but did have one question with a significant difference (Table 32). The question "is contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities" was seen to be significantly higher by the observers. The leader's "self" score of 20 placed the leader very close to the fiftieth percentile according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 29).

"Enabling others to act" as a leadership practice produced a significant difference at the .05 level. Again, the leader's "self" score was significantly below the "observer" score. This practice had two questions, "gives people a lot of discretion to make their own decisions" and
Table 32. LPI Results
"Inspiring a Shared Vision"
Site Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self</td>
<td>observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. describes the future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. allows others to share dreams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. communicates a positive future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. connects others to common vision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. forecasts the future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. is contagiously excited about future</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"creates an atmosphere of mutual trust in the projects he or she leads", determined to be significant (Table 33). The leadership practice of "enabling others to act" was ranked first among the five leadership practices (Table 28). The leader's "self" score of 25 placed the leader in the top half according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 29).

The highest percentile ranking according to Kouzes and Posner's work was received for the leadership practice of "modeling the way" as it approached the upper third (Table 29). The leader's "self" score was 23. This practice was not determined to be significant at the .05 level; however, it did produce one significant question. The question "is consistent in practicing the values he or she espouses" was seen as significantly higher at the .05 level by the
Table 33. LPI Results
"Enabling Others to Act"
Site Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score self observer std. P-value</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. involves others in planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. respects others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. allows others to make decisions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. develops cooperative relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. creates atmosphere of trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. creates a sense of ownership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total for practice</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.6667</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. LPI Results
"Modeling the Way"
Site Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question abbreviated context</th>
<th>Score self observer std. P-value</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. has leadership philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. breaks down into manageable steps</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. has people adhere to common values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. discusses beliefs on operation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. consistent in values</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. requires clear goals and planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total for practice</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.6000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"observers" (Table 34). A ranking of second was achieved by the leadership practice of "modeling the way" (Table 28).

The lowest ranking received for a leadership practice at site Z was the practice of "encouraging the heart" (Table 28). The leader's "self" score of 18 placed the leader in the bottom quartile according to Kouzes and Posner's work (Table 29). The "observers" however would have ranked this practice third and placed the leader above the fiftieth percentile (Table 30). The leadership practice was identified as significantly different at the .05 level. The "observer" score was significantly higher at the .05 level on five of the six questions found within the leadership practice. The questions were "takes the time to celebrate accomplishments when project milestones are reached", "makes sure that people are recognized for their contributions to the success of our projects", "praises people for a job well done", "gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions", and "finds ways to celebrate accomplishments" (Table 35).

Relationship of Demographic Data to Embedded Unit Data

At site Z, when demographic data were correlated with the "observer" scores of the LPI for each leadership practice two relationships were identified with correlation coefficients greater than 0.60 (Table 36). A negative relationship was identified between the number of
Table 35. LPI Results "Encouraging the Heart" Site Z

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abbreviated self observer std. dev. value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context</td>
<td>raw avg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. takes time to celebrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. recognizes peoples contributions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. praises people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. appreciates and supports members</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. celebrates accomplishments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. publicly recognizes good work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total for practice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

supervisors and the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". Number of supervisors was rated on a ratio scale and the LPI measurement of "enabling others to act" used a five point Likert type scale. A negative relationship was also discovered between the rating of professional relationship and the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". Both of these variables were evaluated using a five point Likert type scale.

Discussion of Qualitative Data of Leader

In the interview with the leader, four major accomplishments were cited and discussed. The first of these accomplishments was stated to have more or less evolved. The leader's role was more involved with
management than leadership as most of the effort was concentrated on the lengthy process of innovating ways to finance the project. The other accomplishments proved to be more leader intensive.

Each of the other three accomplishments involved change. This change was directed at the heart of the department and would affect every member in their daily activities. The change was not the result of past actions but the change in the environment which the department existed. Bureaucratically, the university and college were shifting emphasis. Students entering into the department also had different resources entering and expectations upon graduation. The department needed to change to survive.

To survive the department had to attract new sources of funding, modify current curriculums, and become more directed in their efforts. The leader believed in the
subordinates and each member’s ability to contribute. To establish direction the department as a whole identified possible directions, prioritized the directions, and allocated resources accordingly. The leader began the process by creating a document which was believed to encompass ideas from every member and presented it as a starting point for discussion. The leader felt the finished product included ideas from both the leader and subordinates, however all may not agree with this opinion. In securing funding, the leader’s role would be to identify opportunities, encourage members to apply for funds, protect members from internal regulations, and reward those that were successful. The challenge of curriculum was segmented and assigned to committees. These committees then reported back to the entire group for discussion, adoption, and implementation.

Through these accomplishments, the leader saw the importance in involving everyone. It was important that the individuals believed the ideas implemented were their own and not dictated by the leader. The leader’s role involved identifying the group’s will, defining group issues, providing opportunity for discussion, and concluding with some form of something. In the discussion, it became important to insure that discussion stayed on the issue and control was maintained. Subordinates needed the opportunity
to present their beliefs, but it needed to be presented in a professional manner and not personal.

The leader felt pulled in two directions. The leader was elected by the faculty to direct the department in service to the faculty. As their leader the responsibility also included representing the department and reporting to the dean of the college. The dean was believed to be supportive of the leader and department; however, was not always in agreement with the faculty. The leader was the link between these two important participants within the university bureaucracy and challenges arose. The leader did believe that final authority rested in the leader's hands.

In conclusion, the leader felt it was important to allow the subordinates to be productive in their interests. In doing this, the leader believed in challenging them, presenting ideas and related opportunities to them, and protecting them from the daily operations and threat of overload within the bureaucracy. The leader felt as a productive and accepted member of the department. The leader felt that more recognition was deserving of the subordinate's led.

**Discussion of Qualitative Data of Subordinate**

The subordinates will be identified in two halves based off of their LPI average total scores. The upper half had an average "observer" score of 25.6667 in total and 27.6667
on the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". They each identified different accomplishments of the leader as their personal best. These ranged from the relationships within the department to basic departmental survival. The lower half had an average "observer" score of 21.3333 in total and 25.6667 on the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". They identified the leader's personal best accomplishments and the ones identified could be defined within departmental survival and research development.

