

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

The leadership abilities of famous political leaders, statesmen, businessmen, and military commanders have fascinated people around the world. The topic of leadership has drawn the attention of researchers from different fields of study. While the literature on leadership is abundant, the present study focused on leadership in Mongolian higher education. Therefore, it was important to examine three particular bodies of literature. First, research on American leadership theories is presented. Next, studies on leadership in higher education are presented. Finally, studies that have employed the instrument used to collect data in the present study are described.

American Leadership Theories

Leadership theories in the U.S. extend from trait theories that emerged in early 1940s, to behavioral theories that were popular in the 1950s and 1960s, to contingency theories which developed in the 1960s, to organizational frames of the 1980s. As the names of leadership theories imply, some researchers looked at distinguishing traits of leaders, others looked at their behaviors and actions, while still others explored leadership situations and environments, or relationships between leaders and followers. Different theories employed various techniques and instruments to measure leadership skills.

The evolution of the leadership literature can be explored by examining concepts and theories on leadership over a period of time. Several scholars have offered overviews of the development of a definition of leadership. (Birnbaum, 1992; Brown, 1997). Brown (1997) analyzed definitions of leadership by decade between 1900 and 1990. He noticed that during the period 1900-1930, leadership literature emphasized leader control and centralization of power. Further, the center of attention in defining leadership shifted from leaders' personalities in the 1930s, to groups and functions of collective efforts in the 1940s. Another shift occurred in the 1950s when the focus of leadership studies was on visioning and goal-sharing. Influencing others became the center of leadership studies in the 1960s, in conjunction with the popularization of the behavioral movement. In the 1970s, scholars examined the relationships and interactions between leaders and followers. A final shift in the 1980s moved scholars to explore transformational and transactional leadership ideas.

Development of the scope of leadership research can be traced through these main stages. The scope of study expanded during each stage. Each approach has made positive contributions to the development of leadership theory.

The trait approach was one of the first systematic efforts to find out what makes some people great leaders. Representatives of the trait approach were engaged in answering questions about the universal traits of famous leaders. Despite the fact that this approach was the earliest approach to leadership, interest in the trait approach never ended. As Northouse (1997) noted, the trait approach is alive and well in the 1990s. Based on studies of leadership traits and characteristics conducted by various researchers (Lord, Phillips, & Rush, 1980; Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1974), Northouse identified five major leadership traits: intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability. According to research, strong verbal ability, perceptual ability, and reasoning are crucial traits of the intelligence of leaders. Self-confidence including self-esteem, self-assurance and a strong desire to accomplish tasks are important traits of leaders. Integrity is exhibited through qualities such as honesty and adherence to a set of principles. These traits create trust among followers. Leaders with interpersonal skills are more sensitive to followers' needs and are more sociable. In sum, the trait approach creates leadership profiles that have heuristic utility for the selection of leaders in organizations. Trait theory is also useful for leaders who can use such studies to increase their awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses.

Other researchers looked at the issue of leadership differently. Instead of looking at personal traits, these scholars broadened the scope of study by focusing on leaders' behaviors. These researchers attempted to answer explore how leaders behave and how they act. This approach is commonly called the style approach. For example, researchers from the Ohio State University subdivided leader's behavior into two dimensions: task behavior and relationship behavior. These two types of behaviors were later called "initiating structure" and "consideration" respectively by Stogdill (1974). Initiating structure included task behaviors like organizing work, allocating responsibilities, and scheduling work activities. Consideration included relationship behaviors as building mutual respect and trust between leaders and subordinates. Combining the two behavioral dimensions along a continuum yielded a certain leadership style. The Ohio State studies led to the development of the Leadership Behavior

Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), an instrument to assess leaders' behavior. This instrument was modified several times and is still being used in leadership studies.

One model of leadership style was developed through a study at Michigan State University (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Likert, 1961, 1967). It also identified two types of behaviors called production orientation and employee orientation. Production orientation meant emphasis on technical and technological aspects of production whereas employee orientation related to attention to human aspects such as personal needs, interests, and personalities of employees. The first behavior is very similar to initiating structure and the second is similar to consideration as formulated in the Ohio State studies.

