This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

INFORMAL FACULTY LEADERSHIP IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS, AREAS OF INFLUENCE, AND CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCES

presented by

Kathleen Eaton Guy

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D.	degree in	Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources-Education and Communications Systems

Major Professor's Signature

May 6, 2005

Date

INFORMAL FACULTY LEADERSHIP IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS, AREAS OF INFLUENCE, AND CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCES

By

Kathleen Eaton Guy

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Education and Communication Systems

2005

ABSTRACT

INFORMAL FACULTY LEADERSHIP IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS, AREAS OF INFLUENCE, AND CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCES

By

Kathleen Eaton Guy

Leadership is a central theme, playing a pivotal role in theories of ongoing and productive institutional transformation within higher education. The notion of leadership and its role in organizational development is evolving, becoming richer and more inclusive and focusing attention on more than the role of a single hero as ultimate visionary leader. While executive leadership is important, a model that excludes consideration of the broad sweep of leadership roles is a model that is out of step with the 21st Century community college. Issues of shared governance, multiple missions, institutional maturity and organizational complexity mitigate against single source leadership. Leadership is distributed in many forms throughout the organization, which suggests that leaders emerge in response to issues and challenges and that leadership is potentially the role of everyone in the organization rather than a virtue vested in one person or a small number of individuals.

Of special interest to this research study were informal community college faculty leaders who, without formal designation, exercise influence and attract followers. The purpose of this research study was to develop an understanding of informal faculty leadership in the community college from the perspective of informal faculty leaders themselves. The research sought to answer these questions:

1. What characteristics and behaviors exemplify effective informal faculty leaders?

2. What factors contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders?
3. What issues tend to be influenced by informal faculty leaders, and do their peers perceive this influence as positive or negative?
4. What circumstances tend to draw out or be associated with informal faculty leaders in the exercise of informal leadership?

The population for this research study was informal faculty leaders from Michigan community colleges. Six Michigan community colleges were selected and a purposive sample was drawn through nominations of informal faculty leaders by department chairs at each of the colleges. Informal faculty leaders were defined as faculty without recognized positional authority yet who influence others within the college either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. Care was taken not to disclose to the research participants that they themselves were considered informal leaders.

Key findings regarding the nature of informal faculty leadership from the perspective of informal faculty leaders include:

- Informal faculty leadership is generally associated with positive attributes.
- Concern about issues, a feeling of personal responsibility and the opportunity to contribute expertise cause informal leaders emerge.
- Informal faculty leaders are perceived to have high levels of positive impact on curriculum.
- Informal faculty leaders are perceived differently by females than males, by longer serving than newer faculty in higher education, by high length than low length faculty at their current institution and by technical/occupational faculty than liberal arts/general studies faculty.

This book is dedicated to
Mark, Lindsey and Emily
for their love, generous understanding
and encouragement–every step of the way.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There has not been a single step of this educational and personal growth journey that has been taken alone. I have been blessed by birth, by circumstance and by association to be connected with mentors, friends and colleagues who have stepped in, each at the perfect moment, with care, advice, encouragement and sustenance for mind soul and spirit:

To my parents, John and Mary Eaton, who have been lavish with their love and faith in me. As exemplary lifelong learners and educators, they instilled in me from a very early age the priceless gift of confidence and the family value of education.

To my benefactor of insight and wisdom, Bill Craft, as mentor, trusted colleague and friend, he has challenged me to new accomplishment and shared his Lake George Camp as a retreat for writing, reflection and renewal.

To my committee chair, Joe Levine, whose belief in facilitating learning has been demonstrated time and again through caring, guidance, patient encouragement and exemplary responsiveness.

To my friends and colleagues at Northwestern Michigan College—particularly Karen Anderson and the staff in College Relations and the Foundation—for contributing generously to my peace of mind by stepping up and leading formally and informally.

To my colleagues and friends—Roberta Teahen, Charlene Lutes, Kari Kahler and Marguerite Cotto—the MSU "cohort" from Traverse City—with whom I have traveled this learning journey and shared its triumphs and challenges.

To the faculty, Board of Trustees and Foundation Board at Northwestern Michigan College for inspiring this research study through their remarkable demonstrations of informal leadership.

To my friend in data, Dave Donovan, for his patient guidance as tutor and interpretive guide.

To my ally in (Microsoft)word Jan Neumann, whose expertise and calm presence added immeasurably to the flow of research mailings and the precision of every data table.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a central theme, playing a pivotal role in theories of ongoing and productive institutional transformation within higher education. The notion of leadership and organizational development is emerging as a concept richer and more inclusive than that of the single hero as ultimate visionary (DePree, 2003; Green, 1988, 1994; Kelley, 1988; Piland & Wolf, 2003; Scott, 2003; Smith, 1996). "Instead of leadership being a solo act, an aria sung by the CEO...it is a shared responsibility, more like a chorus of diverse voices singing in unison" (O'Toole in Bennis, Spreitzer and Cummings, Eds., 2001, p.160). While effective executive leadership is important, the notion of an omnipotent leader is a model that is out of step with the 21st Century community college. Issues of shared governance, institutional maturity and organizational complexity mitigate against single source leadership. In the 21st century, leadership is needed at many levels and in many contexts. Thus, a valuable source of leadership will be leadership behaviors exercised by those without the formal trappings of authority, power or position.

The notion of capitalizing on leadership distributed throughout the organization suggests that leaders emerge in response to issues and challenges, and that leadership is potentially the responsibility of everyone in the organization rather than a virtue vested in one person.

> It borrows from Lave's 1993 notion of "stretched across" suggesting that leadership is stretched across different people and different artifacts, within different contexts. This does not mean that leadership tasks are merely delegated to multiple people, although that is one aspect of distributed leadership. In his discussion of distributed cognition, Roy

> Pea states that distributed cognition is not about the end result being *more* than the sum of the parts, it is about the end result of distributed cognition being *different* than the sum of the parts (Sherer, 2004, p. 4).

This distribution of leadership opportunity, and perhaps expectation, imbues in those without the formal trappings the leadership mantle "informal." Informal leadership is leadership that is exercised by those not in formal positions of leadership but those who are recognized as leaders nonetheless (Pielstick, 2000). Informal leadership has been recognized as an important dynamic in organizational behavior. In a study comparing the characteristics of informal versus formal leaders, Pielstick found that while both formal and informal leaders develop shared visions, "informal leaders are more likely to include a moral and inspiring purpose, provide for the common good, and create meaning" (Pielstick, 2000, p. 111).

Increasingly in business and industry, employees at all levels are expected to identify problems, contribute to their solution and help guide colleagues—in short exercise leadership.

> In addition to all people down the line who may properly be called leaders at their level, there are in any vital organization or society a great many individuals who *share leadership tasks* unofficially, by behaving responsibly with respect to the purposes of the group. Such individuals, who have been virtually ignored in the leadership literature, are immensely important to the leader and to the group" (Gardner, 1990 p. xiii).

Now, in the manner of business and industry, institutions of higher education are becoming corporatized (Atlas, 2005). The challenges facing higher education echo those of for-profit businesses—limited resources, increased competition, demands for accountability, and high expectations from constituents for service and flexibility. Scarce resources and ever-increasing expectations for performance and accountability are not

temporary maladies; instead, as is true with business and industry, these dynamics are characteristic of the higher education operating environment. In today's complex organizations, formal leaders must nurture a notion of informal leadership that is applied in day-to-day practice and guided by institutional values and shared vision. The literature tells us that the organizations that do this successfully learn together and become stronger and more adaptable (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross and Smith,1994).

In the 21st Century community college context there are more issues and opportunities demanding special knowledge and contextual leadership than ever before. The "missions" of community colleges have multiplied and expanded in response to expectations from the communities they serve (Amey and VanDerLinden, 2002, Bailey and Morest, 2004). They have become leaders in workforce development, community convening, cultural programming and baccalaureate degree partnerships in addition to their more traditional roles of transfer and career education, developmental education and avocational learning. "The accretion of activities continues unabated" (Bailey and Morest, 2004, p. 1). While performing more functions in response to community expectations, the community college organizational hierarchy has become flatter in order to capitalize on specialized knowledge and expertise and adapt scarce financial resources to ever expanding programs and services. By necessity and, in some cases, by default, community colleges can be found to grow increasingly reliant on informal leaders—people who provide leadership that coalesces others and contributes purposeful behavior that is not preordained or centrally planned.

In 1990, the Points of Light Foundation was established as a nonpartisan non-profit organization designed to recognize the achievements of volunteer heroes. The

Extra Mile award, sponsored by the Points of Light Foundation, recognizes individuals whose achievements have been made in the public interest; have had a positive effect on a significant number of people; have been made while the person was acting as a private citizen, not as an appointed or elected government official; and have been undertaken outside of a person's normal work assignment. Informal leaders in community colleges are, in their context, points of light for their colleges and their colleagues.

The concept of shared governance in higher education offers a construct in which to view both distributed leadership and informal leadership. Amey and Twombly's (1994) review of leadership skills in shared governance highlights the advantages to this approach to governance. "It allows leaders to draw upon the talents and expertise of community college members for setting goals and objectives, solving problems, and creating alternatives. It affords to members throughout the college a different level of ownership, involvement, and commitment than many past approaches to governance" (Amey and Twombly, 1994, p. 282).

It should be noted that in the context of this study shared governance and the notion of leadership emerging throughout the body of the organization were not considered one and the same. In California, for example, shared governance is a statutory requirement for community colleges. In other states and community college systems shared governance is sometimes an aspiration or rhetorical reference to efforts to include faculty and staff in certain areas of institutional decision-making. In the context of this study, the notion that leadership can emerge throughout the organization was not predicated on state statute or generally shared aspirations. Rather it was based on a growing body of literature that explicitly or implicitly speaks to the emergence of leaders

without portfolio. These individuals, without the formal imprimatur of leader, garner followers, energize coalitions and influence day-to-day organizational events. Informal leaders can act to reinforce established institutional polices and practices. Informal leaders can lead the loyal opposition or even resistance movements that seek to modify or redirect organizational policy and practice, and their emergence seems to be a fact of life in contemporary organizations. This study sought a better understanding of their behavior and related contextual influences.

Followers are the defining characteristic for both formal and informal leaders. Without followers, as Drucker notes (in Hesselbein, Goldsmith and Beckhard, Eds.,1996), it is impossible to define leaders. Followers validate leaders. As interpreted through the literature, the actions of followers are an important aspect of the leader-follower relationship. A leader who understands the needs and values of followers and effectively cultivates their aspirations and talents tends to optimize the leader-follower relationship The leader/follower relationship, involving informal leaders distributed throughout the organization, may involve situations in which leadership and followership are no longer either/or propositions; as Smith describes (in Hesselbein, et.al., Eds.,1996), they have become both/and imperatives. From hour to hour and day to day, members of the organization are called upon to think and do, manage themselves and others, make decisions and carry them into practice—and to know when each role is most appropriate. As Kanter (1999) suggests, the long march of many throughout the organization trumps the bold stroke of a few. Rather than a force to be submitted to, leadership is most effective when it is embraced as an opportunity and modeled by all members of the organization.

Background and Setting

This study focused on informal faculty leaders in the community college. The evolution and growth of community and technical colleges throughout the United States has occurred primarily within the last 40 to 50 years (Young in Palmer and Katsinas, Eds., 1996). As a sector of higher education, community colleges have evolved as organizations characterized by their open admissions policies; heterogeneous enrollment; multiple and ever-expanding missions; adaptability to workforce, community and learner needs; and accountability to the myriad demands of taxpayers, donors, students, funding agencies and accrediting bodies. Community colleges manage a complex agenda shaped by multiple priorities in service to diverse constituencies. By their very nature, community colleges are created of, by and for the people in discrete geographic areas. Local dynamics of economy, culture, politics and demography are reflected in the programs and services of the college and exhibited in active relationships between the colleges and the communities they serve.

While community college missions and priorities continue to multiply, traditional operating revenues often do not keep pace. As state economies contract and the need for public funding for education, health care, human services and corrections continue to expand, budget requests are outpacing state revenues. This has been particularly evident during the first years of the 21st Century. The nation's softening economy, September 11, 2001, the war in Iraq and increased foreign economic competition contributed to uncertain financial times, and concurrent reduction in state aid revenue as a percentage of community colleges budgets began to occur.

Due to organizational culture and often exacerbated by limited financial resources, community colleges are characterized by flat organizational structures. Formal leadership hierarchies are lean, and conduct of the organization's daily business is distributed among formal leaders as well as faculty, para-professionals and others who are not part of the formal leadership structure. Higher education is a labor-intensive business, and it is not uncommon for community colleges to allocate a majority of their operating revenues to personnel (Douglas and Harmening, 1999). When resources are lean, personnel budgets become targets for reductions. Either through attrition (resignations, retirements) or reductions in force (retrenchments, layoffs) fewer people remain to perform the same amount of work. Lean hierarchies and complex missions require leadership to be exercised throughout the organization.

While missions expand and budgets contract, community colleges are also facing an unprecedented wave of retirements. The age of most of the nation's community colleges and the graying baby boom generation are converging, resulting in the retirement of many career presidents, vice presidents, deans and faculty members during the next ten years. Forty-five percent of the nation's 1,200 presidents plan to retire by 2007 and 79% will retire by 2014. Paradoxically, the number of advanced degrees conferred in community college administration decreased by 78% from 1982 to 1997, a signal that a sufficient number of prospective new leaders are not in the traditional leadership pipeline (Shults, 2001).

Although individual faculty members possess limited formal responsibility for the overall direction of institutional affairs, they are perceived as having great influence over matters that form the core or soul of the college—teaching, learning, and student success.

Collectively faculty are considered to have significant sway over the quality of the institution. By tradition, these members of the academy place value on and persist in seeking opportunities to share their opinions through discourse and dialogue. The review of academic matters, problem solving, and decision making often are diffused throughout the organization's academic divisions, departments and curriculum clusters resulting in a form of leadership that is "rooted in systems, processes and culture" (O'Toole, in Bennis, Spreitzer and Cummings, Eds., 2001, p. 160).

O'Banion and Kaplan (2004) state that the notion of placing learning first as the core business of the educational enterprise has been an emerging commitment of community colleges since the early 1990s. This approach has focused the attention of hundreds of community colleges throughout the nation and led to a transformation that emphasizes the importance of defining how every program, policy, practice and budget expenditure will affect student learning. Faculty are key players in this transformation to learning-centered organizations as they "engage in redesigning the historical architecture of education and creating innovative structures and practices to place learning front and center" (O'Banion and Kaplan, 2004, p. 17). A more integrated, inclusive approach to leadership has been ushered in with the learning-centered movement.

> Leadership for learning involves making decisions, defining values, setting goals, and determining strategies designed to facilitate the core work—learning—of the educational institution. In so doing, it moves beyond traditional notions of leadership as an administrative or management function. It is, instead, an integrated process that involves administrators, faculty, and other college employees in a shared effort to ensure that learning occurs and is documented in meaningful formats for the institution and the individual members of the institution (Wilson, 2002, p.2).

Community colleges are complex organizations combining formal structures, cultural myths and symbols and interactions that can best be viewed from a political frame of reference involving coalitions and partisan behavior (Bolman and Deal, 2003). Relationships are often stretched and sometimes strained between and among working groups—faculty and administrators, faculty and faculty, administrators and administrators, department chairs and faculty, support staff and administrators—as members of the organization go about the daily business of teaching and learning while supporting the academic infrastructure. Advocacy for a variety of causes can result in daily political churn around topics as varied as new policies, curriculum changes, assessment, budget allocations, workspace assignments, pay and parking. There are formal processes for voicing opinions and garnering support and there are informal processes based upon personal influence and persuasion networks.

Given their complex missions, flat organizational structures, transformation to learning-centered organizations, tendency to utilize shared governance models, and imminent wave of retirements, community colleges are called to consider a changing leadership paradigm. In light of the demands to operate more like a business—creating business plans for operational units, outsourcing services, developing a marketing orientation for product, pricing and promotional strategies—formal leaders have their hands full. Areas of specialization found in today's community colleges including enrollment management, strategic planning and market research, bespeak the language of business. However, when it comes to innovation, transformation and implementation much is dependent on the devolution of leadership throughout the organization. Leaders without portfolio are needed—perhaps required—throughout the organization as never

before to ensure the vitality, viability and ultimate usefulness of community colleges in the 21st Century.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of informal faculty leadership in the community college—its characteristics, behaviors and impact on the organization—through a descriptive quantitative study of informal faculty leaders at selected Michigan community colleges. A research questionnaire was utilized to gather perceptions about informal faculty leaders. Informal faculty leaders were chosen as the focus of this study because of their direct involvement with matters central to the mission of community colleges—teaching, learning and student success. Based on Nesselrode's (1996) study of leadership of individuals outside of top administrative positions in the community college and anecdotal evidence gained from a preliminary discussion group conducted as part of this research study, there is reason to believe that informal faculty leaders exist in community colleges and that they can be identified by others at their institutions.

In some situations they may be seen to have a positive impact and move the organizational mission and vision forward; in other situations they may be seen as working in opposition to efforts attempted by formal leaders. This study sought to gain a preliminary understanding of the nature of informal faculty leadership in the community college in order to provide institutions with a set of useful tools to mobilize informal faculty leaders in the best interest of the organization. More specifically, this study

explored the following questions from the perspective of faculty members identified by their department chairs as effective informal faculty leaders:

1. What characteristics and behaviors exemplify effective informal faculty leaders?
2. What factors contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders?
3. What issues tend to be influenced by informal faculty leaders and do their peers perceive this influence as positive or negative?
4. What circumstances tend to draw out or be associated with informal faculty leaders in the exercise of informal leadership?

Definition of Terms

Faculty

A full-time or part-time, regular or adjunct member of the liberal studies or occupational/vocational instructional staff of the college.

Effective Informal Faculty Leaders

Those without recognized positional authority yet who influence others either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. Those who have influenced others within the college and, as a result, have exerted a positive or negative influence on some aspect of the organization.

Influence

An interpersonal interaction in which one person acts intentionally to change the behavior of another in a given direction (Katz and Kahn, 1966).

Leadership

"The process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers" (Gardner, 1990, p.1).

Significance of this Study

A commonly held assumption is that for an institution to be effective administrators must be leaders. Evidence, however, suggests that all administrators are not leaders and all leaders do not necessarily emerge from administrative ranks. DePree, (2003), Green, (1988, 1994), Kelley, (1988), Pilestick, (2000), Scott, (2003) and Smith, (1996) have articulated the contemporary view of leadership which suggests that organizations are strengthened when leadership is exercised by individuals from throughout the organization who are not part of the formal leadership hierarchy.

Within organizations, there are formal systems and structures for voicing opinions and garnering support, and there are parallel informal systems for accomplishing the same. The faculty is the largest group of players within this informal system. At the core of this informal network lies the opportunity to shape and influence issues related not only to teaching, learning and student success but also to issues related to every other area of the institution—from planning and budgeting to policies and facilities. While informal leadership has been recognized as an important organizational dynamic (Senge, et.al., 1994; Cooper and Pagotto, 2003; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Komives, Lucas and McMahon, 1998) there is a lack of research and information about the specific phenomenon of informal faculty leadership in the community college.

A qualitative study conducted nearly a decade ago (Nesselrode, 1996) examined leadership of individuals outside of top administrative positions at two community colleges. Sixteen individuals, all faculty and mid-level administrators, were nominated by two or more of their peers for inclusion in the study. Findings included that the leaders outside of top administrative positions exert influence among their peers and superiors, they have leadership attributes consistent with exemplary presidents and the lack of positional authority is perceived by these leaders as an impairment. Pielstick (2000) conducted a study of formal versus informal leading among graduates of the James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership and found significant differences between formal and informal leaders in each of six areas of interest: shared vision, communication, relationships, community, guidance and character. Of 161 leadership variables in each of the six areas, 87 (54%) showed a significant difference between formal and informal leaders. Informal leaders were perceived as showing higher levels of leading than formal leaders overall, including more likely to include a moral and inspiring purpose; to listen and seek to understand; and to be humble, fair and altruistic (Pielstick, 2000).

Although they possess limited formal power or authority, faculty members are perceived as having the greatest influence over matters at the heart of the college and thereby the quality of the institution—teaching, learning, and student success. Faculty are expected to play dual roles, as pedagogical professionals and specialists in a discipline of study and as contributing members of the larger organization. Some assert that acts of leadership performed by faculty members are intended to demonstrate their formal leadership potential. From this perspective, faculty members who lead or

participate in service to the institution beyond their pedagogical/discipline are working in quasi-administrative roles and are doing so because they aspire to formal leadership positions. Others suggest that the motivation to lead is altruistic and that faculty who assume leadership roles do so because they have expertise to contribute or a passion for the cause, not because they are interested in advancing up the hierarchy.

It is understood (Nesselrode, 1996) that informal faculty leaders perform throughout the organization—without being selected, directed, empowered or evaluated by the formal leadership hierarchy. In today's complex operating environment, community colleges need all the tools they can marshal in order to succeed. Understanding and stimulating leadership behavior throughout the organization in more systematic and deliberate ways may turn these informal and perhaps sporadic faculty leadership efforts into more high yield results that in the past. The more that can be learned about informal leaders, the more likely formal leaders are to recognize their value to the institution and to capitalize on their influence in the best interest of the organization. With an improved understanding of informal faculty leaders, community colleges will be able to identify factors that encourage, focus and bring cohesion to this leadership resource while better understanding the ultimate gain or deficit that results from it.

Limitations

This study was confined to a population of informal faculty leaders at six Michigan community colleges and utilized a purposive sampling procedure.

Therefore, the generalizability of the results to other settings is limited in scope. The study had validity and reliability only to the particular population on which this study focused.

Department chairs at each of six Michigan community colleges were asked to nominate faculty members from their institutions who they perceived as effective informal faculty leaders, applying a definition furnished by the researcher. It is possible that Department Chairs from the same institution may have had differing observations and perspectives and therefore dissimilar interpretations of the "informal faculty leader" label. Further, this study focused on informal *faculty* leaders—which excludes support and technical staff, paraprofessionals or anyone else occupying a position without formal authority from within the college. Therefore, the results of this study are not generalizable to all informal faculty leaders or to informal leaders who are not faculty members. Given that leadership can be situational and considering that respondents were asked to reflect on their observation of informal faculty leaders at their colleges when answering the research questionnaire, the results reported may not necessarily reflect the characteristics of informal faculty leaders as a whole.

Assumptions

Although there was no direct control over the responses given by respondents to the research questionnaire, it is assumed that respondents were able and willing to give valid responses to all statements in the questionnaire. It is also assumed that respondents were able and willing to give reliable responses to all statements in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Leadership is often conceived of as a process. Komives, Lucas and McMahon (1998) view leadership as "a relational process of people together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good" (p.11). DePree (1989) describes leadership as an "art...liberating people to do what is required of them in the most effective and humane way possible" (p.xx). Gardner (1990) expresses leadership as "the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers" (p.1).

Others approach leadership as a characteristic or collection of characteristics attributable to individuals. Wills (1994), for example, defines, "the leader is one who mobilizes others toward a goal shared by leader and follower" (p.17). Bennis and Nanus (1985) define a transformative leader as "one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change" (p. 3). Bennis, Cronin, Gardner and Rosenbach and Taylor (in Rosenbach & Taylor, Eds., 1998) define leaders as managers of attention, meaning, trust and self. According to Cronin, "Students of leadership develop their capacities for observation, reflection, imagination, invention and judgment. They communicate and listen effectively; as Cronin suggests "they squint with their ears" (in Rosenbach & Taylor, Eds., 1998, p. 2). Maxwell (1993) distills the leadership definition to one word—influence—and says the ability to attract followers is key to this definition.

Common to all of these definitions is the suggestion that leadership is not a solo act that occurs in a vacuum. Leadership requires context and involves, may even depend upon, interactions with other people—sometimes labeled as followers—those who leaders attempt to guide, influence, convert, liberate, persuade and finally induce and commit to action. Drucker's definition of leadership (in Hesselbein, Goldsmith and Beckhard, Eds., 1995) underscores the indispensable role of followers: "The only definition of a leader is someone who has followers" (p. xii).