The first area of examination was the idea of "we" versus "I" within the department. Both upper and lower halves were very much in agreement in the idea of a "we" department. The department was commonly referred to as a family. Individuals of varying rank complimented the leader as treating them as equals. Feelings were strong that the department was not an object of the leader, but a product that the entire department was responsible for. There was some discussion and more predominate in the lower half that some individuals within the department may not agree with this idea. Some individuals, who were not interviewed, may feel that the department was not attentive to their desires and was leaving them behind.

Again both groups were in agreement on the idea of creating interactions between and among people. Much discussion was directed at the regularly scheduled faculty
and staff meetings. These meetings were complimented for their open and controversial discussion. Subordinates praised the efforts of the leader to get feelings shared, ability to maintain control, and the no retaliation environment. Subordinates felt comfortable sharing their feelings, even when in opposition of others including the leader, and the ability to shake hands and work together after the meeting. The leader's listening skills were also complimented.

Subordinates felt comfortable with their involvement in planning and problem solving for the department. The leader commonly used delegative strategies for introducing ideas into the department. Both halves stated that they appreciated the judgment used by the leader in determining which decisions should be brought before them. They felt this provided them with more time to follow their own interest and less time involved with the bureaucracy. Major decisions were reached as a team in faculty and staff meetings. The subordinates believed that they were acting on the critical issues facing the department and its future. They appreciated the leader asking for their opinions and involving them on issues that would affect them.

The idea of focusing on gains, not losses, provided some disagreement between the two halves. Many of the comments from the lower half had a recurring overtone of survival of
the department. This group placed emphasis on the fact the
department still exists basically intact after much pressure
from within the bureaucracy. The upper half recognized the
survival issue but did not dwell on it. The lower half felt
enabled to act but appeared to be looking for or cautious
about where to act. The upper half was more challenged and
excited about what they were doing.

Communication was an agreed upon strength of this
department. Subordinates all felt comfortable in
communicating with their leader whether it was to seek
additional information or present a new idea. They
appreciated the leader's efforts to be accessible to them.
Subordinates, though not always in agreement with the
bureaucracy, appreciated the leader's continual effort to
keep them informed of developments within the college and
university. The relationships within the department lead to
a very open and courteous communication environment.

The final discussion will center around the idea of
allowing people the opportunity to be autonomous and use
their own discretion. It was commented that the leader
commonly challenged the problems but did not interject
personal control. On their own personal projects, both
groups believed that they had the opportunity to be
autonomous and use their own discretion. Individuals were
given authority to create their own budgets for their
projects. When external funds were secured by an individual, that individual was given control, within university bureaucracy guidelines, to allocate how the funds would be expended. Other issues, that impacted the department more directly such as curriculum, received mixed comments from both groups. Individuals felt little autonomy on these issues even when in their opinion it affected them more directly than others. These issues were not however decided upon by the leader; but, by the entire faculty and staff during their regularly scheduled meetings. This situation created some frustration within the department.

In conclusion many common elements did exist within this department. The department was composed of individuals with different backgrounds, desires, and expectations. The department could be divided easily between two specific divisions of their discipline. Conflict did occur with these differences; however, the leader demonstrated exceptional abilities to control the conflict and prevent the department from becoming competitive internally. The leader did not demand respect but received it freely from the department members. The department at site Z efficiently operated within a realized and open environment.
Multiple Case Study

Demographic Data

Each of the case study sites were similar and unique in their own ways. All of the sites were departments operating within Colleges of Agriculture at Land Grant Universities. Being within this system, all of the departments were challenged by their administration on the issues currently facing agriculture and the land grant system. Each of the departments was required to exist in a similar university bureaucracy. The faculty within all of these departments were concerned with a similar promotion and tenure system.

The financial situation was quite different at each site. Site X was funded in the more traditional manner of central university funds for teaching, research, and extension. At the other end of the spectrum was site Y which was totally dependent upon external sources for the funds to operate. To generate these funds, site Y depended upon the sale of the product that it produced. Site Z was again more traditional depending upon central university funds, however it had been very successful at receiving external funds through grants. Each department was unique in how they obtained the funds to operate.

All of the departments were housed within the university proper. Each of the departments existed in a multiple floor university building in which their department was just one
of several housed within the structure. All offices were of similar type and personnel had access to similar equipment. Site Y was more crowded than either of the other two sites.

The individuals that participated in the case studies were slightly different at each site (Table 37). All three leaders had advanced into their leadership role directly after serving within that institution. Leadership at site X and Z was a chair and therefore elected by the faculty of the department. Site Y had a leader that was appointed and not elected by the department. Site X was composed of a more senior faculty and had a long rich tradition of excellence. Socially and professionally, site Z appeared more closely related and operated in a more relaxed environment. Site Y was the youngest in both age of the department and age of the individuals involved with it. Site Y appeared to operate in a more stressful and high paced environment than either of the other two sites.

After examining the LPI data several conclusions could be made concerning the different leaders and their strengths related to each other (Table 38). The leader at site X was the strongest at the leadership practice of "encouraging the heart". Both the leader's "self" score and the subordinate's "observer" scores were high and no significant difference at the .05 level was discovered. The leader at site Z was identified by the data to be the strongest in the
Table 37. Demographic Results
Summary
All Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Site X</th>
<th>Site Y</th>
<th>Site Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Assist.</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years under current leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of leaders served under</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Relationship</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 younger, 5 older</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Relationship</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationship</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 distant, 5 close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leadership practice of "enabling others to act". Both leader and subordinate ranked this practice first and "self" and "observer" scores were both high. This practice did, however, show a significant difference at the .05 level. The leader at site Z also showed a strength in the practice of "modeling the way". The leadership practices of "challenging the process" and "inspiring a shared vision" were shown to be comparative strengths in the leader at site Y. The subordinate "observer" and the leader "self" scores indicated a strength in these two practices though maybe not as apparent as in some of the other practices.
Table 38. LPI Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Location</th>
<th>Score Statistics</th>
<th>Score Location</th>
<th>Score Statistics</th>
<th>Score Location</th>
<th>Score Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>self observer location</td>
<td>raw rank</td>
<td>avg. rank</td>
<td>std. dev.</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>self observer location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Challenging the Process&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.5714</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Y</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.5000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Z</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.8333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Inspiring a Shared Vision&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.1429</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Y</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.3333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Z</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.8000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Enabling Others to Act&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.5556</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Y</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Z</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.6667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Modeling the Way&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site X</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.0000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Y</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.1667</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Z</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.6000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Encouraging the Heart&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site X</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.8750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Y</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.1667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Z</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.4000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Qualitative Data of Leaders

The leaders at all three sites were doing an excellent job of leading their current departments. The styles used, however, by each of these leaders was different. The faculty and staff through which these leaders accomplished their departmental mission was also considerably different.