Another model of leadership behavior is the Leadership Grid. The Leadership Grid first appeared in the early 1960s and it was initially called the managerial grid (Blake & Mouton, 1964, 1978, 1985). This model is based on two dimensions of leadership behavior called "concern for production" and "concern for people." As the name implies, concern for production includes activities related to the achievement of tasks such as new product development, increased sales, and profit growth. Concern for people involves activities directly related to building people's trust, developing commitment, stimulating compensation schemes, and promoting personal self worth.

Each of these dimensions can be measured on nine-point scales. The actual grid consists of two intersecting axes: the horizontal axis measures concern for people and vertical axis measures concern for production. When two axes are juxtaposed, the Leadership Grid reveals 81 (9x9) possible styles of which five styles are extreme cases and others are closely related to one of these extreme styles. These extreme styles are: the Authority-Compliance Style; the Country Club Style; the Impoverished Management Style; the Middle-of-the-Road Style, and the Team Management Style (Blake & Mouton, 1964, 1978, 1985).

The third approach to the study of leadership is the situational approach. From the late 1960s, some researchers (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) included a new dimension in their studies: the different situations in which leaders act. They looked at leadership not only from behavioral perspectives but from the perspective of situations. Since the term situation is vague, they narrowed this term down to the developmental level of followers. Therefore, in addition to the previous two dimensions of leaders' behavior, they have involved a third dimension:

developmental level of followers. Developmental level of subordinates is determined by the competence and commitment of subordinates on a continuum from low through medium to high. The authors used terms “directive behavior” and “supportive behavior” to describe the behavioral dimensions. These terms are very similar to task behavior and relationship behaviors.

Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi (1985) developed the Situational Leadership II (SLII) model. According to this model, leadership fits into four distinct styles. The first style is the “directing style” that reflects a high directive behavior and low supportive behavior when the development of followers is low or moderately low. The second style is the “coaching style” that reflects a high directive behavior and high supportive behavior at the same developmental level of followers. The third style is the “supporting style” with a low directive and a high supportive behavior when the maturity of followers is moderate or high. The fourth style is a “delegating style” that reflects a low level of directive and a low level of supportive behaviors and is appropriate when the level of development of followers is high or moderately high. This model has heuristic value because leaders can diagnose the situation and then adapt their leadership style by adjusting their directive and supportive behaviors according to the level of maturity of their followers in any given situation.

The fourth approach to the study of leadership study is contingency theory. Fiedler and Chemers (1974) developed contingency theory based on their numerous studies of styles of leaders who worked in different organizational contexts. The purpose of contingency theory was to define the effective matching of leadership style and organizational context. In this theory, leadership style serves as the dependent variable and factors of situations or organizational context serve as independent variables.

According to contingency theory, leadership styles are divided into two types: task-motivated and relationship-motivated. These two styles are similar to concern for production and concern for people in the Leadership Grid model. If leaders are primarily concerned about achieving goals and objectives, they have a dominant task-motivated style. Conversely, if leaders are primarily concerned about developing close interpersonal relationships, they have a predominantly relationship-motivated style. Fiedler and his associates have developed the LPC scale to measure leadership style.

The authors (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974) proposed to measure the situation through three factors: leader-member relations; task structure; and position power. Leader-member relations are measured as good or bad. Leader-member relations include characteristics such as group atmosphere, the extent of loyalty, confidence, attraction to leaders, and the existence of friction within the group. The second variable, task structure, involves clarity of task, clarity of roles for each group member, and clarity of ways to complete every task. Task structure is measured as high or low. The third variable, position power is measured as strong or weak power depending on how leaders motivate or punish. Position power is strong when the leader has the legitimate authority to hire and promote an employee. It is weak if leaders do not have such authority. These situational factors or variables all together are measured on a continuum from a “most favorable” situation when there are good leader-member relationships, clarity of tasks and roles, and strong power to a “least favorable” situation when there are poor leader-member relationships, low structure or unclear tasks, and weak leader position power.

Another extension of leadership studies is Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory. LMX theory is focused on the interactions between leaders and followers as a process. According to this theory, the leadership process is a dyadic relationship between leaders and followers. Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975) first developed this idea. Since then, LMX theory has undergone some revisions and modifications (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Initially, the authors concentrated on dyadic linkages formed between a leader and each of his or her subordinates. These were called vertical dyad linkages. Analyses of their properties and characteristics revealed two types of dyadic relationship: in-group and out-group. If dyadic relationships are mutually trusting and respectful and influence is reciprocal, it is an in-group type relationship. If the dyadic relationship is based only in a formal employment contract, it is an out-group relationship.

Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) focused on developing high quality leader-member exchanges termed “leadership making.” According to Graen & Uhl-Bien’s leadership making model, development of a high quality relationship between leader and subordinate goes through three stages. The first is the stranger phase, when the dyadic relationship relies primarily on a contract and the roles described in the job descriptions. The second is the acquaintance phase when both leader and subordinate have social exchanges involving new ways of exchanging personal and

job related information which leads to formation of trust and respect. The final phase, mature partnerships, emerges when mutual trust and respect are firmly formed and both leader and subordinate are affected by each other in reciprocal ways. To evaluate the degree of mutual respect, trust, and obligation in relationships between leader and subordinate, the researchers have developed the LMX questionnaire. This instrument is administered to leaders as well as subordinates to reveal the effectiveness of their relationship. In further studies, Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) attempted to link LMX theory to real performance, innovation, career progress, and other organizational variables.

One modern approach to leadership studies is the transformational leadership approach. The transformational leadership approach emerged in the 1980s, a period when radical reforms and changes were occurring in politics, the economy, and many other fields. These reforms were referred to under different names such as government reinvention, corporate restructuring or turnaround. From the transformational leadership perspective, there are two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership focuses on the exchanges between leaders and followers: rewards, corrective actions, and reinforcement to reach desired outcomes. Transformational leadership is a process that results in changes and transformations of individuals and the whole organization through changes in values, ethics, and long-term goals. Both transactional and transformational leadership types deal with followers, relationships with them, and their performance.

Transformational leadership models may incorporate earlier models of leadership. For example, according to proponents of LMX theory, LMX is both transactional and transformational because it begins as transactional social exchange and evolves into transformational social exchange (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

The model of transformational leadership was first developed by Bass (1985, 1990) and further enriched by Bass and Avolio (1993, 1994). The model describes four main factors of transformational leadership: (1) idealized influence; (2) inspirational motivation; (3) intellectual stimulation; and (4) individualized consideration. The first factor, idealized influence, means having a leader as a role model and followers who emulate this charismatic leader and are willing to follow him or her. The second factor, inspirational motivation, includes actions of leaders such as effective communication of expectations, thoughtful development of

commitment, and promotion of team spirit among subordinates through the formation a shared vision. The third factor, intellectual stimulation, involves such practices as enabling and encouraging others to think in new ways, to express different points of view, to be creative in dealing with issues, and promoting individual efforts of followers. The fourth factor, individualized consideration, encompasses the creation of a supportive atmosphere where everyone cares about each other, treats everyone as colleagues with respect and dignity, and promotes a climate in which leaders listen carefully to the needs of co-workers.

Researchers have developed an instrument to measure transformational leadership. Bass (1985) developed the first version of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The current MLQ, the most widely used instrument, was refined by Bass and Avilio (1993). This instrument consists of 21 items and is administered to followers to reveal their perceptions about a leader on the four factors of a transformational leader and the three factors of transactional leadership.

Thus, theories of leadership have evolved from trait theories to behavioral theory, to contingency theory, to leader-member exchange theory, and to transformational theory. Each appeared as a result of adding new ideas to existing theory or modifying the focus of previous theories and adopting different perspectives.

Leadership Studies in Higher Education

Most studies of leadership have been done in corporate sector, government organizations, and in the military. Until recently, leadership studies in higher education settings have not been conducted due to the unique characteristics of colleges and universities. Birnbuam (1989) noted that studying leadership in colleges and universities is more difficult than in many other settings because of dual control systems, conflicts between professional and administrative authority, unclear goals, and other properties unique to normative, professional organizations.

Birnbaum and his associates did analyze the perceptions of leadership by university and college presidents in the U.S. This was one of a series of studies of leadership in the higher education setting. Birnbaum and his associates have conducted an extensive five-year investigation of higher education leadership within the framework of the Institutional Leadership Project (ILP). The ILP, one of the most comprehensive studies on leadership in higher education, has produced 51 books, monographs, chapters, and papers (Birnbaum, 1992).

Based on assumptions that myths have some truth, Birnbaum used five myths to interpret this complex phenomenon. These myths include the myth of presidential vision, the myth of the president as transformational leader, the myth of presidential charisma, the myth of presidential distance, and the myth of presidential style. All these myths were detected to some extent in all 32 presidents of universities and colleges who participated in longitudinal ILP study. Thus, these researchers have studied the phenomenon of leadership using different perspectives.

