Assessing the Performance of Academic Chairs: A Leadership Approach

Evaluando el Desempeño de Coordinadores Académicos: Un Acercamiento de Liderazgo

Eduardo Raúl Diaz[1]
Southwestern Community College District

Abstract

Academic chairs play an essential role within their educational institutions because they work closely with faculty, staff, and students to address important challenges. This research examines faculty perceptions about the organizational performance of their program chairs in one institution of higher education in Baja California, Mexico. The study was grounded on the Full Range Leadership model instrumented with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The regression models suggest that organizational effectiveness, workplace satisfaction, and extra effort positively correlate with transformational and transactional

---

[1] Email: ediaz@swccd.edu

leader behaviors. The models also suggest that these same outcomes negatively correlate with passive leadership. The main conclusion is that program chairs should aim to inspire faculty members to pursue positive change, clearly communicate performance expectations and rewards systems, and accept responsibility for the outcomes of their departments. This study is original because it offers educational institutions a replicable process to assess program chair performance as well as recommendations to improve the effectiveness of training and development programs.

Keywords: leaders, leadership styles, assessment, training.

Resumen

Los coordinadores académicos juegan un papel esencial en sus instituciones educativas porque trabajan de cerca con el personal docente y administrativo, y con estudiantes para abordar retos importantes. Esta investigación busca examinar las percepciones del personal docente sobre el desempeño organizacional de sus coordinadores académicos en una institución de educación superior en Baja California, México. La investigación se fundamentó en el modelo de Rango Total de Liderazgo instrumentado mediante el Cuestionario Multifactorial de Liderazgo. Los modelos de regresión sugieren que la efectividad organizacional, satisfacción con el trabajo, y esfuerzo adicional muestran correlaciones positivas con conductas de liderazgo transformacional y transaccional. También sugieren que estos factores muestran correlaciones negativas con liderazgo pasivo. La principal conclusión es que los coordinadores de programas académicos deben inspirar al profesorado para obtener cambios positivos, comunicar expectativas de desempeño y criterios de recompensa, y aceptar responsabilidad por los resultados de su departamento. Este estudio es original porque ofrece a instituciones educativas un proceso replicable para evaluar el desempeño de coordinadores académicos, así como recomendaciones para mejorar la efectividad de programas de entrenamiento y desarrollo.

Palabras clave: líderes, estilos de liderazgo, evaluación, entrenamiento.

Introduction

Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) need to recruit, develop, and retain academic leaders to address emerging challenges and create a favorable environment for change. These challenges include adapting to the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic (Gervacio-Jiménez & Castillo-Elías, 2020; Roache et al., 2020), developing holistic teaching models to better serve students and other constituents (Waddock & Lozano, 2013; Wrigley & Straker, 2017), helping students develop their entrepreneurial skills and become employable (Atehortúa-Granados, 2010; Díaz et al., 2019; Karimi et al., 2016; Villasana et al., 2016), narrowing in gender gap in top organizational roles through in education (Diaz & Lituchy, 2019; Villasana et al., 2016), and promoting faculty-led research in support of institutional initiatives (Parsons et al., 2013). These challenges can be addressed through planned and direct change initiatives carried out by cohesive work teams.

Having the right people in leadership roles within IHE requires careful planning accompanied by adequate evaluation of the factors that inhibit or facilitate leader development and promotion (Baker et al., 2019). It is common practice to promote faculty and staff who excel in their discipline to leadership roles. The problem is that these individuals often lack the necessary leadership training and experience to support their organizations in their quest to address emerging challenges (Hoekstra & Newton, 2017). To achieve their goals, academic leaders need to have the respect and support of faculty and staff (Schmidt & Silva, 2005). The way to earn this is by adopting appropriate behaviors that are conducive to team success, work satisfaction, and an organization-wide intention to strive to achieve higher order goals.

The present study examines the leadership factors that associate with teacher perceptions of program chair Organizational Effectiveness, ability to generate Satisfaction in the workplace, and ability to inspire people to make an Extra Effort in support of initiatives. This research was conducted using the nine-factor structure of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, known as the MLQ 5x (Avolio & Bass, 1999). Others have used this instrument in educational contexts to better understand classroom leadership (Erdel & Takkaç, 2019) and faculty motivation (Al Asad et al., 2017). The novelty of the present study rests in its focus on the leadership competencies of program chairs as perceived by faculty

members. Its main contribution is showing how IHE can conduct an initial assessment of their program chairs´ leader behaviors to promote self-awareness and identify training opportunities in change-oriented institutions.

1. Review of the Literature

1.1. Leadership in IHE

Leadership in IHE is about finding ways to help others assimilate their changing circumstances. This is somewhat obvious given that students conduct their educational experiences to prepare themselves for the future. Leaders in charge of academic programs should be willing to adapt their educational processes and initiatives to help faculty, staff, and students make the learning experience richer and relevant for the future (Kouzes & Posner, 2019). This kind of ability requires training and experience. Thankfully, leadership can be learned with intention and appropriate direction (Northouse & Lee, 2019).