The leader at site X appeared to be the most concerned about detail. This department operated efficiently in a very formal manner. In contrast the leadership style employed at site Y by the leader showed little concern for detail only results. Site Z would be located somewhere between these two sites on the continuum when concerned about detail. Site X again had very formal documents depicting policies and procedures while informal and flexible best described the situation at site Y.

All leaders showed a real concern for their subordinates. Many of the leaders' comments suggested a frustration that they felt when attempting to show appreciation to their subordinates. The leader at site X was extremely efficient at passing this recognition on to the subordinates of the department. It also appeared that each of the leaders was doing a better job of appreciating their subordinates than they personally felt.

All leaders were found to be visionary in their leadership roles. The leader at site Y was extremely
creative and efficient at passing this vision for the department on. This leader also expressed and operated with a level of excitement that was phenomenal. The leaders at both sites X and Z had accomplished considerable change within their respective departments and had successfully passed their visions on to their subordinates.

All of the leaders appeared to have good relationships with their subordinates. The leader at site Z had developed the strongest relationships with all of the individuals within the department. This individual was highly respected and depended upon by all staff members as more than just a boss they got along with but a personal friend. No limitations were observed at any site when evaluating leader subordinate relations.

The expectations of the subordinates were high by all leaders. The leaders all expected their subordinates to work hard, produce quality work, and contribute to the department in its quest to meet its mission. The leadership at site Y had set the highest standards. This department was dedicated to producing a product that not only met but exceeded customer demands. All leadership showed immense trust in their subordinates to produce the quality product desired.
Discussion of Qualitative Data of Subordinates

The subordinates at all three sites were seen to be exceptional individuals that took their role within their department seriously. A good mix of individuals was also interviewed at each site including faculty at various levels, professional and scientific, staff, and graduate students on assistantships. The group also encompassed both sexes and a variety of ages.

The subordinates at all sites appeared to have developed some form of relationship between each other. Some segregation did exist at all sites and generally existed between either different divisions of a department or rank positioning. Site Z was seen as having the most segregation while site Y had very little segregation. Site Y definitely had the tightest team developed within the department, however all departments had shown that they could work together.

The intensity of activity within the department varied immensely. Site Z appeared to have a very easy going pace of activities. Things appeared to get accomplished but there did not appear to be the immense pressure of attempting to get things completed. Site Y was the opposite of site Z. This department operated at a frantic pace and pressure was there to continually develop that high quality
product. Site X operated somewhere between these two departments.

The individual makeup of each department was also different. The individuals at site Y were very task oriented and appeared to enjoy the high paced, high stress environment. Conscious of detail and maintaining a professional image appeared to be the norm at site X. Site Z was unique with its laid back and flexible atmosphere. Even with the different makeup at each department, they were all very productive.

Effective communication channels existed in all three departments. At site X, much of the communication was in the form of written or electronically transferred professional memos. At site Z it was common to see casual face to face conversation occurring in hallways between offices. At site Y quick questions and hand written messages were the norm. All offices had different communicational channels but each was unique and effective in its own way.

The perception of the subordinates and their department varied. Site Y was at one end of the continuum and continually referred to themselves as a "team". They were poised to do battle against any competitor and were confident they made the best product available anywhere. Site X was in the middle and regularly referred to
themselves as the "department". At the other end of the continuum was site Z who referred to their organization as a "family". This group believed that if they worked hard and stuck together they would be able to survive and prosper.

In conclusion, the department at each site was unique and had developed its own environment in which to work. These environments varied greatly but so did the type of individual that was working within each environment. All subordinates demonstrated an ability to get along with each other and to make a contribution to the departments quest to fulfill its mission.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Man has long had a history of a curiosity with the phenomena of causing organized action within another man. This curiosity has led to a long and continual study of the topic now known as leadership. Leadership was defined as the ability to cause action in a group or individual to pursue a unified direction, goal, or purpose. Leadership has been the central issue around which this project has been conducted.

The study of leadership has gone through an evolutionary process. Leadership studies began with the examination and identification of individual traits that people possessed. As these "great man" theories developed it was thought that leaders were born and not made through a developmental process. The "great man" theories gave way to the behavioral and situational approach theories of leadership. Behavioral studies concentrated on the singular actions of leaders as they led their followers. Situational approaches examined the details of the situation in which the leader operated and concluded that the situation dictated what type of leader was necessary. These theories have led to today's
transformational theories of leadership where attention is directed at the relationship that exists between the leader and follower.

In reviewing the study of leadership, the work of two individuals located at the Leavey School of Business and Administration, Santa Clara University became very interesting. Dr. James Kouzes and Dr. Barry Posner identified and described five practices of leadership found in exemplary leaders. They originally detailed these ideas in a book entitled *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*. They identified the five practices of leadership as: 1) challenging the process, 2) inspiring a shared vision, 3) enabling others to act, 4) modeling the way, and 5) encouraging the heart. It was within these leadership practices that the research project continued.

To evaluate these five leadership practices, Kouzes and Posner created an evaluation instrument called the *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)*. This instrument was composed of thirty questions, six of which were related to each leadership practice, that were evaluated on a five point Likert scale. The instrument was available in two forms, one identified as "self", designed for the leader, and one identified as "observer", designed for the subordinate. This instrument had been widely used for the
evaluation of leadership practices and a data base was established.

When examining this data base an interesting phenomena was discovered. A significant difference was routinely discovered when comparing the leader's "self" score and the subordinate's "observer" score. Upon closer examination, the significant difference was verified and it was determined to be a normal event and consistently present. Examination also revealed that no attempt had been made to explain why the difference occurred.