In addition to the study on myths, numerous former university presidents published manuscripts where they generalized their ideas about leadership based on their personal practices, behavior, activities, and styles and their observations and own studies. (Bogue, 1994; Cohen & March, 1986; Fisher & Tack, 1988; Fisher, Tack, & Wheeler, 1988; Kerr, 1995; Kerr & Gade, 1986; Walker, 1979). These manuscripts are not just personal recollections about their tenure as university presidents, rather they are about experimental leadership practices generalized into concepts and metaphors.

The study of leadership cannot be complete without close consideration of the organization. The type of organization usually serves as an adjective to the term leadership and the combined term becomes a field of study. For instance, educational leadership is related to school systems or higher education systems. Leadership and organization are inseparable parts and they coexist. A leader does not function without an organization and any organization exists under the leadership of someone who is either elected or appointed. Accordingly, some researchers study leaders and organizations together and any study on leadership to certain extent involves organizational study.

In the higher education setting, the book Leadership and Ambiguity by Cohen and March (1974) deserves serious attention. Cohen and March introduced a new term “organized anarchy”, to communicate distinctive organizational characteristics of colleges and universities and their problems which have to be taken into consideration by their leaders. Since modern universities in the U.S. represent complex organizations, the authors looked at higher education institutions and their administration from different perspectives that they called metaphors. They looked at universities and colleges as enterprises functioning in a competitive market environment and described the roles of presidents in such settings as entrepreneurial. Assuming the university as an administrative unit with a hierarchy of tasks and authority leads to role of

the president as manager. Looking at university as a place of collective bargaining enabled them to see the president as a mediator. Portraying universities and colleges as a democracy supposes a presidential role as a head politician. Imagining a university as a consensus process made it possible to see the president as the chairman of a board. Pretending the university is a judicial system leads one to think of the president as a judge. Presenting the university as an anarchic or autocratic system enabled them to see the university president as a catalyst or a king. In sum, looking at universities from different perspectives results in different images of leaders of educational institutions. Cohen and March (1974) identified eight different leadership roles of the president of a higher education institution from politician to entrepreneur.

Bolman and Deal (1984) developed another model for understanding organizations and linked that model to leadership practices or styles. Their book Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations (1984) identified four frames for viewing organizations: the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic or cultural. These frames offer insights into organizations and their leadership opportunities. One advantage of this model is that it groups theoretical ideas related to organizations into four categories and then integrates them by focusing on leadership of an organization. The structural frame is the most discussed in the Bolman and Deal model because this frame deals with issues of organizations such as goals, roles and levels, linkages, and technologies. This frame takes into account environmental influences on structure and the relationship between trends of differentiation or integration and organizational structure.

The next frame is the symbolic frame that focuses on concepts, ideas, and feelings. There are many symbolic events and characteristics associated with organizations which Bolman and Deal (1984) define through four constructs: myths, stories and tales, rituals and ceremonies, and metaphors. Organizational members acknowledge and respect myths and take them into account in their actions. Myths play an important role in promoting commonly accepted values.

Stories about organizational life describe organizations in more crystallized forms that people can use to distinguish the best traditions of the organization. In this sense, stories and fairy tales about an organization are very instructive. Leaders of organizations need to acknowledge and use stories and tales in their work. Stories are usually inspirational and passed

from person to person. Organizational stories in written and oral form are told for external and internal audiences. Through stories, stakeholders outside the organization get more lively and colorful information about the organization and its leaders. They admire an organization's stories and develop more supportive attitudes towards that organization (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

Bolman and Deal (1984) pointed out that ceremonies and rituals play a role in promoting unity and enable people to express their shared values and vision. Nations, provinces, and organizations have rituals and ceremonies associated with certain activities and events. These rituals are respected by the members of the entity. Rituals, ceremonies, and similar actions are not only symbolic, but also give meaning to certain organizational rituals. These actions unite people in the organization through a sensible and sometimes very sentimental manner and express their shared values and shared faith in the organization.

