

2007

Leadership, Communication and Religiosity in Higher Education Administration: Distinctions That Make a Difference

G. L. Forward

Kathleen Czech

Patrick Allen

George Fox University, patrickallenauthor@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/soe_faculty



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Published in *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, March 2007, 30(1) <http://www.relcomm.org/journal-of-communication-and-religion.html>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - School of Education by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

Leadership, Communication and Religiosity in Higher Education Administration: Distinctions That Make a Difference

G.L. Forward, Kathleen Czech, Patrick Allen

This project investigated the communicative and religious components of transformational leadership and job satisfaction in the context of higher education. Specifically, 224 CAO members of the Council of Independent Colleges completed a survey assessing their own leadership style, communication behavior, and religiosity. A stepwise multiple regression procedure revealed seven significant predictors of transformational leadership. The most important variables included attentiveness, openness, role negotiation, and intrinsic religious orientation. Additionally, a t-test compared a subset of CAOs from institutions affiliated with the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities with CAOs in non-affiliated institutions. Results revealed statistically significant differences in attentiveness, information support, exercise of transformational leadership, and religious identity, practice, and orientation. Lastly, a second stepwise regression procedure revealed five significant predictors of CAO job satisfaction including availability of emotional support, level of commitment to the job, and amount of religious activity. The paper concludes with a discussion of implications for conducting higher education administration in ways that best reflect religious ideals. Keywords: Leadership, transformational leadership, organizational communication, higher education administration, religiosity

Colleges and universities are an integral and influential part of modern society and essential to satisfying many individual aspirations. Nonetheless, the study of management in these contexts has been relatively neglected

(Mech, 1997). Academic leaders specifically find themselves in a unique position with a leadership role that has no clear parallel in business or industry. According to Gmelch (2000), academic leaders may occupy the least studied and most misunderstood management position anywhere in America. Due to this gap in the literature, leadership in higher education is often predicated on inappropriate models gleaned from other organizational contexts (Plas & Lewis, 2001). This is a troubling trend given the pervasive belief that leadership is the single most critical component of organizational success (Birnbaum, 1992).

Additionally, as Ackerman and Maslin-Ostrowski (2002, p. 5) note, it is widely agreed that schools in the US “are facing a dearth of leaders capable of providing good leadership.” Many of the talents administrators need to lead effectively, especially interpersonal communication skills, are not those cultivated while teaching and conducting research (Hickson & Stacks, 1992). In fact, a preponderance of administrators assumes their assignment within the educational hierarchy with little or no formal preparation for the roles they are expected to fulfill (Bedian, 2002; Educational Management Network, 2001). Although research consistently demonstrates a link between communication competency and effective leadership, neophyte administrators routinely report skill deficiencies in these areas (Townsend & Bassoppo-Mayo, 1996).

Gmelch (2000) has called for a radical change in our approach to leadership development in higher education. Fortunately, disillusionment with traditional leadership models has led to a new wave of leadership studies in both for-profit and non-profit contexts (Buzzanell, Ellington, Silvio, Pasch, Dale, Mauro, Smith, Weir, & Martin, 1997). The realization that leadership in academe must be practiced in a troubled, complex, and crisis-ridden environment makes this an especially fruitful context for the study of transformational leadership (Hill, 1999). Transformational leadership is inherently communicative in nature, is distinguishable by its “spiritual” dimension, and is predicated on morally-grounded leader-member relationships resulting in shared goals and values (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996).

Therefore, this paper contributes to the theoretical and empirical literature specifically by exploring the contribution of particular communication behaviors (Hackman & Johnson, 2000) and religious (moral) dimensions (Corvig, 2000) of CAO leadership in higher education administration. Further, given the chaotic nature of the CAO role and the reality of rapid turn-over in this position, we explore the impact that communication, religiosity (morality), and leadership style has on CAO job satisfaction. Lastly, since leadership in state-sponsored institutions must also reflect the priorities and constraints of government mandates, we have limited our sample frame to CAOs who serve in private, independent colleges and universities in the U. S. We hope that these findings will help private educational administrators at the CAO level to enhance their leadership effectiveness, vocational satisfaction, and longevity in the position in ways that benefit everyone in the organization.

Literature Review

Academic Leadership in America

The role of the CAO. The position of the chief academic officer (CAO) is especially challenging and deserving of attention. The scope of the CAO's position is often wider and more complex than that of the university president (Bright & Richards, 2001). As a result, Mech (1997, p.113) argues, "on many campuses, the CAO has as great-or even greater- effect on the campus than does the president." CAOs, more than any other leader, link the central administration with academic departments and become the crucial backbone of university decision-making (Wolverton, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 1999). Every CAO must be prepared to deal with a bewildering variety of developing relationships, priorities, and problems. According to Bright and Richards (2001, p. 233), the CAO is "invoked as the cause and explanation of unpopular campus policies, as the reason for a failed promotion, and for other sources of discontent. In short, the provost is like a dean but even more remote and terrible." A role of this scope and imagery requires a leadership style that will ultimately

cultivate these working relationships and motivate and maintain continued development of faculty and staff (Mech, 1997).

CAO job satisfaction. Although the position of CAO is indispensable, those who occupy the position certainly are not, as evidenced by the “revolving door” often associated with this office (Wolverton, 1984). Research indicates that CAOs frequently feel caught between the expectations of individual faculty, college departments, and those of the central administration and Board of Trustees (Bogue, 1994). The resulting pressures on the CAO often result in high job stress, role ambiguity, incongruent expectations, and low levels of commitment resulting in frequent job turnover.

CAOs frequently report low job satisfaction and leave administration to return to the classroom. At present, the average CAO serves less than six years in their administrative post (Gmelch, 2000). Therefore, we contend that an in-depth examination of the CAO role may help clarify those communication behaviors and religious (moral) factors that contribute to CAO job satisfaction and aid administrators in experiencing a longer and more effective leadership career.

Leadership Paradigms in Higher Education Administration

Traditional leadership models. This leadership dilemma stems from both the changing nature of the CAO role as well as the leadership models higher education has embraced for a number of years. According to Tucker and Bryan (1991), there was little to manage in higher education prior to World War II. However, following the war and through the late sixties, higher education in the U.S. experienced an unprecedented era of expansion resulting in too much to manage with a concomitant lack of administrative focus or direction. At present, the leadership task in colleges and universities is characterized by changing expectations, dual control systems, conflict between professional and administrative authority, unclear and/or incongruent goals, and the expectations of other professional organizations to which faculty belong (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989).

