

A PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS AT THE JORDANIAN UNIVERSITIES: A CASE STUDY OF THE HASHEMITE UNIVERSITY

Prof. Aieman Ahmad Al-Omari¹

¹ *Dean, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to identify how do individuals who have worked for and with the president describe him regarding his leadership effectiveness as he led the Hashemite University during his time period, and analyze the significant differences in the university participants based on their gender (male, female) and job role (faculty member, staff). Data collection randomly selected from faculties and administrative units, the actual response rate for faculty members were (131) and staffs were (214). A 48 items survey covered the six areas of leadership effectiveness were used in the survey comprising presidential leadership effectiveness. The responses indicated that the most leadership effectiveness for the university president was for the Adaptive Change Agent, closely followed by the Innovator, the Visionary was the third, the Relationally Strong was fifth, and the Team Builder was Sixth. There was significant difference at the 0.05 level between male and female participants in the (Team Builder) in favor of male. There were significant differences at the 0.05 level between faculty members and staff participants in the (Adaptive Change Agent), (Good Fit), (Visionary) in favor for faculty members. While the significant differences at the 0.05 level between faculty members and staff participants in the (Team Builder), and (Innovator) in favor for staff.

Keyword: - Leadership Effectiveness; University President; Hashemite University, Jordan.

1. INTRODUCTION

Leading effectively in higher education requires addressing complex challenges. The challenges in which universities function has been facing were identified as mass expansion; decrease of governmental expenditure and support for universities; diversification of financial resources; internationalization; commercialization and an increase in the entrepreneurial character of institutions; changes brought by information and communication technology development; and the adaptation of curricula to accommodate and capitalize on labor market requirements (Alzyoud & Bani-Hani, 2015; Barblan, Daxner, and Ivosevic, 2007; and Eckstein, 2003). Therefore, one of the major distinctive of leading in higher education institutions concerns the complexity of the multiple structures and cultures. Because of these wide-ranging cultures, individuals and groups within the institution often have vastly different expectations and perspectives.

Effective leadership in higher education is that the best leaders understand that they do not lead alone. Eddy and Van Der Linden (2006) state that leadership is now being described more in terms of relationships than merely by titles and roles. It takes a community of leaders, working together, moving in harmony toward the agreed upon vision, to accomplish effective and long term change (Slater & Martinez, 2000). Birnbaum (1987) states that it is more effective to view faculty as constituents and not as followers, though leading through change in any context is

difficult as the leader negotiates internal demands and external pressures, higher education institutions are notorious for independent thinking and skepticism toward change and innovation.

Different studies regarding the leadership of presidents within higher education institutions exist, including topics such as: how a president's use of power frames the way change is implemented in their institutions (Eddy, 2003), understanding the institution's organizational culture (Amey, 2006), conditions and initiatives needed to affect transformational change (Eckel, Hill, & Green, 1998), cultivating a climate of innovation (Downey, 2001).

A review of the literature which assesses an effective and successful president in higher education is an essential in understanding the attributes and practices fit with leading in a given context. There are different attributes and practices which have surfaced by the researchers, namely, a leader who is: relationally strong, an adaptive change agent, a developer and shaper of the new culture, a good fit with the institution, an effective team builder, a visionary, and an innovator (Boyce, 2003; Denton & Moore, 2009; Dittmar, 2009; Donnelly, 1995; Fincher, 1997; Julius, Baldrige, & Pfeffer, 1999; Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

For this study, as a conceptual framework, six attributes and practices used as follows: **Relationally strong**, the president in a higher education institution who is relationally strong as the key in creating a culture in which interpersonal relationships is highly valued. Having a collegial environment, both faculty-to-faculty and between faculty and administration, is essential for substantive change in the institution (Dittmar, 2009). Other important relationship characteristics include humility and empathy to the needs of others, along with an ability to manage conflict (Julius, Baldrige, & Pfeffer, 1999).

Change agents, effective higher education leaders also need to function as adaptive change agents and know how to thrive in an environment where change is needed. Institutional change comes in a variety of shapes and sizes. In some contexts, slow evolutionary change is sufficient. In others, radical change is necessary (Boyce, 2003). Along these lines, change is often erroneously viewed as a project, not a process.