This discrepancy provided the basis upon which this research project was developed. In an attempt to examine this discrepancy this research project conducted a systematic exploration into the literature, designed and conducted actual research on individuals identified as practicing leadership, and provided documentation of the results and observations made. It was hoped that this study could continue the evolutionary study of the phenomena man has grown to know as leadership.

Five research questions were established to guide this research project as it explored and attempted to identify some possible causes of this discrepancy. The five research questions were:

1. To describe the leadership practices of an individual within a leadership position.
2. To identify indicators of Kouzes and Posner's "enabling others to act" leadership practice.

3. To collect information related to indicators of Kouzes and Posner's "enabling others to act" leadership practice on an individual within a leadership position.

4. To relate collected indicator information to descriptive data of an individual within a leadership position.

5. To draw implications from case study analysis.

To meet the challenges set forth by the research questions a methodology was established. As discovered in the review of literature, the evaluation of a phenomenon such as leadership was very well suited for qualitative types of research. The review further discovered that the case study format of research was extremely powerful in exploratory research efforts where the questions of how and why were being asked. Based on these strengths a multiple case study with embedded unit analysis was selected. It was also determined that the LPI would serve as the embedded unit.

The review of literature provided a thorough explanation of the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". In this review a comprehensive description of indicators was developed to identify the components of the leadership
practice of "enabling others to act". The primary indicators in the fostering collaboration portion of "enabling others to act" could be summarized with a we not I philosophy, the pursuit of collaborative efforts, the seeking integrative solutions, and the building of trusting relationships. The sharing of resources, involvement of subordinates in the decision making process, the strength of relationships, and the insurance of follower visibility and recognition were the primary indicators in the second portion of "enabling others to act" known as strengthening others. This list allowed the research project to fulfill one of the research questions and provided guidance to the researcher as the project continued.

Three sites were chosen to serve as locations for the case study. The locations chosen were departments or centers with good reputations for excellent leadership located within Colleges of Agriculture at Land Grant Universities in the Midwest. The sites were chosen because of their location, willingness to participate in the study, and size of department. Because of the inability to generalize case study results through the use of statistical generalizations, no population was identified or sampling procedure used. Each of the sites was visited during a single day in the months of July or October by the primary
investigator to collect the case study and embedded unit data.

During the visit to each case study site, the investigator followed a predetermined protocol. This protocol provided the guidelines and list of supportive materials necessary for the investigator to systematically collect the necessary data. The protocol was also reviewed and approved by the Iowa State University, Human Subjects Review Committee. Prior to the visit agendas were written and materials were collected. The scheduling of individuals within each site was arranged through the secretarial personnel at each site. Once at the actual sites, the researcher conducted an informational meeting for all participants and spent the remainder of the day in individual interviews with each participant and observing the operations of the department or center. The investigator then left the site to begin the analysis of the collected data.

Data were collected from each of the three sites. The series of case studies involved three leaders and 21 subordinates. The data collected during the interview process were all determined to be of a usable form. Three of the embedded unit analysis instruments were incomplete, but complete for the items determined to evaluate the
leadership practice of "enabling others to act" and therefore used in the study.

The leadership data collected were related to the demographic data obtained from each participant. Analysis of this data revealed no consistently significant relationship between demographic data and leadership practices. The data were evaluated through statistical correlation between demographic and embedded unit data. No statistically significant relationship was consistently identified. Using a pattern building technique, the qualitative data were also related to the demographic data. This technique also failed to provide a consistent relationship between the demographic and leadership data collected. With this information the research question to relate collected indicator information to the descriptive data of an individual within a leadership position was answered.

The results provides a detailed description of the data collected at each of the case study sites in both qualitative and quantitative formats. This data extensively describe the leadership practices of three individuals identified as being in leadership positions. The detailed perspectives of both the leader and subordinate were presented in the results.
Quantitatively, site X had the most senior faculty and had been exposed to more leaders than any other site. Site Y was dominated by non-faculty personnel. Site Z was found to posses the closest personal and professional relationships. The LPI data drew attention to site X in the leadership practice of "encouraging the heart". Site Z was noted for "modeling the way" while site Y for "challenging the process" and "inspiring a shared vision".

Qualitatively, site X could be summarized in the word professionalism. The leader at site X was a strong encourager and followed a very formal leadership structure. Site Y was led by a visionary individual with a very product oriented approach. Site Y could be summarized in the word intense with a strong sense of team and intense pace present within the department. The leader at site Z had established the strong relationships. Site Z appeared to have an easy going pace in which things got accomplished and people got along despite some professional segregation.

The data collected also provided information related to the indicators of Kouzes and Posner's leadership practice of "enabling others to act" from three individuals identified as being in leadership positions. This information advanced the research project as it answered two more of the research questions proposed at the beginning of the study.
Conclusion

The results of the study were very supportive of both the transformational theories of leadership and Kouzes and Posner's leadership practices. Through the study, data were collected and recorded to be added to the documentation of the phenomena known as leadership. The study also successfully answered the five research questions presented at the conception of the study.

The study supported the transformational style of leadership as defined in the review of literature. The data, both qualitative and quantitative in nature, clearly depicted similar relationships between the different leaders and followers at each case study site. The individuals identified as leaders at each site were also found to be in the practice of causing action in a group or individual to pursue a unified direction, purpose, or goal. The data revealed different environmental situations and both leader traits and behaviors at each case study site. These findings would tend to discredit the "great man", behavioral, and situational approach theories of leadership. The similarities discovered in the relationships between leader and follower however, clearly supported the transformational theories of leadership.

The leadership practices identified by Kouzes and Posner were also identifiable in the case study analysis. At each
site, the leader could be found "challenging the process". Each leader had changed the traditional operations or status quo of the department to insure the survivability of the department in today's environment. Each leader also depicted a future for the department that was different than the current situation and had inspired and shared that vision with the followers. All of the departments were seen as locations of unified activity. The leaders had successfully empowered the followers and were "enabling others to act". Leaders continually presented themselves as models for subordinates to follow. Finally, leaders were seen "encouraging the heart" of their followers. These leaders successfully demonstrated each of the five leadership practices identified by Kouzes and Posner and found in the review of literature.