Effective leadership rests in teams rather than on any single individual (Williams, 2009). This suggest that attention should be placed on the impact of leader behavior on his or her followers rather than on specific traits (Kouzes & Posner, 2019). Leithwood et al. (2020) argued that school leaders influence the performance of those responsible for facilitating student learning (e.g., teachers), suggesting that the contribution of the leader can be assessed indirectly through the achievement of faculty, staff, and students. Direct assessment, however, will focus on measuring specific leader behaviors through adequately validated instruments and methods. Assessment results serve educators well because they help promote self-awareness along with training and rewards opportunities (Northouse & Lee, 2019).

Transformational leadership theoretical models focus on shared values and change (Northouse & Lee, 2019; Kouzes & Posner, 2019). In IHE, transformational leaders increase trust and cooperation on the part of management, faculty, and staff to address common challenges and achieve shared goals (Kouzes & Posner, 2019). Proponents of transformational leadership theory argue that the relationship between department heads and their subordinates is most effective when it is based on the pursuit of higher order goals (Bass, 1981; Chemers, 2000). These goals tend to be long-term and supported by a shared sense of

morality. The development of transformational leadership competencies can be facilitated through assessment and training based on established models and instruments (Kouzes & Posner, 2019).

1.2. Leader Development in IHE

In IHE, the process or journey that faculty, staff, and students engage to create a favorable environment for growth and prosperity is often an end to itself. While specific objectives tend to be the focus of institutional evaluation and academic program quality (e.g., retention and graduation rates), the subjective and long-term definition of success often rest on the impact of academic leaders through the work they do every day to promote a culture of transformation (Kouzes & Posner, 2019). For this reason, it is prudent for future studies on school leader development to focus on how leaders achieve intended outcomes rather than simply focusing on end results (Leithwood et al., 2020).

While important, the effects and impact of leaders tend to be perceived or assessed after a long time. Their behaviors as perceived by immediate followers (e.g., faculty and staff); however, can be measured promptly and allow for self-awareness, training, and increased efficacy. Therefore, it makes sense for researchers to support IHE in finding ways to assess and provide feedback to department and program chairs in a way that training, and development programs can be deployed to greater effect. The reason why researchers and leadership experts should be involved in the assessment is because educators may have different views about the role of program chairs, or the behaviors they should enact, to enhance their influence (Hoekstra & Newton, 2017). It would be up to the experts to guide them through the process by recommending theoretical models and analysis techniques. This guideline is especially important given the diversity in IHE in terms of their management structures, and overall organizational culture (Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

In support of their middle management teams, IHE are promoting leadership development programs. These programs vary in their approach; for example, researchers documented the implementation of a fellowship program designed to help minority faculty members improve their scholarship efficacy to consolidate their influence (Davis et al., 2011), and others implemented leadership workshops to train female faculty for leadership roles in science and engineering academic programs and schools (O'Bannon et al., 2010).

Several leader development initiatives have proven to be effective in promoting organizational efficacy and student learning (Kouzes & Posner, 2019). These leader development initiatives show that context plays an important role and suggest that every institution should examine its needs before engaging in training and development programs for faculty and staff.

One noteworthy example of how one IHE deployed an effective leadership training program was documented by Geer (2020). The author carried out his research in an IHE that intended to help faculty members develop the competencies needed to be promoted to the position of school principal. The intervention consisted of an internship program designed to help educators develop the competencies to become effective leaders. A major finding was that self-determined learning experiences were appropriate for educators seeking to lead their organizations, suggesting that leadership training should follow individual and organizational self-awareness and appropriate follow-ups. This example is consistent with the call for alignment made by Badillo-Vega et al. (2015) in Mexico. The authors agued that the objectives of managers and educators in IHE should be addressed as a whole, but noted that this type of integration requires effective, transformational leadership that is rarely found in IHE in the country.

Similarly, one of the most well-known leader development frameworks was created by Kouzes and Posner (2019). Their Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership model (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, encourage the heart) has been used in educational contexts extensively over the years (Díaz, 2020; Díaz et al., 2020; Turan & Bektas, 2013). This model includes the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), a 30-item questionnaire that helps participants assess their competencies and make informed decisions regarding the actions they can take to improve their levels of efficacy. The main takeaway is that different educational institutions and individuals need to think about which theoretical model could serve them best, and what scope and depth of information they require to make informed decisions regarding training and development.