A good fit, Fincher (1997) has found that even though a president might be highly qualified academically and administratively, this individual still might be a mismatch with their institution. The importance of institutional fit must be strongly considered when a president is hired, and when there are concerns about a president's appropriate fit in the important areas of mission, identity, and culture early in his or her tenure and they are not addressed, significant problems arise (Denton & Moore, 2009). Other research indicates that the issue of fit or suitability is closely tied to the president's vision for the institution and how positively the constituents embrace the vision (Donnelly, 1995).

Team builder, the importance of building a strong team that can implement the vision of the president is crucial. Presidents who have built a quality team model and instill in the team a positive work environment, a commitment to a strong work ethic and building ethical climate in the university, the value of empowering capable people to do their jobs with excellence, and a low tolerance for inappropriate and dysfunctional behavior have a greater opportunity for success (Al-Omari, 2013; Julius et al., 1999).

A visionary, one important characteristic of an effective vision is that though it must inspire and stretch the employees, it must be anchored in a future reality (Donnelly, 1995). In addition, even though the vision may originate from the president, it must become a shared vision with those who will be involved in implementing it (Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

An innovator, leading through innovation is different than being a change agent in that the innovative change is something new for the organization and driven by emerging needs and opportunities in societal culture. Institutions of higher are often forced to innovate or cease to exist (Osland & Ankeny, 2007). Effective presidents must stay in

tune with opportunities which can produce growth and greater institutional health, and innovation is often the best vehicle to accomplish this.

“Colleges are reportedly desperately seeking leadership. They seek leaders with vision who are not satisfied with the status quo—leaders who are unafraid of change and have the power and wherewithal to transform their organizations” (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989, p. 73). Therefore, this research focuses upon how this president through his attributes, practices, and achievements led the University. This research is important, because higher education institutions; Hashemite University as a public university face a new environment and challenges that necessitate independence from governmental and state support.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Despite much research on presidential leadership, there is one group of higher education entities for which limited research exists in understanding presidential effectiveness, namely, the presidents of the Jordanian Universities. These universities experienced substantial growth from the early 1960s to the 2000s. Though all ten public universities and 18 private universities in Jordan grew on average by about 0.25%.

Despite healthy growth in decades past, in a time of national and global economic instability and on-going, rising tuition costs of both public and private colleges and universities, higher education institutions now find themselves in a precarious position. The current economic times have threatened the survival of some colleges and universities. Leading effectively in such colleges and universities in a time of external crisis is a great challenge. A leader, therefore, needs to understand the context and be able to use the appropriate leadership approach. Leading effectively through crisis requires a leader to possess both the ability to discern the context and the skill to implement appropriate change. Therefore, this study emphasizes on presidential leadership effectiveness of the Hashemite University as a case study.

1.2 Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to identify how do individuals who have worked for and with the president describe him regarding his leadership attributes, practices, and achievements as he led the Hashemite University during his time period. And analyze the significant differences in the university participants based on their gender (male, female), and job role (faculty member, staff).

The following research questions guide the study:

Question One: How do individuals who have worked for and with the president describe him regarding his leadership effectiveness as he led the Hashemite University during his time period?

Question Two: Do president leadership attributes, practices, and achievement as perceived by participants differ based on their gender (male, female), and job role (faculty member, staff)?

1.3 Case Setting

The data for my research came from one institution of higher education, Hashemite University, whose campus is located in Zarqa, Jordan. Zarqa is a city of approximately 1,500,000 people, a beautiful rural setting in middle of Jordan. Hashemite University has an undergraduate enrollment of approximately 31,000, and a graduate population of 700. The parents of the majority of the college students are middle class. Sixty percent of the students are females, forty percent are males.

Hashemite University (HU) is a state-supported university located in the Zarqa governorate of Jordan. HU has a comprehensive urban campus. The university includes departments for the Arts, Sciences, Educational Sciences, Medicine, Allied Health Sciences, Nursing, Engineering, Information Technology, Business Administration, Natural

Resources and Environment, Tourism and National Heritage, and Childhood. It is located in the vicinity of Zarqa on a strategic site that is parallel to the international highway that links Amman with Mafraq and at the crossroad that connects Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Iraq. HU is a motivated community of scholars and scientists with a shared dedication to the quest of knowledge, the value of community service, and the importance of dialogue to a stable and flourishing society. The current president was appointed interim president of Hashemite University in 2011 and president in 2012.