The examination into the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" revealed several interesting occurrences. First, the embedded unit analysis failed to replicate the significant difference commonly found when using the Leadership Practices Inventory. Secondly, the case study qualitative analysis was very supportive of the practice of "enabling others to act" as defined by Kouzes and Posner. Finally, some insight may have been gained into possible causes of differences perceived by leaders and
followers in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act".

A significant difference was only discovered in one of the three sites when comparing the LPI "self" and "observer" measurements of the leadership practice "enabling others to act". This discovery was interesting but not detrimental to the study as the LPI was being used only as an embedded unit to provide quantitative descriptions of the site to the researcher. The one significant difference that was discovered occurred in the opposite tail of the distribution than normally documented. No discredit should be directed at the LPI instrument as these three studies only represent three small populations. Some bias could be attributed to a lack of involvement of all subordinates or a randomized sampling methodology at two of the three sites.

The case study was very supportive of the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" as defined by Kouzes and Posner. Kouzes and Posner begin their discussion of "enabling others to act" with the concept of foster collaboration. Fostering collaboration was symbolized by a we not I philosophy. All sites were seen possessing this philosophy by referring to their organization as a team, department, or family and seldom speaking in the singular vernacular. Other evidence of this collaboration was the dependence and trust found between individuals within the
department. All individuals within each department were actively involved in meeting the challenges presented to them and understood the relationship of their activity with the accomplishment of the departmental mission. Individuals were seen as contributors to the departments in all respects and not just isolated workers. The second concept presented by Kouzes and Posner in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" was strengthen others. A key component of strength within an organization is the accessibility to information. All departments had an open communication system in place that demonstrated the free flow of information between the followers and leader in a two direction path. Strength and power go together when discussing an organization. The leaders at each of these sites empowered their followers and in turn expanded the strength of their department. Successful empowerment is demonstrated in the highest degree when followers begin acting as leaders themselves within the organization and this was demonstrated at several of the sites.

Through the analytical pattern building analysis of the case study, the concept of leader expectations emerged. Though no pattern could be clearly developed, an association may exist between the followers perception of "enabling others to act" and the expectations given by the leader. When followers were expected to produce at ever increasing
levels of quality and given the freedom to be creative in the finished product they appeared to perceive more enabled to act. In contrast, when followers were expected to perform at a high level of quality but produce a similar product in both appearance and quality they appeared to perceive some limitations on their ability to act. It appeared as if leaders could be perceived as limiting followers ability to act by having a defined expectation of what product the follower should produce. In these situations the follower appeared to attempt to produce the expected product and failed to maximize their individual ability in creating the product. This failure to maximize potential may result in a perceived deprivation of being enabled to act.

In conclusion, this study was very supportive of the transformational theories of leadership and Kouzes and Posner's five leadership practices. The study found the multiple case study with embedded unit analysis very applicable and well suited for the study of the phenomena known as leadership. The five research questions presented at the conception of the study have been successfully addressed and answered throughout the documentation of the study.
Implications

This study has again demonstrated our inability to fully explain the phenomena known as leadership. This study did add to the body of knowledge on the subject of leadership, however many questions still remain. Support was added to the transformational theories of leadership and Kouzes and Posner's leadership practices. Educational programs will be challenged to incorporate the findings of this study within the body of knowledge known as leadership. In conducting this study, the results and conclusions suggest several implications regarding the study of leadership.

Agricultural education is the discipline dedicated to the "scientific study of the methods and principles of teaching and learning as they are appropriate for teaching subjects in agriculture" (Barrick, 1989, p. 28). It has been identified by Hughes and Barrick (1993) that one of the components of the agricultural education model is developing employability, leadership, and personal skills. Buriak and Shinn (1993), through a national delphi study, identified four research problem areas for agricultural education as: 1) knowledge base for learning and teaching, 2) curricula and program planning, 3) delivery methodologies, and 4) program relevance and effectiveness. They further defined the area of knowledge base for learning and teaching to include the activity of individual achievement of which
leadership and organizational development is an objective. Leadership is a subject area of relevance to agricultural education.

Agricultural educators need to incorporate the findings of this study into the knowledge base for learning and teaching as it relates to agriculture. Agricultural education not only needs to incorporate these findings but should continue a sustained and focused research effort on the phenomena known as leadership. Williams (1991) challenged agricultural education to pursue relevant problems in a sustained manner that yield clear solutions and, when applied, provide vigor for the discipline of agricultural education. Leadership has been identified as one of these relevant problems.

Though this study was very supportive of the transformational theories of leadership, there are many questions still unanswered concerning the relationships that exist between leader and follower. Additional efforts should be directed at attempting to better understand the complex relationships that exist between the leader and follower. Only as researchers expand our knowledge of these relationships will man be better able to satisfy his or her curiosity.

Kouzes and Posner's leadership practices were again supported by this study, however, some of the intricate
details of each practice remain a mystery. The Leadership Practices Inventory was seen to be a useful tool in evaluating the leadership practices of a leader. This study produced evidence that the LPI can be used as an effective measurement device of a leader's leadership practices. However, the past documentation of a significant difference in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act" between "self" and "observer" was not supported by this study with its limited and selected populations.

The case study analysis revealed a possible association between the expectations of a leader and their impact on the followers perception of their ability to act. Further study should be conducted to determine if and what impact this association might have on the leader-follower relationship including the leadership practice of "enabling others to act".

This study also found the case study format of qualitative research very efficient at exploring the phenomena of leadership. Future studies should not be afraid to use the case study format. The embedded unit analysis within the case study worked efficiently and provided important quantifiable data to help describe the individuals involved in the study.

In conclusion, man's curiosity with the ability of an individual to cause action in a group or individual to
pursue a unified direction, purpose, or goal remains unsatisfied. The study of leadership should continue until a better understanding of the relationship that exists between leader and follower can be achieved and this curiosity can be satisfied. Only as this relationship is better understood can the educational process be modified and the students of leadership be better prepared for leading today's organizations.
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APPENDIX A

PERSONAL BEST LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE
APPENDIX A

PERSONAL BEST LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE (SHORT FORM)

Instructions: With regard to leadership, experience is the best teacher. Most leaders learn what to do by trying it themselves or by watching others. The problem is that not all of what is done or observed is ideal or even appropriate. Therefore, it is important to base your leadership practices on the best of what you do or see—those times when you have done your best as a leader or when others have achieved their personal best. Such examples provide role models for effective leadership.