1.3. Theoretical Framework

This section describes the Full Range Leadership Model and its application in educational contexts. This is important in understanding the three main categories in the model: transformational, transactional, and passive leadership. Bass (1985) is credited with the creation of the model as well as the MLQ, which is used in survey research to collect data self-reports and/or evaluators. Adaptations have been carried out by several researchers, including Avolio and Bass (1999) and Molero-Alonso et al. (2010). The Full Range Leadership model, as instrumented by the MLQ 5x, includes five transformational, two transactional, and two passive leadership factors. The following paragraphs describe, briefly, the factors that make up the model and the MLQ 5x.

Transformational leadership. The transformational leadership factors focus on the leader-follower relationship and the pursuit of long-term, higher order goals. The first factor, Idealized Influence-Attributes (IIA), measures perceptions on how the leader creates a trusting environment by taking an interest on the goals and expectations of followers. The behaviors involved are closely tied to those in the second factor, Idealized Influence-Behavior (IIB), which addresses the leader´s willingness to articulate the group's long-term vision as well as the ethical implications that underlie the decision-making process. The third factor in this category, Inspirational Motivation (IM), was designed to measure the frequency with which the leader finds ways to challenge his or her followers with interesting assignments that motivate them to perform with increased devotion at work (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Molero-Alonso et al., 2010). The next transformational leadership factor, Intellectual Stimulation (IS), measures how often the leader enables the rest of the group to challenge assumptions and solve problems in new and innovative ways. The last factor in this category, Individual Consideration (IC), addresses the willingness of the leader to mentor his or her followers by asking about their needs and helping them articulate expectations and strategies to achieve current and future goals (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Molero-Alonso et al., 2010).

Transactional leadership. Transactions are part of leader-follower relationship in that all parts involved seek to obtain something of value through a fair transaction (Bass, 1997). Many leader-follower relationships are based on clearly defined terms that make it possible for individuals to work with others and maintain a sense of fairness and satisfaction

(Chemers, 2000). While transactional dimensions are important in most relationships at work, the lack of shared values and aims for future growth tend to reduce commitment and long-term vision. Contingent Reward (CR) is the first of two factors in the transactional leadership category. This factor is concerned with the frequency with which the leader establishes performance measures and rewards followers when they achieve or surpass expectations (Molero-Alonso et al., 2010; Parveen, et al., 2018). The second factor, Active Management by Exception (AME), involves carefully supervising assignments to identify errors promptly and make the necessary corrections before problems become difficult to manage (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Molero-Alonso et al., 2010). What these two factors have in common is the focus on the attention paid to objectives and assignments, based on agreed-upon standards and expectations.

Passive leadership. The third category in the Full Range Leadership model measures the leader´s tendency to decline to enact his or her role by being out of reach to the group (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Molero-Alonso et al., 2010; Parveen, et al., 2018). This leadership style is generally considered undesirable and ineffective (Northouse & Lee, 2019). However, there is evidence to suggest that this style of leadership can be effective in promoting specific outcomes (e.g., increased self-efficacy) among followers in educational contexts (Khan, 2020). Laissez Faire (LF) leadership takes place when the leader is absent, creating a situation where members of the group decide and act for themselves (Avolio & Bass, 1999). Passive Management by Exception (PME) takes place when the leader fails to supervise operations adequately, allowing for mistakes to go undetected. This causes the group to have to deal with complex situations that could have been avoided. Typically, these factors correlate negatively with perceptions of leader effectiveness and satisfaction (Bass, 1981).

2. Implications for this Study and Hypotheses

The Full Range Leadership model, instrumented by the MLQ 5x, provides a useful framework to assess the leadership competencies of program chairs in a way that serves the needs of the educational institution where they work. The transformational and transactional factors should positively correlate with the response variables Organizational Effectiveness, Satisfaction, and Extra Effort. Meanwhile, the passive leadership constructs would be

expected to negatively correlate with the same variables. The results should help create awareness of the organizational culture and leadership approach within the IHE selected. Specifically, the results will serve program chairs by documenting the perceptions of faculty members in terms of the relationships among the leadership factors and the response variables. The results should also inform future training programs for program chairs and promote self-awareness. Therefore, the study is justified in pursuing to test the following hypotheses:

- H1: Transformational leadership behaviors in program chairs positively correlate with Organizational Effectiveness, as perceived by faculty members.
- H2: Transactional leadership behaviors in program chairs positively correlate with Organizational Effectiveness, as perceived by faculty members.
- H3: Passive leadership behaviors in program chairs negatively correlate with Organizational Effectiveness, as perceived by faculty members.
- H4: Transformational leadership behaviors in program chairs positively correlate with their ability to generate Satisfaction in the workplace, as perceived by faculty members.
- H5: Transactional leadership behaviors in program chairs positively correlate with their ability to generate Satisfaction in the workplace, as perceived by faculty members.
- H6: Passive leadership behaviors in program chairs negatively correlate with their ability to generate Satisfaction in the workplace, as perceived by faculty members.
- H7: Transformational leadership behaviors in program chairs positively correlate with generating Extra Effort, as perceived by faculty members.
- H8: Transactional leadership behaviors in program chairs positively correlate with generating Extra Effort, as perceived by faculty members.
- H9: Passive leadership behaviors in program chairs negatively correlate with generating Extra Effort, as perceived by faculty members.