Traditionally, this administrative challenge has been addressed by exercising greater hierarchical control either through autocratic

authority or reliance on bureaucratic structures. In a study by Lees, Smith, and Stockhouse (1994, p.12), higher education administrators most often defined leadership as “a one way approach whose purpose was getting others within the organization to conform to or comply with the leader’s directives by using various sources of social power.” In the extreme, autocratic leaders emphasize hierarchy, centralized decision-making, and control over others even when manipulation, threats, and coercion are the means utilized to establish and maintain this dominance (Forward, 2001). As a result, autocratic leaders tend to generate passive, and sometimes even active, opposition to their leadership as a means of resisting control (Bedian, 2002). Although it may be unfair to the Italian prince after whom it has been named, leadership that emphasizes control by means of manipulation and coercion has come to be widely known as Machiavellianism (Girodo, 1998) and that is the sense in which we employ it in this paper.

In addition, many institutions seem to develop a bureaucratic style of leadership in an effort to establish “strict boundaries” and keep things “neat and tidy” (Ackerman & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2002, p. 5). Almost by default, notes Birnbaum (1992), colleges and universities migrated toward a bureaucratic style of leadership and now are among the most bureaucratically entrenched organizations in the country. Individual leaders who employ a bureaucratic framework emphasize setting priorities, making orderly decisions, and communicating through established lines of authority. The bureaucratic leader can control certain aspects of the institution through stringently enforced policies and procedures, but this style of leadership tends not to motivate faculty and the staff who must approve, or at least implement, new programs and other changes if they are to be successful (Wolverton, 1984). Until the leadership paradigm of universities addresses the inherent limitations of both autocracy and bureaucracy, CAOs will be placed in the position of needing to create change in an environment with little motivation or commitment to do so (Montez & Wolverton, 2000).

Transformational leadership. Radical changes need to occur in higher education administration that will fundamentally

alter our understanding of the CAO role and transform the shared governance model in use since the end of World War II (Munitz, 1995). Not only does communication and religiosity impact CAO job satisfaction, but a new model that recasts the relational paradigm on which ideas of leadership are predicated, is urgently needed as well (Forward, 2001). Over the past several years, much attention has been given to the construct of transformational leadership as one such re-conceptualization (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998). While leadership is undeniably complex, contemporary explications of the concept have increasingly suggested that it is a communication phenomenon with a moral, spiritual, or religious dimension (Corvig, 2000; Forward, 2001; Hodgson, 1994; Moxley, 2000; Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2002; Russell, 2001; Sass, 2000). In particular, the notion of transformational leadership is viewed as a two-way interpersonal relationship centered on this moral dimension.

Burns (1978) characterizes transformational leadership as a process that motivates group members by appealing to higher ideals and moral values. This type of leadership seeks to raise levels of consciousness about the importance of specified and idealized goals and adds a dimension of spirituality to leadership by asking organization members to respond to a correspondingly higher level of moral and ethical conduct (Covrig 2000; Northouse, 2001). Likewise, Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) also suggest that moral leadership has a spiritual quality to it that not only communicates a central vision but also alters group members' innermost values and goals. This attention to values, goals, and higher-level human needs ultimately makes leadership a moral activity argues Hodgson (1994). As such, administrators have a responsibility to be personally moral in their actions and also to be a "cause of civic moral education," which leads to both self-knowledge and community awareness.

While many administrators, especially novice CAOs, do not utilize a transformational style of leadership, the challenge to be change agents for their institutions and take the initiative in planning and implementing change is paramount for most CAOs (Hilosky & Watwood, 1997). Transformational leadership

especially emphasizes motivating others to support leader-intended change and focus on values and goals. Firth-Cozens and Mowbray (2001) argue that transformational leaders are more likely to be entrepreneurial, willing to take risks, and informal in their relationships with others. Brown and Moshavi (2002) further find that those who work for a transformational leader are more effective, are willing to expend extra effort, and are more satisfied in their jobs. This would suggest that in order to be an effective CAO, a transformational style of leadership has much to commend it. Therefore we will ask respondents to evaluate the degree to which they exhibit three types of leadership behaviors labeled as Machiavellian, Bureaucratic, and Transformational (Girodo, 1998), and explore the communicative and religious (moral) dimensions of these leadership types.

Communication in Higher Education Administration

In order to lead, inspire, and motivate the constituents of any organization, competent communication is essential. According to Zorn and Violanti (1996) communication is central to organizational functioning and to the daily goals of individuals in the organization. A major part of the CAO's role is establishing meaningful relationships and a major part of that task involves effective communication which contributes both to job satisfaction and leadership (Hickson & Stacks, 1992). When viewing leadership as an influential relationship, a communication-based perspective becomes paramount. Hackman and Johnson (2000) define leadership as human communication that modifies the attitudes and behaviors of others in order to meet shared group goals and needs. Leadership styles inherently display a distinct set of communication behaviors.

Research shows that many CAOs desire to become more competent communicators. In a study by Townsend and Bassoppo-Mayo (1996), almost half of the respondents expressed a desire for greater communication competence. The need for training in the traditional communication skills of listening, speaking and writing, as well as the ability to mediate and resolve conflicts, were frequently mentioned. If administrators can combine a multitude

of communication competencies with a transformational leadership style that inspires and elevates faculty and staff to higher levels of innovation, critical thinking, and morality, the revolution that higher education is calling for may begin. Therefore, in this study we include several measures of communicator style, social support, and role negotiation in an effort to foreground “how” CAOs are doing their job and how communication contributes to job satisfaction and leadership behavior.

The Council of Independent Colleges, the CCCU and Religiosity

There is a long history of both public and private education in the United States. At present, the Department of Education estimates that there are about 4,000 institutions of higher learning in the U.S. Approximately 40% (1,600) of that number are private, independent colleges and universities (CCCU Advance, 2003). Many of these private schools have a religious connection, history, denominational affiliation and/or a spiritual component to their mission. All of the respondents in our study are CAOs in private institutions belonging to the Council of Independent Colleges. However, a sizable subgroup in our sample serves in religiously oriented universities and belongs to both the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) and the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Both the CIC and CCCU are national service organizations that aid private, independent colleges and universities in pursuit of their educational, administrative, and financial goals (Splete & Garth, 1997). They are similar, in that each provides a wide array of programs, services, collaborative projects, seminars, and workshops to help their constituencies function more successfully in our current educational environment. Additionally, we found no statistically significant demographic differences between the memberships of the two groups included in this sample suggesting they are heterogeneous collections of educators in private institutions.