2. METHODS

2.1 Research Design

This study was a quantitative conducting through utilizing "A Presidential Leadership Effectiveness Questionnaire" among participants "Faculty members and staff) in the Hashemite University.

2.2 Population and Sample of Study

The population involved with this study consists of the faculty members and staff who worked in the Hashemite University in Jordan during the academic year 2014/ 2015. This university utilizes 586 faculty members and 900 employers. In gathering data from a random sample of these faculty members and employers, various faculties and administrative units were selected in a random manner. Data collection continued from randomly selected faculties and administrative units until data had been obtained from at least the minimum number of respondents from the faculty members and employers. In conducting the study, the actual response rate for faculty members (131) and staff (214) were collected.

2.3 Instrumentation

The instrumentation used for the survey part developed by the researcher. Several surveys were evaluated; The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990), and Indicators of Presidential Effectiveness (Michael, Schwartz, & Balraj, 2001).

A 48 items covered the six areas of leadership effectiveness were used in the survey comprising presidential leadership effectiveness. The participant was asked to rank on a Likert-type scale of 1-5 their response. These responses range from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

2.3.1. Relationally strong, 8 items in this area characterized the president of the university who is relationally strong as the key in creating a culture in which interpersonal relationships is highly valued.

2.3.2. Change agents, 8 items in this area characterized university leaders to function as adaptive change agents and know how to thrive in an environment where change is needed. Institutional change comes in a variety of shapes and sizes.

2.3.3. A good fit, 8 items in this area characterized the issue of fit or suitability is closely tied to the president's vision for the institution and how positively the constituents embrace the vision.

2.3.4. Team builder, 8 items in this area characterized the importance of building a strong team that can implement the vision of the president.

2.3.5. A visionary, 8 items in this area characterized the important of an effective vision that inspire and stretch the employees.

2.3.6. An innovator, 8 items in this area characterized effective presidents must stay in tune with opportunities which can produce growth and greater institutional health, and innovation is often the best vehicle to accomplish this.

For the purpose of examining the validity of the instrument (face validity evidence) was presented to post-secondary education experts. They were asked to check whether the statements in the instrument are clear and linked appropriately with the areas that were classified to them in advance. Regarding the reliability of the instrument split-half procedure was used; a pilot study had been conducted. 30 faculty members participated in the pilot study, those faculty members did not participate in the final study. Stability coefficients for the instrument in each case were 0.85, 0.84, 0.78, 0.77, 0.81 and 0.81 for the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth areas, respectively. These values can be considered reasonably satisfactory to support the objectives of the current study.

2.4 Data Collection and Analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17 was used to analyze the data collected from the surveys. Descriptive statistics providing means and standard deviations were calculated for the first question. T-test was employed to answer the second question.

In order to understand the results of this study, it was important to set specific cut points to interpret the participants total scores related to their perception of the president leadership effectiveness. Regarding the cut points, it should be noted that the researcher used the response scale of each item that ranged from 1 to 5 to determine these cut points according to the following manner: 1-2.33 = low, from 2.34 to 3.67 = moderate, and 3.68-5.00 = high levels.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Question One: How do individuals who have worked for and with the president describe him regarding his leadership effectiveness as he led the Hashemite University during his time period?

Means and standard deviation were computed for each of six factors that were identified as being leadership effectiveness for the university president. The responses indicated that the most leadership effectiveness for the university president was for the *Adaptive Change Agent* ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.649$), closely followed by the *Innovator* ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.754$). The *Visionary* was the third leadership effectiveness factor ($M = 3.90$), the *Relationally Strong* ($M = 3.37$) was fifth, and the *Team Builder* ($M = 2.98$) was Sixth. Responses are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness

No.	Dimensions	Means	SD
1	Relationally Strong	3.37	.019
2	Adaptive Change Agent	4.09	.649
3	Good Fit	3.55	.210
4	Team Builder	2.98	.149
5	Visionary	3.90	.570
6	Innovator	3.99	.754