Take about fifteen minutes to write some notes about your personal best as a leader.

1. Recall a time when, in your opinion, you did your very best as a leader of other people. Your leadership experience can be with your present organization or with a previous employer. It can be in the public or private sector; as an appointed, selected, or "emerged" leader; for pay or volunteer. Just choose one that you believe is your best. Write a very brief identifying description of that experience below (for example, "implementing the start-up of the Canadian branch" or "leading the task force on solid-waste disposal").

2. Think about the choice you just made and use the space provided to summarize five to seven things that you did as a leader. (Consider how you led, what your leadership actions were, and what caused this leadership experience to be your personal best.

(1)

(2)
3. What words best describe the character (the quality, nature, personality, tone, special mood, Etc.) of this experience?

4. What would you say were the major lessons or morals about leadership that you learned from this experience?
APPENDIX B

IOWA STATE HUMAN SUBJECTS FORM
Information for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects

Iowa State University

(Please type and use the attached instructions for completing this form)

1. Title of Project: An Exploration of the Leadership Practice "Enabling Others to Act": A Case Study

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

Thomas Lawrence Yrill 07/02/93
Typed Name of Principal Investigator

Agricultural Education and Studies 206 Curtiss Hall 4-0047
Department Campus Address Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of other investigators

Richard L. Carter 07/02/93 Major Professor

4. Principal Investigator(s) (check all that apply)

- Faculty - Staff - Graduate Student - Undergraduate Student

5. Project (check all that apply)

- Research - Thesis or dissertation - Class project - Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

6. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)

30. # Adults, non-students 0 # ISU student 0 # minors under 14 0 other (explain)

7. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, Item 7. Use an additional page if needed.) The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) created by Kouzes and Posner has been and currently is an effective way to evaluate the leadership practices used by an individual within a leadership position. Results from studies using the LPI have exposed that a significant difference is commonly found between "Self" and "Other" responses to the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". It is the purpose of this study to attempt to explore possible reasons for this significant difference through the use of a multiple case with embedded unit analysis case study. Data will be collected from departmental executive officers and their employed subordinates located at three sites within departments at midwestern colleges of agriculture. Data will be collected at each site throughout a single day using documentation, direct observation, interviews, and two questionnaires, one demographic and the other Kouzes and Posner's LPI instrument.

(Please do not send research, thesis, or dissertation proposals.)

8. Informed Consent: ☑ Signed informed consent will be obtained. (Attach a copy of your form.)

☐ Modified informed consent will be obtained. (See instructions, item 8.)

☐ Not applicable to this project.
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. ☑️ Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #s), how they will be used, and when they will be
      removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. ☑️ Consent form (if applicable)

14. ☐ Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. ☑️ Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

   First Contact: July 12, 1993
   Last Contact: August 15, 1993

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

   Month / Day / Year

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer: Richard L. Carter 07/06/93

   Department or Administrative Unit: Agricultural Education and Studies

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

   ☑️ Project Approved  ☐ Project Not Approved  ☐ No Action Required

   Patricia M. Keith 7/9/93

   Name of Committee Chairperson  Signature of Committee Chairperson

GC: 1/90
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA INSTRUMENT "SELF"
An Exploration of the Leadership Practice "Enabling Others to Act": A Case Study
Demographic Data Instrument "Self"

1. Please mark the description that best fits your position prior to becoming the departmental executive officer (DEO).
   - [ ] DEO of a similar department at another university
   - [ ] DEO of a non-similar department at another university
   - [ ] DEO of a different department within this university
   - [ ] Professor in a similar department at another university
   - [ ] Professor within this department at this university
   - [ ] Other

2. Please indicate the number of years you have served as the DEO of this department.

3. Please indicate the number of different immediate supervisors you have served under since taking full time employment in any position.

4. On a continuum of 1 to 5, please indicate your leadership style as compared to your immediate supervisor's style with 1 representing identical and 5 representing opposite.

5. On a continuum of 1 to 5, please indicate your general professional relationship with your department's members with 1 representing distant and 5 representing close.

6. On a continuum of 1 to 5, please indicate your family's social relationship with your department's members with 1 representing distant and 5 representing close.
APPENDIX D
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA INSTRUMENT "OBSERVER"
An Exploration of the Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices
A Case Study
Demographic Data Instrument
"Observer"

1. Please mark the description that best fits your current position.

   _____ Professor
   _____ Associate Professor
   _____ Assistant Professor
   _____ Staff (instructor, advisor, secretary)
   _____ Graduate Assistant

2. Please indicate the number of years you have served under the leadership of this departmental executive officer.

   _____

3. Please indicate the number of different immediate supervisors you have served under since taking full time employment in any position.

   _____

4. On a continuum of 1 to 5, please indicate your age in relationship to your departmental executive officer with 1 representing considerably younger and 5 representing considerably more experienced (older).

   _____

5. On a continuum of 1 to 5, please indicate your professional relationship with your departmental executive officer with 1 representing distant and 5 representing close.

   _____

6. On a continuum of 1 to 5, please indicate your family's social relationship with your departmental executive officer with 1 representing distant and 5 representing close.

   _____
APPENDIX E

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY "SELF"
On the next two pages are thirty descriptive statements about various leadership behaviors and activities. Please read each statement carefully; then rate yourself in terms of how frequently you engage in the practice described. Record your response by drawing a circle around the number that corresponds to the frequency you have selected. You are given five choices:

1. If you rarely or very seldom do what is described in the statement, circle "1."
2. If you do what is described once in a while, circle "2."
3. If you sometimes do what is described, circle "3."
4. If you do what is described fairly often, circle "4."
5. If you do what is described very frequently or almost always, circle "5."

In selecting the answer, be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in each behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you typically behave.

For example, the first statement is "I seek out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities." If you believe you do this "once in a while," circle "2." If you believe you seek out challenging opportunities "fairly often," circle "4."