The art and science of leadership has been studied in business, government and the non-profit sector; popularized by the media; analyzed by academicians and investigated by social scientists and organizational theorists. In both the technical and popular literature, leadership emerges as a prized commodity, sometimes deemed a heroic, larger-than-life attribute; sometimes considered the source of mischief and a tendency to self-promotion.

More than 11,000 books and articles have been written about the topic of leaders and leadership and some 850 definitions of leadership offered (Bennis and Nanus, 2003), and still, an observation made by leadership scholar James MacGregor Burns more than a quarter century ago is true today, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns, 1978, p. 2). Leadership with its many facets and its still-elusive qualities remains a subject of intense interest. The effort to corral its skills, discipline and application continues.

Whether based in personality and natural attributes or skills learned, many of the elements that shape leadership in practice can be attributed to the personal characteristics of those who are considered leaders. In addition, there are organizational levers and

leadership tools available to individuals occupying formally recognized positions of leadership. These leadership roles benefit from sources of power and influence beyond personal traits and acquired skills. Some of these additional sources of power and influence can be exercised directly such as the ability to hire and fire, set the organizational agenda or assign or withhold scarce material or symbolic resources. Some are derived from shared expectations and perceptions of the organization's "designated" followers (Burns, 1978). Although shared expectations and perceptions may be more ephemeral than the formal elements of the organization, they are equally important in defining and empowering or confusing and limiting leadership.

Shared expectations and perceptions of the organization may be ill formed, weakly fashioned or highly developed and palpable. Bolman and Deal (1997) offer four major frames practitioners can use to "make sense" of organizations—the structural, human resources, political and symbolic frames. These frames serve both as "windows" on the organization and "lenses" for bringing it into focus (pps. 12-15). From the structural frame perspective of the organization, leadership is assigned to those holding certain official titles. In higher education, for example, these titles may include dean, department chair, vice president, provost or president. To the untrained eye, others including faculty, staff, administrators and various support personnel might be considered followers—subordinates looking to the leaders for direction, inspiration, decisions and solutions. In practice, nothing could be further from the truth. Leadership can emerge from all levels and limiting one's analysis to what appears to be the formal leadership structure misses the rich and varied life of most organizations.

Kouzes and Posner (1993, in Komives, Lucas and McMahon, 1998) offer the term "constituent" as an alternative to "follower." "A constituent is someone who has an active part in the process of running an organization and who authorizes another to act on his or her behalf. A constituent confers authority on the leader, not the other way around" (p. 12). Rost (1991, in Komives, et.al., 1998) encourages use of the term "collaborator" due to the negative connotation of the word "follower" dating back to the industrial worldview (p.13). Komives, et.al. (1998) suggest still another variation: "participants" as involved in the leadership process, actively sharing leadership with other group members. "Participants include the informal or formal positional leader in a group as well as all active group members who seek to be involved in group change" (p.13).

Generally, and without the enhanced definitions such as those offered by Kouzes and Posner; Rost; Komives, Lucas and MacMahon, a less enlightened view of followers would be their lack of the instincts, insight and ability to take on formal leadership roles. The notion that leadership is exercised only by those who hold formal positions with inherent status and power and the assumption that followers lack the ability or interest to lead are among the common leadership myths (Gardner, 1990; Komives, et.al., 1998). "Leaders are almost never as much in charge as they are pictured to be, followers almost never as submissive as one might imagine" (Gardner, 1990, p. 23). Other leadership myths purport that leaders are born not made, that charisma is a requirement of effective leaders, that leadership is a rare skill, that leadership exists only at the top of an organization, and that leaders control, direct, prod and manipulate their followers (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Komives, et.al., 1998).

More contemporary views of leadership reflect the understanding that leadership occurs throughout the organization and is not the result of the heroic personality of the CEO or exclusive purview of those in formally recognized leadership positions (Senge, et.al., 1994; Cooper and Pagotto, in Piland and Wolf, Eds., 2003). In business and in education, the ability of organizations to cope with the expectations of their constituents requires a more comprehensive consideration of where and how leadership can be exercised throughout the organization. "If there was ever a moment in history when a comprehensive strategic view of leadership was needed, not just by a few leaders in high office but by large numbers of leaders in every job...this is certainly it" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 2).

Recognizing the importance of leadership throughout the organization, Komives, Lucas and McMahon (1998) offer a definition of leadership that can be applied to positional leaders or participants-collaborators-group members: "any person who actively engages with others to accomplish change" (p.14). Using this definition, anyone in the organization has the opportunity to exercise leadership.

Characteristics of Leadership

The literature of leadership offers a number of insights into a more detailed look at the characteristics of leaders including the traits, qualities and behaviors of leaders. Perhaps the earliest theory of leadership was the "Great Man" or "Great Person" theory that asserted that leaders possessed special qualities that enabled them to capture the hearts and minds of the masses. Leaders were born, not made, and no amount of "learning or yearning" could change this fate (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 5). When this

perspective failed to explain all of leadership, it was suggested that events—factors of timing, place and circumstance—made great leaders. The limitations of both "Great Man" and "Big Bang" theories of leadership were their either/or nature—leadership was either inherent within the person or a product of the situational environment.

If the answer did not lie in who they were or the situations in which they found themselves, perhaps the secret could be found in their behavior as leaders. Two primary types of leadership behavior were identified: task/accomplishment and interpersonal relationships. Those who exhibited high performance in both categories were perceived by their peers as leaders. Those who performed high in task behavior but average in relationships were sometimes considered leaders. Those who excelled in relationship behavior only were less often perceived as leaders by their peers, and those who did not perform well in either category were never considered leaders (Sashkin and Rosenbach in Rosenbach and Taylor, Eds., 1998).

When considering gender roles in organizational settings, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) indicate that "the behavior of female leaders, compared with that of male leaders, may be more interpersonally oriented, democratic, and transformational. In contrast, the behavior of male leaders, compared with that of female leaders, may be more task-oriented and autocratic" (pps. 787-788). However, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt caution that "because of the constraining impact of leadership roles...any differences between women and men who occupy the same role are unlikely to be large in size" (p. 788).

Until recently, most of the research and literature on leadership focused primarily on men. "The implicit, taken-for-granted assumption was that leadership was basically a

male activity. In the past decade or so however, there has been a surge of interest in gender and leadership, stimulated by dramatic shifts in women's roles and by the accomplishments of individual women" (Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 344-345). Questions still abound: do men and women lead differently? Are they perceived of differently in leadership roles? Bolman and Deal (1991, 1992a) found no differences between gender with regard to leadership frame issues of structural, human resource, political and symbolic. "Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that women tended to be somewhat more participative and less directive than men (in Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 346). Generally speaking men and women in similar positions of leadership are perceived of as more similar than different by their subordinates (Carless, 1998; Komives, 1991; Morrison, White and Van Velsor, 1987 in Bolman and Deal, 2003). When differences are identified, they are usually in favor of women on issues of leadership and managerial behavior (Bass, Avolio, and Atwater, 1996; Edwards, 1991; Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis, 1990; Weddle, 1991; and Wilson and Wilson, 1991 in Bolman and Deal, 2003).

Amey and Twombley (1992) conducted a meta-analysis of the images, rhetoric and organizational context of community college leadership found in the literature on the evolution of the community college movement. A short list of men is recognized for their seminal role in shaping what is considered today's comprehensive community college. Predominant throughout the literature from the 1960s to the mid-1980s are images of "commander" and "great man" as institutional leaders (Amey and Twombley, 1992, p. 139). As community colleges evolved from the growth to maturation stage in the late 1980s through the 1990s, the challenge for their leaders was to reclarify and/or reinterpret the institutional mission (Hudgins,1990; Lorenzo, 1989), and, in the view of

some, to engage in all-out transformation (Roueche, et.al., 1989, in Amey and Twombley, 1992). Transformational leadership behaviors were called for, according to "mainstream" authors like Roueche, et.al., (1989) and leaders of these transforming institutions were described as "blue-chippers" both terms, according to Amey and Twombley, that supported "the traditional, elite imagery" of community college leadership (1992, p. 141). Alternate voices (Eaton, 1988 and Desjardins, 1990, in Amey and Twombley, 1992) called for a new style of leadership that was more cooperative and collaborative than authoritative and hierarchical.

Stogdill (1958) studied the research relevant to leadership traits and found six that were common in 15 or more of the studies he reviewed: intelligence, scholarship, dependability, activity, social participation and socioeconomic status. His list of traits expanded when he identified the commonalities of 10 or more of the studies: sociability, initiative, persistence, knowing how to get things done, self-confidence, alertness to and insight into situations, cooperativeness, popularity, adaptability and verbal facility. Typology notwithstanding, Stogdill concluded that leaders could not possess these traits alone and become successful leaders. The characteristics of leaders needed to "bear some relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers" (Stogdill, in Dean, 2002, p. 6). DePree (1992) echoes this perspective, pointing out that "one obvious requirement" of leadership is learning the perspective of followers. "Leaders cannot function without the eyes and ears and minds and hearts of followers" (p. 200).

Cronin (1983) offers a tentative list of leadership qualities, which include self-knowledge/self-confidence; learning/renewal; coalition building; world mindedness/a sense of history and breadth; and understanding the nature of power and authority. He

adds that "leadership consists of a spiral upwards, a spiral of self-improvement, self-knowledge and seizing and creating opportunities so that a person can make things happen that would not otherwise have occurred" (pp. 15-16).

There does not appear to be a "one size fits all" or universally agreed-upon taxonomy of leadership characteristics. "Definitions [of leadership] reflect fads, fashions, political tides and academic trends" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 4). Jennings (1961, in Dean, 2002, p. 6) asserts, "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." Perhaps leadership is "in the eye of the beholder" (Kouzes and Posner, 1996 in Rosenbach and Taylor, Eds., 1998).

The style of leaders was the focus of research conducted by Lewin and Lippitt (1938) when they attempted to classify leadership as democratic or autocratic and identified three basic styles of leaders: democratic, laissez-faire and authoritarian. Subsequent research (Lippitt, 1966) returned to the important influence of situation and the inappropriateness of stereotyping leaders without consideration of the environment in which they were leading. Contemporary leadership theory underscores the notion that leadership takes its form and is influenced by external circumstances (Hock, 2000), personal experiences, the relationship of followers (Hock, 2000; Senge 1994; Seifter, 2001) and the understanding that organizations are living and sometimes unruly systems (Wheatley, 1997; Zohar, 1997).

Drucker asserts (in Hesselbein, Goldsmith and Beckhard, Eds.,1995), "There may be a few born leaders, but there are surely far too few for us to depend on them" and that "leadership must be learned and can be learned" (p.xi). He offers a list of qualities he has

observed or experienced first-hand with effective leaders: they have followers, they do the right things, they are highly visible and they are responsible. Kouzes and Posner (1996) surveyed more than 25,000 people around the globe in a range of organizations, asking what they admired and looked for in their leaders. According to these data, people want leaders who are honest, forward-looking, inspiring and competent. Three of these four characteristics refer to "source credibility"—the believability of the communicator. Kouzes and Posner (1996) assert that credibility is the most fundamental asset a leader should possess (in Rosenbach and Taylor, Eds.,1998, p. 223).

Texaco CEO Alfred C. Decrane, Jr. (1995) offers a "constitutional model" of leadership (in Hesselbein, Goldsmith and Beckhard, Eds., 1995, p. 249), a *de facto* set of core leadership competencies that can be adapted and applied to a variety of situations as conditions change and new challenges arise: character (humor and humility, self-aware, inquisitive, open-minded, action-oriented), vision, behavior (act, create change, seize opportunities, deploy people, seek consensus, communicate, be positive) and confidence. Covey (in Hesselbein, et.al., Eds.,1995) emphasizes the importance of leaders having a passion for learning "...through listening, seeing emerging trends, sensing and anticipating needs in the marketplace, evaluating past successes and mistakes, and absorbing the lessons that conscience and principles teach us..." (p. 150).

Pielstick (2000) developed a comprehensive leader profile in a meta-ethnographic study emphasizing transformation leadership. This profile, later articulated as authentic leading, describes a pattern of evidence which defines leadership in terms of six major themes: shared vision, communication, relationships, community, guidance and character. Of these, shared vision (the development and communication thereof) was

identified as the "most common distinguishing characteristic identified with leadership overall, and authentic leadership specifically" (Pielstick, 2000, p. 100).

In 1996 the W.K. Kellogg Foundation convened a panel of educators and practitioners to examine the environment for leadership in higher education with an emphasis on modeling new and more effective forms of leadership. Their report, Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change (2000), documented by the James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership at the University of Maryland, identifies five "group qualities" and five "individual qualities" that define effective leadership, as shown in Table I below (Astin and Astin, 2000, pp.11-13).

Table 1. Ten Qualities that Define Effective Leadership

Group Qualities	Individual Qualities
Shared purpose - reflects the shared aims values of the group's members; can take time to achieve	Commitment - the passion, intensity and persistence that supplies energy, motivates individuals and drives group effort
Collaboration - an approach that empowers individuals, engenders trust, and capitalizes on diverse talents	Empathy - the capacity to put yourself in another's place; requires the cultivation and use of listening skills
Division of labor - requires each member of the group to make a significant contribution to the overall effort	Competence – the knowledge, skills and technical expertise required for successful completion on the transformation effort
Disagreement with respect – recognizes that disagreements are inevitable and should be handles in an atmosphere of mutual trust	Authenticity – consistency between one's actions and one's most deeply felt values and beliefs
A learning environment – allows members to see the group as a place where they can learn and acquire skills	Self-knowledge – awareness of the beliefs, values and emotions that motivate one to seek change

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2000.

Most agree that personal characteristics are not the sole determinants of leadership capability. Situation and environment, demonstrated behavior, and lessons from the past are also important factors in considering the attributes of leadership. A recurring theme emphasized in the literature is the importance of followers in the leadership equation. To return to Drucker's straightforward definition, leaders are those

who have followers. Followers legitimize leaders and, in order to be successful, leaders must pay close attention to the characteristics and goals of followers.

Power and Leadership

The review of leadership literature would be incomplete without consideration of the issues of power. Burns (1978) defines power "not as a property or entity or possession but as a *relationship* in which two or more persons tap motivational bases in one another and bring varying resources to bear in the process..." p. 15). He underscores the ubiquity of power by saying, "it exists whether or not it is quested for"(p. 15). Identifying the attributes of power for the purposes of generalization, Burns (1978) cites Robert Dahl's description of the three dimensions of the reach and magnitude of power: distribution, scope and domain. *Distribution* is the concentration or dispersion of power among persons of diverse influence in political, social and economic arenas. *Scope* is the extent to which power is generalized over a wide range or is specialized to a certain activity. Power focused in one kind of activity may be relatively weak in another. *Domain* refers to the number and nature of power respondents who are influenced by the person(s) in power versus those who are not (Burns, 1978, p.16).

Prevalent in the literature of leadership since the early 1990s is the growing emphasis on cultivating leaders at all levels of the organization and, as Heifetz (1994) asserts, "giving the work back to the people" (p.128). "The scarcity of leadership from people in authority, however, makes it all the more critical to the adaptive successes of a polity that leadership be exercised by people without authority. These people—perceived as entrepreneurs and deviants, organizers and troublemakers—provide the capacity

within the system to see through the blind spots of the dominant viewpoint" (Heifetz, 1994, p. 183).

Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, and Smith (1999) assert that change in learning organizations relies on the consideration and cultivation of leaders throughout the enterprise. "Organizations will enter a new domain of leadership development when we stop thinking about preparing a few people for "the top" and start nurturing the potential for leaders at all levels to participate in shaping new realities. The core leadership challenge of our era lies in addressing core issues for which hierarchical authority is inadequate" (Senge, et.al., 1999, p. 568). Similarly, Badaracco (2002) encourages us to look at leadership with a "wide-angle lens" (p. 5). He suggests that the majority of issues are not resolved by a "swift, decisive stroke" from someone at the top. "What usually matters are careful, thoughtful, small, practical efforts by people working far from the limelight. In short, quiet leadership is what moves and changes the world" (Badaracco, 2002, p. 9).

Heifetz and Laurie (1997) urge the protection of leadership voices from below. "People speaking beyond their authority usually feel self-conscious and sometimes have to generate "too much" passion to get themselves geared up for speaking out. They pick the wrong time and place, and often bypass proper channels of communication and lines of authority. But buried inside a poorly packaged interjection may lie an important intuition that needs to be teased out and considered" (Heifetz and Laurie, 1997, p. 129). To reject or ignore it, they caution, "is to lose potentially valuable information and discourage a potential leader in the organization" (p. 130).

O'Toole (in Bennis, Spreitzer and Cummings, Eds., 2001) describes an emerging pattern of collective leadership in corporations as observed in a 2001 study undertaken by Booz Allen & Hamilton and the University of Southern California's Center for Effective Organizations for the World Economic Forum. The characteristic observed was more rooted in the systems and culture of the organization than "cascading" leadership in which a strong positional leader empowers other leaders down the organizational line. More than an act of symbolic empowerment from positional leader to non-positional leaders, they observed people at all levels of the organization behaving more like "owners and entrepreneurs than employees or hired hands" (Bennis, et.al., Eds., p. 160).

Robbins (in Robbins and Zirinsky 1996) describes six bases of power, extending beyond Etzioni's categories of coercive, remunerative and normative organizations and similar to French and Raven's definitions of the bases of power as coercion, reward, expertise, legitimacy and referent. All are helpful in examining the exercise of power versus the practice of leadership. The bases of power include:

- Legitimate power—the authority granted by virtue of a position of formal authority held in the hierarchy of an organization; legitimate power includes coercive and rewarding power with the added leverage of rank; legitimate power lies in position rather than relationships.
- Coercive power—the authority to punish as granted by legitimate authority, including dismissal, suspension, demotion, the assignment of unpleasant work or embarrassment; the potential or actual use of force (as in prisons and correctional institutions).

- Reward power (extrinsic)—the ability to control and manipulate salary and wages, commissions, working conditions and other perks.
- Reward power (intrinsic)—the ability to grant rewards such as recognition, new responsibilities, professional accolades, etc.
- Expert power—the influence of expertise; may also derive from control of information.
- Referent power—the influence of personal traits that others believe are desirable and therefore admired; conferred by the organization and therefore can exist at any level.

Formal leaders have the opportunity to exercise all six bases of power while it would appear that informal leaders would draw from the latter three: reward (intrinsic), expert and referent power.

Morgan (1997), in his explication of organizations as political systems, examines power from both the resource relationship—a commodity someone controls—and social relationship "characterized by some kind of dependency (i.e. as an influence over something or someone)" perspective (p. 171). He offers a list of the 14 most important sources of power ranging from "formal authority" to "control of a decision processes" to "control of boundaries" to "symbolism" and the "management of meaning" to the "power one already has" (Morgan, 1997, p. 171). It appears that there are similarities in concept between Morgan's sources of power and Robbins' (1996) concept of power—coercive and extrinsic reward relate to formal authority while referent power is analogous to the power one already has. Sociologist Richard Emerson (1962, in Scott, 2003) supports the notion of power as a values exchange relationship, viewing power as relational,

situational and "at least potentially" reciprocal, reinforcing the concept that power is more appropriately viewed as a social relationship than a characteristic of an individual (p. 310).

The process of power in informal groups was studied in the 1950s (Sherif and Sherif, 1953; Bales, 1952 in Scott, 2003), and the results identified how personal qualities and social relationships became the basis for the sanctioning of leadership within these groups. Further analysis by Homans and Blau (1961, 1964, in Scott, 2003) indicated that the process of differentiation of group members was based on a series of exchanges, i.e., some members demonstrate their willingness to make greater contributions to goals—be they individual or group goals. Power, then, becomes a product of unequal exchange relationships that exist within the group based on the characteristics and behavior of individuals. In contrast, positional power is attached to the person who occupies the position, regardless of his or her personal qualities or performance.

The work of Burns (1978) led to the development of new perspectives on the study of leadership and power, underscoring Max Weber's (1947) distinction between economic and non-economic sources of authority. Burns' concept, subsequently labeled as transformational leadership, appeals to followers beyond their self-interest. Transformational leadership, according to Burns' definition, "occurs when one or more persons *engage* with others such that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality," leading to the transformation of leaders, followers and the social system in which they function (Burns, 1978, p. 20). Weber called these non-economic sources of authority or influence. This concept of leadership contrasted with the earlier transactional or remunerative/reward approach.

Morgan (1997) observes, "hardly anyone will admit to having any real power. Even chief executives often say that they feel highly constrained, that they have few significant options in decision making, and that the power they wield is more apparent than real" (p. 196). One reason, he offers, is that there is a significant difference between what he labels "surface manifestations" and the "deep" structure of power, suggesting that culture, history, economics, class relationships and other deeply-rooted factors are imbedded in an organization. Another possible explanation Morgan offers is that access to power is so highly distributed that the power "playing field" is leveled. While some may have positional power, others may have considerable personal power. Posner and Kouzes (1998) tell us, "Leaders cannot be appointed or anointed superiors. Constituents determine where someone is fit to lead. The trappings of power and position may give someone the right to exercise authority, but we should never, ever mistake position and authority for leadership" (p. 223).

The literature reveals that while positional power may be assigned, personal power must be earned. Non-positional power is manifested in the byplay of social relationships where the behavior, character and espoused commitment of certain individuals are perceived to add value. Power can be conferred whether or not it is sought. Key to the granting of power is the expectation and perception of the organization's "designated" followers.

Leaders and Followers

"Once you define leadership as the ability to get followers, you work backward from that point of reference to figure out how to lead," says Maxwell (1993, p. 2).

He asserts that most people identify leadership with position and therefore, pursue rank and title to become recognized as leaders. As a result, some positional leaders are less than effective because they rely exclusively on their authority in the exercise of leadership rather than on cultivating followers. Conversely, those who lack positional power often do not perceive of themselves as leaders and therefore, never develop their leadership skills (Maxwell, 1993, p. 2).

It has also become clear that leadership is often distinct from authority, although authorities may be leaders. Weber (1947) likened authority to legitimacy and believed that people would obey authority as long as they believed it was legitimate. Authority and leadership are built upon voluntary obedience. If leaders lose legitimacy, they lose the capacity to lead (Bolman and Deal, 2003).

Most agree that leaders cannot be leaders without followers. The quality of the relationship between leader and follower is the crux of the matter. As Chaleff (1997, in Rosenbach and Taylor, Eds., 1998) explains, "it is the relationship between leaders and followers all the way up and down the organization chart that makes programs, breaks programs and makes or breaks careers" (p. 89).

Kelley (1998) reinforces the importance of the relationship between leaders and followers in his description of five followership patterns. He suggests that there are two underlying behavioral dimensions that predict follower performance. One dimension measures the degree to which followers exercise independent, critical thinking and the other ranks them on an active to passive scale. Low on both scales are "Sheep," passive and uncritical, and "Yes People" who are deferential to a fault. "Alienated Followers" have settled into a pattern of "disgruntled acquiescence" because someone or something

turned them off at some point in the past. "Survivors" hunker down and ride out change. "Effective Followers" are those who add value to the organization—often as much as leaders do, Kelley says. They take initiative and succeed without the oversight of strong formal leadership (Kelley, 1998, pps.143-144).

Considering the efforts of more than a few (Kouzes and Posner, 1993; Rost, 1991 and Komives, Lucas and McMahon, 1998) to find alternative designations for the term "follower," following suffers from an image problem as evidenced by Kelley's descriptions of "Sheep" and "Yes People." Few have a burning desire to grow up to be followers. Herein lies the organizational paradox, says Smith (in Hesselbein, Goldsmith and Beckhard, Eds., 1996). While members of the organization—followers—are expected to comply with orders from on high, they are also called upon to be leaders. Many organizations declare, "people are our most important asset." At least at the level of theory espoused (Argyris & Schon, 1974), organizations expect and encourage advancement up the ladder, admire risk taking and value entrepreneurial thinking.