3. Method

This is a quantitative study conducted through the survey research method. Survey research is effective and efficient with studies that take place in educational institutions (Fowler, 2014). In this case, the educational institution is a three-campus system located in the state of Baja California, Mexico, that serves undergraduate and graduate students. The dependent variables were Organizational Effectiveness, Satisfaction, and Extra Effort. The independent variables were the transformational, transactional, and passive leadership variables in the MLQ 5x.

3.1. Participants

A total of nine program chairs participated in this study, this out of 34 programs offered by the institution. Each program chair agreed to have his or her leadership competencies assessed by the faculty members who serve their programs. Participation was voluntary for all involved. The academic programs represented were Bachelor of Business Administration (n=25), Humanities and General Education (n=19), Bachelor of Engineering (n=14), Master of Education (n=14), Master of Business (n=8), Master of Engineering (n=4), Master of Neuropsychology (n=3), Bachelor of Psychology (n=2), and Bachelor of Law (n=1). In total, 90 faculty members completed the MLQ 5x. The majority, 62.2%, were part-time faculty, while 25.6% were full-time faculty members. The remaining 12.2% identified themselves as administrative employees within the educational institution and visiting professors.

Several faculty members serve more than one academic program, but they were asked to respond the survey based on their experience with the program where they have a greater stake. Several faculty members serve more than one academic program, but they were asked to respond the survey based on their experience with the program where they have a greater stake. Most of the faculty in the study were female (n=60), outnumbering their male colleagues two-to-one. Forty of the participants reported being older than their program chairs, while the rest noted that they were younger (n=35), unsure (n=9), and same age (n=6).

3.2. Instrument

The MLQ 5x includes 36 items designed to measure nine leadership factors. Each factor consists of four items. The descriptions have already been provided in the Theoretical Framework section. Additionally, the MLQ 5x includes three response variables. Organizational Effectiveness consists of four items that measure how the leader is perceived in terms of his or her ability to get results by working with others. Satisfaction consists of two items that measure how others feel about the methods the leader uses to approach assignments. Extra Effort consists of three items designed to measure how the leader can influence others to work beyond expectations. The Spanish version of the MLQ 5x was used in the electronic survey with permission from MindGarden, Inc.

Validity was assumed because of the time-honored tradition that accompanies the MLQ 5x. Several leadership studies have been conducted with this instrument over the years, making it widely known and accepted (e.g., Avolio & Bass, 1999; Bass, 1985; Khan, 2020). Internal consistencies were calculated through the alpha Cronbach coefficient, which is considered appropriate when $\alpha \geq .65$ when using translated versions. In addition to the MLQ 5x, the survey included identification items (e.g., academic program, name of program chair).

3.3. Analysis

Once the data collection phase was completed, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to tests the hypotheses. The independent variables were the factors in each of the transformational, transactional, and passive leadership categories. The main element of the model summaries was Adjusted R^2 coefficients because of the use of multiple predictor variables. In addition, Pearson correlations, which served to identify the direction of the relationship between the variables, and R^2 were included in the model. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine whether to retain or reject the hypotheses. Alpha levels were established $\leq .05$. The process was conducted with SPSS version 26 software.

4. Results

The Full Range Leadership model includes three additional factors. These are response variables Organizational Effectiveness ($\alpha = .88$), Satisfaction ($\alpha = .92$), and Extra Effort ($\alpha = .66$). The three response variables fulfilled the minimum reliability coefficient requirement

($\alpha \geq .65$). However, two transformational (IE and IC) and one transactional variable (MEA) had to be dropped from further analysis because of low reliability.

Table 1

Full Range Leadership Model Reliability Coefficients.

Leadership Model	Factor	No. Items	Cronbach Alpha
Transformational	IIA	4	.76
	IIC	4	.65
	IM	4	.79
	IS	4	.58
	IC	4	.49
Transactional	CR	4	.71
	AME	4	.53
Passive	LF	4	.75
	PME	4	.66

As shown in Table 2, Pearson correlations suggest moderate to high positive relationships among the five transformational leadership factors and the three response variables. One transactional leadership factor (CR) showed a positive relationship as well. The other transactional factor, AME, was dropped from further analysis because of low reliability. As expected, both passive leadership factors (LF and PME) showed negative relationships with the response variables.

Table 2

Pearson Correlations Among Leadership Factors and Response Variables.