However, the CCCU differs from the CIC in at least one important aspect. The CCCU exists to serve the religious and moral vision of a subset of private institutions that describe

themselves as intentionally “Christ-centered” (CCCU Advance, 2003). The CCCU’s mission is to help institutions transform lives by faithfully relating scholarship and service to biblical truth (CCCU Advance, 2003). As of this writing there are 105 member schools in North America.

CCCU administrators claim that their schools concentrate on starting the relationships that are critical for graduates and faculty to succeed in today’s organizational world. Since leadership is founded upon relationships, Hodgson (1994) argues, organizations are a unique portrayal of the resulting social reality. What the organization stands for and whom it attracts are all central in crafting an explanation of how its administrators are moral in their leadership. Moral leadership in administration depends on the nature, history, and current structure of the organization as it is reflected in organizational culture and expectations (Covrig, 2000).

Since CCCU schools are committed to Christian values and the United States is one of the most religious countries in the Western world (Gallup, 2000), it is natural to focus attention on the leader’s religious values and practices. As Aiken (2002) notes, American religiosity is expressed not only in professed beliefs but also in personal behavior and how we treat others. CAO religiosity should influence the way a leader interacts with others, processes decisions, exercises leadership, and comes to be viewed as successful and moral or not. As a result, we will specifically include an investigation of personal religious beliefs, practices, and motivations of our CAO respondents.

Summary

The CAO in every institution of higher education must lead, administer, and manage the people and ideas that are the life-blood of the institution. The CAO’s leadership style, evidenced in their communicative behavior and religiosity, can drastically influence the interpersonal relationships on which the CAO depends, as well as the over-all relational climate of the institution. To gain more insight into the unique dynamics of the CAO role, this study looked at self-reports of communication

and religiosity as they relate to academic leadership and how all three of these factors ultimately impact CAO job satisfaction. The following research questions are posed to better understand the complexities of these dynamics as they influence higher education administration.

Research Questions

RQ 1: What communication, religious, or demographic variables contribute to self-reported CAO use of transformational leadership?

RQ2: How do CAOs from CCCU-affiliated institutions differ from their non-affiliated peers in communication, religiosity and leadership?

RQ3: What communication, religious, or demographic variables contribute to self-reported CAO job satisfaction?

Method

Research Participants

The subjects in this study (N = 225) ranged in age from 31 to 76 years with a mean age of 54 (SD = 8.7). Sixty-two percent (n = 139) were male and 38 % (n = 85) were female. The sample was predominately white (90.2 %, n = 202) but included 14 (6.3 %) individuals who identified themselves as Black/African-American. Many of the CAOs were relative neophytes. Examination of the descriptive statistics revealed that a majority of the respondents (73.5 %, n = 165) had been in their present assignment for five years or less. The entire sample had a mean tenure in their present assignment of 4.8 years (SD = 5.5, Median = 3.0) with an average of 15 years teaching experience (SD = 8.3) prior to moving into an administrative post.

A plurality of respondents (42.2 %, n = 95) serve as Chief Academic Officer in institutions that enroll between one to two thousand students. Only 14 (6.3 %) work in institutions that enroll five thousand or more students whereas 51 (22.7 %) serve schools that enroll fewer than one thousand students.

Most survey respondents taught full-time prior to assuming administrative responsibilities. They listed more than 50 academic specialties that cluster broadly into 19 disciplinary domains (see Table 1). However, five academic disciplines including Literature, Education, History, Psychology, and Chemistry/Biology, account for over half of the sample (55 % $n = 123$).

Research Procedures

The sample frame for this project was established by securing a membership directory from the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) headquartered in Washington, D.C. The CIC is a professional organization comprised of educators in private, four-year colleges and universities in the U.S. One of the authors of this paper is a member of the organization and typically attends their annual meeting. The membership directory contained the names and addresses of 479 CAOs. Thirty individuals were selected for a pilot test of the survey designed to investigate CAO conceptualizations of leadership, communication style, religiosity, and job satisfaction. Twenty-two of the 30 pilot test surveys were returned and the data analyzed using the SPSS statistical package. We then modified the survey instrument on the basis of those results.

We then put together a survey packet consisting of a cover letter, survey, SASE, and separate response card so that names could be removed from the mailing list in preparation for a second mailing to non-respondents. The mailing list was prepared by removing the names of the 30 CAOs included in the pilot test, as well as removing the CIC member co-author and two others who had vacated their positions since publication of the directory. This resulted in an initial mailing sent to the 446 remaining names. One-hundred-eighty surveys were returned (40.4 %) following this first mailing. An identical second packet was sent to those remaining on the list approximately five weeks later. This mailing generated an additional 46 (10.3 %) surveys for an accepting sample of 50.7 % ($N = 226$ with 1 unusable survey). This is an appropriate response rate for survey research in general and is especially robust given the top management tier of a university CAO (Baruch, 1999).

Instrumentation

Respondents completed a four-page survey measuring leadership, communication style, religious activity, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction, as well as personal and institutional demographic markers. Since all of the variables except demographics were continuous, the survey consisted primarily of Likert-type questions using a 7-point metric scaled from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). These questions were designed to measure the amount or extent of a particular behavior or attitude all of which exist on a continuum (e.g., persons with higher scores on openness, intrinsic religious motivation, and job satisfaction are indicating a higher level of these behaviors and attitudes than those persons with lower scores on these variables). Table 2 contains descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha for each of these continuous variables.

The dimensionality of each scale was assessed using confirmatory factor analysis on each multi-item instrument (Kim & Mueller, 1978). Questions in each scale were retained only when the item achieved a factor loading greater than .50 and only when the resulting scale was unidimensional (Hair, Jr., Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1992). In addition, all scales were evaluated as to face validity and internal consistency using Cronbach alphas. This procedure estimates reliability on the basis of average correlations between items within each scale instrument. According to Nunnally (1978), an alpha of .6 should be considered sufficient in social science research. All of the scales utilized for this project achieved reliability coefficients of .6 or better except one. However, with appropriate caution, that one item was retained due to the exploratory nature of the research.

The correlation matrix is presented in Table 3. Monge (1980) suggests examining the intercorrelations between all of the predictor variables to assess the possibility of multicollinearity. Since all of the intercorrelations are less than the .70 standard suggested by Monge (1980, p. 52), with most significantly less so, we conclude that artificially inflating the relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable is not an issue here.