In today's complex organizations, it is important for leaders to understand that occasionally they need to follow and often need to seek out and encourage followers to become leaders. Smith refers to this as "both/and" performance (in Hesselbein, Goldsmith and Beckhard, Eds., 1996). "Today, the people in an effective organization must both think and do, both manage others and manage themselves, both make decisions and do real work" (1996, p. 201). Smith emphasizes that leaders must be sensitive enough to know when their most effective option is to follow, understanding that the organization's performance relies on the "capacities and insights of other people" (p. 200).

Kanter (1999) asserts that the key to sustaining change within an organization is not the "bold stroke" of leadership but the "long march—the independent, discretionary and ongoing efforts of people throughout the organization" (p. 15). DePree (1989) suggests that for an organization to be truly effective requires being open to "giants at all levels" enabling us to "think about being abandoned to the strengths of others, of admitting that we cannot know or do everything" (p. 7).

An overall impression of the literature is that organizational vitality depends on the "both/and" performance of everyone in the enterprise resulting in the whole becoming greater than the sum of the parts. Formal leaders must encourage leadership behavior at all levels, and followers must be permitted to exercise influence beyond their narrow jurisdiction and to lead up. Unlike formal leaders, they do not have to take on the whole organization at once. Their accession to informal leadership affords an element of choice, an opportunity to be selective and the likelihood of gaining followers and influencing events beyond the capacity of designated formal leaders.

Leadership in Higher Education

In the early history of the academy, the faculties did it all. Over time the organization of knowledge led to specialization as did the differentiated staffing that gave rise to the role of administration. In the late 19th Century the United States began building its system of higher learning which was inspired by distinguished European universities, particularly German universities. Among the most recognized and some might say "heroic" U.S. college and university leaders of this era were William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago and Charles Elliott at Harvard.

In their wake followed the development and expansion of an administrative/managerial class that focused on technical and day-to-day operational matters. After World War II, with the advent of the G.I. Bill and rapid expansion of public higher education, leaders like Clark Kerr at the University of California initiated another great wave of building and development in higher education (Goodchild and Wechsler, 1997). Since then higher education leaders have adopted many of the precepts originally designed for and implemented in the business world. One of these precepts is the quest for leadership as embodied in the "Great Man" or "Great Person" mystic—the search for the heroic renaissance leader. Following the decade of the 1990s in which the CEO was lionized as the wellspring of corporate vitality and shareholder value, the business world has reconsidered the presumed centrality of the CEO in creating and sustaining fundamental business success.

Unlike many business practices applied to higher education, the Great Man/Great Person theory of leadership has been met with skepticism. "It's hard to imagine that the heroic model of leadership was ever a particularly useful one for academe," says Madeline F. Green, Director of the Center of Leadership Development at the American Council of Education (1994, p. 55). In the 1970s, Cohen and March (1974) described the academy as an "organized anarchy" in which the organization's goals and purposes were unclear and little direct power was ascribed to positional leaders (p. 1). Green (1994) asserts that, given the realities of academia in which the balance of power constantly shifts from interest group to interest group, "the traits of the leader become less important than the complex interrelationships among leaders, followers, context and the tasks at hand" (p. 56).

In a higher education leadership research project conducted in 1986 under the auspices of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, Bensimon and Neumann interviewed presidents and other positional leaders at 28 institutions to determine how they interacted and communicated with one another, established goals, transmitted values and developed an understanding of their campuses. "We were intrigued with the idea of leadership as interactive, collaborative and shared. It became increasingly difficult for us to think in terms of individual leaders without referring, at the same time, to their interactions (intended or not) with those around them" (Bensimon and Neumann, 1986, p. xiv). Bogue (1994) asserts that the most important task of today's formal leaders in higher education is the articulation of a philosophy—the values and ideals that inspire the work of the organization. "An element of that philosophy will surely be that leadership is not necessarily something that others do for or to us but something we do together in shared ventures of purpose, persistence, and pleasure" (Bogue, 1994, p. xv).

In the dawn of the 21st Century higher education is seen as much an engine of economic development as the repository, embodiment and chief transmitter of our collective culture and cannon. In the U.S. some exposure to higher education is becoming more an expectation than an option—no longer an exclusive rite of passage reserved for the wealthy or highly motivated. With open access to higher education assured through the nation's community colleges and growing pressure from new for-profit providers, higher education is facing an environment in which there are more students, fewer public funds and unprecedented expectations of accountability from every constituency.

Leadership in Community Colleges

The three decades following World War II signaled an era of rapid community college establishment and growth. J. Eaton (interview, October 4, 2004) indicated that founding presidents were generally considered pioneering leaders in this educational movement. Often as the first person hired, founding presidents had an advantage in matters of power and control that few of their successors could match. They built their colleges from the ground up—interpreting the mission of access and opportunity, securing funding, building campuses, hiring faculty and developing programs.

Today, the community college sector has emerged as a positive, respected and versatile force in higher education and society, educating nearly half of all undergraduates in the nation and fully two-thirds of all minority students. "While they share a commitment to open access, comprehensiveness and responsiveness to local needs, community colleges are a set of diverse institutions" (Palmer and Katsinas, Eds., 1996, p.4). This diversity is a result of their versatility--nimble local colleges able to shape and transform themselves to meet community needs. The roles played by community college leaders and the ability to serve successfully in these roles are influenced directly by the growing complexity of the community college environment and the evolution to a relatively flat organizational hierarchy with many distributed centers of influence and decision making.

Leadership now is in the hands of many. Piland and Wolf (2003) observe that leadership "is exercised by members of the faculty, by key members of the support staff and certainly by administrators and members of governing boards" (p. 1). They note that

the distributed nature of leadership is complex both in theory and in practice and, when added to the multifaceted landscape of the community college, working successfully with distributed leadership can be especially daunting. Cooper and Pagotto (in Piland and Wolf, Eds., 2003) speak to the prevalence of faculty members as a source of informal leadership, often feeling "the pull of leadership from the moment they enter community colleges" (p. 29). They are called upon to serve in a variety of capacities beyond the classroom including membership on budget and strategic planning committees, curriculum committees, search teams for faculty and administrators and accreditation and self-study committees. As faculty are visible and prominent in service to the college mission beyond their prescribed teaching roles, so are members of the classified staff, administrators, paraprofessionals and others not considered part of the formal leadership hierarchy. "There is no place in today's university where we can sit and watch the unruly world go by" (Ramsden, 1998, p. 231).

Informal leaders get things done as a result of their own individual efforts or by influencing and inspiring others. They are referred to by Senge (2000) as "natural leaders who emerge based on excellence of performance, clarity of vision or quality of the heart" (p. 25). Given the prevalence of faculty and staff "followers" serving as leaders without positional power, it appears that informal leadership can be observed on community college campuses today—a brand of leadership that may be instrumental in influencing the overall success of the institution.

In some cases the need for leadership from all corners of the institution is a consequence of the sheer volume of work that needs to be accomplished—there are more initiatives to be addressed than the formal leaders can lead or manage. Occasionally, the

short-term reassignment of faculty and staff to projects "beyond the job description" is the result of a call for new perspectives or specific expertise that can only come from faculty, line administrators and support staff. Weighty issues that stir emotions such as a breakdown of shared governance, program or service changes, modifications in the core curriculum and establishing faculty load also may bring forth informal leaders. They gather followers while playing roles of spokespersons, conveners, negotiators, agitators or coalition builders.

Some have suggested that the increasing focus on and importance of informal leaders signals a new organizational model for community colleges (Gould and Caldwell, 1998). "Like business and industry, the successful community colleges of the next millennium will radically alter their management models and foster organizational synergy. These thriving institutions will create organizational cultures symbolized by decentralized decision making, collaborative governance, alignment of structure and systems with institutional values and goals..." (p. 350).

The forces that guide this research study are fourfold. Community colleges today are grappling with multiple missions. They are characterized by flat organizational hierarchies with distributed and devolved centers of influence and control. They are actively transforming themselves from a focus on input, teaching and resources, to a focus on output, learning. They are drawing upon the talents of faculty and staff to actively engage in every aspect of the development, design and delivery of positive learning outcomes across the spectrum of community college engagement with students and the community. In some situations this engagement results from an expectation

inherent in the practice of shared governance, in others it is the spontaneous exercise of situational leadership.

As a result of these forces, it is important to the future of community colleges to develop a better understanding of the full range of leadership in practice—including leadership that is not traditionally or formally sanctioned through title or position and yet is commonly observed as an existing phenomenon, particularly among faculty in community colleges. Whether by design or by default, the devolution of leadership is occurring. An aspect of this devolution is the influence of informal faculty leaders—a phenomenon that has not been systematically investigated and as a result, is not well understood.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to develop an understanding of informal faculty leadership in the community college from the perspective of informal faculty leaders themselves. The research sought to answer the following questions:

1. What characteristics and behaviors exemplify effective informal faculty leaders?
2. What factors contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders?
3. What issues tend to be influenced by informal faculty leaders and do their peers perceive this influence as positive or negative?
4. What circumstances tend to draw out or be associated with informal faculty leaders in the exercise of informal leadership?

This chapter will include a description of the population, the sample used in the research, the development of the survey instrument, the data collection procedures and the data analysis procedures.

Population

Since the purpose of this research was to develop an understanding of informal faculty leadership in the community college from the perspective of informal faculty leaders themselves, the population for this research study was informal faculty leaders from six Michigan community colleges.

Selection of Sample

Permission was sought and received from six Michigan community college presidents to have faculty from their colleges participate in this study. Each of the six presidents was contacted by e-mail and asked to provide, via email, the names and addresses of faculty department chairs that were subsequently invited to nominate effective informal faculty leaders for this study. The guiding variable of the institutional selection process was to include colleges of different enrollment size, since size could have a bearing on the organization's structure, culture and, therefore, on the prevalence and influence of informal leaders. Colleges with enrollment that ranged from a low of 2,000 students to a high of 14,000 students were selected to participate.

Department chairs were invited to offer nominations of effective informal faculty leaders for this study because, in their formal leadership roles, department chairs are well positioned to observe the characteristics and behaviors of faculty members. As immediate supervisors of faculty members, department chairs are likely to have frequent contact with faculty members in department meetings, on college committees, and in less formal settings (e.g. hallway conversations), and witness their interactions with other faculty and staff.

Upon receipt of the faculty department chair mailing lists from the presidents, a total of 53 department chairs were sent a letter (see Appendix A) via U.S. mail asking them to nominate faculty members whom they considered to be effective informal faculty leaders on their campuses. The letter explaining the purpose of the research and requesting the nominations also included a nomination form (see Appendix B) and a self addressed, stamped return envelope in which to return the nomination form.

The definition of informal faculty leaders provided to department chairs in the letter of invitation to nominate was: faculty without recognized positional authority yet who influence others within the college either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. Effective informal faculty leaders were defined as: those who have influenced others within the college and, as a result, had either a positive or negative influence on some aspect of the organization.

Department chairs were asked to provide the names and addresses of any and all faculty members who met the aforementioned definitions of effective informal faculty leaders without regard to any other qualifying criteria (i.e. teaching discipline, full-time or part-time status, gender, years of service, etc.). Department chairs were assured that their nominations would be confidential, that they could submit them anonymously, that their names would not be connected in any way with the survey, and the individuals they nominated would not know the source of their nomination.

The unit of analysis for this study was individuals identified by nominators from the same institution. This study incorporated the non-probability sampling technique of purposive or judgment sampling (Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh, 1996). Individuals who were judged by department chairs to be effective informal leaders, as defined, were nominated to participate.

Two weeks after the initial mailing was sent to department chairs asking for their nominations of effective informal faculty leaders, an email reminder was sent to all 53 department chairs. The email was sent to all department chairs due to the fact that the nominations were submitted anonymously and it was not possible to know which department chairs had returned nomination forms from those who had not. A total of 93

faculty members, perceived as effective informal faculty leaders by their department chairs, were nominated to participate in the research study.

It is noted that the purposive sampling technique utilized in this research study had limitations that could affect the results of the study. The challenges of purposive sampling are the extent to which judgment can be relied upon to arrive at a typical sample and that the individuals judged to be typical of the population will remain typical over time (Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh, 1996). The advantage of purposive sampling for this study was the non-random selection of individuals judged to demonstrate the behaviors of effective informal faculty leaders.

Research Instrument Design

A quantitative research instrument was utilized to gather data on the topic. The instrument was designed to explore the perceptions of informal faculty leaders with regard to their observations of informal leaders in the community college. Five steps were taken in the development of the research instrument, the Informal Faculty Leader Questionnaire (IFLQ).

Step 1 - Comprehensive Literature Review - Initial research for the development of the instrument was completed through a comprehensive literature review of topics relating to leadership characteristics and behaviors, leadership and power, and leadership and followership. Books, journal articles, dissertations and websites pertaining to leadership in for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, including higher education, were examined. The review of literature provided an analysis of leadership theory. An analysis of the current literature on leadership enabled the researcher to accumulate the

information to form a baseline of accepted characteristics and behaviors of leaders, to understand the implications of leading with and without formal authority, and to be familiar with the role of followers in the leadership equation.

Step 2 – Pre-research Discussion - A group of six faculty members from one of the six community colleges selected for the research study participated in a pre-research discussion of effective informal faculty leadership and its related terminology. The discussion was designed to identify informal faculty leader characteristics, behaviors and issues to be explored in the research instrument and to ascertain terminology appropriate to the topic and familiar to the population to be surveyed that could be used in the instrument. Those selected for participation in Step 2 were not considered for later participation in the research.

Step 3 – Development of the Informal Faculty Leader Questionnaire Instrument (IFLQ) - Using the information gained in Steps 1 and 2, along with guidance from the researcher's Dissertation Committee, Step 3 focused on the development of the IFLQ. Research instrument questions were developed using terminology appropriate to the topic and familiar to the population to be surveyed. The design of the research instrument followed recommendations cited by Creswell (1994), Alreck and Settle (1985) and Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh (1996) for organizing and grouping items by topic, content and scaling technique, composing scales and composing instructions.

Step 4 – Field Testing of the Instrument - The IFLQ was field tested with six informal faculty leaders—four of whom participated in the discussion noted in Step 2 and two who had not participated in the discussion in Step 2. The purpose of field testing the IFLQ was to determine if the research instrument cover letter and instructions were

understandable, if any of the questions required clarification, if the order of the questions was appropriate and if the estimated time required to complete the IFLQ was ten to fifteen minutes. None of the participants in this step of the research participated at later stages of the research.

Step 5 – Instrument Revision - Using information from Step 4, above, the IFLQ was revised and the final instrument was developed (See Appendix C). Participants were asked to reflect on their observation of informal faculty leaders at their colleges as they responded to the IFLQ. Included in the IFLQ were questions on informal faculty leader characteristics and behaviors, their influence on the institution, the ways in which informal faculty leaders emerge within the institution, circumstances in which informal faculty leaders are likely to exercise leadership, and the factors that define informal faculty leaders.

Data Collection Procedures

Each of the 93 nominees was sent a letter of invitation (see Appendix D) to participate in the research study, a copy of the Informal Faculty Leader Questionnaire (see Appendix C), two copies of a Consent to Participate Form (see Appendix E), a self-addressed stamped envelope for return of the completed research questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope for return of one copy of the signed Consent to Participate Form. Care was taken in the letter of invitation to not disclose that the survey participants themselves were considered informal leaders, since this might have affected the outcome of the study. Instead, the 93 research study participants were told that they

had been invited to participate in the study for the purpose of providing a faculty member's perspective on informal faculty leadership within the community college.

Exactly two weeks after this initial packet was mailed, an identical packet was mailed to all nominees who had not yet returned a signed Consent to Participate Form. Within forty days of the initial mailing to the survey sample, a total of sixty-two completed IFLQs were received and an identical number of signed Consent to Participate forms were received. IFLQs were date stamped the day of arrival, recorded by code number and filed according to code number for data entry at a later date.

Data Analysis

Response codes were created for each of the nine IFLQ questions. Responses from individual research questionnaires were entered into SPSS, the software utilized to analyze the data. Data were verified for accuracy following data entry by running test descriptive and cross-tabulation comparisons.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data and to identify the mean agreement/disagreement scores of the five multi-part questions in the IFLQ: characteristics and behaviors of informal leaders, the ways in which informal leaders emerge, factors that define informal leaders, the areas/degrees of influence on the institution by informal leaders and circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership. For each of these five survey questions, respondents were asked to assign numerical values to their level of agreement with each statement of these multi-part questions using a five point Likert-like scale ranging from 5=strongly agree to

1=strongly disagree. For purposes of data interpretation, the mean agreement/disagreement scores were categorized as follows:

Scores ≥ 4.0 were considered to represent high association

Scores ≤ 2.99 were considered to represent low association

The remaining four of the nine survey questions were demographic in nature and analyzed first using descriptive statistics, including frequencies and means. In order to examine the affect of years of experience in higher education and years of experience at their current institution, a subset of data were analyzed that was one standard deviation away from the mean for Question 7 and Question 8. This allowed for comparing the survey responses when highly experienced faculty were compared with those faculty who had little experience.

Since the data available through this survey were means data, two-tailed t-tests, a statistical method of assessing the significance of differences between two mean values for the same variable (Alreck and Settle, 1985), were used in the data analysis. T-tests were used to analyze where important differences existed with regard to the demographic information provided by respondents—male/female, newer/longer serving in higher education, high longevity/low longevity at current institution and technical/occupational or liberal arts/general studies faculty—when considering every variable described in Questions 1-5: informal leader characteristics and behaviors, how informal faculty leaders emerge, factors that define effective informal faculty leaders, areas/degrees of influence on the institution and circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership. Level of significance for all analyses was set at $<.05$.

Limitations

Because of the small sample size and the purposive, non-random selection of institutions and individual participants, the results of this research cannot be generalized to all community colleges. This research was exploratory in nature and the results should be treated as analyses that are grounded in systematically gathered data from a limited number of respondents.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

In the previous chapter the methodology for this study was explained in detail, from the Informal Faculty Leader Questionnaire to the statistical procedures utilized in analyzing the data.. This chapter presents the data that were collected together with an analysis of the data.

Informal Faculty Leader Demographics

Response Rate

Table 2 shows the number of Informal Faculty Leadership Questionnaires that were mailed, the number and percent that were returned completed and the number and percent used in the data analysis.

Table 2: Response Rate

	IFLQs Mailed	IFLQs Returned Completed	IFLQs Used in Data Analysis
Informal Faculty Leader	93	62 (67%)	62 (67%)

The Informal Faculty Leader Questionnaires were mailed to a total of 93 individuals nominated as being informal faculty leaders at six Michigan Community Colleges. Each one of the 93 individuals was nominated to participate in the study by one or more department chairs at their respective colleges. Sixty-two Questionnaires were returned completed for a response rate of 67%. Sixty-two Questionnaires were used for data analysis.

Gender of Respondents

Table 3 shows the gender of respondents.

Table 3: Gender of Respondents		
Gender	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Male	32	51.6
Female	29	46.8
Total	61	98.4
Missing	1	1.6
Total	62	100.0

As shown in Table 3, a total of 32 males (51.6%) and 29 females (46.8%) returned completed Questionnaires. One respondent did not answer the gender question.

Years of Experience in Higher Education

Table 4 shows the frequency distribution and mean of respondents' years of experience in higher education.

Table 4: Frequencies and Mean for Years of Experience in Higher Education		
Years of experience in higher education	**Frequency**	**Percent**
3	1	1.6
5	1	1.6
6	1	1.6
7	1	1.6
8	1	1.6
10	2	3.2
11	2	3.2
12	1	1.6
13	1	1.6

Table 4 (continued): Frequencies and Mean for Years of Experience in Higher Education		
Years of experience in higher education	**Frequency**	**Percent**
14	1	1.6
15	3	4.8
16	4	6.5
17	3	4.8
18	3	4.8
19	1	1.6
20	9	14.5
22	1	1.6
23	2	3.2
24	2	3.2
25	4	6.5
30	6	9.7
32	1	1.6
33	1	1.6
34	1	1.6
35	1	1.6
36	1	1.6
37	3	4.8
38	2	3.2
40	1	1.6
Missing	1	1.6
Total	62	100.0
Mean Years of Experience		21.6
Std. Deviation		9.3

As shown in Table 4, respondents' years in higher education ranged from a low of 3 years to a high of 40 years. Thirty-eight (62%) of the respondents had between 15 and 30

years of experience. One respondent did not answer the years in higher education question. The mean of respondents' years in higher education was 21.6 years. The standard deviation was 9.3. In the examination of the effect that years in higher education might have on the responses to IFLQ items, subsequent data analyses for the years in higher education demographic compared newer and longer serving faculty and included only those respondents whose years in higher education were at least one standard deviation above the mean, 31 years or more, and compared them to those whose years in higher education were at least one standard deviation below the mean, 12 years or less.

Years of Experience at Current Institution

Table 5 shows the frequency distribution and mean of respondents' years of experience at their current institution.

Table 5: Frequencies and Mean for Years at Current Institution

Years of experience at your current institution	Frequency	Percent
3	1	1.6
4	1	1.6
5	1	1.6
6	1	1.6
7	3	4.8
8	1	1.6
9	1	1.6
10	2	3.2
11	4	6.5
12	2	3.2

Table 5 (continued): Frequencies and Mean for Years at Current Institution		
Years of experience at your current institution	**Frequency**	**Percent**
13	1	1.6
14	2	3.2
15	4	6.5
16	5	8.1
17	4	6.5
18	5	8.1
19	2	3.2
20	5	8.1
23	1	1.6
25	5	8.1
27	1	1.6
29	1	1.6
30	1	1.6
34	1	1.6
36	2	3.2
37	2	3.2
38	2	3.2
Missing	1	1.6
Total	62	100.0
Mean		18.2
Std. Deviation		9.0

As shown in Table 5, respondents' years at their current institution ranged from a low of 3 years to a high of 38 years. Forty-two (69%) of the respondents had between 10 and 26 years of experience at their current institution. Subsequent data analyses for the years of experience at current institution demographic compared high longevity and low longevity

faculty and included only those respondents whose years of experience at their current institution were at least one standard deviation above the mean, 27 years or more, and compared them to those whose years of experience were at least one standard deviation below the mean, 9 years or less.

Technical and Liberal Arts Faculty

Table 6 shows the academic area of the college represented by respondents.

Table 6: Academic Area of Faculty Respondents

What area of the college do you represent?	Frequency	Percent
Technical/occupational	26	41.9
Liberal arts/general studies	35	56.5
Missing	1	1.6
Total	62	100.0

As shown in Table 6, 35 respondents (56.5%) represented liberal arts/general studies areas and 26 respondents (41.9%) represented technical/occupational areas of the college. One respondent did not answer the academic area question.

Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Table 7 shows the mean agreement scores for statements describing the characteristics and behaviors demonstrated by informal faculty leaders.

Table 7: Mean Agreement Scores for Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Informal faculty leaders...	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
... demonstrate concern for people/relationships.	61	4.43*	.59
... demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability.	60	4.38*	.61
... are self inspired to lead.	61	4.28*	.80

Table 7 (continued): Mean Agreement Scores for Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders			
Informal faculty leaders...	**N**	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
... work behind the scenes.	62	4.18*	.76
... are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur.	61	4.15*	.70
... demonstrate networking ability.	61	4.15*	.68
... demonstrate concern for tasks.	61	4.15*	.65
... have a positive outlook.	62	4.02*	.69
... are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy.	62	3.92	.71
... seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions.	61	3.92	.76
... are conferred the "status" of informal leaders by others.	61	3.90	.62
... tend to be deliberative in decision making.	60	3.88	.64
... seek consensus.	62	3.84	.77
... get others to agree with their ideas.	62	3.82	.67
... are altruistic.	60	3.72	.78
... are systems thinkers.	62	3.47	.76
... promote their own personal opinions.	61	3.34	.79
... mainly influence their peer group.	61	3.23	.99
... are humble.	62	3.21	.73
... are highly visible, prominent.	61	3.18	.87
... are motivated by self-interest.	61	3.15	1.05
... are self appointed as informal leaders.	61	3.10	.89
... are prideful.	62	2.97**	.90
... tend to be spontaneous in decision making.	61	2.54**	.85
... have a negative outlook.	62	2.16**	.73
... have narrow insight.	62	1.95**	.64

* = high association
** = low association

A total of 26 statements describing characteristics and behaviors that might be ascribed to informal faculty leaders were developed with the aid of a discussion group representing

community college faculty. Respondents to the IFLQ were presented with the 26 statements in the Questionnaire and asked to indicate on a five-point Likert-like scale the degree to which they agreed or disagreed that each statement was typical of informal faculty leaders. In the IFLQ the five point scale was structured as follows: strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.