Category	Factor	Organizational Effectiveness	Satisfaction	Extra Effort
Transformational leadership	IIA	.81**	.83**	.69**
	IIC	.77**	.79**	.69**
	IM	.76**	.72**	.66**
	IS	.55**	.67**	.51**
	IC	.64**	.58**	.62**

Transactional leadership	CR	.71**	.73**	.73**
Passive leadership	LF	-.68**	-.64**	-.52**
	PME	-.68**	-.64**	-.46**

**p<.01

Once the directions of the relationship between de independent and dependent variables were established (Table 2), the regression model summaries were calculated to identify the predictors of Organizational Effectiveness, Satisfaction, and Extra Efforts. Table 3 illustrates that each of the three leadership factors predict Organizational Effectiveness with transformational, passive, and transactional leadership factors (in that order) showing strong and moderate effect sizes. Additionally, as shown in Table 4, transformational, transactional, and passive leadership factors (in that order), show strong and moderate effect sizes in predicting faculty members´ Satisfaction with their program chairs. Finally, as noted in Table 5, transformational and transactional leadership factors show moderate effect sizes that predict Extra Effort on the part of faculty members in response to their program chairs. Passive leadership shows weak effect sizes.

Table 3

Leadership Factors as Predictors of Organizational Effectiveness.

	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	SE	F
Transformational leadership	.86	.75	.74	1.39	85.83**
Transactional leadership	.71	.51	.50	1.93	91.73**
Passive leadership	.75	.57	.56	1.82	57.72**

**p<.01

Table 4

Leadership Factors as Predictors of Satisfaction.

	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	SE	F
Transformational leadership	.87	.77	.76	.86	97.87**
Transactional leadership	.73	.53	.53	1.21	102.31**
Passive leadership	.71	.50	.49	1.26	44.85**

**p<.01

Table 5

Leadership factors as predictors of Extra Effort.

	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	SE	F
Transformational leadership	.75	.57	.55	1.71	37.92**
Transactional leadership	.73	.54	.53	1.74	104.44**
Passive leadership	.55	.30	.28	2.16	18.93**

**p<.01

Pearson R correlations and the linear model summaries noted in this section makes it possible to test the hypotheses expressed in this research. H1 – H9 were retained based on the adjusted R^2 coefficients and statistical significance. This suggest that the transformational and transactional leadership models positively correlate with each of the response variables. Furthermore, as predicted, passive leadership negatively correlated with each of the response variables.

5. Discussion

The results from the survey suggest that transformational, transactional, and passive leadership factors associate with faculty perception of program chair performance in terms of Organizational Effectiveness, Satisfaction, and Extra Effort. This section will go into detail on the implications for academic leaders. The discussion is relevant today because leadership development programs in educational contexts are in high demand, which increases the need to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs (Romero-Alonso et al., 2020). To do this, it is important to define predictive and response variables that provide a useful framework to establish goals and assessment criteria for program chair performance, as well as promoting self-awareness and relevant feedback.

5.1. Organizational Effectiveness

Transformational leadership factors were the strongest predictors of Organizational Effectiveness for program chairs in the study. This suggest that increasing behaviors that motivate and inspire, promote a culture of integrity, and challenge people to be creative will

serve program chairs when they try to work with people across organizational functions and hierarchical levels to achieve desired results. Therefore, one aim of leadership development in educational contexts should rest in promoting transformational behaviors to integrate wide ranging educational goals and enlist support across departments (Fung, 2017).

The call for change across educational institutions has been placed forward for some time now. Klimoski and Amos (2012) and Wrigley and Straker (2017) realized that innovations taking place in business and industry require educational institutions to change to help their students develop relevant competencies. This reality called on educational leaders to promote change in their scholarship and teaching, which requires unequivocal faculty cooperation. To cite one example where educators are starting to use leadership development efforts to facilitate change in education, Bianchini et al.´s (2014) research in one graduate program in Australia documented the deployment of their leadership model to help their educational institution adapt to the changing academic and market dynamics that will shape the future the education industry.

Passive leadership factors proved to be the second most influential factors in promoting Organizational Effectiveness in program chairs. As noted in Table 2, passive leadership correlated negatively with this response variable ($R = -.68$), which suggests that adopting a passive leadership approach could prove to be counterproductive. Available research suggest that individuals (followers) believe that this leadership style influences their own level of efficacy (Khan, 2020), but the result from the present study is consistent with the theory that supports the idea that passive leaders are generally considered less effective (Bass, 1981). Therefore, program chairs should make every effort to be available to their followers and try to identify emerging problems before they become hard to manage.

From a leader development perspective, it is important that program chairs in training learn the importance of carefully evaluating their subordinates. Belker et al. (2018) noted that part of the job for managers is to assess the performance of their subordinates and provide them with timely and actionable feedback. Programs chairs who learn how to periodically evaluate the performance of faculty and staff will make themselves visible to the team, which will help sustain the perception of Organizational Effectiveness.