Metaphors make things easier to understand and people knowing this appreciate using metaphors in communications. As Bolman and Deal (1984) noted, metaphors enable people to understand unfamiliar things. Leaders can communicate complicated ideas or future images effectively through carefully selected metaphors. Humor is another useful means of integrating functions among people in organizations. Play is helpful in handling difficult situations joyfully so that participants feel more free and creative in finding options to solve problems. Instead of a rule-driven atmosphere, a playful atmosphere builds a more creative and friendly environment.

In summary, the four organizational frames described by Bolman and Deal (1984) provide a deeper understanding of an organization. But the Bolman and Deal model described organizations in general. Other scholars have adapted the model to reflect higher education organizations. For example, Birnbaum (1988) modified Bolman and Deal's organizational framework to describe an academic environment. He proposed that university leaders deal with bureaucratic, collegial, political, and symbolic processes in their interactions with organizations. He renamed the structural, human resource, and political frames of Bolman and Deal's model into the bureaucratic, the collegial, and political frameworks respectively and related these frames to higher education institutions. He examined the bureaucratic frame in association with classic thoughts such as scientific management (Taylor, 1947), characteristics of bureaucracy (Weber, 1947), and administrative principles (Fayol, 1949). He related the collegial frame to classical theories such as human relations (Likert, 1961) and Theory X and

Theory Y (McGregor, 1957). The collegial frame viewed an organization as collectives of organizational members, people working together. Bensimon (1989) emphasized that this frame enables outsiders to see colleges and universities as communities of scholars who share their professional expertise, value system, and organizational goals. According to the political frame colleges and universities consist of many different interest groups (formal and informal) that fight over the limited resources.

These frames were referred to as cognitive frames and were used in the studies conducted in the ILP project. Bensimon (1989) analyzed how university presidents were using the frames based on interviews with them. Thirteen presidents espoused a single frame. Five used the bureaucratic, four the collegial, one the political, and three the symbolic frame. Eleven reported using two frames, seven espoused using three frames, and only one talked about all four frames. Patterns of using the frames by the presidents depended on institutional type. Community college leaders mostly used a single frame, either the bureaucratic or collegial, whereas university leaders relied on two to four frames.

A review of current literature suggests that the subjects of most studies were university and college presidents. (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981; Bensimon, 1989; Birnbaum, 1989, 1992; Brown, 1997; Cohen & March, 1974; Tierney, 1989). Additionally, many former presidents have written insightful books on university leadership based on their experiences and observations. (Bowen & Shapiro, 1998; Fisher & Koch, 1996). Instructive case studies have also been offered in the literature (Bowen & Shapiro, 1998).

In terms of techniques employed in these studies, researchers of leadership in higher education have used qualitative methods such as long interviews, surveys, and instruments designed to detect behavioral practices (Bauer, 1993; Brown, 1997; Fields & Herold, 1997; Riley, 1991). But present study focused on a single theory of leadership and a single instrument designed to measure leadership practices. It was important, therefore, to examine that theory and that instrument in some detail.

Overview of Leadership Studies Using LPI

One way to investigate the style approach is to conduct a leadership practices inventory, a practice that has been used since the early 1980s (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, 1997). Kouzes and Posner also looked at leaders' behaviors and activities, but they took a different perspective.

The first perspective that they wanted to investigate was what leaders did when they were at their “personal best” in leading others. They wanted to hear about experiences in which, from their own perception, people set their leadership standards of excellence. To find out patterns of leadership successes and uncover the best practices, the authors chose ordinary leaders, not just famous leaders, of well known companies and organizations. The second perspective they wanted to know about was what people said about their leaders’ behaviors and activities when they admired and looked at their leaders. (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Kouzes and Posner employed both survey and interview methods in their study on leadership. Initially, the personal-best leadership survey with 38 open-ended questions was administered to more than 550 senior and middle managers. This survey on average took about two hours to complete because it entailed reporting detailed recollections from respondents. The authors also conducted 42 in-depth interviews. As the authors noted, these cases were tales of dynamic changes and bold actions (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Their analyses of the personal-best cases of leadership revealed certain distinct practices when leaders were doing their best. The scholars have extended their studies by involving more and more participants - managers at all levels representing different types of organizations from government agencies to business, to religious, to military organizations. Studies were conducted in different geographical areas including foreign nations. These distinct leadership practices were exhibited with consistency by leaders at different levels and from different areas and sectors. Strikingly, the same patterns were found in surveys completed by leaders’ constituents.