As noted by the eight items with an asterisk in Table 7 above, a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale illustrates high association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders. As seen in Table 7, respondents show high association with these statements about informal faculty leaders: "demonstrate concern for people/relationships," "demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability," "are self inspired to lead," "work behind the scenes," "are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur," "demonstrate networking ability," "demonstrate concern for tasks," and "have a positive outlook."

Conversely, as noted by the four items with a double asterisk in Table 7, a mean score of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale illustrates low association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders. As seen in Table 7, respondents show low association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders: "are prideful," "tend to be spontaneous in decision making," "have a negative outlook," and "have narrow insight."

The characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders with high association in Table 7 were those that were also characterized as favorable by the original discussion group utilized in Step 2 of the IFLQ development—upbeat, positive and constructive—including a strong emphasis on interpersonal relationships: networking ability, concern

for people/relationships, seeking advice/counsel from others and ability to influence people up/down the hierarchy—and the very practical aspects of getting the work done: demonstrating knowledge/expertise and being task-oriented. At the opposite end of the spectrum are the unfavorable attributes—negative outlook, narrow insight, prideful behavior and less thoughtful or consultative decision making style. Respondents to this survey associate informal faculty leaders with characteristics and behaviors that may be considered favorable or positive.

The Emergence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Table 8 shows the mean agreement scores of responses to the question, "At your college, how do informal faculty leaders emerge?"

Table 8: Mean Agreement Scores when Considering Factors that Contribute to the Emergence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Informal faculty leaders step forward because they...	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
... are deeply concerned about the issue(s) at hand.	62	4.39*	.52
... feel a responsibility to lead.	62	4.05*	.64
... are encouraged by their peers.	61	3.97	.63
... know something--their area of expertise is involved.	61	3.97	.60
... are encouraged by formal leaders.	61	3.34	.87
... are motivated by the exercise of influence and power.	62	2.50**	.90

* = high association
** = low association

Six statements describing how informal faculty leaders emerge were listed in the IFLQ. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert-like scale the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. The scale was structured as follows: strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.

As noted by the two items with an asterisk in Table 8 above, a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale illustrates high association with these factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders. As seen in Table 8, respondents show high association with these statements: informal faculty leaders step forward because they "are deeply concerned about the issue(s) at hand" and "feel a responsibility to lead."

Conversely, as noted by the item with a double asterisk in Table 8 above, a mean score of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale illustrates low association with one factor that contributes to the emergence of informal faculty leaders. As seen in Table 8, respondents show low association with the statement: informal faculty leaders step forward because they "are motivated by the exercise of influence and power."

Although the literature speaks to the opportunity to exercise influence and power as compelling factors for some leaders, the results presented above show that respondents to the IFLQ associate with different factors such as concern about an issue or feeling a sense of personal responsibility. Respondents also showed agreement that influence, in the form of peer encouragement; and pragmatism, when the opportunity to lead in their area of expertise is presented, are factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders. In the opinion of respondents the rewards linked to the acquisition of power and influence are not considered as important as other determining factors in the informal leadership equation.

Factors That Define Effective Informal Faculty Leaders

Table 9 shows the mean agreement scores with statements describing the "factors that define effective informal faculty leaders."

Table 9: Mean Agreement Scores for Factors that Define Effective Informal Faculty Leaders			
Effective informal faculty leaders...	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
... need to be effective communicators--oral and written.	62	4.47*	.62
... transcend boundaries--they influence others beyond their department or discipline.	62	4.31*	.69
... communicate through dialogue and face-to-face interaction.	62	4.29*	.55
... recognize and engage the talents of others.	62	4.23*	.61
... are influential in shaping the college.	62	4.18*	.61
... must first be perceived as effective teachers/educators.	62	4.05*	.82
... can emerge any where, any time--age, gender and experience are not necessarily determining factors.	62	3.94	.92
... are those with more experience and greater longevity in the institution.	62	3.26	1.10

* = high association

Eight descriptors that could define effective informal leaders were listed on the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert-like scale the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement as an accurate descriptor for informal faculty leaders. The scale was structured as follows: strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.

As noted by the six items with an asterisk in Table 9 above, a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale illustrates high association with these factors that define effective informal faculty leaders. As seen in Table 9, respondents show high association with these factors that define effective informal faculty leaders: "need to be effective communicators—oral and written," " transcend boundaries—they influence others beyond their department or discipline," "communicate through dialogue," "recognize and engage the talents of others," " are influential in shaping the college," and "must first be perceived as effective teachers." Respondents did not show low association with any of

the factors in Table 9 in that none of the statements received a mean agreement score of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale.

Although it might be expected that length of service, age, gender or master teacher status would be factors predictive of informal faculty leaders, respondents indicated high association with statements related to cultivating and nurturing followers as defining elements of informal faculty leaders. There is high association among respondents with descriptors of informal faculty leaders as effective communicators—oral, written and face-to-face; able to cultivate beyond their cubicles by transcending narrow departmental boundaries; and adept at recognizing and engaging the talents of others. Responses to the IFLQ show that informal leaders may emerge anywhere, any time. Regardless of the specific events at hand, what respondents are inclined to see as the common thread involving informal faculty leaders is that they demonstrate and communicate an interest in and concern for issues and people beyond their traditional, even parochial, boundaries.

Influence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Table 10 shows the mean positive and negative degrees of influence of informal faculty leaders by area of influence.

Table 10: Mean Agreement Scores for Area of Influence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Area of Influence	Positive or Negative	Mean	N
Curriculum	Positive influence	4.00*	59
Curriculum	Negative influence	4.00*	1
Assessment	Positive influence	3.71	52
Assessment	Negative influence	2.67	9

Table 10 (continued): Mean Agreement Scores for Area of Influence of Informal Faculty Leaders			
Area of Influence	**Positive or Negative**	**Mean**	**N**
Compensation	Positive influence	3.57	51
Compensation	Negative influence	2.10	10
Shared Governance	Positive influence	3.48	54
Shared Governance	Negative influence	2.33	6
Budget	Positive influence	2.61**	49
Budget	Negative influence	2.09**	11

* = high influence
** = low influence

Respondents were asked to rate five possible Areas of Influence: Shared Governance, Curriculum, Budget, Compensation and Assessment in the IFLQ. For each Area of Influence respondents were asked to give a positive rating or a negative rating to indicate the direction of informal faculty leaders' influence on each Area. For each Area of Influence respondents were also asked to indicate on a five-point Likert-like scale the degree to which informal faculty leaders have an impact on the Area of Influence. The scale was structured as follows: very high=5, high=4, neutral=3, low=2, very low=1. Responses to this question were analyzed in pairs to consider both positive and negative mean ratings for each Area of Influence. Only those pairs that met the scoring threshold of 4.0 or higher and 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale are discussed below.

As noted by the item with an asterisk in Table 10, a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale illustrates high influence for this Areas of Influence. Respondents (n=59) show high positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of curriculum. One respondent (n=1) showed high negative influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of curriculum.

Conversely, as noted by the item with a double asterisk in Table 10, a mean score of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale illustrates low influence with this Area of influence. As seen in Table 10, respondents (n=49) show low positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of budget, and low negative influence (n=11) by informal faculty leaders on the Area of budget.

This particular question on the IFLQ gave respondents the opportunity to rate each Area of Influence as "positive" or "negative" in addition giving each Area a high to low score on the Likert-like scale. Although only one respondent indicated a negative influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of curriculum, it was a high influence score at 4.0.

Not surprisingly, an Area in which faculty are traditionally perceived as having significant expertise and influence, curriculum, was given the high influence, positive mean score when considering all five Areas of informal faculty leader influence tested. Budget, an Area that has tended to be more the purview of formal administrative leaders, was given low positive influence and low negative influence mean scores.

By design the IFLQ placed emphasis on informal faculty leadership. The Areas of budget and compensation may fall more appropriately in the domain of a more formal category of faculty leadership. In many institutions faculty are regularly engaged in budget and compensation issues and this engagement tends to be represented in sanctioned faculty leadership positions such as union or faculty association leader, department chair, or planning/budget committee member. In any event, whether it is budget and shared governance as substantive Areas or because these Areas are the

domain of more formally designated faculty leaders, respondents tended to regard informal faculty leaders as less influential in Areas of budget and compensation.

Circumstances in Which Faculty are Likely to Exercise Informal Leadership

Table 11 shows the mean scores of agreement with statements describing "circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership."

Table 11: Mean Agreement Scores when Considering Circumstances in Which Faculty are Likely to Exercise Informal Leadership

Faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership in order to	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
... offer perspective or opinion on an important/sensitive issue.	60	4.32*	.54
... "step up" and do their part: lead/serve on a committee, task force, etc.	60	4.30*	.50
... influence formal leaders.	60	4.08*	.65
... influence followers.	60	3.78	.67
... demonstrate participation in shared governance.	59	3.75	.78
... fulfill "service to college mission" requirements.	60	3.58	.87
... prepare for a formal leadership position.	60	3.27	.92

* = high association

Seven statements describing circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership were listed in the IFLQ. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert-like scale the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. The scale was constructed as follows: strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1. As noted by the items marked with an asterisk in Table 11 above, a mean score of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale illustrates high association with these circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership.

As seen in Table 11, respondents show high association with these statements about circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership: in order

to "offer perspective or opinion on an important/sensitive issue," "step up and do their part: lead/serve on a committee, task force, etc." and "influence formal leaders." Respondents did not show low association with any of the circumstances in Table 11 since none of the statements received a mean agreement score of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale.

When indicating agreement with circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership, respondents showed high agreement with statements describing circumstances that offer the potential of influencing beyond the body of faculty—by offering perspective or opinion on an important or sensitive issue and by stepping up to lead or serve on a committee or task force. In both of these situations the forum for leadership is likely to include more than faculty peers, although some committees and task force initiatives could be intra-faculty activities. Based on these responses, it appears that informal faculty leaders are more active on the boundaries of their departments with other departments, beyond the boundaries of their departments with the college as a whole, or beyond the boundaries of their departments and the college with the external community. This idea is reinforced by respondents' high association with the statement "informal faculty leaders are likely to exercise informal leadership in order to influence formal leaders." Given these high association scores, it appears that respondents concur that informal faculty leadership is a boundary-spanning activity.

Significant Differences Shown by Gender of Respondents

Table 12 shows the statements for which statistically significant differences were found between the mean agreement/disagreement scores of male and female respondents.

Table 12: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Males and Females when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Informal faculty leaders . . .	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability.	Male	31	4.23*	.56	.012***
	Female	28	4.61*	.57	.012***
. . . demonstrate networking ability.	Male	31	3.97	.55	.016***
	Female	29	4.38*	.73	.017***
. . . are motivated by self-interest.	Male	31	2.84**	1.04	.017***
	Female	29	3.48	.99	.017***
. . . are systems thinkers.	Male	32	3.28	.77	.056
	Female	29	3.66	.72	.055
. . . demonstrate concern for tasks.	Male	31	4.26*	.63	.125
	Female	29	4.00*	.65	.126
. . . work behind the scenes.	Male	32	4.03*	.65	.152
	Female	29	4.31*	.85	.158
. . . tend to be spontaneous in decision-making.	Male	31	2.39**	.72	.172
	Female	29	2.69**	.97	.177
. . . are conferred the "status" of informal leaders by others.	Male	31	3.84	.52	.317
	Female	29	4.00*	.71	.322
. . . have narrow insight.	Male	32	1.88**	.71	.338
	Female	29	2.03**	.57	.333
. . . are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur.	Male	31	4.23*	.67	.396
	Female	29	4.07*	.75	.398

Table 12 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Males and Females when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders					
Informal faculty leaders . . .	**Gender**	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)**
. . . are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy.	Male	32	3.84	.63	.398
	Female	29	4.00*	.80	.404
. . . tend to be deliberative in decision-making.	Male	30	3.83	.59	.429
	Female	29	3.97	.68	.430
. . . are self inspired to lead.	Male	31	4.19*	.87	.469
	Female	29	4.34*	.72	.466
. . . seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions.	Male	31	3.87	.85	.514
	Female	29	4.00*	.65	.510
. . . have a positive outlook.	Male	32	3.97	.69	.578
	Female	29	4.07*	.70	.578
. . . get others to agree with their ideas.	Male	32	3.84	.63	.616
	Female	29	3.76	.69	.617
. . . have a negative outlook.	Male	32	2.13**	.61	.667
	Female	29	2.21**	.86	.673
. . . mainly influence their peer group.	Male	31	3.26	.96	.742
	Female	29	3.17	1.04	.742
. . . demonstrate concern for people/relationships.	Male	31	4.45*	.62	.807
	Female	29	4.41*	.57	.807
. . . promote their own personal opinions.	Male	31	3.35	.80	.831
	Female	29	3.31	.81	.831
. . . are prideful.	Male	32	2.97**	.93	.872
	Female	29	2.93**	.88	.872

Table 12 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Males and Females when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Informal faculty leaders . . .	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . are altruistic.	Male	31	3.74	.77	.894
	Female	28	3.71	.81	.894
. . . are self-appointed as informal leaders.	Male	31	3.10	.87	.905
	Female	29	3.07	.92	.905
. . . seek consensus.	Male	32	3.84	.81	.936
	Female	29	3.83	.76	.936
. . . are humble.	Male	32	3.22	.71	.950
	Female	29	3.21	.77	.951
. . . are highly visible, prominent.	Male	32	3.19	.78	.969
	Female	28	3.18	.98	.969

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant differences

A total of 26 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors were analyzed to examine differences between male and female agreement ratings. Of these, three statements, those marked with triple asterisks in Table 12, showed statistically significant differences between mean agreement ratings of males and females. Characteristics and behaviors showing statistically significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining 23 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors did not show statistically significant gender differences as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 12, female respondents, as compared to male respondents, show high association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal

leaders: "demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability," "demonstrate networking ability" and "are motivated by self-interest."

Not unexpectedly, two of these characteristics and behaviors are related to issues of informal faculty leader performance: what they know—knowledge and expertise ability, and who they know—their ability to network throughout the institution. High association with know-how and relationship strength show that females believe these are characteristics and behaviors that one would expect from an informal leader. Surprisingly, the third statement of characteristics and behaviors in which a statistically significant difference was found between females' and males' mean scores is related to personal gain. As shown in Table 12, females, more than males, associate self-interest as a motivating factor for informal faculty leaders. Since self-aggrandizement is more a gender stereotypic characteristic for males than for females in leadership roles, this statistically significant difference in association is of interest.

Of note in Table 12 are four other statements in which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for females and males, were different when considering the high association score threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale. Female respondents indicated high association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders: "are conferred the status of informal leaders by others," " are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy," "seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions" and "have a positive outlook." Male respondents' mean scores did not meet the high association threshold for these same four characteristics and behaviors.

Table 13 shows a statement for which a statistically significant difference was found between the mean agreement/disagreement ratings of male and female respondents when considering factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders.

Table 13: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Males and Females when Considering Factors that Contribute to the Emergence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Informal leaders step forward because...	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
... their area of expertise is involved.	Male	31	3.81	.60	.034***
	Female	29	4.14*	.58	.034***
... they feel a responsibility to lead.	Male	32	3.97	.69	.209
	Female	29	4.17*	.54	.204
... they are encouraged by their peers.	Male	31	3.90	.60	.430
	Female	29	4.03*	.68	.432
... they are motivated by the exercise of influence and power.	Male	32	2.41**	.91	.527
	Female	29	2.55**	.87	.526
... they are deeply concerned about the issue(s) at hand.	Male	32	4.38*	.55	.776
	Female	29	4.41*	.50	.775
... they are encouraged by formal leaders.	Male	31	3.35	.88	.846
	Female	29	3.31	.89	.846

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant difference

A total of six factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders were analyzed to examine differences between male and female agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 13, showed a statistically significant difference between the mean agreement ratings of males and females. Factors showing statistically significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining five statements of factors that contribute to the emergence of informal

faculty leaders did not show statistically significant gender differences as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 13, female respondents, as compared to male respondents, show a statistically significant difference in association ratings for, "informal leaders step forward because their area of expertise is involved."

Given normal circumstances and gender stereotypic tendencies, it is not unexpected that women would emphasize expertise over other factors such as the motivation of influence and power or feeling a personal responsibility to lead. It is interesting that the factors that might suggest a more stereotypic female affinity for relationship issues—encouragement by peers or encouragement by formal leaders—did not show statistically significant differences between association scores for females and males when the t-test was applied.

Of note in Table 13 are four other statements in which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for females and males, were different when considering the high association threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale. Of the factors listed that could contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders, female respondents indicated high association with: "they feel a responsibility to lead" and "they are encouraged by their peers. " Male respondents' mean agreement scores did not meet the high association threshold for these same two factors.

Table 14 shows the statement for which a statistically significant difference was found between the mean agreement/disagreement ratings of male and female respondents when considering factors that define effective informal faculty leaders.

Table 14: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Males and Females when Considering Factors that Define Effective Informal Faculty Leaders

Factors that Define Informal Faculty Leaders . . .	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . need to be effective communicators--oral and written.	Male	32	4.25*	.62	.005***
	Female	29	4.69*	.54	.005***
. . . must first be perceived as effective teachers/educators.	Male	32	3.88	.75	.083
	Female	29	4.24*	.87	.086
. . . is conducted through dialogue and face-to-face communication.	Male	32	4.19*	.59	.114
	Female	29	4.41*	.50	.112
. . . transcend boundaries--they influence others beyond their department or discipline.	Male	32	4.19*	.59	.204
	Female	29	4.41*	.78	.211
. . . age, gender and experience are not necessarily determining factors.	Male	32	4.03*	.82	.316
	Female	29	3.79	1.01	.321
. . . recognize and engage the talents of others.	Male	32	4.22*	.55	.712
	Female	29	4.28*	.65	.714
. . . are influential in shaping the college.	Male	32	4.16*	.51	.753
	Female	29	4.21*	.73	.757
. . . are those with more experience and greater longevity in the institution.	Male	32	3.22	1.07	.842
	Female	29	3.28	1.16	.843

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant difference

A total of eight statements that define effective informal leaders were analyzed to examine differences between male and female agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 14, showed a statistically significant difference between mean agreement ratings of males and females. Characteristics and behaviors showing statistically significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less.

The remaining seven statements that define effective informal leaders did not show statistically significant gender differences as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 14, female respondents, as compared to male respondents, show a significant difference in association rating with " effective informal faculty leaders need to be effective communicators—oral and written."

While this finding is interesting, the comprehensive nature of the statement, "need to be effective communicators—oral and written" makes it difficult to determine what may have led to the difference in association scores between females and males. A disaggregation of oral and written communication techniques and approaches might be helpful in creating a more complete understanding of this issue. Is it more important in the minds of female respondents that informal faculty leaders be strong on oratorical skills—effective, clear, persuasive and compelling on their feet in front of large and small audiences of peers and formal leaders? Or is it more important in the minds of female respondents for informal faculty leaders to be strong writers who can compose articulate, well-reasoned and convincing messages and convey them in a handwritten note, email, memo or position paper? The topic of communication, oral, written and perhaps even non-verbal communication, is one deserving of further explication.

Of note in Table 14 are two other statements for which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for females and males, were different when considering the high association threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale. Female respondents indicated high association with "must first be perceived as effective teachers/educators" as a factor that defines effective informal faculty leaders. Male respondents' mean score did not meet the high association threshold for this same factor.

Male respondents indicated high association with "age, gender and experience are not necessarily determining factors." Female respondents' mean score did not meet the high association threshold for this same statement.

Table 15 shows a statement for which a statistically significant difference was found between the agreement/disagreement ratings of male and female respondents when considering circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership.

Table 15: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Males and Females when Considering Circumstances in which Faculty are Likely to Exercise Informal Leadership

Circumstances – Faculty who exercise informal leadership are likely to . . .	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . "step up" and do their part: lead/serve on a committee, task force, etc.	Male	31	4.16*	.45	.024***
	Female	29	4.45*	.51	.025***
. . . demonstrate participation in shared governance.	Male	31	3.61	.56	.170
	Female	28	3.89	.96	.183
. . . offer perspective or opinion on an important/sensitive issue.	Male	31	4.23*	.50	.177
	Female	29	4.41*	.57	.179
. . . influence followers.	Male	31	3.68	.65	.206
	Female	29	3.90	.67	.206
. . . fulfill "service to college mission" requirements.	Male	31	3.45	.77	.228
	Female	29	3.72	.96	.232
. . . prepare for a formal leadership position.	Male	31	3.19	.87	.528
	Female	29	3.34	.97	.530
. . . influence formal leaders.	Male	31	4.13*	.50	.575
	Female	29	4.03*	.78	.581

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant difference

A total of seven statements of factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders were analyzed to examine differences between male and female mean agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 15, showed a statistically significant difference between mean agreement ratings of males and females. Factors showing significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining six statements of factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders did not show statistically significant gender differences as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. There were no other statements for which the non-statistically significant mean agreement scores for females and males were different when considering the high association score threshold.

As seen in Table 15, female respondents, as compared to male respondents, show a significant difference in association ratings with the factor, "faculty who exercise informal leadership are likely to step up and do their part: lead/serve on a committee, task force, etc."

Given that this single statement stands out as statistically different and given the relative isolation of this statement, it is difficult to determine its full implication. It does, however, seem to be consistent with previous research on the perspective of women who are preparing for formal leadership positions as compared to men who are preparing for formal leadership positions. While women's needs are similar to men's needs in those areas generally regarded as competencies for formal leadership—taking initiative, working well with people, understanding significant issues, problem solving, etc.—the tendency of women is often to feel compelled to be "hyper-qualified" so that others will

view them as equals when compared to their male counterparts in equivalent formal leadership positions (Shavlik and Touchton, 1988).

If one were to make the assumption that, in general, the skills and experiences required for formal leadership positions are in some ways analogous to the skills and experiences required for informal leadership, it may offer insight into the statistically significant difference evidenced in this situation. The difference could be attributable to the notion that women, more than men, feel a greater need to exhibit leader competence to others. Leading or serving on a committee or task force would qualify as a "noticeable" act of faculty leader behavior.

There were no statistically significant differences between the mean agreement scores of male and female respondents when considering "areas of informal faculty leader influence."

Significant Differences Shown by Years in Higher Education

Table 16 shows the statement for which a statistically significant differences was found between the agreement/disagreement ratings of newer and longer serving faculty respondents when considering characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders.