The transactional leadership factor explained a moderate effect size of the variance for program chair Organizational Effectiveness. Although this factor (CR) was not as strong a predictor of this response variable as the transformational or passive leadership factors, it is clearly an important part of the model. For this reason, it is important for program chairs to establish clearly defined expectations in their departments, and follow-through with a rewards system to promote achievement. Training in this area must recognize that early-stage leader-follower relationships will mostly rely on transactional methods, which will hopefully evolve into a transformational relationship with time (Belker et al., 2018). Therefore, especially at the beginning, program chairs need to clearly establish expectations, requirements, and rewards, so that faculty members have sufficient direction.

5.2. Satisfaction with the Program Chair

The transformational leadership factors were the strongest predictors of faculty satisfaction with leader performance. This is not surprising considering that leaders that take care of their followers and take an interest in their future tend to create gratifying work environments (Kouzes & Posner, 2019). Clearly, promoting Satisfaction with faculty and staff has many advantages (e.g., less turnover), and helps solidify support for program chairs. The aims of leadership assessment and training in educational context should include an evaluation of the methods and strategies program chairs use to relate with faculty, staff, and students. This should prompt these educational leaders to engage in transformational behaviors that will yield increased collaboration in the long-term.

The transactional leadership model also supports faculty Satisfaction with program chairs. This supports the claim that teachers appreciate clear guidelines and criteria regarding objectives, performance standards, and rewards systems that govern their work environment. It is important that program chairs learn to deploy the transactional elements of the relationship with and among peers, supervisors, and subordinates. Admittedly, an overemphasis on transactional behaviors is not appropriate in educational contexts because this would help create a *quid pro quo* culture that could lead to negative, unintended consequences (e.g., teach to the test). However, some level of bureaucracy and clarity of expectations will almost always serve those involved well.

The passive leadership model in this study supports the claim that program chairs should make themselves available to faculty members and share in the responsibility for identifying potential challenges and help correct mistakes. While it is a time-honored tradition to provide freedom and discretion to faculty members as they conduct their teaching and scholarly work, it is important they feel supported and recognized. For program chairs, visibility, communication, and shared responsibility are key elements of their work. These aspects can be addressed through training.

5.3. Extra Effort

Once again, the transformational leadership model proved to be the strongest predictor of the response variable, in this case, Extra Effort. This suggest that faculty members are more likely to exceed the requirements of their job when working with program chairs who behave in a manner consistent with transformational leadership theory. Along with the transformational model, the transactional leadership model yielded a moderate association with Extra Effort. The similarity in the variance between both models support the combination of transformational and transactional behaviors aimed at getting followers to go beyond what is expected of them (Bass, 1985; Chemers, 2000). The passive leadership model showed a weak association with the response variable, but enough to suggest that faculty members will work harder when the program chairs is involved with their work.

Situations that require faculty members to work beyond what could be considered normal (e.g., program review and accreditation) could be better managed by program chairs that are involved, visible, and deploy a mix of transactional and transformational behaviors. These leaders would be likely to count on the support of the faculty members and ensure that people will be willing to work overtime and engage tasks that are not normally required of them.

6. Implications, Limitations, and Future Studies

This study was conducted to assess leadership competencies in program chairs with the hope that the results could help promote self-awareness and identify training opportunities for educational leaders. This type of research is relevant today because educational institutions face a variety of emerging circumstances that require them change and adapt. For the program

chairs in this study, the suggestion is that transformational, transaction, and passive leadership behaviors influence faculty perceptions of Organizational Effectiveness, Satisfaction, and Extra Effort. These findings may not be surprising to leadership scholars and experienced academic leaders, but it is important to support these claims with actual research that can be replicated. Hopefully, the present study achieves this.

While the results presented here could be transferred to other IHE under certain circumstances, it is important to keep in mind that the IHE under analysis has specific characteristics that could have influenced the outcomes of the study. For example, this IHE is a private institution that is managed in a way that is like a for-profit organization. The decision-making process tends to be expedited and performance measures are established by the department heads. This is likely not the case on public IHE, so leader evaluations might turn out different results or may require a different model.

A key takeaway from this study is that it is possible for IHE to conduct timely and theory-based applied research that serve specific organizational imperatives. Organizational change based on innovation and communities of inquiry is increasingly reliant on the work of educational researchers (Shani & Coghlan, 2018). The suggestion is that organizational change must be guided by research-driven decision-making that results from carefully planned inquiry (Coghlan & Shani, 2014). The kind of research conducted in IHE that serves their specific needs is called applied research (Parsons et al., 2013), and more specifically action research (Ross & Bruce, 2012).

There are several examples where this type of exercise has worked. To cite a few, this type of research design has been conducted across educational contexts to examine the influence of managing executives on the commitment of lecturers to promote organizational change (Griffioen et al., 2018), to understand the leadership practices values by graduate students (Díaz et al., 2020), and to describe the influence of national culture and gender on entrepreneurial leadership self-efficacy in graduate students (Díaz, 2020). All this to say that the findings in the present study are based on a well-established theoretical framework and the recommendations provided were based on the results from the statistical analyses. This is something other institutions can emulate to inform their internal assessments.