Leadership. Leadership was conceptualized as consisting of three leadership styles labeled Machiavellian, Bureaucratic, and Transformational (Girodo, 1998). These styles are defined primarily in terms of interpersonal orientation toward others in the use of influence and power (Hitt, 1990). A high score on Machiavellianism suggests a willingness to use coercion or manipulation in pursuit of a desired end. A high Bureaucratic score suggests a focus on officially mandated policies and procedures and the subsequent enforcement of administrative rules. Lastly, we measured the Transformational style of leadership. A high Transformational score denotes leaders who engage others in ways that are supportive, engender mutual accountability, and lead to individual growth (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Additionally, as conceptualized by Burns (1978) and further developed by Bass (1985), there is a moral dimension at the core of this leadership type that results in high levels of perceived leader integrity. These three leadership styles were measured using the instrument developed by Girodo (1998) in his study of police managers.

Communication. We assessed a number of communication and communication-related behaviors using self-report measures of communicator style, social support, and role negotiation. Various aspects of Communicator Style were measured using Norton's (1983) instrument. Norton (1983) defines communicator style as the way we utilize verbal and paraverbal cues to signal how message content should be interpreted. This scale has been used in a large number of research projects involving communication and personality in both interpersonal and organizational contexts (McCroskey, Daly, Martin, & Beatty, 1998). In addition, a number of researchers have selected pertinent subscales for specific purposes and ignored others that were not germane to the study (Rice, Chang, & Tourbin, 1992). We have followed that procedure here by focusing on attentiveness, openness, dominance, and contentiousness by using items from these four sub-scales of Norton's (1983) instrument. However, a low Cronbach's alpha for the contentiousness subscale prompted us to closely examine the factor analysis of the four items in-

cluded in this measure. Contrary to Norton's (1983) research, this resulted in a two-factor solution. We have labeled the first factor "argumentativeness" because it indicated a desire to debate or defend a point of view. The second factor retained the label "contentiousness" because the questions focus on challenging others in a more negative, abrasive fashion.

Two communicative aspects of social support were also deemed relevant to this research. The first, information support, involves providing an organization member with relevant information necessary to effectively perform a given job and reduce role uncertainty (Forward, 1999). Emotional support, on the other hand, involves the affective dimension of a relationship and results in the belief that one is valued, loved, or esteemed (Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990). Both information support and emotional support were measured using six items from Edward's (1980) work support instrument.

The last communication behavior included here involves role negotiation. Role negotiation involves interaction between organization members intended to modify expectations about how a role should be enacted and evaluated (Miller, Johnson, Hart, & Peterson, 1999). This communication activity was measured using the five-item Role Orientation Scale (Jones, 1986). Low scores on this scale indicate a custodial approach to a role in which little communication is targeted toward changing the assigned purpose, mission, or procedures conventionally associated with a given position. Higher scores on this variable indicate a willingness to intentionally engage others in a conscious effort to modify the parameters and expectations associated with one's job.

Religiosity. Religion in the United States continues to exert a powerful influence on personal beliefs, behaviors, and social interaction (Aiken, 2002). This is relevant because an emerging line of theory and research suggests there may be a "spiritual dimension" to leadership (Judge, 1999). This spiritual dimension necessitates awareness of one's inner being and the effects it has on self-perception and attitudes toward others (Moxley, 2000). This spiritual dimension of CAO thought and behavior was measured in two ways. First, respondents answered a series

of questions designed to assess how religiously oriented they consider themselves to be, how close to God they feel, and how often they engage in religious practices. Judge (1999) utilized these same questions in his leadership study involving CEOs and the development of executive character.

In addition, religious motivation was measured using an instrument originally developed by Allport and Ross (1967) and modified by Gorsuch and McPherson (1989). This self-report instrument measures the degree to which one's motivation to be involved in religious activities is intrinsic or extrinsic and has been used successfully with a number of different types of samples (Baumbach, Forward, & Hart, 2006; Judge, 1999). Extrinsically motivated individuals seek some personal material benefit or social gain from their religious activities. Intrinsically motivated persons seek inner meaning and connection to a higher power that provides an overall framework for life.

Vocational Outcomes. Organizational commitment is conceptualized as the intention to continue in one's present role. This construct was included because of its relevance to turnover and as a possible predictor of job satisfaction. It was measured by the instrument constructed by Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979). Job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable that reflects one's affective response to an organizational role. This variable was measured using Spector's (1997) job satisfaction scale.

Demographics. The final section of the survey collected data about the respondents (e.g., age, sex, ethnicity), their personal history (e.g., discipline, teaching history, tenure as CAO), and institution (e.g., student enrollment, membership in Council of Christian Colleges & Universities).

Results

Transformational Leadership

The first research question used a stepwise multiple regression procedure to identify those dynamics and attributes that contribute to the self-reported exercise of transformational leadership in an academic context. Multiple regression is one of

the most widely used and versatile statistical techniques in communication research (Hayes, 2005). Although other statistical methods can sometimes be employed in associational research, multiple regression is the most commonly used procedure to explore the predictive value of several independent variables on a single dependent variable, as we are doing here (Morgan, Gliner, & Harmon, 2006). In addition, the use of the stepwise method is consistent with the exploratory nature of this study and is especially useful for model building (Morgan et al., 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

Therefore, this question was addressed by computing a stepwise regression equation with transformational leadership as the dependent variable and communication behaviors, religious motivation and activity, and demographic variables in the predictor set. Seven statistically significant predictors entered the equation (see Table 4) with the communication-related variables of attentiveness, openness, and role negotiation among the most important. The equation resulted in adjusted $R^2 = .18$, $F(7,217) = 7.79$, $p < .001$.

CCCU Affiliation

The second research question sought to explore the differences between CAOs from CCCU-affiliated institutions with those from non-affiliated schools. Table 5 contains the results of a t-test using affiliation status as the grouping variable. Results of Levene's (1960) test of homogeneity of variances shows that equal variances can be assumed for all of the variables except strength of religious identity and frequency of religious practices. In each case, statistical significance was determined by perusal of the appropriate line on the SPSS output.

Examination of the t-test results reveals that many of the statistically significant differences are modest ones. Nonetheless, CCCU-affiliated CAOs report somewhat higher scores on attentiveness, availability of information support, importance of religious identity, frequency of religious practices, closeness to God, intrinsic religious motivation, as well as greater self-reported use of transformational leadership behaviors. CCCU-

affiliated CAOs report a lower score only on “number of years teaching” prior to assuming their administrative assignment.