Table 16: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Newer and Longer Serving Faculty when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – informal faculty leaders . . .	Your years of experience in higher education.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . are altruistic.	12 years or less	7	3.00	.58	.010***
	31or more years	11	4.00*	.77	.007***

Table 16 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Newer and Longer Serving Faculty when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – informal faculty leaders . . .	Your years of experience in higher education.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur.	12 years or less	7	3.43	.98	.028
	31or more years	11	4.36*	.67	.052
. . . are motivated by self-interest.	12 years or less	7	3.86	1.07	.050
	31or more years	11	2.82**	.98	.060
. . . work behind the scenes.	12 years or less	7	4.57*	.53	.083
	31or more years	11	4.09*	.54	.087
. . . demonstrate concern for tasks.	12 years or less	7	4.00*	.82	.101
	31or more years	11	4.55*	.52	.149
. . . seek consensus.	12 years or less	7	3.57	.79	.118
	31or more years	11	4.18*	.75	.127
. . . get others to agree with their ideas.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.38	.145
	31or more years	11	3.73	.65	.105
. . . seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions.	12 years or less	7	3.57	1.13	.163
	31or more years	10	4.20*	.63	.218
. . . are conferred the "status" of informal leaders by others.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.38	.170
	31or more years	10	3.90	.32	.190
. . . are self-appointed as informal leaders.	12 years or less	7	3.57	.53	.226
	31or more years	10	3.10	.88	.189
. . . are self inspired to lead.	12 years or less	7	4.00*	1.00	.268
	31or more years	11	4.45*	.69	.317
. . . demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability.	12 years or less	7	4.57*	.53	.324
	31or more years	11	4.27*	.65	.305
. . . promote their own personal opinions.	12 years or less	7	3.57	.53	.390
	31or more years	10	3.30	.67	.371

Table 16 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Newer and Longer Serving Faculty when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – informal faculty leaders . . .	Your years of experience in higher education.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . demonstrate concern for people/relationships.	12 years or less	7	4.29*	.49	.399
	31or more years	11	4.55*	.69	.363
. . . are highly visible, prominent.	12 years or less	7	3.29	1.11	.423
	31or more years	11	2.91**	.83	.459
. . . have a negative outlook.	12 years or less	7	2.00**	.58	.490
	31or more years	11	2.27**	.90	.446
. . . are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy.	12 years or less	7	4.00*	.58	.535
	31or more years	11	4.18*	.60	.533
. . . tend to be spontaneous in decision-making.	12 years or less	7	2.43**	.53	.575
	31or more years	10	2.70**	1.16	.528
. . . have narrow insight.	12 years or less	7	1.86**	.69	.725
	31or more years	11	1.73**	.79	.718
. . . tend to be deliberative in decision-making.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.69	.834
	31or more years	10	4.20*	.42	.850
. . . are systems thinkers.	12 years or less	7	3.57	.79	.869
	31or more years	11	3.64	.81	.868
. . . demonstrate networking ability.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.38	.881
	31or more years	11	4.18*	.60	.868
. . . mainly influence their peer group.	12 years or less	7	3.29	1.25	.887
	31or more years	11	3.36	1.03	.893
. . . are humble.	12 years or less	7	3.14	.69	.901
	31or more years	11	3.18	.60	.905

Table 16 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Newer and Longer Serving Faculty when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – informal faculty leaders . . .	Your years of experience in higher education.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . are prideful.	12 years or less	7	2.86**	.90	.922
	31or more years	11	2.82**	.75	.926
. . . have a positive outlook.	12 years or less	7	4.29*	.76	.964
	31or more years	11	4.27*	.47	.968

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant difference

A total of 26 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors were analyzed to examine differences between newer and longer serving faculty mean agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 16, showed a statistically significant difference between newer and longer serving faculty. Characteristics and behaviors showing statistically significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining 25 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors did not show statistically significant differences between newer and longer serving faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 16, faculty with 31 years or more in higher education, as compared to faculty with 12 years or less in higher education, showed a statistically significant different association rating with this characteristic and behavior, "informal faculty leaders are altruistic."

Faculty with extended experience in higher education have seen the ebb and flow of the organizations in which they have spent their careers. Given the long tenure of faculty in this research study—in higher education and at their current institutions—it

could be assumed that they have gained a perspective on the culture and the challenges of the organization that their newer serving counterparts have not yet achieved. One could observe that long faculty tenure tends to bring out one of two "extreme" sentiments—either the individual becomes more deeply committed to the enterprise and its mission with each passing year or the individual becomes more cynical and less enthusiastic about the organization with each passing year. The resulting behaviors could generally be categorized as "model" on the part of those more deeply committed and "critic" on the part of those who become cynical.

Given the statistically significant difference in this particular characteristic of informal faculty leaders, it suggests that at least among respondents to this research questionnaire, longer serving faculty are more models than critics. Longer serving faculty have devoted their careers to higher education, demonstrating a commitment to the mission and to learners. While these faculty might have chosen at some point to "chase the action" outside of higher education—move on in search of more lucrative positions—they have not. With this perspective in mind, it is not surprising that longer serving faculty in higher education show high association with the statement that informal leaders are "altruistic" while newer serving faculty do not show high association with this same statement.

Of note in Table 16 are seven other statements in which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for newer and longer serving faculty, were different when considering the high association threshold of 4.0 and higher on a 5.0 scale and the low association threshold of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale. Longer serving faculty indicated high association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty

leaders: "are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur," "seek consensus," and "seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions." Newer serving faculty mean scores did not meet the high association threshold for these same three characteristics and behaviors.

Newer serving faculty indicated high association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders: "get others to agree with their ideas" and "are conferred the status of informal leaders by others." Longer serving faculty mean scores did not meet the high association threshold for these same two characteristics and behaviors.

In the opposite direction, longer serving faculty indicated low association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders: "are motivated by self-interest" and "are highly visible, prominent." Newer serving faculty mean scores did not meet the low association threshold for these same items.

Table 17 shows the statements for which statistically significant differences were found between the mean agreement/disagreement ratings of newer and longer serving faculty when considering factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders.

Table 17: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Newer and Longer Serving Faculty when Considering Factors that Contribute to the Emergence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Informal Faculty Leaders step forward because . . .	Your years of experience in higher education.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . they are deeply concerned about the issue(s) at hand.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.38	.042***
	31or more years	11	4.64*	.50	.032***
. . . their area of expertise is involved.	12 years or less	7	3.86	.90	.517
	31or more years	10	3.60	.70	.539
. . . they are encouraged by their peers.	12 years or less	7	3.71	.76	.656
	31or more years	10	3.90	.88	.648
. . . they are encouraged by formal leaders.	12 years or less	7	3.14	.69	.418
	31or more years	10	2.80**	.92	.394
. . . they are motivated by the exercise of influence and power.	12 years or less	7	2.57**	.79	.655
	31or more years	11	2.36**	1.03	.635
. . . they feel a responsibility to lead.	12 years or less	7	3.86	.38	.108
	31or more years	11	4.18*	.40	.107

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant difference

A total of six statements describing factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders were analyzed to examine differences between newer and longer serving faculty mean agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 17, showed a statistically significant difference between mean agreement ratings of newer and longer serving faculty. Characteristics and behaviors showing significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining five statements describing factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders did not show statistically significant differences between newer and longer serving

faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 17, respondents who have 31 years or more in higher education, as compared to respondents with 12 years or less in higher education, show a statistically significant difference in association rating with the statement, "informal leaders step forward because they are deeply concerned about the issue(s) at hand."

This difference is interesting, but not surprising. Perhaps this response is attributable to the fact that faculty who have 31 years or more in higher education may feel that they have already proven their professional pedagogical worth and feel confident in turning some of their attention to issues outside of the classroom. Those with 12 years or less in higher education may still be primarily focused on their teaching and learning responsibilities. While the statement does not indicate whether the "issue(s) at hand" are related to the department, to faculty specifically, or to the organization as a whole, one could give longer serving faculty the benefit of the doubt by assuming that the "issues" transcend parochial "what's in it for me" interests. On the other hand, the reverse could be true. Longer serving faculty respondents have observed higher education organizations in all of their political, cultural and symbolic splendor over more than three decades. Given this experience, they may perceive of informal faculty leaders emerging for reasons of enlightened self-interest—to make certain that the faculty position is well represented, given appropriate deference and shrewdly protected.

Of note in Table 17 are two other statements for which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for newer and longer serving faculty, were different when considering the high association threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale and 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale. Longer serving faculty respondents indicated high

association with "they feel a responsibility to lead" as a factor that contributes to the emergence of informal faculty leaders. Newer serving faculty mean scores did not meet the high association threshold for this same factor. At the opposite end of the scale, longer serving faculty respondents indicated low association with "they are encouraged by formal leaders" as a factor that contributes to the emergence of informal faculty leaders. Newer serving faculty mean scores did not meet the low association threshold for this same factor.

Table 18 shows the statement for which a significant difference was found between the mean high/low ratings of newer and longer serving respondents when considering informal faculty leader influence.

Table 18: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Newer and Longer Serving Faculty when Considering Areas of Influence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Area of Positive Influence	Your years of experience in higher education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
Shared Governance	12 years or less	7	3.00	.82	.025***
	31 years or more	10	4.00*	.82	.027***
Curriculum	12 years or less	7	3.71	.49	.165
	31 years or more	11	4.18*	.75	.129
Assessment	12 years or less	4	4.25*	.96	.174
	31 years or more	10	3.50	.85	.230
Compensation	12 years or less	7	3.29	.95	.301
	31 years or more	10	3.90	1.29	.276
Budget	12 years or less	6	2.50**	.55	.413
	31 years or more	9	2.78**	.67	.395

* = high influence
** = low influence
*** = significant difference

A total of five Areas of informal faculty leader influence were analyzed to examine differences between newer and longer serving faculty agreement ratings. Of these, one Area, marked with triple asterisks in Table 18, showed a statistically significant difference between the mean agreement ratings of newer and longer serving faculty. Areas of Influence showing significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining four Areas of Influence of informal faculty leaders did not show statistically significant differences between newer and longer serving faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 18, respondents who have 31 years or more in higher education, as compared to respondents who have 12 years or less in higher education, indicated high influence in a positive direction by informal faculty leaders on "Shared Governance."

In this instance, longer serving faculty appear to be demonstrating support for the role of faculty in shared governance by indicating that informal faculty leaders have a high level of positive influence in this arena. These results are in keeping with the notion that faculty with longer experience often demonstrate a willingness to work within the system—the "models" as opposed to the "critics" as described earlier in this chapter. They are not hell raisers or interested in leading a cabal. Instead they appear amenable to the notion that informal faculty leaders participate in the prevailing myths, symbols and substance of shared governance and believe that this participation yields positive results.

Although the definition and practice of shared governance varies from institution to institution, informal faculty leader participation does not appear to suggest a quasi-administrative role. Instead, it may imply that faculty participation in shared governance—in what could be considered as fairly benign leadership roles—

demonstrates an effort to be part of the institutional team—a "modeling" behavior. That is to say, because shared governance is, to a greater or lesser extent, an accepted organizational practice, informal faculty leaders can participate without offending the culture of the faculty or the culture of the administration. Given the many issues related to shared governance because of its centrality to discourse and decision-making on many community college campuses, this topic would be of interest for further study as it relates to informal faculty leadership.

Of note in Table 18 are two Areas of Influence in which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for newer and longer serving faculty, were different when considering the high influence threshold of 4.0 and above on a 5.0 scale. Longer serving faculty indicated a high level of positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of Curriculum. Newer serving faculty mean scores were below the high influence threshold. Newer serving faculty indicated a high level of positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of Assessment. Longer serving faculty mean scores did not meet the high influence threshold for this same Area of Influence. There were no Areas of Influence in which the mean agreement scores for newer and longer serving faculty were different when considering mean scores that met the low influence threshold.

Table 19 shows the statement for which a significant difference was found between the mean agreement/disagreement rating of newer and longer serving respondents for circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership.

Table 19: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of Newer and Longer Serving Faculty when Considering Circumstances in which Faculty are Likely to Exercise Informal Leadership

Circumstances – Faculty who exercise informal leadership are likely to . . .	Your years of experience in higher education.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . fulfill "service to college mission" requirements.	12 years or less	7	2.86**	.90	.037***
	31or more years	10	3.80	.79	.045***
. . . influence followers.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.38	.139
	31or more years	10	3.70	.67	.106
. . . prepare for a formal leadership position.	12 years or less	7	3.00	1.15	.420
	31or more years	10	2.60**	.84	.452
. . . demonstrate participation in shared governance.	12 years or less	7	3.57	.79	.435
	31or more years	9	3.89	.78	.436
. . . "step up" and do their part: lead/serve on a committee, task force, etc.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.38	.484
	31or more years	10	4.30*	.48	.464
. . . influence formal leaders.	12 years or less	7	4.14*	.38	.587
	31or more years	10	4.30*	.67	.550
. . . offer perspective or opinion on an important/sensitive issue.	12 years or less	7	4.29*	.49	.963
	31or more years	10	4.30*	.67	.960

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant difference

A total of seven statements describing circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership were analyzed to examine differences between newer and longer serving faculty agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 19, showed a statistically significant difference between mean agreement ratings of newer and longer serving faculty. Circumstances showing statistically significant differences in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining six

statements of circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership did not show significant differences between newer and longer serving faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 19, respondents who have 12 years or less in higher education, as compared to respondents who have 31 years or more in higher education, showed a significant difference in association rating with the statement, "to fulfill 'service to college mission' requirement."

Upon analysis of these results, there are some interpretation issues that could either cast a positive light or a less-than positive light on newer serving faculty when comparing results with those of their longer serving counterparts. If one assumes "to fulfill service to mission requirements" suggests that this is something that informal faculty leaders do because they are self-motivated to contribute to the good of the whole, then the newer serving faculty's low association with this item would not be laudable. If one assumes that this is something informal faculty leaders do because they are fulfilling a requirement it suggests an obligatory "check the box on the evaluation" mentality that is more perfunctory than praiseworthy.

Given these two interpretations, the response to this item given by newer serving faculty could be due to their as yet undeveloped understanding of contributing to the "greater good" as integral to the faculty role or due to their perception that service to mission is a proforma faculty service requirement and therefore not as meaningful or significant. Either way, newer faculty did not strongly support "service to mission" as a compelling prompt for the exercise of informal faculty leadership. Before offering further analysis, it would be important to know more about how respondents interpreted this item.

Of note in Table 19 are two statements in which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for newer and longer serving faculty, were different when considering the high association threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale and the low association threshold of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale. Newer serving faculty indicated high association with "to influence followers" as a circumstance in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership. Longer serving faculty scores did not meet the high association threshold for this same statement. Longer serving faculty indicated low association with "to prepare for a formal leadership position" as a circumstance in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership. Newer serving faculty mean scores did not meet the low association threshold for this same statement.

There were no significant differences, as defined by a t-test score of .05 or below, between the mean agreement scores of newer and longer serving faculty respondents when considering "factors that define effective informal faculty leaders."

Significant Differences Shown by Years of Experience at Current Institution

Table 20 shows the statements for which statistically significant differences were found between the mean agreement/disagreement ratings of high longevity and low longevity faculty for characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders.

Table 20: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of High Longevity Faculty and Low Longevity Faculty at Current Institution when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – Informal faculty leaders . . .	Your years of experience at your current institution.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur.	9 years or less	9	3.78	.83	.018***
	27 or more years	10	4.60*	.52	.024***

Table 20 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of High Longevity Faculty and Low Longevity Faculty at Current Institution when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – Informal faculty leaders . . .	Your years of experience at your current institution.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability.	9 years or less	9	4.78*	.44	.036***
	27 or more years	10	4.20*	.63	.033***
. . . are conferred the "status" of informal leaders by others.	9 years or less	9	4.22*	.44	.048***
	27 or more years	9	3.78	.44	.048***
. . . are motivated by self-interest.	9 years or less	9	3.67	1.00	.093
	27 or more years	10	2.90**	.88	.096
. . . work behind the scenes.	9 years or less	9	4.67*	.50	.095
	27 or more years	10	4.20*	.63	.091
. . . demonstrate concern for tasks.	9 years or less	9	4.00*	.71	.096
	27 or more years	10	4.50*	.53	.104
. . . are self-appointed as informal leaders.	9 years or less	9	3.44	.73	.207
	27 or more years	9	3.00	.71	.207
. . . promote their own personal opinions.	9 years or less	9	3.56	.53	.257
	27 or more years	9	3.22	.67	.257
. . . are prideful.	9 years or less	9	2.78**	.83	.272
	27 or more years	10	3.20	.79	.274
. . . demonstrate networking ability.	9 years or less	9	4.11*	.60	.275
	27 or more years	10	4.40*	.52	.280
. . . are humble.	9 years or less	9	2.89**	.60	.288
	27 or more years	10	3.20	.63	.287
. . . are highly visible, prominent.	9 years or less	9	3.22	1.09	.311
	27 or more years	10	2.80**	.63	.329
. . . have a negative outlook.	9 years or less	9	2.00**	.71	.450
	27 or more years	10	2.30**	.95	.443
. . . get others to agree with their ideas.	9 years or less	9	3.78	.67	.478
	27 or more years	10	4.00*	.67	.478

Table 20 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of High Longevity Faculty and Low Longevity Faculty at Current Institution when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – Informal faculty leaders . . .	Your years of experience at your current institution.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . seek consensus.	9 years or less	9	3.78	.67	.478
	27 or more years	10	4.00*	.67	.478
. . . are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy.	9 years or less	9	3.89	.60	.506
	27 or more years	10	4.10*	.74	.502
. . . seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions.	9 years or less	9	3.89	.93	.555
	27 or more years	9	4.11*	.60	.556
. . . tend to be deliberative in decision-making.	9 years or less	9	4.11*	.60	.661
	27 or more years	9	4.22*	.44	.661
. . . are systems thinkers.	9 years or less	9	3.56	.73	.692
	27 or more years	10	3.70	.82	.690
. . . are altruistic.	9 years or less	9	3.44	.88	.720
	27 or more years	10	3.60	.97	.718
. . . have narrow insight.	9 years or less	9	1.89**	.60	.788
	27 or more years	10	1.80**	.79	.785
. . . are self inspired to lead.	9 years or less	9	4.11*	.93	.808
	27 or more years	10	4.20*	.63	.813
. . . tend to be spontaneous in decision-making.	9 years or less	9	2.67**	.71	.814
	27 or more years	9	2.78**	1.20	.815
. . . demonstrate concern for people/relationships.	9 years or less	9	4.33*	.50	.816
	27 or more years	10	4.40*	.70	.813
. . . mainly influence their peer group.	9 years or less	9	3.33	1.12	.896
	27 or more years	10	3.40	1.07	.896
. . . have a positive outlook.	9 years or less	9	4.22*	.83	.948
	27 or more years	10	4.20*	.63	.949

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant differences

A total of 26 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors were analyzed to examine differences between high longevity and low longevity faculty agreement ratings. Of these, three statements, those marked with triple asterisks in Table 20, showed statistically significant differences between mean agreement ratings of high longevity and low longevity faculty. Characteristics and behaviors showing statistically significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining 23 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors did not show statistically significant differences between high longevity and low longevity faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less.

As seen in Table 20, respondents with 27 years or more at their current institution, as compared to respondents with 9 years or less at their current institution, show a significant difference in association rating with the characteristic and behavior, "inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur." Respondents with 9 years or less at their current institution, as compared to respondents with 27 years or more at their current institution, show a significant difference in association rating with "informal faculty leaders are conferred the 'status' of informal leaders by others" as a characteristic and behavior of informal faculty leaders. While respondents with 9 years or less and 27 years or more indicated high association with the characteristic and behavior "informal faculty leaders demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability," the difference in their mean scores was statistically significant.

The mean agreement scores for low longevity and high longevity faculty for "informal faculty leaders demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability" are somewhat of an anomaly in that both categories of respondents scored this item above the high

association threshold. This suggests, perhaps, that in the academic environment knowledge and expertise are universally valued commodities that are recognized and appreciated by all faculty—independent of time or on-the-job experience. With this assumption in mind, perhaps low longevity faculty believe that a characteristic of informal faculty leaders is their demonstration of knowledge and expertise—since this is a characteristic that could apply to them as low longevity faculty and therefore allow them to be perceived of as leaders or exercise informal faculty leader roles.

Referring back to Table 9, the mean agreement score for all respondents did not meet the high association score threshold for "more experience and greater longevity in the institution" as a factor that defines effective informal faculty leaders. When comparing these results with the results shown in Table 20, it is interesting that low longevity faculty, as compared to high longevity faculty, showed high association with the characteristic and behavior that informal leaders must be conferred with this status by others. Respondents to this research questionnaire did not consider longevity as a strong determinant of informal faculty leadership. Low longevity faculty believe that the "status" of informal leader is conferred by others. Therefore, these results support the notion that *behaviors* noticed and recognized by others are more cause for conferral of informal faculty leader status than longevity. This "behaviors" notion also reinforces the assertion by Drucker (1996) and others that leadership is not self-proclaimed; it must be recognized, bestowed and confirmed by followers. Even though longevity and experience are not perceived of as strong determinants of informal faculty leadership by respondents overall, one could speculate that high longevity faculty still believe that it has something to do with being an elder in the institutional culture.

Not surprisingly, the elders—high longevity faculty, as compared to low longevity faculty—showed high association with the statement that the inspiration to lead comes about "as a result of situations or events that occur." Those who have experienced the woof and the warp of the institutional fabric over time have likely witnessed some of the organization's most important lessons. They have experienced trends and events that relate to transfer mission, technical/occupational mission, cultural mission, workforce development mission, community service mission, and so on. Issues related to these trends and events—and the institution's role in anticipating or reacting to them—have been the substance of discussion, debate, deliberation and decision—offering multiple opportunities for the exercise of informal faculty leadership. Time and again, high longevity faculty, more so than their low longevity peers, have witnessed these opportunities as "inspiration" to exercise informal leadership.

Of note in Table 20 are eight other statements in which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for high longevity faculty and low longevity faculty, were different when considering the high association score threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale and the low association score threshold of 2.99 or lower on a 5.0 scale. High longevity faculty indicated a high association with these informal faculty leader characteristics and behaviors: "seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions," "are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy," "seek consensus" and "get others to agree with their ideas." Low longevity faculty mean scores did not meet the high association threshold for these same characteristics and behaviors. High longevity faculty indicated low association with these informal faculty leader characteristics and behaviors: "are highly visible, prominent" and "are motivated by self-

interest." Low longevity faculty mean scores did not meet the low association threshold for these same characteristics and behaviors. Low longevity faculty indicated low association with two informal leader characteristics and behaviors: "are humble" and "are prideful." High longevity faculty mean scores did not meet the low association threshold for these same characteristics and behaviors.

Table 21 shows the statements for which statistically significant differences were found between the high/low influence ratings of high longevity and low longevity faculty for informal faculty leader Areas of Influence.

Table 21: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores of High Longevity and Low Longevity Faculty at Current Institution when Considering Areas of Informal Faculty Leader Influence

Area of Positive Influence	Your years of experience at your current institution.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
Shared Governance	9 years or less	8	2.88**	.64	.014***
	27 or more years	10	3.90	.88	.011***
Budget	9 years or less	6	2.33**	.52	.037***
	27 or more years	8	3.00	.53	.038***
Assessment	9 years or less	5	4.20*	.84	.095
	27 or more years	9	3.33	.87	.101
Curriculum	9 years or less	9	3.78	.67	.176
	27 or more years	9	4.22*	.67	.176
Compensation	9 years or less	8	3.50	1.07	.195
	27 or more years	9	4.11*	.78	.207

* = high influence
** = low influence
*** = significant differences

A total of five Areas of informal leader influence were analyzed to examine differences between high longevity and low longevity faculty agreement ratings. Of these, two areas,

marked with triple asterisks in Table 21, showed statistically significant differences between mean agreement ratings of high longevity and low longevity faculty. Areas showing statistically significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining three areas of informal leader influence did not show statistically significant differences between high longevity and low longevity faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less.

As seen in Table 21, respondents with 9 years or less at their current institution, as compared to respondents who have 27 years or more at their current institution, show a significant difference in association ratings for "degree of positive influence of informal faculty leaders on shared governance" and "degree of positive influence of informal faculty leaders on budget." Of the remaining three areas of "informal faculty leader influence" there were no statistically significant differences shown between respondents with 9 years or less at their current institution and respondents with 27 years or more at their current institution as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less.

It is not surprising that respondents with low longevity in the institution, as compared to high longevity respondents, would indicate that informal faculty leaders have a low, positive influence on shared governance and budget. Having less experience with the ebb and flow of the organization, low longevity faculty may not yet have acquired important lessons about the culture of the organization. Generally speaking, they may not know the idiosyncrasies of the formal and informal systems, be familiar with the networks of the institution or know who and what the influencers are. They do not perceive of shared governance as a generally accepted forum in which to exercise both practical and symbolic informal faculty leader leadership and influence.