These findings led them to create a model of leadership. The model of leadership consists of five fundamental practices: challenging the process; inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act; modeling the way; and encouraging the heart. Going into further detail, they uncovered the principles or commitments, as called by them, that would support these practices. Kouzes and Posner have formulated ten commitments of leadership in a such way that there are two commitments for each practice that describe the content of that practice. For example, the two commitments for challenging the process involve searching out challenging opportunities to change, grow, or innovate; and improving and experimenting which involves taking risks and learning from the mistakes that accompany such risks. The two commitments for the practice of inspiring a shared vision are envisioning an uplifting and ennobling future and enlisting others

in a common vision by appealing to their values, interests and hopes, and dreams. (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). In turn, detailed descriptions of these commitments enabled the authors to create a quantitative instrument to measure leaders' behaviors and activities - the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). This instrument measures behaviors and activities commonly exhibited by leaders.

Thus, this study of leaders' behaviors and actions resulted in identifying the five leadership practices which are formulated through ten leadership commitments. This enabled the researchers to design a research instrument that measures leadership. This study is distinguished from other leadership studies. Other leadership studies emphasized two dimensions, initiating structure and consideration, which were not discussed in detail. On the contrary, the LPI study focuses on the five leadership practices (or five dimensions) and describes them through leadership commitments and thirty statements on the LPI instrument. The practices, the commitments, and the instrument are logical extensions of the ongoing leadership studies by the researchers.

The LPI has been used in different settings. There were several studies that used LPI in school administration settings (Long, 1991; Riley, 1991; Ross, 1995) and also several studies in college settings (Bauer, 1993; Brown, 1997; Plowman, 1991).

A study by Riley (1991) focused on differences between superintendents' and principals' perspectives of leadership behaviors. The results revealed that there are no significant differences between the two groups of leaders in terms of the extent to which they rated themselves and in terms of how they ranked behaviors associated with leadership practices: challenging the process; inspiring a shared vision, and encouraging the heart. Significant differences were found in enabling others to act and modeling the way. Superintendents scored higher in enabling whereas principals rated themselves higher in modeling. LPI-Self mean scores between the two groups' of leaders differed significantly. The superintendents rated themselves higher than principals on average.

Long's (1991) study focused on identifying and analyzing the factors utilized by superintendents in achieving their personal best in education. The researcher modified and used Kouzes and Posner's LPI. Results of this study showed that the most important contributors to personal-best successes are involving others (33%), taking risks (16%), and envisioning the

future (16%). According to Long, the most important leadership strategies are enabling others to act followed by inspiring a shared vision, modeling the way, encouraging the heart, and challenging the process.

Plowman (1991) assessed the leadership practices of college presidents and found that the presidents' perceptions of their leadership practices are all significantly higher than the perceptions of their administrative team members. The presidents rated themselves in the 70th percentile or above on the normative LPI profile. In his doctoral dissertation, Brown (1997) examined relationships between public university and college presidents' self-rated leadership practices and institutional type. He analyzed differences by selected personal characteristics such as race, age, gender, and years of experience. His analyses revealed significant differences regarding race and age of college and university presidents. There were significant differences between African-American and Caucasian presidents ($p=.026$) and between presidents of different age groups ($p=.012$). He found no significant differences by institutional type, gender, years of experience, or academic background of presidents (Brown, 1997).

Fields and Herold (1997) used the LPI instrument to examine transactional and transformational leadership. They studied how a leadership instrument that focuses on several narrow dimensions of leadership behavior relates to transformational and/or transactional leadership. The authors reached the conclusion that the broader dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership can be inferred from subordinate reports of leadership behaviors, even when using instruments not specifically designed for this purpose such as the LPI (Fields & Herold, 1997).

In sum, the LPI has been used independently as a research instrument also and in combination with other leadership concepts and instruments. Data collected through administration of the LPI-Self and LPI-Observer can be used in variety of ways for research purposes.

Overall, then, the literature on leadership has gone through several stages, from trait theory to transformational theory. Since the present study was designed to provide baseline information about leadership practices among leaders of higher education in Mongolia, it was important to select a conceptual framework for the study that focused on leadership practices. The Kouzes and Posner (1997) frame is one that focuses on leadership practices. Additionally,

there is a reliable and valid instrument, the LPI, that measures the constructs of that frame.

Therefore, it was logical to employ the Kouzes and Posner frame for the present study and to use the LPI to collect data on leadership practices in higher education in Mongolia.