Job Satisfaction

This final research question sought to explore the impact of specific communication attributes, religious orientation, commitment, and various demographic markers on CAO job satisfaction. Again, due to the exploratory nature of this question, it was also addressed using a stepwise multiple regression procedure with job satisfaction as the dependent variable (Table 6). Five variables entered the equation at $p \leq .05$. Examination of the beta weights reveals a meaningful relationship between all five variables and CAO levels of job satisfaction. The overall model explained 47 % of the variance in job satisfaction scores with emotional support and commitment being the most powerful predictors, adjusted $R^2 = .47$, $F(5,179) = 33.15$, $p < .001$.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to specifically explore communicative and religious dimensions of CAO leadership and job satisfaction. We found that transformational leadership was predicted by the communicative processes of attentiveness, openness, negotiation, avoidance of argumentativeness, as well as by intrinsic religious motivation. Job satisfaction was predicted by commitment, emotional and social support, and amount of religious activity. These findings hint at a complex social dynamic involving the interplay of communication behaviors, social support, religious practices and motivation, and organizational context and identity. The particular contributions of communication and religiosity to CAO leadership and job satisfaction are discussed in more detail below.

Transformational Leadership

In this paper we have conceptualized transformational leadership as an especially appropriate paradigm for university governance. As Tucker and Bryan (1991, p. 3) note, universities and businesses are very dissimilar and leadership practices “cannot be applied to

both in the same way.” Indeed, a growing body of research over the last several years suggests that traditional leadership models are almost always inappropriate for the nonprofit sector (Plas & Lewis, 2001). In addition, as Brown and Moshavi (2002) conclude, organizational members are more satisfied when supervised by managers who exhibit transformational leadership behaviors.

Scholars have defined transformational leadership as a communication phenomenon with perceptual, moral, and performance dimensions (Bogue, 1994). Hackman and Johnson (2000) note that leadership is a special form of communication grounded in the human ability to manipulate symbols and negotiate a shared reality focused on collaborative outcomes. Hill (1999, p. 214) concurs in stating his “strong belief that leadership is primarily a set of communication behaviors.”

This research reveals four communication behaviors that impact the self-reported use of transformational leadership by CEOs. Attentiveness, openness, and role negotiation all make a slight but positive contribution to transformational leadership. On the contrary, higher scores on transformational leadership indicate lower scores on argumentativeness. Norton (1983) defines attentiveness as an interpersonal dynamic akin to empathy. He notes the “the attentive communicator makes sure that the other person knows he or she is being listened to” (Norton, 1983, p. 70). Closely related to this is the notion of openness, which includes communicative behavior characterized by a friendly, convivial, often outspoken and extroverted interpersonal style (Norton, 1983). Openness allows organization members to gain information, try out ideas without fear of reprimand, and increase efficiency and performance (Miller, Johnson, Hart, & Peterson, 1999).

Finally, role negotiation consists of intentional interaction for the purpose of modifying expectations about how a role should be fulfilled and evaluated (Miller, Johnson, Hart, & Peterson, 1999). However, since there is an inverse relationship between transformational leadership and argumentativeness, CEO willingness to engage in role negotiation does not seem to carry the negative connotations often associated with argumentativeness in interpersonal relationships. Since the

intended consequences of transformational leadership are follower development and enhanced performance, each of these communication behaviors should result in an increased ability of organization members to think on their own, develop new ideas, and question outmoded operating procedures (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002).

There has been an explosion of interest since the late 1980's on spirituality and religion in the workplace (Nadesan, 1999). Sass (2000) states that the relationship between leadership and religiosity deserves empirical exploration. Increasingly, leadership theorists and researchers are discovering support for the notion that there is a moral (spiritual) dimension to transformational leadership (Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2002). This focus on the internal landscape of leadership comes with the realization that a leader's personal values have important effects on leader-member relationships (Bogue, 1994; Russell, 2001). Specifically, this research reveals that intrinsic religious motivation contributes to the self-reported use of transformational leadership. On the contrary, those individuals motivated by personal gain through religious pursuits are less likely to engage in transformational leadership behavior. Intrinsic religious motivation thrives on philosophical reflection and introspection, thus enhancing those qualities that putatively contribute to the exercise of transformational leadership. As a result, observes Judge (1999), religiously intrinsic leaders may be more skilled in analyzing their relationships and interpersonal communication and the effect it has on others.

Lastly, it is worth noting that female CEOs are somewhat more likely than males to report the use of transformational leadership behavior. This finding is consistent with Careless (1998) who also found that female managers were rated as more transformational than their male counterparts by a mixed-sex group of managerial peers. Additionally, a significant body of research has found that transformational leadership, in general, is more congruent with stereotypically feminine approaches to corporate life and relationships (Buzzanell, et al., 1997). Women in leadership roles have often been judged to be more

relationally oriented than their male peers. This greater female emphasis on affiliation is especially evident in communication behaviors (Careless, 1998). Mulac, Seibold, and Farris (2000) found that women were perceived as being more personable and approachable, gave more positive feedback to others, more readily expressed interpersonal concern, and were more likely to invite other group members to participate in decision making activities. All of these behaviors would likely cause one to be perceived as more transformational in leadership.

CCCU Affiliation

The second research question sought to explore the contribution of communication and religiosity to CAO leadership by comparing those who serve in CCCU institutions with those who lead the academic program in nonaffiliated universities. Analysis of the data reveals statistically significant differences in all of the measures of religiosity including strength of religious identity, frequency of religious practices, closeness to God, and intrinsic religious motivation. These results are expected given the historical connection between organized religion in the US and private, church-related institutions of higher education. Selection procedures and hiring policies in most CCCU institutions tend to guarantee a high level of congruence between the religious identity and mission of the university and those who serve in leadership roles. As Russell (2001) notes, the shared values of organization members are encapsulated in the corporate culture. In many ways, CAOs in CCCU institutions are charged with representing, protecting, and promulgating the university's religious identity and culture.

A more tantalizing suggestion in the data is the finding that CCCU affiliated CAOs are more attentive, experience greater information support, and are slightly more likely to exhibit transformational leadership behaviors than their non-affiliated peers. Bedeian (2002) has observed that educational administrators often develop a sense of superiority that makes it difficult for faculty to communicate with them. However, the central concept in the literature on religiosity in organizations is the notion of

“connectedness” (Sass, 2000, p. 196). This connection includes an awareness of the inner self that is consistent with intrinsic religious motivation. In addition, it includes connection with and respect for others that is also consistent with transformational leadership. This research supports the idea that personal and organizational religious values can be aligned and that these values affect “moral reasoning, behavior, and leadership style” in the organization (Russell, 2001, p. 5).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is perhaps the most studied organizational outcome variable (Spector, 1997). It is an attitudinal construct that reflects a persons’ emotional reaction to their job and the expectations associated with it (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Again, this research investigated the communicative and religious components of CAO job satisfaction and found that emotional and information support, commitment, and frequency of religious activity have an important impact on satisfaction scores.