Low longevity faculty also ascribe low influence to informal faculty leader influence on issues of budget. It is not clear from these results if the budget is being interpreted by respondents as particular to the departmental budget, the overall institutional budget or somewhere in between. Perhaps by virtue of less experience at their current institution, they are not personally knowledgeable about the budget, how it is constructed, and where the push points are, and as a result may perceive of informal faculty leaders as less influential on budget matters. While faculty may have some influence on budget matters, these issues are more traditionally perceived to be within the administrative/management purview. Before offering further analysis, it would be important to know more about how respondents interpreted the word "budget."

Of note in Table 21 are three Areas of Influence for which the mean agreement scores for high longevity and low longevity faculty were different when considering the high agreement score threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale. Low longevity faculty showed a high level of positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of Assessment. The high longevity faculty mean score for assessment did not meet the high influence threshold for assessment. On the other hand, high longevity faculty indicated high, positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Areas of curriculum and compensation. The low longevity faculty mean scores for curriculum and compensation did not meet the high influence threshold.

There were no statistically significant differences, as defined by a t-test score of .05 or below, between how high longevity and low longevity faculty rated their agreement with statements regarding "how informal faculty leaders emerge," "factors

that define effective informal faculty leaders" or "circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership."

Significant Differences Shown by Academic Area of Faculty

Table 22 shows the statements for which statistically significant differences were found between the mean agreement/disagreement ratings of technical/occupational and liberal arts/general studies faculty for characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders.

Table 22: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores by Academic Area of Faculty when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – Informal faculty leaders . . .	What area of the college do you represent?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . tend to be deliberative in decision making.	Technical/occupational	25	3.64	.76	.006***
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	4.09*	.45	.012***
. . . demonstrate concern for tasks.	Technical/occupational	25	3.92	.70	.030***
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.29*	.57	.037***
. . . seek consensus.	Technical/occupational	26	3.62	.85	.056
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.00*	.69	.065
. . . seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions.	Technical/occupational	26	3.73	.72	.069
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	4.09*	.75	.068
. . . are humble.	Technical/occupational	26	3.38	.75	.116
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	3.09	.70	.120
. . . are motivated by self-interest.	Technical/occupational	25	3.40	1.19	.122
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	2.97**	.92	.139
. . . demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability.	Technical/occupational	25	4.28*	.54	.159
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	4.50*	.62	.151

Table 22 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores by Academic Area of Faculty when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – Informal faculty leaders . . .	What area of the college do you represent?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . have a positive outlook.	Technical/occupational	26	3.88	.77	.204
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.11*	.63	.219
. . . are highly visible, prominent.	Technical/occupational	26	3.35	.89	.209
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.06	.85	.213
. . . tend to be spontaneous in decision-making.	Technical/occupational	26	2.69**	.84	.210
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	2.41**	.86	.208
. . . get others to agree with their ideas.	Technical/occupational	26	3.92	.56	.220
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	3.71	.71	.204
. . . promote their own personal opinions.	Technical/occupational	26	3.19	.80	.233
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.44	.79	.235
. . . are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur.	Technical/occupational	25	4.04*	.84	.314
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.23*	.60	.342
. . . have narrow insight.	Technical/occupational	26	2.04**	.72	.364
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	1.89**	.58	.379
. . . demonstrate concern for people/relationships.	Technical/occupational	25	4.36*	.57	.423
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.49*	.61	.417
. . . demonstrate networking ability.	Technical/occupational	25	4.24*	.72	.477
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.11*	.63	.488
. . . mainly influence their peer group.	Technical/occupational	25	3.32	1.03	.500
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	3.14	.97	.505
. . . are systems thinkers.	Technical/occupational	26	3.38	.75	.517
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	3.51	.78	.515
. . . are self-appointed as informal leaders.	Technical/occupational	26	3.00	.75	.530
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.15	.99	.515

Table 22 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores by Academic Area of Faculty when Considering Characteristics and Behaviors of Informal Faculty Leaders

Characteristics and Behaviors – Informal faculty leaders . . .	What area of the college do you represent?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . are conferred the "status" of informal leaders by others.	Technical/occupational	26	3.96	.53	.627
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.88	.69	.615
. . . are altruistic.	Technical/occupational	25	3.68	.69	.685
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.76	.85	.676
. . . are prideful.	Technical/occupational	26	3.00	1.10	.717
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	2.91**	.74	.732
. . . are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy.	Technical/occupational	26	3.88	.65	.756
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	3.94	.76	.750
. . . have a negative outlook.	Technical/occupational	26	2.19**	.63	.797
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	2.14**	.81	.790
. . . work behind the scenes.	Technical/occupational	26	4.19*	.80	.803
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.14*	.73	.806
. . . are self inspired to lead.	Technical/occupational	25	4.28*	.68	.914
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.26*	.89	.910

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant differences

A total of 26 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors were analyzed to examine differences between technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty mean agreement ratings. Of these, two statements, those marked with triple asterisks in Table 22, showed statistically significant differences between mean agreement ratings of technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty. Characteristics and behaviors showing statistically significant differences are

defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining 24 statements of informal leader characteristics and behaviors did not show statistically significant differences between technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 22, liberal arts/general studies faculty respondents, as compared to technical/occupational faculty respondents, show a significant difference in association ratings with the statements, "informal faculty leaders demonstrate concern for tasks" and "informal faculty leaders tend to be deliberative in decision making."

Though it might have been expected that the data would have shown technical faculty with high agreement that informal leaders demonstrate "task" behavior, the opposite was true. These results tend to confuse rather than clarify. Given the stereotypic tendencies of technical faculty, they get the job done and they focus on results and right answers. There is little tolerance for ambiguity when learning to fly an airplane, mill a machine tool or administer medication. Technical faculty are focused on moving students through a progression of courses that build skills and competencies with the end goal of placing students in jobs.

Alternatively the stereotypic tendencies of liberal arts faculty to conduct themselves in a more philosophical manner, discussing, questioning and exploring the black and white of an issue as well as all the shades of gray, suggest that a stronger agreement with "task" behavior among this group is counter intuitive. For these same reasons, the mean scores for "deliberative in decision making" seem right on target with liberal arts faculty, as compared to vocational faculty, showing high association with this as a characteristic of informal faculty leaders.

That said one possible explanation for these results might be due to liberal arts faculty origins and evolution as the "first faculty" in the community college. These faculty may feel as if their leadership stature is established. Technical faculty may still be striving for comparable leadership recognition. If one is willing to go along with this as a possible explanation for "task" behavior being more strongly affirmed by liberal arts faculty, perhaps it is because they have moved beyond dealing with the question of recognition as informal leaders to a more focused set of substantive issues and tasks that need attention.

Of additional interest is that liberal arts faculty respondents outnumbered technical faculty respondents to this study by nearly 57 percent to 42 percent. While this raises more questions than can be answered about who is considered a leader versus who was nominated to participate versus who completed the research questionnaire, it does suggest an area to be further explored.

Of note in Table 22 are five characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders for which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for technical and liberal arts faculty, were different when considering the high association threshold of 4.0 and above on a 5.0 scale and the low association threshold of 2.99 and below on a 5.0 scale. Liberal arts faculty respondents indicated high association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders: "have a positive outlook," "seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions" and "seek consensus." Technical faculty mean scores did not meet the high association threshold for these same characteristics and behaviors. Liberal arts faculty respondents indicated low association with these characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders: "are motivated by

self-interest" and "are prideful." Technical faculty mean scores did not meet the low association threshold for these same characteristics and behaviors.

Table 23 shows the statement for which a statistically significant difference was found between the mean agreement/disagreement ratings of technical/occupational and liberal arts/general studies faculty when considering factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders.

Table 23: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores by Academic Area of Faculty when Considering the Emergence of Informal Faculty Leaders

Informal faculty leaders step forward because . . .	What area of the college do you represent.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
. . . they are encouraged by formal leaders.	Technical/occupational	26	3.62	.75	.028***
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.12	.91	.024***
. . . they are deeply concerned about the issue(s) at hand.	Technical/occupational	26	4.27*	.45	.112
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.49*	.56	.101
. . . they feel a responsibility to lead.	Technical/occupational	26	3.96	.53	.269
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	4.14*	.69	.250
. . . they are motivated by the exercise of influence and power.	Technical/occupational	26	2.38**	.80	.495
	Liberal arts/general studies	35	2.54**	.95	.485
. . . their area of expertise is involved.	Technical/occupational	26	3.96	.66	.955
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.97	.58	.956
. . . they are encouraged by their peers.	Technical/occupational	26	3.96	.60	.957
	Liberal arts/general studies	34	3.97	.67	.956

* = high association
** = low association
*** = significant difference

A total of six statements describing how informal faculty leaders emerge were analyzed to examine differences between technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general

studies faculty mean agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 23, showed a statistically significant difference between mean agreement ratings of technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty. Statements showing significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining five statements describing how informal faculty leaders emerge did not show significant differences between vocational/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 23, there was a statistically significant difference in mean scores for the statement, "informal leaders step forward because they are encouraged by formal leaders," yet neither technical faculty nor liberal arts faculty association ratings met the high association threshold.

Given the hierarchical and sometimes autocratic nature of many of the career fields represented by the technical faculty—health care, hospitality/culinary, law enforcement—technical faculty respondents, as compared to liberal arts faculty, might have been expected to show high association with the statement that "informal leaders step forward because they are encouraged by formal leaders." Perhaps as a result of their experience in these career fields prior to or concurrent with their teaching careers, technical faculty may tend more toward a hierarchical view of the organization in which leadership must be called forth by formal leaders rather than conferred by peers or self-initiated. While there may be differences from the vantage point of technical faculty and liberal arts faculty, neither group registers high association with the notion of formal leaders providing the impetus for informal leaders.

Of note in Table 23 is one statement for which the mean agreement score for liberal arts faculty and technical faculty was different when considering the high association score threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale. Liberal arts faculty respondents indicated high association with informal faculty leaders emerging as a result of "feeling a responsibility to lead." The technical faculty mean score did not meet the high association threshold for "feeling a responsibility to lead."

Table 24 shows the statement for which a statistically significant difference was found between the mean high/low influence ratings of technical/occupational faculty respondents and liberal arts/general studies faculty respondents when considering Areas of informal faculty leader influence.

Table 24: Comparing Mean Agreement Scores by Academic Area of Faculty when Considering Informal Faculty Leader Influence

Area of Positive Influence	What area of the college do you represent?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)
Compensation	Technical/ occupational	22	3.05	1.33	.007***
	Liberal arts/general studies	28	4.00*	1.05	.009***
Shared Governance	Technical/ occupational	25	3.20	1.00	.069
	Liberal arts/general studies	28	3.71	1.01	.069
Budget	Technical/ occupational	23	2.48**	1.08	.303
	Liberal arts/general studies	25	2.76**	.78	.310

Table 24 (continued): Comparing Mean Agreement Scores by Academic Areas of Faculty when Considering Informal Faculty Leader Influence					
Area of Positive Influence	**What area of the college do you represent?**	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**t-test for Equality of Means Sig. (2-tailed)**
Curriculum	Technical/ occupational	25	3.96	.89	.853
	Liberal arts/general studies	33	4.00*	.75	.857
Assessment	Technical/ occupational	25	3.72	.94	.918
	Liberal arts/general studies	26	3.69	.97	.918

* = high influence
** = low influence
*** = significant difference

A total of five areas of informal leader influence were analyzed to examine differences between technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty mean agreement ratings. Of these, one statement, marked with triple asterisks in Table 24, showed a statistically significant difference between mean agreement ratings of technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty. Areas of influence showing significant differences are defined as those with a t-test score of .05 or less. The remaining four areas of informal leader influence did not show significant differences between mean agreement ratings of technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty as defined by a t-test score of .05 or less. As seen in Table 24, liberal arts/general studies faculty respondents, as compared to technical/occupational faculty respondents, show high, positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of compensation.

Generally speaking, issues of faculty compensation are steeped in tradition, bound by union or other contracts and influenced by peer benchmarks, the vitality of revenues, cost of living indices and issues of evaluation and performance. In most cases, faculty compensation is applied equitably, through some combination of step and scale, in recognition of longevity, level of education and job performance. Assuming this scenario, it might be expected that there would not be a statistically significant difference in the mean agreement scores of technical and liberal arts faculty with regard to the level of informal faculty leader influence on issues of compensation.

Perhaps one explanation for the difference in response is due to the fact that in some community colleges, compensation for hard-to-fill faculty positions in technical/occupational fields, such as information technology and nursing, may be indexed to the occupational career field instead of the traditional faculty scale. Since liberal arts faculty would have had less experience with these exceptions to the compensation pattern of practice, they may feel a greater sense of influence over compensation issues than do their technical faculty peers. Other explanations for this difference are not immediately apparent which suggests that this is another area that may need to be further explored.

Of note in Table 24 is one Area of Influence in which the mean agreement scores, though not statistically significant for technical faculty and liberal arts faculty, were different when considering the high association score threshold of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale. Liberal arts faculty members showed high, positive influence by informal faculty leaders on the Area of curriculum. The technical faculty mean score did not meet the high association threshold for the Area of curriculum.

There were no significant differences, as defined by a t-test score of .05 or below, between the mean agreement scores of technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty with regard to "factors that define effective informal faculty leaders" or "circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership."

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the purpose and need for this research study, a discussion of the key findings and conclusions drawn from research results, related implications and recommendations for further study.

Purpose and Need for the Research Study

The purpose of this research study was to develop an understanding of informal faculty leadership in the community college—characteristics and behaviors of informal leaders, their influence on the organization, how informal leaders emerge, and circumstances in which informal leadership is likely to be exercised. More specifically, the following research questions were explored:

1. What characteristics and behaviors exemplify effective informal faculty leaders?
2. What factors contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders?
3. What issues tend to be influenced by informal faculty leaders, and do their peers perceive this influence as positive or negative?
4. What circumstances tend to draw out or be associated with informal faculty leaders in the exercise of informal leadership?

Leadership is a current theme in higher education playing a central role in theories of organizational change and institutional transformation. The interesting thing about leadership is that the more it is studied the richer and more inclusive the concept of

leadership becomes. It is no longer limited to the "traditional notions of the solitary, heroic leader" (Bolman and Deal, 1997 p. 296).

It is true that leaders make things happen, but things also make leaders happen. Context influences both what leaders must do and what they can do. "No single formula is possible or advisable for the great range of situations that potential leaders encounter" (Bolman and Deal, 1997, p. 296). The single hero as ultimate visionary and the general notion of leadership are explored in DePree (2003); Green (1988, 1994); Kelley (1988); Piland and Wolf (2003); Scott (2003); and Smith (1996).

While effective, formally designated executive leadership is important, the notion of an omnipotent, top-down executive model of leadership seems out of step with the 21st Century community college. In recent decades the comprehensive community college mission has become many missions. The community college portfolio of programs and services has evolved, mostly through addition, expanding in response to expectations from the communities and constituencies they serve (Bailey and Morest, 2004). Community colleges have become a collection of many substantially different things camouflaged in a single comprehensive concept. Scratch the surface and revealed is a wide variety of programs and services operating on highly individual and program specific schedules with personnel and other resources often separate and distinct from one another.

This evolutionary period of four or more decades has spawned issues of shared governance, encouraged organizational complexity and resulted in a uniquely, substantially North American institution. The American community college has passed through its emerging stages, survived its early phases of dramatic growth and entered a

period of maturity as an established enterprise, still adding to its mission and rarely, if ever, culling. Organizational complexity, concern that decisions reflect special knowledge gained from those closest to the student/learner/client, and expectations that commitment to the organization can be enhanced through participation all mitigate against a single focus on highly concentrated top-down leadership. As community colleges perform more functions, the configuration of leadership and influence has perforce become more diffused throughout the organization. The result is that the overall organizational structure has become flatter as community colleges respond to widely varying student and community needs, seek out specialized knowledge and expertise, manage scarce financial resources and capitalize on potential new revenue streams.

Increasingly in business and industry employees at all levels are expected to identify problems, contribute to their solution and help guide colleagues in carrying out the organization mission. In short, employees at all levels are encouraged to exercise leadership. Now, in the manner of business and industry, institutions of higher education are becoming corporatized (Atlas, 2005) as the challenges facing higher education echo those of for-profit businesses—limited resources, increased competition, demands for accountability and high constituent expectations for service and flexibility.

In the 21st Century community college context there are more issues and opportunities demanding special knowledge and contextual leadership than ever before. By necessity, and in some cases by default, community colleges are becoming increasingly reliant on informal leaders. Pielstick (2000) defines informal leaders as those who exercise leadership but who do not occupy formal positions of leadership. Informal leadership has been recognized as an important dynamic in organizational behavior

(Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Kanter, 1999; Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, and Smith, 1994; Cooper and Pagotto, 2003).

It is understood that informal faculty leaders perform throughout the community college organization (Nesselrode, 1996) without being selected, directed, empowered or evaluated by the formal leadership hierarchy. In today's complex operating environment, community colleges need all the tools they can marshal in order to succeed. Although faculty members possess limited formal authority or responsibility for the overall direction of the institution and the business plans of its multiple missions, faculty are perceived as having great influence over matters that form the soul of the college—teaching, learning and student success.

Since the early 1990s, the notion of placing learning first as the core business of the community college (O'Banion and Kaplan, 2004) has led to the transformation of many community colleges to learning-centered organizations. This shift in focus has placed faculty squarely in the center of this transformation. A more integrated and inclusive approach to leadership has been ushered in with the learning-centered movement (Wilson, 2002), which suggests a renewed emphasis on faculty roles and responsibilities. The learning college emphasizes the links between decision-making and the collective institutional effort to ensure student learning, irrespective of program, service or delivery system.

Understanding and stimulating leadership behavior throughout the organization in more systematic and deliberate ways may turn these informal and perhaps sporadic faculty leadership efforts into more high yield assets for the future. The more that can be learned about informal faculty leaders, the more likely formal leaders are to recognize

their value to the institution and to capitalize on their influence in the best interest of the organization. With an improved understanding of informal faculty leaders, community colleges will be able to identify factors that encourage, focus and bring cohesion to this leadership source while better understanding the ultimate gains that may result.

Findings and Conclusions

In this section, key findings are listed and discussed in detail along with related conclusions. This research study of informal faculty leadership in the community college sought to examine the phenomenon of leadership exercised by faculty members without recognized positional authority yet who influence others either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations.

Effective informal faculty leaders, for the purpose of this study, are defined as those faculty members who have influenced others within the community college and, as a result, have exerted a significant influence, positive or negative, on some aspect of the organization. The study explored issues related to informal faculty leadership from the perspective of faculty members nominated by their department chairs to participate in the study. Each department chair was asked to nominate only those faculty members who they, as department chairs, considered met the definition of informal faculty leader.

Key findings regarding the nature of informal faculty leadership from the perspective of informal faculty leaders have been organized around six major themes.

- Informal faculty leadership is generally associated with positive attributes.
- Concern about issues, a feeling of personal responsibility and the opportunity to contribute expertise cause informal leaders to emerge.

- Informal faculty leaders are perceived to have high levels of positive impact on curriculum and assessment.
- Informal faculty leaders are perceived differently by females than by males.
- Informal faculty leaders are perceived differently by longer serving and newer faculty in higher education and by high and low length of employment at their current institution.
- Informal faculty leaders are perceived differently by technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty.

Theme 1—Positive Attributes

Informal faculty leadership is generally associated with positive attributes.

Introduction

A review of the literature on leadership suggests that there is not a "one size fits all" or universally agreed-upon taxonomy of leadership characteristics. Bennis and Nanus (1985) state that definitions of leadership are influenced by fads, political tides and academic trends. Jennings (1961, in Dean, 2002) asserts that there is not a definitive set of qualities that can be used to discriminate between leaders and non-leaders. Kouzes and Posner (1996, in Rosenbach and Taylor, Eds., 1998) offer that leadership is in the eye of the beholder.

Stogdill (1958) tells us that characteristics of leaders need to bear some relationship to the goals and characteristics of followers. A recurring theme emphasized in the literature (Drucker in Hesselbein, Goldsmith and Beckhard, Eds., 1995; Burns,

1978; Rost, 1991; Kouzes and Posner, 1993) is the importance of followers in the leadership equation. Most agree that personal characteristics are not the sole determinants of leadership and that situations and environments, together with demonstrated behavior and lessons from the past, are also important factors when considering the attributes of leadership. In general, the literature of leadership correlates the characteristics of leadership with qualities that are perceived to be positive and desirable.

Key Findings

This research study sought to identify the level of agreement or disagreement with the perception of leadership characteristics and behaviors demonstrated in the community college setting by informal faculty leaders. The characteristics and behaviors included in the Informal Faculty Leadership Questionnaire were those gleaned from the literature and augmented by characteristics and behaviors suggested by a discussion group of informal faculty leaders from one community college.

Of the 26 statements offered, the highest mean agreement scores of all respondents tended to align with characteristics and behaviors that could be considered positive:

- concern for people and relationships,
- demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability,
- self-inspired to lead,
- work behind the scenes,
- lead as a result of situations or events that occur,
- demonstrate networking ability, and

- have a positive outlook.

Conversely, the lowest mean agreement scores of all respondents tended to align with characteristics and behaviors that could be considered negative:

- have narrow insight,
- have a negative outlook,
- tend to be spontaneous in decision making, and
- are prideful.

Agreement scores for the positive attributes of informal faculty leaders give support for leadership as described by Cronin (1984) that "consists of a spiral upwards, a spiral of self-improvement, self-knowledge and seizing and creating opportunities so that a person can make things happen that would not otherwise have occurred" (p. 15-16) and to Senge's (2000) description of natural leaders "who emerge based on excellence of performance, clarity of vision or quality of the heart" (p.25).

Conclusions

This tendency to ascribe informal faculty leadership with positive characteristics and behaviors is not necessarily self-reverential, since respondents, informal faculty leaders, did not know the basis upon which they were chosen to participate in the study, other than the fact that they were current members of the faculty at a community college. This finding affirms Baker's (1990) premise of teachers as leaders and Hines' (1992) assertion that "good community college leaders possess the characteristics of master teachers, mentors, agents for change and community builders"(in Nesselrode 1996, p.139). The tendency to ascribe positive attributes was further supported by the assertion

of informal faculty leaders who participated in the group discussion conducted prior to development of the questionnaire—that informal faculty leaders must first be considered "good teachers" before they can be considered "good leaders." Good teachers who have achieved informal faculty leader status are likely to be cast in a favorable light. Since respondents to this research study were asked to reflect on their personal observations of informal faculty leaders at their college as they completed the questionnaire, it is not surprising that the "eye of the beholder" responses yielded higher mean agreement scores for positive characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders than for negative characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders.

Theme 2—Peers and Expertise

Interaction with peers and the opportunity to contribute expertise are areas in which informal faculty leaders have similar positive views.

Introduction

Prevalent in the literature of leadership since the early 1990s is the growing emphasis on cultivating leaders at all levels of the organization (Heifetz, 1994 and Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth, and Smith, 1999). These are assumed to be people without authority who "provide the capacity within the system to see through the blind spots of the dominant view" (Heifetz, 1994, p. 183). Badaracco (2002) suggests this is the "wide angle lens" perspective on leadership (p. 5), and Senge, et.al., (1999) asserts that "the core leadership challenge of our era lies in addressing issues for which hierarchical authority is inadequate" (p. 568).

Key Findings

Informal leaders are those without recognized positional authority yet who influence others either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. This research study sought to identify the factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders within the six community colleges studied. In general, greater agreement was found with faculty leaders stepping forward for these reasons:

- they have a feeling of personal responsibility,
- they are concerned about issues, and
- they have expertise to contribute.