The main limitation of this study rests in the use of a convince sample, which negates generalizability. However, others can see this as a documented effort to help one educational institution embark in a change effort by facilitating decision-making processes through scholarly work. Hopefully, others will find this example useful and conduct their own work. Therefore, future studies should be carried out under applied research designs to document evaluations of institutional, department, and program level leaders to help them advance their missions and support their values. This is especially recommended for educational institutions in developing countries where this type of inquiry continues to emerge.

7. Conclusion

The transformational leadership model explained a relatively high percent of the variance when predicting faculty perceptions of Organizational Effectiveness, Satisfaction, and Extra Effort in program chairs. This was higher than the transactional, and passive models. Nonetheless, all three leadership styles proved to be significant, which means that faculty members expect their program chairs to inspire, motivate, challenge, and promote ethical behavior. At the same time, program chairs should establish clear assignments, expectations, and rewards. They should also be available and take responsibility for the work (non-avoidant).

These desirable transformational and transactional behaviors can be developed with experience and training. Perhaps the main benefit of this type of research is that the results lend themselves to a variety of professional development practices. After the initial assessment, feedback and training sessions should follow. The results presented here represent the reality in one educational institution, but hopefully, they can inspire educators and scholars to conduct similar exercises in other contexts as part of an effort to promote change through research-driven initiatives. This helps give researchers a more important role in the planning and management of their educational institutions while advancing their scholarly work.

References

Al Asad, S., Dănăiață, D., & Năstase, M. (2017). The influence of leadership in teachers' practice in Bedouin high schools. *Review of International Comparative Management, 18*(4), 362–375.

Atehortúa-Granados, J. A. (2010). La gestión empresarial en los programas de pregrado de la Corporación Universitaria Lasallista. *Revista Lasallista de Investigación, 7*(1), 25–35.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 72*(4), 441–462. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789

Badillo-Vega, R., Buendía-Espinosa, A., & Krücken, G. (2015). Liderazgo de los rectores frente a la" tercera misión" de la universidad: visiones globales, miradas locales. *Revista mexicana de investigación educativa, 2*0(65), 393-417.

Baker, V. L., Lunsford, L. G., & Pifer, M. J. (2019). Patching up the "leaking leadership pipeline": Fostering mid-career faculty succession management. *Research in Higher Education, 60*(6), 823–843. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-018-9528-9

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics, 13*(3), 26–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*(2), 130–139. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.2.130

Belker, L. B., McCormick, J., & Topchik, G. S. (2018). *The first-time manager* (7 ed.). HarperCollins.

Bianchini, S., Maxwell, T., & Dovey, K. (2014). Rethinking leadership in the academy: An Australian case. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International, 51*(5), 556–567. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.786582

Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 4*(1), 27–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.4.1.27

Coghlan, D., & Shani, A. B. (2014). Creating action research quality in organization development: Rigorous, reflective and relevant. *Systemic Practice & Action Research, 27*(6), 523–536. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-013-9311-y

Davis, D. J., Herawell, M., Gunnip, R., Derry, L. G., Wells , J., & Trimble, D. (2011). Writing and visiting fellowships: Strategies to inform the development of educational leadership faculty. *E Journal of Organizational Learning & Leadership, 9*(2), 14–25.

Díaz, E. R. (2020). Entrepreneurial leadership in Indian and Mexican graduate students. *Latin American Business Review, 21*(3), 307-326. https://doi.org/10.1080/10978526.2020.1761824

Díaz, E. R. (2020). Educational leadership: The case of graduate students in Mexico. *Revista Innovación Educativa, 20*(83), 79-98.

Díaz, E. R., & Lituchy, T. R. (2019). Leader behavior expectations from a gender perspective: An extension of theLEAD studyin Mexico. *Revista del Centro de Investigación de la Universidad La Salle, 13*(52), 101-120. https://doi.org/10.26457/recein.v13i52.2459

Díaz, E. R., Díaz-López, K., & Durazo-Watanabe, E. (2020). Adaptación del inventario de prácticas de liderazgo con estudiantes mexicanos de posgrado. *Revista del Centro de Investigación de la Universidad La Salle, 14*(54), 95-118. https://doi.org/10.26457/recein.v14i54.2648

Díaz, E. R., Sánchez-Vélez, C. G., & Santana-Serrano, L. (2019). Integrating the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership model into entrepreneurship education. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13*(3). https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2019.130310

Erdel, D., & Takkaç, M. (2019). The relationship between teacher classroom leadership and learner autonomy: The case of EFL classrooms. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education, 8*(3), 752–770. https://doi.org/10.30703/cije.549344

Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fung, D. (2017). Strength-based scholarship and good education: The scholarship circle. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International, 54*(2), 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2016.1257951

Geer, C. G. (2020). Addressing reality: A model for learner driven and standards-based internships for educational leadership programs. *Journal of Higher Education Theory & Practice, 20*(1), 33–54.