Allen (1995, p. 343) argues that people are “fundamentally concerned about whether or not their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being.” This appears to be true at every level in the organizational hierarchy and is certainly true for this sample of respondents. CAOs must attempt to balance the competing demands of multiple constituencies in an environment often mired in ponderous bureaucracy (Tucker & Bryan, 1991). In the midst of this reality, communication that reminds leaders that they are valued, esteemed, and cared for, and messages that reduce uncertainty about self, other, and relationships, are essential to feelings of satisfaction on the job (Forward, 2000). It is also possible that the use of transformational leadership makes it easier for CAOs to not only provide social support to others but, at the same time, be in a position to receive the informational, emotional, and tangible support inherent in these types of leader-follower relationships.

The organizational commitment variable merits mention here as well. The construct includes both affective and behavioral intentions to remain in a given organization (Meyer & Allen,

1997). Job satisfaction and commitment are obviously related ($r = .52$) but also partially unique in what they explain. Clearly, CAOs who are committed to their university report greater job satisfaction ($b = .31$) and, no doubt, CAOs who are satisfied are more committed.

Lastly, greater frequency of religious activity also contributes to greater job satisfaction ($b = .21$). As mentioned in the previous discussion concerning CCCU affiliated CAOs, this finding concerning religious activity may reflect greater congruence with espoused values and connectedness with organizational others. In addition, this finding may reflect the notion that religious activity contributes to a global sense of life satisfaction and better personal adjustment that is reflected on the job as well (Barna, 1994). As Aiken (2002) reports, religious activity helps people remain interested in the world and provides a sense of social and community integration. Finally, it may also be easier for those who serve in church-related institutions to see their religious activity as an expression of their understanding of vocation-as-calling. A conceptual frame such as this may contribute to over-all feelings of commitment and job satisfaction.

Limitations and Future Research

Some caution in interpreting these results is urged for the following reasons. First, this project relied on cross-sectional, self-report survey data. All the usual caveats about self-report data apply here although there is empirical support for the accuracy of self-perceptions concerning the kinds of skills and attitudes reported in this paper (Reinsch & Shelby, 1997). Nonetheless, we recognize that in-depth interviewing might supply a more nuanced understanding of behavior only hinted at here. We therefore encourage additional research exploring these phenomena using qualitative methods and procedures.

Secondly, due to the exploratory nature of this project, we decided to retain the variable "attentiveness" in spite of its low internal reliability estimate. It was a statistically significant predictor in both the t-test and stepwise regression procedures and may be evocative of an important interpersonal dynamic.

However, its low reliability requires that any conclusions involving this behavior remain highly tentative pending additional measurement and testing.

Finally, the differences in group means and variance explained by certain predictor variables were very modest. Again, conclusions involving those particular variables should be tentative and suggestive only. Future research utilizing these and other variables, and with a variety of populations, will continue to build the empirical literature base exploring the dynamic interplay of these human behaviors and motivations.

Conclusion

This project investigated the communicative and religious components of CAO job satisfaction and transformational leadership. This is important since so many CAOs are selected on the basis of skills and criteria that do not reflect the demands of their administrative role resulting in low satisfaction and rapid turnover (Bogue, 1994). Also, as Johnson (1999) concludes, a majority of employed adults work for someone with poor leadership skills. There is no reason to assume that academics are an exception to this generalization. As such, there are two practical implications that can be drawn from this research. First, communication matters for educational leaders and their followers. A brochure produced by the Educational Management Network (2002) concludes that the skills most essential for academic administrator success are effective interpersonal communication and team-building abilities. Effective communication facilitates both job satisfaction and transformational leadership thereby helping to create an organizational environment in which CAOs can receive needed emotional and information support and where followers are listened to and engaged in an active process of role negotiation.

Secondly, this research specifically suggests there is a link between effective leadership style and religiosity. Pascarella (1996, p. 9) has argued: "We need a spiritual foundation for working together to manage our technical capabilities and our human faults." Unfortunately, long emergent assumptions and

practices have accumulated to shape workplaces that often stifle the human spirit and discourage displays of our humanity and spirituality (Pascarella, 1996). Although we do not believe there is such a thing as “Christian leadership,” per se, we do believe that “Christians-in-leadership” should make a difference in the workplace. As Bogue (1994, p. xi) notes, “a few collegiate leaders would appear to suffer not only from a paucity of ideas but a poverty of ideals” including integrity, candor, stewardship, humility, and compassion. Our Christian commitment should provide a foundation for those ideals and should motivate us to communicate and lead in ways that honor God, respect our fellows, and facilitate personal growth and wholeness. This project makes a beginning contribution to the empirical database suggesting there is a link between communication, religiosity, and leadership.

G. L. Forward (Ph.D., The Ohio State University, 1995) is a Professor of Organizational Communication in the Department of Communication & Theatre at Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego, CA <GLForward@ptloma.edu>.

Kathleen Czech (Ed.D., University of San Diego, 2007) is an Associate Professor in the same department.

Patrick Allen (Ph.D., University of Oklahoma, 1985) is Chief Academic Officer and Vice President of Academic Affairs at Southern Nazarene University, Oklahoma City, OK. The authors wish to thank JCR editor John Pauley for moving the article to publication, former editor Helen Sterk who initiated the process, and the anonymous reviewers for their significant help in improving the manuscript.

An earlier version of this paper was “A Top Paper in Religious Communication” at the 2004 RCA Convention, Chicago, IL.