The highest mean agreement scores among all respondents were for the above stated reasons. Peer encouragement was also an inducement. Least likely to contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leaders were:

- the opportunity to exercise influence and power, and
- encouragement by formal leaders.

It appears that informal leaders who participated in this study believe in the selflessness of informal leadership more strongly than self-aggrandizement.

Conclusions

These strong agreement scores—feeling a personal responsibility to lead, because their area of expertise is involved and encouragement to lead by their peers—reinforce the findings of Sherif and Sherif, 1953 and Bales, 1952 (in Scott, 2003) who determined that personal qualities and social relationships become the basis for the sanctioning of

leadership within informal groups. Further analyzed by Homans and Blau (1961, 1964, in Scott, 2003) the process of differentiation of group members was based on a series of exchanges, i.e., willingness by some to make greater contributions to goals. Power, then, becomes a product of unequal exchange relationships that exist within the group based on the characteristics and behavior of individuals and the expertise that they possess rather than on positional power that is attached to the person who occupies a position of formal authority. While positional power may be assigned, personal power must be earned and expert power must be demonstrated.

This also suggests that informal leaders are less likely to meet the pure definition of informal leaders if they are encouraged to lead by formal leaders. Informal leaders who become "sanctioned" by formal leaders may be perceived to lose their informal status since endorsement by a formal leader may tend to carry with it an expectation that the informal leader will begin to behave like a formal leader with the trappings of formal leadership—legitimate power and authority. Plante (in Green, 1988) suggests that one thing formal leaders should never do is to promote faculty leadership. "To insist that someone "lead" is about as reasonable as to insist that someone be charming. Leadership supposes self-propulsion" (p. 81).

Theme 3—Positive Impact on Curriculum and Assessment

Informal faculty leaders are perceived to have high levels of positive impact on curriculum and assessment.

Introduction

Although individual faculty members possess limited formal responsibility for the overall direction of the institution, they are perceived as having significant influence over matters that form the core or soul of the college—teaching, learning and student success. As a result faculty are collectively considered to have significant sway over the quality of the institution. This is especially true as hundreds of community colleges across the U.S. have undergone the transformation to learning-centered organizations (O'Banion and Kaplan, 2004). This transformation carries with it the implicit, and in a growing number of institutions explicit, understanding that decisions about every program, policy, practice and budget expenditure are held to the test of "how will this decision affect student learning?"

Key Findings

Not surprisingly, this research study found that informal faculty leaders are perceived to have the highest level of positive influence on issues related to:

- curriculum, and
- assessment.

Faculty exercise significant influence over issues of teaching, learning and student success—issues that are subsumed within the areas of curriculum and assessment. Traditionally, faculty members have been charged with the overall responsibility for developing and revising the curriculum by creating courses and contributing to decisions about new courses and programs of study, by participating in subject area or departmental meetings and by serving on curriculum committees.

Community college faculty typically have considerable latitude over the implementation of the curriculum from the selection of textbooks and other instructional materials to methods of instructional delivery and student assessment. Learning outcomes assessment of student learning has been elevated to a major topic of concern by accrediting agencies and funding organizations. At the institutional level faculty have played a key, often leading, role in addressing the issue of assessment in practice—identifying student learning outcomes, communicating with students, specifying selected artifacts to demonstrate student learning, evaluating student performance against stated outcomes and modifying curricular or pedagogical approaches in order to enhance student learning.

The influence of faculty over curriculum and assessment are supported by the results of this study. That said, it is worth noting that the highest negative mean agreement score given by respondents was for informal faculty leader influence on assessment, leaving one to speculate that there may have been a negative experience with assessment at one or more of the six institutions participating in this study or that assessment initiatives lead or participated in by informal faculty leaders had not matched hoped-for expectations.

There is less strength of agreement about the perceived positive influence of informal faculty leadership on issues of:

- compensation,
- shared governance, and
- budget.

These results suggest that if the issues are not within the traditional purview of faculty, as in the case of curriculum and assessment, those issues that relate to the institution as a whole are perceived to be less positively influenced by informal faculty leaders.

Conclusions

The concept of shared governance is portrayed as an organizational climate and culture issue rather than an organizational structure issue (Amey and Twombley, 1994). While differences of opinion persist about whether shared governance means an equal voice or an equal vote, advocates of shared or participative governance "begin from the premise that leaders are found throughout the organization, not just in traditional positions of authority" (Amey and Twombley, 1994, p. 270). Shared governance bespeaks a culture of involving organizational members in some aspects of decision making which pervade virtually every area of the college from institutional planning and budgeting to policy making.

"Plante points out the importance of including faculty in decisions that affect all aspects of institutional life and not simply those areas deemed to be the traditional purview of the faculty" (Oster in Green, 1988 p. 89). "The development of meaningful faculty leadership requires exposing faculty to all aspects of the institution and having them as full partners" (Oster in Green, 1988, p. 91). In this research study, the fact that informal faculty leader influence on shared governance, compensation and budget is perceived as less strongly positive and, in fact, issues of budget and compensation have the highest frequency scores for negative faculty leader influence, n=11 and n=10,

respectively, suggests that informal faculty leaders are not achieving their desired level of "full partner" influence with regard to these larger institutional issues.

Theme 4—Gender Differences

Informal faculty leaders are perceived differently by females than by males.

Introduction

Eagly and Johnson (1990, in Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001) reviewed studies that compared men and women on task and interpersonal styles and democratic and autocratic styles. Since the studies included in this meta analysis included laboratory experiments, which compared the styles of male and female leaders of laboratory groups; assessments studies, which compared the leadership styles of people not selected for leadership roles (e.g. non-managerial employees) and organizational studies which compared male and female leadership styles for managers who occupied the same organizational role (e.g. school principal), Eagly and Johnson divided the studies into these three types to analyze and compare the results.

They found a "significant relation between the social context of the research and the extent to which leadership styles were gender-stereotypic. Specifically, in the laboratory and assessment settings, the tendency for participants to have gender-stereotypic styles—women interpersonally oriented and men task-oriented—was stronger than it was in the organizational settings" (Eagly and Johnson, 1990, in Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt 2001, p. 789). Because constraining managerial roles were not a factor in the laboratory experiments or assessment studies, male and female approaches

to leadership tended toward gender stereotypic differences with males perceived as speaking assertively, influencing others, competing for attention, initiating activity directed to assigned tasks and making problem-focused suggestions and females perceived as speaking tentatively, not drawing attention to themselves, accepting others' direction, supporting and soothing others and contributing to the solution of relational and interpersonal problems. In the organizational studies that compared males and females who occupied the same organizational role, "the gender stereotypic tendencies in task and interpersonal style were eliminated, presumably because gender became merely a background influence as the managerial role took precedence. The tendency for women to be more participative and democratic than men, however, was intact in all three classes of studies" (Eagly and Johnson, 1990, in Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt 2001, p. 789).

Key Findings

In this study of informal faculty leaders in the community college, six areas of gender difference were found in which females agreed more so than their male counterparts with issues related to informal faculty leaders. Specifically, females had higher mean agreement scores with these statements about the characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders in that they:

- demonstrate networking ability,
- demonstrate knowledge and expertise ability and
- are motivated by self-interest.

These findings suggest inconsistency with the Eagly-Johnson meta-analysis in which the organizational leadership role context eliminated stereotypic gender differences in task

and interpersonal style. Rather, female respondents in this study of informal faculty leaders agreed more so than male respondents that informal faculty leaders:

- are effective communicators—both orally and in written form,
- step forward because their area of expertise is involved, and
- step up and do their part by leading/serving on a committee or task force.

Conclusions

When considering all of the demographic variables tested in this study: males versus females, newer versus longer serving faculty and vocational versus liberal arts faculty, the gender issue evidenced the greatest number of statistically significant differences in mean agreement scores than any other demographic comparison studied—and in each case where differences were found, females demonstrated higher mean agreement than did males. This study is more similar in nature to the organizational study described by Eagly and Johnson (1990), which compared leadership styles for males and females occupying the same managerial roles in the organizational environment as opposed to a laboratory or assessment setting. Given that respondents to this study were nominated to participate because they were perceived by their department chairs as informal faculty leaders, the organizational setting, has not "dampened" the effect of stereotypic gender differences that were found to be more typical of studies conducted in laboratory and assessment settings than in organizational settings when the leaders being studied were considered formal leaders.

Most of the areas of agreement among female respondents related to issues more typically associated with male characteristics and abilities than with female

characteristics and abilities. The exceptions to this observation are the high mean agreement scores related to networking and communication characteristics of informal faculty leaders. There is a prevailing perception that women who seek formal leadership positions need to be "extremely well qualified, have proven records of accomplishment and be over prepared for their positions" (Shavlik and Touchton, in Green, Ed., 1988, p. 101). Rather than appreciate their unique differences "which recently been rediscovered and celebrated as the new directions or discoveries of management gurus...quality circles, attention to each person's unique contribution to the whole, recognition of diversity as a way to increase productivity, intuition as a trusted tool for leaders/managers, and caring and nurturance as essential characteristics of successful leaders" (Shavlik and Touchton, in Green, Ed., 1988, p. 107) the tendency of women is to try and change themselves by conforming to gender stereotypic notions of leadership that are more typically associated with men.

One can conclude from the gender differentiated results of this study—and from those results that did *not* reflect gender differences—that the issue of role prejudice is still prevalent in today's community college environment. For example, it is interesting that the some of the factors that might have suggested a more female stereotypic affinity for relationship issues—recognizing and encouraging the talents of others, emerging as informal leaders due to encouragement by peers or by formal leaders—did not show significant differences in mean agreement scores between males and females. Based on the findings of this study, it appears that in the statistically significant cases, the lens through which women view the characteristics and behaviors of informal faculty leaders tend more toward stereotypic male attributes than stereotypic female attributes.

Theme 5—The Effect of Time Served on Informal Leadership Perspective

Informal faculty leaders are perceived differently by longer serving and newer faculty in higher education and by high longevity and low longevity faculty at their current institution.

Introduction

Bolman and Deal (1997, 2003) point out the frames of reference—structural, human resource, political and symbolic—that can be used to view organizations and interpret organizational behaviors. Institutions of higher education, by tradition and by design, have evolved powerful cultures calculated to shape values and beliefs. These cultures impose standards for learners as well as for faculty and staff, formally through testing, assessment and evaluation, and informally through peer pressure and expected compliance with organizational values and beliefs. Organizational culture influences a wide range of behaviors through implicit and explicit standards from language and public decorum to interpersonal interaction and service to the institution.

Historically the culture of higher education has adhered to the concept of leadership as associated with a particular person or a particular role (president, vice president, dean). Those outside of that role did not consider themselves leaders because they did not see themselves as possessing the abilities and characteristics of leaders or occupying formal administration positions. This culture is now changing. "More recent conceptions of leadership reflect the understanding that it is not an individual trait but is manifest throughout an educational community. Thus, leadership can be understood as separate form any particular role or person and providing opportunities for all organizational members" (Cooper and Pagotto in Piland and Wolf, Eds., 2003, p. 28).

While the negative perceptions and consequences of formal leadership roles in the higher education mitigate against turning the faculty, wholesale, into aspiring administrative leaders, (Cooper and Pagotto in Piland and Wolf, Eds., 2003; Bennett, 1988; Plante, 1988) the opportunity exists for faculty to exercise leadership by moving in and out of informal leadership roles—spanning the traditional, parochial boundaries of faculty and departments.

Key Findings

Respondents with longer careers in higher education and longer association with their current institutions offer perspectives on informal leaders that differ significantly from respondents with shorter careers in higher education and shorter associations with their current institutions. Specifically, those with 31 years or more in higher education show higher mean agreement than their counterparts with 12 years or less in higher education with these characteristics and behaviors:

- Informal faculty leaders are altruistic,
- Informal faculty leaders step forward to lead because they are deeply concerned about the issue at hand,
- Informal faculty leaders have a positive influence on shared governance, and
- Informal faculty leaders are likely to exercise leadership in order to fulfill service to mission requirements.

These results suggest that faculty members with 12 years or less in higher education have yet to coalesce or unite strongly on many of the characteristics of informal leadership tested.

Those with 27 years or more experience at their current institution responded with higher mean agreement scores than their counterparts with 9 years or less at their current institution that:

- Informal faculty leaders are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur, and
- Informal faculty leaders have a positive influence on shared governance and budgets.

Those with 9 years or less experience at their current institution responded with higher mean agreement scores than their counterparts with 27 years or more experience at their current institution that:

- Informal faculty leaders demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability, and
- Informal faculty leaders are conferred the "status" of informal leaders by others.

Conclusions

By virtue of their length of service and experience within higher education, longer serving faculty are likely to have a different view of the organization and their role within it than newer faculty. Longer serving faculty have seen formal leaders come and go over time and witnessed the dramatic evolution of the comprehensive community college

mission, a mostly additive process. This process has seen the progressive renegotiation of the balance and relative centrality accorded:

- The transfer mission
- The technical/occupational and career education mission
- The workforce development mission
- The cultural mission
- The lifelong learning mission
- The community service mission, and
- The economic development mission.

With more years "in the trenches," longer serving respondents have experienced more than half of the typical lifespan of most community colleges in the U.S. They are keepers of institutional memory and capable of offering a seasoned perspective on the institution that only time and experience can provide. They are likely to have been hired when there were fewer faculty and staff members on campus, a time when faculty were called upon to pitch in beyond the classroom in order to help sustain the enterprise by playing dual roles such as administrator and teacher, business manager and teacher or counselor and teacher.

Perhaps this is why those with 31 years or more of experience in higher education responded with higher mean agreement scores than their peers with 12 years or less of experience in higher education that informal leaders are altruistic and that they exercise leadership for the good of the whole—to fulfill service to mission requirements. It may also be a factor for faculty with 27 years or more at their current institution whose higher mean agreement scores than their peers with 9 years or less at their current institution

indicated that informal leaders have a positive impact on shared governance and budget issues.

Conversely, faculty with shorter associations, those with 9 years or less at their current institution, as compared to their longer serving counterparts, responded with higher mean agreement scores that informal leaders demonstrate knowledge and expertise ability and are conferred the status of informal leader by others. This could be attributable to length of service and career stage-related issues. One could assume that newer faculty with fewer years of teaching experience and fewer years in the community college organizational environment have spent more time focused on developing their subject matter expertise, their pedagogical methods and their ability to navigate the organizational systems within which they operate. As a result, faculty with shorter associations may have had less time to venture beyond the classroom or their departments and less opportunity to contribute as members of the college in service to mission.

Given this scenario, it is not surprising that faculty with shorter associations would agree more so than their longer serving peers that informal leaders demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability—they have a "leg up" on something that not everyone else does and that this expertise suggests a rationale for stepping forward to lead informally—and that they are conferred the status of informal leaders by others—their legitimacy comes, in part, because others believe in them. At the opposite end of the spectrum, the higher mean agreement scores of longer serving faculty show that informal leaders lead because it is the right thing to do, when issues or situations warrant and that informal faculty leaders positively impact issues that affect the enterprise—specifically shared governance and budget.

Perhaps those with longer service to higher education and to their institutions view informal leaders as those who have seized a new and welcome challenge—offering a greater decision-making or at least a more likely decision-influencing role within the institution that transcends their traditional boundaries. They have weathered the tough times, experienced the good times and feel a commitment to the organization and its learners, as reflected in their perspective of informal leaders: altruistic members of the organization, inspired by emerging issues and events and providing service to the mission beyond the classroom walls.

Theme 6—Technical/Vocational vs. Liberal Arts/General Studies Faculty

Informal faculty leaders are perceived differently by technical/occupational faculty and liberal arts/general studies faculty.

Introduction

Ideological differences between technical and liberal arts faculty have been a subject of ongoing discussion for as long as faculty from these two broadly defined areas of instruction have coexisted in the community college. Cohen and Brawer (1982) describe the "contrasting modes of teaching" in the liberal arts and occupational courses. Liberal arts instructors place great value on the interaction between instructor and student as well as on individual student reading and reflection. Occupational faculty need laboratories, equipment and partnerships with business and industry. Their students learn by doing, not by talking about doing. "These variant attitudes stem from the different ways that the career and collegiate functions were taught before they came into the

colleges" (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 299). Career preparation descended from apprenticeships in practical work settings while "the liberal arts were the province of a group inclined toward contemplation" (1982, p. 299).

Even as early as the burgeoning growth of community colleges, this was a topic of interest. In a study of faculty opinion about the general purposes of two-year colleges (Medsker, 1960), 97% of respondents agreed that junior colleges should offer two primary educational programs: liberal arts and "terminal" vocational education. When responses of liberal arts faculty and vocational faculty were compared, the relative importance conferred on liberal arts versus vocational education was divided along faculty lines. A higher percentage of liberal arts faculty thought the transfer function was very important and the opposite was true in their rating of the terminal function. Conversely, a higher percentage of vocational faculty rated vocational education as more important than the transfer function.

While many thought that the "divide" between liberal arts and vocational faculty had narrowed, it is interesting to note that the more current study suggests that some of these basic issues continue to characterize the two distinct faculty areas.

Key Findings

Respondents who teach in liberal arts/general studies offer perspectives on informal leaders that differ significantly from respondents who teach in technical/vocational areas. Specifically, those who teach in liberal arts/general studies responded with higher mean agreement scores than their counterparts in technical/vocational fields that informal faculty leaders:

- demonstrate concern for tasks,
- tend to be deliberative in decision making, and
- positively influence compensation issues.

On the other hand, respondents who teach in technical/vocational fields, as compared to their counterparts in liberal arts/general studies, responded with a higher mean agreement score to the statement that informal faculty leaders step forward because:

- they are encouraged by formal leaders.

Conclusions

"The politics of campus is like the politics of a small town" (March and Weiner in Piland and Wolf, Eds., 2003, p. 5). This "two worlds divide" could be said of the politics of technical/vocational and liberal arts/general studies faculty on community college campuses. Through the years, these broad academic areas of the institution have differed on issues of centrality to mission, educational philosophy and budget priorities. Similarly, the academic areas of the college represented by respondents to this study are also a differentiating factor when considering perspectives on informal faculty leadership.

The significant differences in response by faculty teaching in liberal arts/general studies vs. faculty teaching in technical/occupational areas are reminiscent of the issues that have cropped up between these faculty since the early days of the community college. Generally, these faculty have tended to view education through different lenses: liberal arts/general studies faculty have been inclined to assert that education is important because it creates a more well-informed citizenry and prepares learners to be critical thinkers, able communicators and culturally conscious. Technical/occupational faculty

have tended to assert that education—and training—should be focused on gaining specialized skills for employment.

A review of the college instructional areas represented by the technical/occupational faculty participants in this study points to the hierarchical and sometimes autocratic nature of the career fields for which they are preparing students: health care where physicians are strong leaders, aviation where the captain is in command, construction trades where general contractors direct work flow and culinary arts where managing chefs preside. Perhaps as a result of their experience in these career fields prior to or concurrent with their teaching careers, technical/vocational faculty have a more toward a hierarchical view of the organization in which leadership must be recognized and called forth by formal leaders rather than conferred by peers or self-inspired.

Clearly, community college faculty are not "all of a piece." They have differing individual perspectives about informal leadership and, as this study shows, issues of gender, length of service in higher education and at their current institution and the area of the college in which they teach influence these perspectives.

Implications

The results of this study of informal faculty leadership should not be considered without a broader understanding of faculty perspectives on formal hierarchical leadership. In general, the academy has historically devalued administration and deemed aspiration to formal administrative positions as unseemly (Green, 1988). Generally speaking, faculty prefer to be left alone and, unless the organization is in legitimate peril,

their solidarity with this position is legendary. As Green (1988) points out, higher education has been characterized as an "organized anarchy" where institutions are vague and confused about their goals and leadership is hamstrung by the resulting blur. "Other models are less extreme, acknowledging real limitations on leadership in academe, but also allowing for the exercise of leadership within the constraints of external regulation, as well as traditions of faculty autonomy, shared governance and decentralized decision making" (Green, 1988, p.14).

With its tradition of collegiality and civility, higher education is characterized by power that resides in many different areas of the institution with different individuals. Since decision-making and leadership are decentralized formal leaders must rely on legitimate power, which is rooted in shared values and aspirations, which means they are dependent upon the acceptance of followers in order to be effective.

Informal Leaders—Points of Light

In the context of this research study, the phenomenon of informal faculty leadership in the community college setting has been examined. These informal faculty leaders are defined as those without recognized positional authority yet who influence followers either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations and, as a result, exert a positive or negative influence on some aspect of the organization. If faculty tend to eye formal leaders with suspicion, they feel the opposite about informal faculty leaders.

Based on the results of this study, faculty perceive informal faculty leadership as a positive application of leadership. In certain areas, informal faculty leaders have a

significant, positive effect on the institution. In fact, informal leaders possess many of the characteristics sought after in formal leaders: they are effective communicators—oral and written as well as face-to-face, they exert influence, they recognize and engage the talents of others, they demonstrate a concern for people and relationships, they demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability and they know how to network.

The differences appear to lie in the informal nature of this category of leadership and in the fact that informal faculty leaders are of, by and for the faculty. Unofficially and unceremoniously, informal faculty leaders emerge—either through concern about an issue, through a sense of personal responsibility or through the encouragement of their peers. Informal faculty leaders know what needs to be done, and they do it. No one explicitly tells them to act or defines a course of action. Whether through insight, intuition, know-how or providence, they put their values and beliefs into action. Recalling the criteria for the Points of Light Foundation "Extra Mile" award, there are striking similarities: efforts are made in the public interest, have a positive effect on a significant number of people, are performed by a person acting as a private citizen, not as an appointed or elected official, and are undertaken outside of a normal work assignment.

How, then, can community colleges capitalize on this positive internal source of leadership? Are there internal organizational cultural shifts that can be facilitated to encourage informal faculty leaders to emerge? Given what has been learned in this study and what is understood about the nature of the faculty's relationship to administration, few faculty approach the role of informal faculty leadership with the intention of becoming part of the formal leadership hierarchy. Once an informal leader emerges, formal leaders may be tempted to reach in and "help" by providing rewards or

inducements that come in the form of additional leadership opportunities and assignments or professional development experiences. Leadership opportunities for faculty do not necessarily portend opportunities for them to become quasi-administrators. Formal leaders may be better advised to trust these "Points of Light," while exercising tolerance and acceptance of the ambiguity and lack of control that accompanies informal faculty leadership. Given that informal leaders also have the potential to lead the loyal opposition or even resistance movements that seek to modify or redirect organizational policy and practice, the added challenge for formal leaders is knowing when to step in or fall back.

While being sensitive to these cautions, formal leaders can take steps to foster a culture that encourages the involvement and development of people in a climate of responsibility, trust and respect. O'Toole (in Bennis, Spreitzer and Cummings, Eds., 2001) describes this as an emerging model of collective leadership that is rooted in the systems and culture of the organization rather than in gestures of symbolic empowerment from positional leader to non-positional leaders. The result is demonstrated by individuals at all levels of the organization "behaving more like owners and entrepreneurs than employees or hired hands" (in Bennis, et.al., Eds., p. 160).

Informal Leadership—An Inconsistent Phenomenon

Informal leaders emerge within an organization, but can you always count on them? Faculty who provide informal leadership coalesce others and contribute purposeful behavior that is not preordained or centrally planned. When inspired, they swing into action, akin to Superman or Superwoman. At other times, they leave their

capes behind and go about the important work of teaching. Frequently, informal leadership occurs because it is inspired by a cause or because the informal leader has particular knowledge or expertise to contribute. Institutions that become dependent on informal faculty leaders to "pick up the slack" or to fill the leadership gap that occurs when there are more good ideas or challenging issues than there are formal leaders to go around, may be disappointed.

Informal leadership should not be counted on to be timely or convenient. There may be periods within the life cycle of the community college in which informal leaders are more prevalent. This can be a factor of issues to be dealt with, of personal passion for a cause, or some combination thereof. However, given the episodic nature of informal leadership, community colleges should not become dependent on them as "bench strength" for keeping the faculty "in line" or to serve the agenda of formal leadership endeavors.