**Important Note**

If the observations of others are going to be part of your leadership assessment, five to ten people should be selected to complete the LPI-Observer on you. Those selected should be people who have observed you or worked with you in situations in which you led a group on a project. They could be your immediate subordinates. If you are asked to select the people, choose ones who will be frank and whose opinions you respect. In some cases, the respondents will be anonymous; in other cases, it may be decided that the responses will be discussed openly between you and the group of respondents. The respondents must be told whether or not their answers will be anonymous. Also, your name must be written on each of the LPI-Observer instruments before they are distributed.
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY (LPI): SELF

To what extent do you engage in the following actions and behaviors? Circle the number that applies to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely or Very Seldom</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Very Frequently or Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I seek out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I describe to others the kind of future I would like for us to create together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I involve others in planning the actions we will take.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am clear about my own philosophy of leadership.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I take the time to celebrate accomplishments when project milestones are reached.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I stay up-to-date on the most recent developments affecting our organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I appeal to others to share my dream of the future as their own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I treat others with dignity and respect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I make certain that the projects I lead are broken down into manageable steps.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I make sure that people are recognized for their contributions to the success of our projects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I challenge the way we do things at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I clearly communicate a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of our organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I give people a lot of discretion to make their own decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I spend time and energy making certain that people adhere to the values that have been agreed on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I praise people for a job well done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely or Very Seldom</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Very Frequently or Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I look for innovative ways we can improve what we do in this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I show others how their long-term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I develop cooperative relationships with the people I work with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I let others know my beliefs on how to best run the organization I lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I ask &quot;What can we learn?&quot; when things do not go as expected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I look ahead and forecast what I expect the future to be like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I create an atmosphere of mutual trust in the projects I lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I am consistent in practicing the values I espouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I find ways to celebrate accomplishments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I experiment and take risks with new approaches to my work even when there is a chance of failure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I am contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I get others to feel a sense of ownership for the projects they work on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I make sure the work group sets clear goals, makes plans, and establishes milestones for the projects I lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I make it a point to tell the rest of the organization about the good work done by my group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY "OBSERVER"
The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Observer is designed to assist a leader in identifying the extent to which he or she engages in certain leadership practices. You are being asked by one of your colleagues to assess him or her on thirty leadership practices.

INSTRUCTIONS

The name of the person you will assess appears in the blank above marked “Name of Leader.” If you have not been asked to provide your name, your responses will be anonymous. If you have been asked to provide your name, write it in the blank below:

Your Name:

On the next two pages are thirty descriptive statements about various leadership behaviors and activities. Please read each statement carefully; then rate the leader whose name appears on this page in terms of how frequently he or she engages in the practice described. Record your responses by drawing a circle around the number that corresponds to the frequency you have selected. You are given five choices:

1. If the leader rarely or very seldom does what is described in the statement, circle “1.”
2. If the leader does what is described once in a while, circle “2.”
3. If he or she sometimes does what is described, circle “3.”
4. If he or she does what is described fairly often, circle “4.”
5. If the leader does what is described very frequently or almost always, circle “5.”

In selecting the answer, be realistic; answer in terms of how the leader typically behaves. For example, the first statement is “He or she seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her skills and abilities.” If you believe he or she “sometimes” seeks out challenging opportunities, circle “3”; if you believe he or she does this “fairly often,” circle “4.”

After you have marked answers for all thirty statements, turn to page 4 and please transfer your ratings to the blanks provided.
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY (LPI): OBSERVER

To what extent would you say this person engages in the following actions and behaviors? Circle the number that applies to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Rarely or Very Seldom</th>
<th>2 Once in a While</th>
<th>3 Sometimes</th>
<th>4 Fairly Often</th>
<th>5 Very Frequently or Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He or she:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her skills and abilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>describes the kind of future he or she would like for us to create together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>involves others in planning the actions that will be taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>is clear about his or her own philosophy of leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>takes the time to celebrate accomplishments when project milestones are reached</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>stays up-to-date on the most recent developments affecting our organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>appeals to others to share his or her dream of the future as their own</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>treats others with dignity and respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>makes certain that the projects he or she leads are broken down into manageable steps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>makes sure that people are recognized for their contributions to the success of our projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>challenges the way we do things at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>clearly communicates a positive and hopeful outlook for the future of our organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>gives people a lot of discretion to make their own decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>spends time and energy making certain that people adhere to the values that have been agreed on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>praises people for a job well done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely or Very Seldom</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Very Frequently or Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. looks for innovative ways we can improve what we do in this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. shows others how their long-term future interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. develops cooperative relationships with the people he or she works with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. lets others know his or her beliefs on how to best run the organization he or she leads.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. asks “What can we learn?” when things do not go as expected.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. looks ahead and forecasts what he or she expects the future to be like.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. creates an atmosphere of mutual trust in the projects he or she leads.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. is consistent in practicing the values he or she espouses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. experiments and takes risks with new approaches to his or her work even when there is a chance of failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. is contagiously excited and enthusiastic about future possibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. gets others to feel a sense of ownership for the projects they work on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. makes sure the work group sets clear goals, makes plans, and establishes milestones for the projects he or she leads.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. makes it a point to tell the rest of the organization about the good work done by his or her group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL PERMISSION
July 13, 1993

Mr. Thomas L. Krill  
Department of Agricultural Education and Studies  
206 Curtiss Hall  
Ames, Iowa 50011-1050

Dear Tom:

Thank you for your facsimile of July 8, 1993 requesting permission to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your doctoral research. We are pleased to allow you to make copies of the LPI in your research studies to the extent outlined in your letter and according to the following three stipulations:

1. That the following copyright notice appear on all copies of the LPI-Self and LPI-Other: Copyright 1993 by Kouzes Posner International, Inc. Used with permission. In the event that these items are embedded in your questionnaire, than a notice to this effect should be printed: "Some items were adapted from the Leadership Practices Inventory. Copyright 1993 by Kouzes Posner International, Inc. Used with permission" at the end of your survey.

2. That we receive copies of all reports, papers, articles, including your dissertation itself, etc. which make use of the LPI data.