Table 1: *Academic Discipline of Origin for CAOs (n = 223)*

Academic Discipline	N	%
Humanities	90	40.4
Literature/English	39	17.5
History	20	9.0
Bible/Ethics/Philosophy	13	5.8
Music/Art/Photography	12	5.4
Languages	6	2.7

Academic Discipline	N	%
Professional Studies	53	23.7
Education/Administration/Curriculum	28	12.6
Business/Management/Operations	10	4.5
Nursing/Medical/Physiology	9	4.0
Physical Education	3	1.3
Food Nutrition	2	.9
Law	1	.4
Social Sciences	48	21.5
Psychology/Counseling	19	8.5
Political Science	14	6.3
Communication	9	4.0
Sociology	6	2.7
Natural Sciences	32	14.3
Chemistry/Biology	17	7.6
Mathematics	11	4.9
Physics/Engineering	2	.9
Geology/Geography	2	.9

Table 2: *Descriptive Statistics*

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Alpha
Communication			
Attentiveness	5.23	0.72	.51
Openness	3.92	1.11	.69
Dominance	3.62	0.99	.77
Contentiousness	4.03	1.10	.60
Argumentativeness	2.89	1.15	.62
Information Support	4.59	1.45	.89
Emotional Support	5.85	1.16	.93
Role Negotiation	4.53	1.15	.79
Religious Orientation			
Intrinsic Motivation	5.42	1.07	.71
Extrinsic (Personal)	3.47	1.20	.71
Extrinsic (Social)	1.99	1.00	.78
Leadership			
Machiavellianism	4.32	0.94	.61
Bureaucratic	3.14	1.04	.75
Transformational	5.77	0.65	.71
Outcomes			
Job Satisfaction	5.03	1.05	.76
Organizational Commitment	4.59	1.45	.87

Table 3: Correlation Matrix (N = 224)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Attentiveness															
Openness	.01														
Dominance	-.04	.41 ^b													
Contentious	.22 ^b	-.08	.10												
Argumentative	-.12	.16 ^a	.46 ^b	.25 ^b											
Information Support	.05	.15 ^a	.10	.01	-.04										
Emotional Support	-.03	.11	-.04	-.04	.08	.37 ^b									
Role Orientation	.14 ^a	.18 ^b	.19 ^b	.09	.16 ^a	.18 ^b	.12								
Religious Intrinsic	.06	.03	-.00	-.09	-.07	.09	.09	-.02							
Religious Social	-.06	.05	.07	-.05	.06	-.05	-.13	.03	-.10						
Religious Personal	-.06	-.01	.09	.01	-.13	.01	-.15 ^a	-.02	.18 ^a	.22 ^b					
Machiavellianism	.14 ^a	.11	.31 ^b	.15 ^a	.12	.08	-.06	.18 ^b	.05	.09	.06				
Bureaucratic	.10	-.07	.09	.31 ^b	.07	-.03	-.15 ^a	-.02	-.08	.23 ^b	.14	.09			
Transformational	.23 ^b	.24 ^b	.02	.03	-.06	.16 ^a	.09	.22 ^b	.11	-.07	-.16 ^a	.16 ^a	-.03		
Commitment	.08	-.01	-.09	-.04	-.15 ^a	.24 ^b	.46 ^b	.00	.13	-.17 ^a	.02	-.13	.02	.10	
Job Satisfaction	-.01	.15 ^a	.02	-.06	.02	.36 ^b	.57 ^b	.06	.16 ^a	-.09	-.12	.01	-.07	.07	.52 ^b

Notes. ^a correlation is significant at $p < .05$; ^b correlation is significant at $p < .01$.

Table 4: Stepwise Regression of Transformation Leadership (N = 224)

Variables	R ²	R ² cha	b	t
Attentiveness	.07	.07	.17	2.98 **
Openness	.12	.05	.12	3.26 **
Role Negotiation	.15	.03	.12	3.48 **
Argumentativeness	.16	.01	-.07	-2.13 *
Personal (Religious) Motivation	.17	.01	-.08	-2.42 *
Sex	.19	.01	-.16	-2.01 *
Intrinsic (Religious) Motivation	.20	.02	.08	2.01 +
(Constant)			4.06	

Note. Standard Error = .58; Adjusted R² = .18. +p = .052.

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Only statistically significant variables have been included in this table.

Table 5: t-Test Comparison of CCCU-Affiliated and Non-Affiliated CAOs

Variable	CCCU-Affiliated (n = 43)		Non-Affiliated (n = 181)		t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Attentiveness	5.44	0.73	5.18	0.71	2.12*
Information Support	4.92	1.25	4.52	1.49	1.66+
Religious Identity	4.79	0.51	4.09	1.01	6.41***
Religious Practices	3.74	0.58	3.21	0.97	4.72***
Closeness to God	4.28	1.05	3.71	1.28	2.71**
Intrinsic Motivation	5.93	0.89	5.27	1.07	3.62***
Transformational	5.98	0.51	5.72	0.66	2.48*
Teaching Tenure	12.88	8.05	15.59	8.23	-1.95+

Note. Only variables with statistically significant differences in means are included in this table. + p < .10. * p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Table 6: *Stepwise Regression of Job Satisfaction (N = 184)*

Variables	R ²	R ² cha	b	t
Emotional Support	.34	.34	.34	5.88 ***
Commitment	.44	.10	.31	4.95 ***
Religious Activity	.46	.02	.21	2.41 *
Information Support	.47	.01	.10	2.36 *
University Size	.48	.01	.13	1.95 *
(Constant)			-.32	

Note. Standard Error = .72 ; Adjusted R² = .47 . *p < .05.
 p < .01. *p < .001.

Only statistically significant variables are included in this table.

Works Cited

- Ackerman, R. H., & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2002). *The wounded leader: How real leadership emerges in times of crisis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Aiken, L. R. (2002). *Attitudes and related psychosocial constructs: Theories, assessment, and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Allen, M. W. (1995). Communication concepts related to perceived organizational support. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59, 326-346.
- Allport, G., & Ross, J. (1987). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.
- Barna, G. (1994). *Virtual America*. Ventura, CA: Regal.
- Baruch, Y. (1999). Response rate in academic studies: A comparative analysis. *Human Relations*, 52(4), 421-438.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Baumbach, K., Forward, G. L., & Hart, D. (2006). Communication and parental influence on late adolescent spirituality. *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, 29(2), 394-420.
- Bedeian, A. G. (2002). The Dean's disease: How the darker side of power manifests itself in the office of the Dean. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1(2), 164-173.

- Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bogue, E. G. (1994). *Leadership by design: Strengthening integrity in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bright, D.F., & Richards, M.P. (2001). *The academic deanship: Individual careers and institutional roles*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, F. W., & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 79-93.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Buzzanell, P., Ellington, L., Silvio, C., Pasch, V., Dale, B., Mauro, G., Smith, E., Weir, N., & Martin, C. (1997). Leadership processes in alternative organizations: Invitational and dramaturgical leadership. *Communication Studies*, 48, 285-310.
- Careless, S. A. (1998). Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Role*, 39(11/12), 887-901.
- Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. (2003). *The news and people of Christ-centered higher education*. [Brochure]. Washington, DC: Falck.
- Covrig, D.M. (2000). The organizational context of moral dilemmas: The role of moral leadership in administration in making and breaking dilemmas. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(1), 40-59.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (Eds.). (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington.
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744.
- Edwards, K. (1980). *The influence of management function and perceived environmental support on perceived stress and job satisfaction of black females in managerial and professional positions in industry*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.
- Educational Management Network. (2002). *Success factors for academic Deans* [Brochure]. Oak Brook, IL: Witt/Kieffer.
- Firth-Cozens, J., & Mowbray, D. (2001). Leadership and the quality of care. *Quality in Health Care*, 10, 113-117.