Gervacio-Jiménez, H., & Castillo-Elías, B. (2020). Desafíos educativos que enfrenta el Colegio Nacional de Educación Profesional Técnica ante la pandemia sanitaria Covid-19. *Revista del Centro de Investigación de la Universidad La Salle, 14*(53), 45-66. https://doi.org/10.26457/recein.v14i53.2658

Griffioen, D. M., Doppenberg, J. J., & Oostdam, R. J. (2018). Organisational influence on lecturers' perceptions and behaviour towards change in education. *Studies in Higher Education, 43*(11), 1810–1822. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1284191

Hoekstra, A., & Newton, P. (2017). Departmental leadership for learning in vocational and professional education. *Empirical Research in Vocational Education & Training, 9*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40461-017-0057-0

Karimi, S., Biemans, H. J., Lans, T., Aazami, M., & Mulder, M. (2016). Fostering students' competence in identifying business opportunities in entrepreneurship education. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International, 53*(2), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.993419

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? T*he journal of higher education, 73*(4), 435-460.

Khan, H. (2020). Are psychological capital and psychological ownership predictors of the passive avoidant leadership style? *International Journal of Business & Public Administration, 17*(1), 32–54.

Klimoski, R., & Amos, B. (2012). Practicing evidence-based education in leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(4), 685–702. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0018

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner , B. Z. (2019). *Leadership in higher education: Practices that make a difference.* Oakland, California: Berret-Koehlers Publishers, Inc.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 5-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077

Mendoza-Martínez, I. A., Escobar-Álvarez, G. R., & García-Rivera, B. R. (2012). Influencia del liderazgo transformacional en algunas variables de satisfacción organizacional en personal docente y administrativo de una institución pública de educación media superior. *Revista del Centro de Investigación de la Universidad La Salle, 10*(28), 189–206.

Molero-Alonso, F., Recio-Saboya, P., & Cuadrado-Guirado, I. (2010). Liderazgo transformacional y liderazgo transaccional: un análisis de la estructura factorial del Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) en una muestra española. *Psicothema, 22*(3), 495–501.

Northouse, P. G., & Lee, M. (2019). *Leadership case studies in education* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California : Sage.

O'Bannon, D. J., Garavalia, L., Renz, D. O., & McCarther, M. S. (2010). Successful leadership development for women STEM faculty. *Leadership & Management in Engineering, 10*(4), 167–173. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)LM.1943-5630.0000080

Parsons , J., Hewson, K., Adrian, L., & Day, N. (2013). *Engaging in action research: A practical guide to teacher-conducted research for educators and school leaders.* Alberta, Canada: Brush Education, Inc.

Parveen, I., Riffat-un-Nisa, & Uzair-ul-Hassan. (2018). School leadership inducing workaholism in teachers: A case of secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Sciences & Research, 5*(1), 1–25.

Roache, D., Rowe-Holder, D., & Muschette, R. (2020). Transitioning to online distance learning in the COVID-19 era: A call for skilled leadership in higher education institutions (HEIs). *International Studies in Educational Administration, 48*(1), 103-110.

Romero-Alonso, R., Montt-Fabres, B., Pino-Díaz, B., Riquelme-Plaza, I., & Gracia-Romero, M. E. (2020). Evaluar la transferencia de la formación en liderazgo directivo: Un caso chileno. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa, 22*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2020.22.e19.2683

Ross, J. A., & Bruce, C. D. (2012). Evaluating the impact of collaborative action research on teachers: A quantitative approach. *Teacher Development, 16*(4), 537–561. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2012.734746

Schmidt, P., & Silva, R. (2005). Gestión de la docencia superior brasileña, a partir de la misión compartida. *Revista Lasallista de Investigación, 2*(1), 76–84.

Shani, A. B., & Coghlan, D. (2018). Enhancing action, research, and collaboration in organization development. *Organization Development Journal, 36*(3), 37–43.

Turan, S., & Bektas, F. (2013). The relationship between school culture and leadership. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 52*, 155-168.

Villasana, M., Alcaraz-Rodríguez, R., & Alvarez, M. M. (2016). Examining entrepreneurial attributes of Latin American female university students. *Gender & Education, 28*(1), 148–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2015.1093100

Waddock, S., & Lozano, J. M. (2013). Developing more holistic management education: Lessons learned from two programs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 12*(2), 265–284. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0002

Williams, H. S. (2009). Leadership capacity - A key to sustaining lasting improvement. *Education, 130*(1), 30–41.

Wrigley, C., & Straker, K. (2017). Design thinking pedagogy: The educational design ladder. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International, 54*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2015.1108214