Informal Leadership—An Equal Opportunity Venture

The results of this study offer perspectives on informal leaders that differ significantly among respondents with longer careers in higher education and longer associations with their current institutions from those of respondents with shorter careers in higher education and shorter associations with their current institutions. Longer serving faculty agree more so than shorter serving faculty that informal leaders are altruistic, step forward because they care deeply about the issue at hand, and exercise informal leadership in order to fulfill service to mission requirements.

While their perspective about the characteristics and behaviors of informal leadership may differ, all respondents to this research study, regardless of length of service, agree that experience and greater longevity in the institution are not prerequisites for informal leadership. Personal characteristics such as a concern for people and relationships, networking ability and a positive outlook, coupled with knowledge and expertise and inspired by situations/events that occur, are more likely to be factors that contribute to the emergence of informal faculty leadership. Given the impending wave of faculty retirements, this is good news.

Recommendations for Further Research

By systematically gathering and analyzing perceptions about informal faculty leaders, contributed by those considered as informal faculty leaders, this study adds to a growing body of research in the area of community colleges. This study focused on a population that is still emerging in the literature with few research studies addressing the topic directly or in depth.

When approached, department chairs at six community colleges felt confident in their ability to recognize those members of the college's faculty who fit the definition of informal faculty leaders. The certitude with which these individuals were able to recognize informal faculty leaders lends credence the conventional wisdom that these leaders exist, they are recognizable and their influence is being felt.

Although informal faculty leadership may sill reside at the fringes of higher education leadership study, continuing to develop a deeper understanding of the role, influence and motivating factors that contribute to the behavior and contributions of

informal leaders will shed light on yet one more dimension of the many forces at work in shaping and transforming community colleges. This study focused attention on an aspect of institutional leadership involving a population consisting of informal faculty leaders—a category of leadership that has received only limited research attention. As a result, there are numerous opportunities for further useful research.

What Do Others Think?

This study looked at the population of informal faculty leaders based on the perceptions of those presumed to be drawn from the population under study. The effort was made to gather a sample of recognized informal leaders as determined by local experts—department chairs—at the six community colleges involved in the study. It was assumed going into the study that a more refined notion of the informal faculty leader was a necessary first step in better defining the population for future research. To accomplish this first step, this study has engaged those believed most likely to have the keenest insight into the informal faculty leader, specifically those individuals considered to be members of the population of informal faculty leaders.

Given the preliminary profile that has emerged from this study, one offered by a sample drawn from inside the population of informal faculty leaders, it would be interesting to repeat the study using 1) the general population of community college faculty, 2) the general population of community college administrators and 3) the general population of community college trustees in order to determine the level of congruence, or lack thereof, between the perceptual profile offered by the informal faculty leaders and these three populations. An additional variable to consider in subsequent studies would

be the effect of labor unions on informal leadership. This suggests bifurcating the population to be studied between colleges in which employee labor unions are present and colleges in which employee labor unions are not present.

From Perceptual Inventory to Case Studies

This descriptive study has yielded a perceptual inventory of informal faculty leader characteristics and behaviors, factors that define effective informal faculty leaders, situations in which informal faculty leaders emerge, areas in which informal faculty leaders exert influence and circumstances in which faculty are likely to exercise informal leadership. The results of this study present a "mile high" view; the results do not investigate the informal faculty leader in action addressing specific situations and dealing with specific issues. Through the case study approach, further exploration of actual situations in which informal faculty leadership has been exercised would provide additional insight about the behaviors of individual faculty leaders themselves and the resulting effect on their institutions. Preliminary field investigations with accompanying case studies would broaden understanding of the still rather abstract notion of informal faculty leaders through depth study of the issues and actions, accompanying successes and possible disappointments in the real world of informal faculty leaders in action.

The Informal Faculty Leader Typology and Implications for Hiring

The results of this study point to certain characteristics and behaviors of informal leaders. If informal faculty leadership is a leadership phenomenon to be embraced and a practice to be encouraged within the community college, the opportunity to create faculty

profiles that include these characteristics and behaviors and the possibility of emphasizing them in hiring decisions could be significant. A study that examines the prevalence of faculty members who possess the characteristics and behaviors attributed to informal faculty leaders and the prevalence of informal leadership among this population could have important implications for faculty hiring.

The Consequences of Informal Leadership for Informal Leaders

Little is known about the consequences of informal leadership for informal leaders themselves. Are they more or less likely to seek formal leadership positions as a result of their informal leadership experience? As they emerge, how are informal leaders treated by formal leaders? Do informal leaders consistently serve in this role, always finding an issue or a cause, or do they appear, disappear and then remerge when situations arise? Do informal leaders burn out or are they energized by their role? Case studies could help to investigate the personal costs and benefits experienced by informal faculty leaders.

The Effect of Informal Leaders Beyond Traditional Areas of Faculty Influence

The results of this study support the notion of the positive influence of informal faculty leaders on areas within the traditional purview of the faculty, namely curriculum and assessment. For other areas of the college including budget, shared governance and compensation the influence of informal faculty leaders is not perceived of as strongly influential. Additional study is warranted to determine if shared governance and the movement to transform community colleges to learning-centered organizations will

enable informal faculty leaders to have a more prominent effect on these areas of the college.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Date

Title, first name, last name
Job title
College name
Address
City, state, zip

Dear [title, last name]:

I am a graduate student at Michigan State University. For the past few years I have been working on my Ph.D., and part of my studies includes completion of a dissertation. The topic of my dissertation is **Informal Faculty Leadership in Community Colleges.**

The focus of this dissertation research project is to study informal faculty leadership in the community college setting from the perspective of the informal faculty leaders themselves.

The purpose of this letter is to ask for your help in the identification of the survey participants. Specifically, I am seeking your confidential "nomination" of effective informal faculty leaders at your institution. Your name will not be connected in any way with the survey, and the individuals you nominate will not know the source of their nomination.

Informal faculty leaders are defined as those *without* recognized positional authority yet who influence others within the college either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. Effective informal faculty leaders are defined as those who have influenced others within the college and, as a result, had either a positive or negative influence on some aspect of the organization.

Throughout the survey the identities of individual respondents will remain confidential, and reports of research findings will not permit associating subjects or institutions with specific responses. Findings from this survey will form the basis for my dissertation and related presentations.

Would you please take a few minutes to identify the effective informal faculty leaders at your college and return their names on the nomination form provided via fax (231.938.3104) or in the postage paid envelope provided?

Your response **by January 10, 2005** will be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Cordially,

Kathleen E. Guy
7894 Peaceful Valley
Williamsburg, MI 49690
231.938.3102
katguy@chartermi.net

Enclosures (2)

APPENDIX B

INFORMAL FACULTY LEADER NOMINATION FORM

Informal Faculty Leader Nomination Form

for

A Confidential Survey of Informal Faculty Leaders in the Community College

Please list below the names/office addresses of informal faculty leaders at your institution. **Informal faculty leaders are defined as those *without* recognized positional authority yet who influence others within the college either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. Effective informal faculty leaders are defined as those who have influenced others within the college and, as a result, had either a positive or negative influence on some aspect of the organization.**

List *all* that come to mind (please PRINT). My nominees are:

NAME	ADDRESS

APPENDIX C

INFORMAL FACULTY LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE

A Confidential Survey of Informal Faculty Leaders in the Community College

Contemporary views of leadership include the understanding that leadership is not the exclusive purview of those in formal leadership positions. Leadership is frequently distributed throughout organizations, demonstrated by individuals at all levels occupying a wide variety of roles.

The purpose of this research project is to study informal faculty leadership in the community college setting.

Informal faculty leaders are those *without* recognized positional authority yet who influence others either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. Effective informal faculty leaders are defined as those who have influenced others within the college and, as a result, have exerted a positive or negative influence on some aspect of the organization.

Please reflect on your observation of informal faculty leaders at your college as you consider the following questions.

Please respond to all questions beginning on the next page.

When finished, return your survey in the white postage paid envelope provided.

Thank you!

1. Please indicate the degree to which informal leaders demonstrate the characteristics and behaviors identified below. For each descriptor, circle the number that best represents your observation of informal faculty leaders. For example, if you strongly agree that informal faculty leaders demonstrate a concern for people/relationships, circle the number 5.

1a. Informal faculty leaders demonstrate concern for people/relationships

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1b. Informal faculty leaders demonstrate concern for tasks.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1c. Informal faculty leaders are self-inspired to lead.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1d. Informal faculty leaders are inspired to lead as a result of situations/events that occur.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1e. Informal faculty leaders demonstrate networking ability.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1f. Informal faculty leaders demonstrate knowledge/expertise ability.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1g. Informal faculty leaders are motivated by self-interest.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1h. Informal faculty leaders are altruistic.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1i. Informal faculty leaders mainly influence their peer group.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1j. Informal faculty leaders are able to influence up/down the college hierarchy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1k. Informal faculty leaders get others to agree with their ideas.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1l. Informal faculty leaders seek consensus.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1m. Informal faculty leaders work behind the scenes.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1n. Informal faculty leaders are highly visible, prominent.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1o. Informal faculty leaders have narrow insight.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1p. Informal faculty leaders are systems thinkers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1q. Informal faculty leaders are humble.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1r.Informal faculty leaders are prideful.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1s. Informal faculty leaders have a positive outlook.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1t. Informal faculty leaders have a negative outlook.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1u. Informal faculty leaders are self appointed as informal leaders.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1v. Informal faculty leaders are conferred the "status" of informal leader by others.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1w. Informal faculty leaders seek advice and counsel in forming their opinions.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1x. Informal faculty leaders promote their own personal opinions.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1y. Informal faculty leaders tend to be deliberative in decision making.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

1z. Informal faculty leaders tend to be spontaneous in decision making.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2. At your college, how do informal leaders emerge? For each descriptor, circle the number that best represents your view of how informal faculty leaders emerge at your institution. For example, if you strongly agree that informal faculty leaders are encouraged by formal (positional) leaders, circle the number 5.

2a. Informal leaders step forward because they are encouraged by formal leaders.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2b. Informal leaders step forward because they are encouraged by their peers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2c. Informal leaders step forward because their area of expertise is involved.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2d. Informal leaders step forward because they feel a responsibility to lead.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	

2e. Informal leaders step forward because they are deeply concerned about the issue(s) at hand.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2f. Informal leaders step forward because they are motivated by the exercise of influence and power.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3. To what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements?

3a. Effective informal faculty leaders must first be perceived as effective teachers/educators.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3b. Effective informal faculty leaders are those with more experience and greater longevity in the institution.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3c. Any faculty member can emerge as an effective informal leader—age, gender and experience are not necessarily determining factors.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3d. Effective informal faculty leaders recognize and engage the talents of others.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3e. Effective informal faculty leaders are influential in shaping the college.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3f. Effective informal faculty leadership is conducted through dialogue and face-to-face communication.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3g. Effective informal faculty leaders need to be effective communicators—oral and written.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3h. Effective informal faculty leaders transcend boundaries—they influence others beyond their department or discipline.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

4. Please indicate areas in which informal leaders have been influential in shaping your college. Rank each area in terms of the degree of influence (1=low influence and 5=high influence) and indicate whether each area/situation was positive or negative (P=positive and N=negative).

Area of Influence	Positive/Negative (circle one)		Degree of Influence (circle one)
4a. Shared Governance	P	N	5 4 3 2 1
4b. Curriculum	P	N	5 4 3 2 1
4c. Budget	P	N	5 4 3 2 1
4d. Compensation	P	N	5 4 3 2 1
4e. Assessment	P	N	5 4 3 2 1
4f. _____Other	P	N	5 4 3 2 1

5. Under what circumstances have informal faculty leaders been likely to exercise informal leadership at your college? For each circumstance, circle the number that most closely represents your observation. For example, if you strongly agree that informal faculty leaders have been likely to exercise informal leadership to prepare for a formal leadership position, circle number 5.

5a. To prepare for a formal leadership position.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

5b. To "step up" and do their part: lead/serve on a committee, task force, etc.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

5c. To offer perspective or opinion on an important/sensitive issue.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

5d. To influence followers.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

5e. To influence formal leaders.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

5f. To demonstrate participation in shared governance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

5g. To fulfill "service to college mission" requirements.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

6. What is your gender?

____Female ____Male

7. Please indicate your years of experience in higher education.

_____Years

8. Please indicate your years of experience at your current institution.

_____Years

9. What area of the college do you represent?

_____Technical/occupational

_____Liberal arts/general studies

Thank you for completing this survey.

Please return it in the white postage paid envelope provided.

APPENDIX D

RESEARCH LETTER OF INVITATION

Date

Title, first name, last name
Job title
College name
Address
City, state, zip

Dear [title, last name]:

I am a graduate student at Michigan State University and a career community college professional. For the past few years I have been working on my Ph.D., and part of my studies includes completion of a dissertation. I am writing to invite your participation in a survey that will form the basis of my dissertation research.

The topic of my dissertation is **Informal Faculty Leadership in Community Colleges.** Contemporary views of leadership include the understanding that leadership is not the exclusive purview of those in formal leadership positions. Leadership is frequently distributed throughout organizations, demonstrated by individuals at all levels occupying a wide variety of roles.

The purpose of this dissertation research project is to study informal faculty leadership in the community college setting from the perspective of the faculty.

Informal faculty leaders are defined as those *without* recognized positional authority yet who influence others within the college either consistently or in reference to specific issues or situations. Effective informal faculty leaders are defined as those who have influenced others within the college and, as a result, had either a positive or negative influence on some aspect of the organization.

I am seeking your response to the enclosed survey which should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this survey is strictly voluntary.
You can be assured that the identities of individual respondents will remain confidential. Reports of research findings will not permit associating subjects or their colleges with specific responses. Findings from this survey will form the basis for my dissertation and related presentations.

If you agree to participate, please:

1. Sign the enclosed consent forms; keep one for your records and return one in the **GREEN** postage paid envelope provided and
2. Complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the **WHITE** postage paid envelope provided.

Your response by **February 4, 2005** will be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your assistance.

Cordially,

Kathleen E. Guy
7894 Peaceful Valley
Williamsburg, MI 49690
231.938.3102
katguy@chartermi.net

Enclosures (5)

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

A Study of Informal Faculty Leadership in the Community College

Statement of Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in this research study of informal faculty leadership in the community college by completing a questionnaire. The questionnaire should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. In doing so, you should be aware that:

- You will not encounter any procedures which are experimental,
- You will return the completed questionnaire in the white postage paid enveloped provided and no return address is required,
- Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law and your identity and responses will be confidential,
- Reports of research findings will not permit associating your name or your college with specific responses or findings,
- You will not encounter any foreseeable risks or discomforts,
- The benefits of this study will be to provide Michigan community college faculty with information about informal faculty leadership characteristics and behaviors, the circumstances in which informal faculty leaders emerge and the areas in which informal faculty leaders are influential and the degree of influence that informal faculty leaders have on their institutions; the benefit for formal leaders will be a sample profile of informal faculty leadership characteristics and behaviors that could serve as a source of information for the identification of informal faculty leaders in the community college,
- If you have any questions about this study, please contact the investigator (S. Joseph Levine, Ph.D., 1962 Pawnee Trail, Okemos, MI 48864; 517-349-6623; Levine@msu.edu). If you have questions or concerns regarding your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish – Peter Vasilenko, Ph.D., Chair of the

University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) by phone: 517-355-2180, fax: 517-432-4503, email: ucrihs@msu.edu, or regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 and

- Your participation in this study is voluntary and that you may refuse to participate at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Your signature below indicates your voluntary agreement to participate in this study.

_____

Your Name

_____ _____

Signature Date

Please keep one copy of this form for yourself and return the other copy of this form in the **GREEN** postage paid envelope to:

Kathleen E. Guy
7894 Peaceful Valley Road
Williamsburg, MI 49690

APPENDIX F

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acebo, S.C. (1994). A paradigm shift to team leadership in the community college. In G.A. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America: its history, mission, and management* (pp. 580-588). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Alreck, P.L. & Settle, R.B. (1985). *The survey research handbook.* Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Amey, M.J. & Twombly, S.B. (1992). Re-visioning leadership in community colleges. *The Review of Higher Education,* 15(2), 125-150.

Amey, M.J. & Twombly, S.B. (1994). Leadership skills for participative governance. In G.A. Baker (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America: its history, mission, and management* (pp. 268-283). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Amey, M.K. & VanDerLinden, K.E. (2002). The institutional context of community college administration. *American Association of Community Colleges Leadership Series,* 4. Annapolis Junction, MD: Community College Press.

Argyris, C. & Schon, D.A. (1974). *Theory in practice: increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Astin, A.W. & Astin, H.S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered.* Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Atlas, J. (2005, February 27). The battle behind the battle at Harvard. *New York Times,* p. 14.

Badaracco, J.L. (2002). *Leading quietly: an unorthodox guide to doing the right thing.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Bailey, T.R. & Morest,V.S. (2004). *The organizational efficiency of multiple missions for community colleges*. New York: Columbia University Research Center.

Bennett, J.B. (1988). Department chairs: leadership in the trenches. In M.F. Green (Ed.), *Leadership for a New Era* (pp. 57-73). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: the strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (2003). *Leaders: strategies for taking charge.* New York: HarperCollins.

Bennis, W.S., Spreitzer, G.M. & Cummings, T.G. (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: teams and teamwork in higher education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bogue, E.G. (1994). *Leadership by design: strengthening integrity in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1997). *Reframing organizations* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (2003). *Reframing organizations* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolt, J.F. (1996). Developing three-dimensional leaders. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Beckhard, (Eds.). *The leader of the future.* (pp. 161-174). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Browne, C.G. & Cohn, T.S. (1958). *The study of leadership.* Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Chaleff, I. (1997). Learn the art of followership. *Government Executive,* 29(2), 51.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1982). *The American community college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, J.E. & Pagotto, L. (2003). Developing community college faculty as leaders. In W.E. Piland & D.B.Wolf, (Eds.). *Help wanted: preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 27-38). New Directions for Community Colleges, 123. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronin, T.E. (1984). Reflections on leadership. *Presidential Studies Quarterly,* 14(1). Retrieved February 8, 2005, from http://wwwnt.cnet.navy.mil/cls/reflections_on_leadership.htm

DeCrane, A.C., Jr. (1996). A constitutional model of leadership. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Beckhard (Eds.). *The leader of the future.* (pp. 249-256) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an Art.* New York: Dell Publishing.

DePree, M. (1992). *Leadership Jazz.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

DePree, M. (2003). *Leading Without Power.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Douglas, B. & Harmening, T. (1999). *Comparative financial statistics for public two-year colleges: Fiscal Year 1998.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Eagly, A.H. & Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues,* 57(4), 781-797.

Eagly, A.H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.J. & vanEngen, M.L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin,* 129(4), 569-591.

Emerson, R.M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review,* 27(1), 31-41.

Gardner, J.W. (1986). *The tasks of leadership.* Washington, D.C.: The Independent Sector.

Gardner, J.W. (1990). *On leadership.* New York: The Free Press.

Goodchild, L.F. & Wechsler, H.S. (Eds.). (1997). *The history of higher education* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Gould, E.O. & Caldwell, P.F. (1998). Tomorrow's essentials in management: decentralization, collaboration, and ownership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 22, 349-362. Retrieved February 18, 2005 from Academic Search Premier.

Green, M.F. (1988). *Leaders for a new era.* New York: ACE/MacMillan.

Green, M.F. (1994). Not for wimps or cowards: leadership in the post-heroic age. *Educational Record,* 55-60.

Heifetz, R.A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Heifetz, R.A., & Laurie, D.L. (1998). The work of leadership. In *Harvard Business Review on Leadership* (pp. 171-222). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Beckhard, R., (Eds.). (1996). *The leader of the future.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social behavior: its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Jennings, E.E. (1960). *The anatomy of leadership: princes, heroes, and supermen*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Kanter, R.M. (1999). The enduring skills of change leaders. *Leader to Leader,* 13, 15-22.

Kanter, R.M. (2001). Creating the culture for innovation. In F. Hesselbein, M.Goldsmith & I. Somerville (Eds.), *Leading for innovation* (pp. 73-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, D. & Kahn, C. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kelley, R.E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review,* 66(6), 142-148.

Komives, S.R., Nance, L.& McMahon, T.R. (1998). *Exploring leadership: for college students who want to make a difference* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, J.P. (1998). What leaders really do. In *Harvard Business Review on Leadership.* (pp. 37-60) Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1996). Ten lessons for leaders and leadership developers. *The Journal of Leadership Studies,* 3(3), 3-10

Lewin, K. & Lippitt, R. (1938) in Dean, P.J., (Ed.). (2002). Leadership, leaders and leading: part one. *Performance Improvement Quarterly,* 15(1), 5-10.

March, J.G. & Weiner, S.S. (2003). Leadership blues. In W.E. Piland & D.B. Wolf (Eds.). *Help wanted: preparing community college leaders in a new century* (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maxwell, J.C. (1993). *Developing the leader within you.* Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Medsker, L.L. (1960). *The junior college: progress and prospect.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Mintzberg, H. (2002). Managing to innovate. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith & I. Somerville, (Eds.). *Leading for innovation* (pp.141-152). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Nesselrode, G. (1996). *Leadership of individuals outside top administrative positions in two community colleges.* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1996). UMI 9637333.

O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century.* Phoenix: Oryx Press.

O'Banion, T. & Kaplan, J. (2004). Making good on the promise. *Community College Journal,* 74(5), 16-19.

Oster, R. (1988). Developing faculty leadership: a faculty perspective. In M. F. Green (Ed.), *Leaders for a new era* (pp. 87-97). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Palmer, J.C. & Katsinas, S.G. (Eds.). (1996). *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Pielstick, C.D. (2000). Formal vs. informal leading: a comparative analysis. *The Journal of Leadership Studies,* 7(3), 99-114.

Piland, W.E., & Wolf, D.B. (Eds.). (2003). *Help wanted: preparing community college leaders in a new century.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Plante, P.R. (1988). In support of faculty leadership: an administrator's perspective. In M. F. Green (Ed.), *Leaders for a new era* (pp.74-86). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Posner, J.M. & Kouzes, B.Z. (2003). *Credibility.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ramsden, P. (1998). *Learning to lead in higher education.* New York: Routledge.

Robbins, B. & Zirinsky, D. (1996). Growing into leadership: Profiles from a 'good' department. *English Journal,* 85(5), 34-39.

Rosenbach, W.E. & Taylor, R.L. (Eds.). (1998). *Contemporary issues in leadership* (4th ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.

Scott, W.R. (2003). *Organizations: rational, natural, and open systems* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Senge, P.M. (2000). Lessons for change leaders. *Leader to Leader,* 18, 21-27.

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R. & Smith, B. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Roth, G. & Smith, B. (1999). *The dance of change*. New York: Doubleday.

Shavlik, D.L., & Touchton, J.G. (1988). Women as leaders. In M.F. Green (Ed.), *Leaders for a new era* (pp. 98-117). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Sherer, J.Z. (2004, April). *Distributed leadership practice: the subject matters*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Sherif, M. & Sherif, C.W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Shults, C. (2001). The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership. *American Association of Community Colleges Leadership Series,* 1. Annapolis Junction, MD: Community College Press.

Smith, D.K. (1996). The following part of leading. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith & R. Beckhard, (Eds.). *The leader of the future* (pp. 199-208). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stogdill, R. (1958). Personal factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature. In C. Browne & T. Cohn (Eds.). *The study of leadership* (pp.50-61). Danville, IL: Interstate.

The Extra Mile. (2005). *The extra mile points of light volunteer pathway.* Retrieved February 28, 2005 from http://www.extramile.us/nominate/

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A.M. Henderson, & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wills, G. (1994). *Certain trumpets: the nature of leadership*. New York: Touchstone.

Wilson, C. (2002). Leadership for learning. *Learning Abstracts,* 5(7), 1-4.

Young, R. J. (1996). Legacy of the post-WWII growth years for community college leadership programs. In J.C. Palmer & S.G. Katsinas (Eds.). *Graduate and continuing education for community college leaders: what it means today* (pp. 5-10). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.