- Forward, G. L. (2001). Servant or CEO? A metaphor analysis of leadership in a nonprofit context. *The New Jersey Journal of Communication*, 9(2), 145-165.
- Forward, G. L. (2000). Clergy stress and role metaphors: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, 23(2), 158-184.
- Forward, G.L. (1999). Encountering the nonprofit organization : Clergy uncertainty and information-seeking during organizational entry. *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, 22(2), 190-213.
- Gallup, G., Jr. (2000). *The Gallup poll: Public opinion 1999*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.
- Girodo, M. (1998). Machiavellian, bureaucratic, and transformational leadership styles in police managers, Preliminary findings of interpersonal ethics. *Perception and Motor Skills*, 86(2), 419-427.
- Gmelch, W.H. (2000, February). *The new dean: Taking charge and learning the job*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.
- Gorsuch, R., & McPherson, S. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E revised and single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 348-354.
- Hackman, M., & Johnson, C. (2000). *Leadership: A communication perspective*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Hair, Jr., J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1992). *Multivariate data analysis with readings* (3rd. ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Hayes, A. F. (2005). *Statistical methods for communication science*. Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hickson, M., & Stacks, D. (Eds.). (1992). *Effective communication for academic chairs*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hill, L. B. (1999). Leadership. In W. G. Christ (Ed.), *Leadership in times of change: A handbook for communication and media administrators* (pp. 199-223). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hilosky, A., & Watwood, B. (1997). Transformational leadership in a changing world: A survival guide for new chairs and deans. In *Walking the Tightrope: The balance between innovation and leadership. Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the Chair Academy*. Reno, NV.
- Hitt, W.D. (1990). *Ethics and leadership: Putting theory into practice*. Columbus, OH: Battelle.
- Hodgson, T.A. (1994). Understanding leadership's moral dimension. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(3), 67-77.
- Johnson, W. B. (1999). Personality characteristics of future military leaders. *Military Medicine*. Retrieved April 28, 2002 from <http://proquest.umi.com>

- Jones, G.R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(2), 262-279.
- Judge, W.Q. (1999). *The leader's shadow: Exploring and developing executive character*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kanungo, R.N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kim, J., & Mueller, C.W. (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Lees, K., Smith, D., & Stockhouse, J. (1994, October). *Implicit theoretical leadership frameworks of higher education administration*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Sun Valley, ID.
- Levene, H. (1960). Test of homogeneity of variances. In I. Olkin, S. Ghurye, W. Hoeffding, W. Madow, & H. Mann (Eds.), *Contributions to probability and statistics: Essays in honor of Harold Hotelling* (pp. 278-292). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- McCroskey, J.C., Daly, J.A., Martin, M.M., & Beatty, M.J. (Eds.) (1998). *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Mech, T. (1997). The managerial roles of chief academic officers. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(3), 282-298.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, V. D., Johnson, J. R., Hart, Z., & Peterson, D. L. (1999). A test of antecedents and outcomes of employee role negotiation ability. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, 24-48.
- Monge, P. R. (1980). Multivariate multiple regression. In P. R. Monge & C. N. Capella (Eds.), *Multivariate techniques in human communication research* (pp. 13-56). New York: Academic Press.
- Montez, J., & Wolverton, M. (2000, April). *The challenge of the deanship*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Morgan, G. A., Gliner, J. A., & Harmon, R. J. (2006). *Understanding and evaluating research in applied and clinical settings*. Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mowday, R., Stears, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Moxley, R.S. (2000). *Leadership and spirit: Breathing new vitality and energy into individuals and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Mulac, A., Seibold, D. R., & Farris, J. L. (2000). Female and male managers' and Professionals' criticism giving: Differences in language use and effects. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 19(4), 389-415.
- Munitz, B. (1995). Wanted: New leadership for higher education. *Planning for Higher Education*, 24(1), 9-16.
- Nadesan, M. H. (1999). The discourses of corporate spiritualism and evangelical capitalism. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13(1), 3-42.
- Northouse, P. (2001). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Norton, R. (1983). *Communicator style: Theory applications, and measures*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Parry, K. W., & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35(2), 75-96.
- Pascarella, P. (1996). *The ten commandments of the workplace*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Plas, J. M., & Lewis, S. E. (2001). *Person-centered leadership for nonprofit organizations: Management that works in high pressure systems*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reinsch, N. L., & Shelby, A. N. (1997). What communication abilities do practitioners need? Evidence from MBA students. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 60(4), 7-29.
- Rice, R.E., Chang, S.J., & Tourbin, J. (1992). Communicator style, media use, organizational level, and evaluation of electronic messaging. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6(1), 3-33.
- Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(2), 76-84.
- Sarason, B.R., Sarason, I.G., & Pierce, G.R. (1990). Traditional views of social support and their impact on assessment. In B.R. Sarason, I.G. Sarason, & G.R. Pierce (Eds.), *Social support: An interactionist view* (pp.9-25). New York: John Wiley & Sons..
- Sass, J. S. (2000). Characterizing organizational spirituality: An organizational communication approach. *Communication Studies*, 51(3), 195-217.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Splete, A., & Garth, R. (1997). *Designing the future: A collective strategy for independent colleges and universities*. Washington, D. C.: Council of Independent Colleges.

- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Townsend, B. K., & Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1996). *If I'd only known: Administrative preparation that could have made a difference*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York: NY.
- Tracey, B., & Hinkin, T. (1998). *Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices?* Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1991). *The academic dean: Dove, dragon, and diplomat* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M.L., & Gmelch W. (1999). The impact of role conflict and ambiguity on academic deans. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70, 80-106.
- Wolverton, R.E. (1984). The chief academic officer: Argus on the campus. In D.G. Brown (Ed), *Leadership roles of chief academic officers* (pp. 7-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zorn, T.E., & Violanti, M.T. (1996). Communication abilities and individual achievement in organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10(2), 139-167.