3. That the LPI may not be sold or used in workshop settings. In other words, that the LPI will be used by you solely as a research instrument.

If you agree to the terms outlined above, please sign one copy of this letter and return it in the enclosed envelope. Enclosed is a copy of an article providing more technical information about the instrument's psychometric properties.

If we can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let us know. Best wishes in your research efforts.

Cordially,

Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.  
Managing Director

I understand and agree to abide by these terms.
An Exploration of the Leadership Practice of "Enabling Others to Act"
Multiple Case with Embedded Unit Analysis Case Study
General Case Study Protocol

Purpose:
To systematically explore the discrepancy that commonly exists between self and observer examination of a leader when using the Leadership Practices Inventory, leadership practice "enabling others to act", developed by Kouzes and Posner.

Procedures:
Field Visits
Location and Order
Pilot Study
Department A
Department B
Contact
Department Executive Officer
People to Interview
Departmental Executive Officer
Faculty Members
Support Staff including Secretaries and Graduate Assistants
People to Observe
Departmental Executive Officer
General Departmental Operations
Other Sources of Information
organizational chart and related material
related memorandum
Consent
Informed Consent Form
Departmental Executive Officer
each subordinate
Investigator
Primary Researcher

Data Collection:
Instruments
General Demographic Data
Leadership Practices Inventory (self or observer)
Related Documentation
Organizational Chart
number of individuals reporting to Departmental Executive Officer
number of levels present
Memorandum
ratio of internal vs. external memorandum sent
total number of activities
total number of activities
examples of follow-up reporting of activities
examples of recognition or reward
Observation
Issues
accessibility to subordinates
involvement of subordinates
public sharing of information

Interview
Departmental Executive Officer
Leader Questions
Subordinates
Observer Questions

Case Study Report
Raw Material Included
Forms
consent
Instruments
demographic data
Leadership Practices Inventory instrument
Documentation
whatever given
Observation
investigator notes
Interview
investigator notes

Analysis
Individual Case Study
descriptive
demographic data
embedded unit analysis
relational
demographic and embedded unit
qualitative
leader
subordinate
explanation building
Multiple Case Study
descriptive
demographic data summary
embedded unit summary
qualitative
analytical pattern building
APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Informed Consent Form

Title: An Exploration of the Leadership Practice "Enabling Others to Act": A Case Study

Purpose: This study is designed to explore the possible reasons for a significant difference that has been commonly found between the responses of "Self" and "Other" when responding to Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act".

Design: A multiple case with embedded unit analysis case study will be used. Three sites have been selected for use with one serving as a pilot study. All data will be reported anonymously.

Risk or Discomfort: If you select to participate in this study you will be asked to attend an informational orientation, complete two survey instruments, a demographic instrument and Kouzes and Posner's LPI instrument, and participate individually in an interview. The investigator will also conduct a general observation of the department and ask to view any relevant documentation concerning the leadership practices of the executive officer. The interview will be informal in nature consisting of the asking of several open ended questions. The investigator may ask follow-up questions to better clarify your answer. The participant may terminate the interview at any time, refuse to answer any or all questions, and will only be asked to reveal documentation of their choosing. Actual individual involvement should be less than one hour including orientation, completion of the surveys, and individual interview. It will be slightly longer for the executive officer.

Benefits: It is hoped that information collected during this study will identify some possible reasons for the significant difference that is commonly found using the LPI between "self" and "other" in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act". These possible reasons would then be available for future research and hopefully lead to the discovery of better methods to "enable others to act".

Confidentiality: All data collected will be coded using a site and respondent code. Interviews will not be recorded and transcribed, only investigator notes with identification codes will be available for analysis. All data, findings and analysis will be reported anonymously. Demographic data will only be reported after pooling with all sites. It is not the purpose of this study to evaluate any executive office and their department, only to explore possible reasons for discrepancies between "self" and "other" responses to the LPI in the leadership practice of "enabling others to act".

I have attended the orientation, had the opportunity to ask questions of the investigator, and read the above statements. I voluntarily agree to participate in this exploratory case study.

Name: ___________________________ Date: _______________
APPENDIX J

INTRODUCTORY MEETING OUTLINE
Introductory Meeting

- **Welcome**
  1. Glad to be here
  2. Excited about study
  3. Thank DEO and other faculty and staff
  4. Who am I

- **What am I here for**
  1. study Leadership
  2. Kouzes and Posner's work
  3. Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)
  4. differences between self and observer
  5. methodology exploratory Multiple Case with Embedded Units Case Study

- **Procedure**
  1. this meeting
  2. survey instruments
     a. Leader, code name
     b. Observer, I will code when I pick them up
  3. interviews
     a. types of questions, open ended with follow up
     b. recording, my notes only
     c. you can decide not to answer any questions and end at any time
  4. documentation
     a. anything you feel is appropriate and will not breach confidentiality
  5. observation
     a. looking for how things occur within department

- **After I leave**
  1. analysis
     a. quantitative, survey instruments
     b. qualitative, my notes
  2. Confidentiality
     a. all anonymous
     b. no mention of names, department, or university
     c. informed consent form
     d. voluntary

- **Answer any questions**
  1. do not mention the leadership practice of "enabling others to act"

- **Pass out instruments**
  1. LPI
  2. demographic data
  3. informed consent form
Leader Questions

• What was the greatest departmental accomplishment during your administration?

• What was your role within this accomplishment?
  1. What did you do?
  2. How did you feel?
  3. How did others feel?

• What is your function as a Departmental Executive Officer?

• How much control do you have over the department?

Documentation
  1. organizational chart
  2. policies and procedures
  3. letters of assignment
  4. letters of recognition

Don’t forget to pick up instruments!
APPENDIX L

OBSERVER QUESTIONS
Observer Questions

• What was the greatest departmental accomplishment during this departmental executive officers administration?

• Who played the key roles during this accomplishment?
  1. leader's role
  2. observer's role

• What was your greatest individual accomplishment during this departmental executive officers administration?
  1. What did you do?
  2. What did others do?
  3. How did you feel?

• What is the function of the departmental executive officer?

• How do you decide what you do?

Documentation Ideas
  1. letters of assignment
  2. letters of recognition

Don't forget to pick up instruments!