Means and standard deviation were computed for each of eight items in "*Relationally Strong*" dimension that were identified as being leadership effectiveness for the university president. The total mean scores of *Relationally Strong* was ($M=3.37$, $SD=0.019$). Related to interpreted scores, *Relationally Strong* were in moderate level. Out of 8 items of the instrument, 7 items were in moderate level. While item (2, *He is an effective listener*) was in high level, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness in "*Relationally Strong*" dimension

Items	Means	SD
1) He shows humility in personal relationships	2.50	.501

2) He expresses appreciation to others	3.00	.000
3) He is kind toward others	3.50	.501
4) He is an effective listener	4.01	1.001
5) He communicates with warmth one-on-one	3.49	.512
6) He relates well with community leaders	3.50	.501
7) He is respectful of others	3.50	.501
8) He is assessable to financial donors	3.50	.501
Total	3.37	.019

Means and standard deviation were computed for each of eight items in "Adaptive Change Agent" dimension that were identified as being leadership effectiveness for the university president. The total mean scores of *Adaptive Change Agent* was (M=4.09, SD=0.649). Related to interpreted scores, *Adaptive Change Agent* were in high level. Out of 8 items of the instrument, 5 items were in high levels. While 3 items in moderate levels, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness in "Adaptive Change Agent" dimension

Items	Means	SD
1) He creates a sense of urgency for change	3.50	.501
2) He enlists others to assist in the change process	3.49	1.502
3) He is courageous in making changes	3.49	1.502
4) He effectively communicates the need for change	3.80	1.027
5) He uses data to raise difficult questions	4.98	.228
6) He effectively utilizes other influencers to produce change.	4.49	.512
7) His actions have led to others engaging in solutions to problems	4.49	.512
8) His changes have produced new structures and sustained improvements	4.49	.512
Total	4.09	.649

Means and standard deviation were computed for each of eight items in "Good Fit" dimension that were identified as being leadership effectiveness for the university president. The total mean scores of *Good Fit* was (M=3.55, SD=0.210). Related to interpreted scores, *Good Fit* were in moderate level. Out of 8 items of the instrument, 4 items were in high levels, while 3 items were in moderate levels, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness in "Good Fit" dimension

Items	Means	SD
1) His actions align with the school doctrinally	3.99	1.001
2) He embodies the institutional mission	3.00	.000
3) He represents the school well to the Fellowship of Jordanian universities	2.99	.076
4) He reflects the school's values	2.49	.512
5) He reinforces the school's heritage	2.99	1.001
6) He has built upon past institutional strengths	4.49	.512
7) He has skills which are compatible with the needs of the institution	4.49	.534
8) He models spiritual maturity	3.99	.152
Total	3.55	.210

Means and standard deviation were computed for each of eight items in "Team Builder" dimension that were identified as being leadership effectiveness for the university president. The total mean scores of *Team Builder* was (M=2.98, SD=0.149). Related to interpreted scores, *Team Builder* were in moderate level. Out of 8 items of the instrument, 1 item was in high level, while 7 items were in moderate levels, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness in "Team Builder" dimension

Items	Means	SD
1) He has selected an excellent administrative team	3.50	.501
2) He delegates responsibility to his team	3.50	.501
3) He encourages professional development of his team	2.50	.501
4) He makes changes in his team members as needed	2.50	.501
5) He empowers and affirms his team	3.48	.534
6) He includes others in decision-making	2.50	.501
7) He includes others in strategic planning	2.00	.993
8) He assists the Board in their development as a team	3.86	.519
Total	2.98	.149

Means and standard deviation were computed for each of eight items in "Visionary" dimension that were identified as being leadership effectiveness for the university president. The total mean scores of *Visionary* was (M=3.90, SD=0.570). Related to interpreted scores, *Visionary* was in high level. Out of 8 items of the instrument, 6 items were in high level, while 2 items were in moderate levels, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness in "Visionary" dimension

Items	Means	SD
1) He is able to communicate vision well	4.47	.595
2) His vision has moved the school forward in enrollment growth	4.46	.594
3) His vision provides motivation for others to take action	4.47	.565
4) He inspires others with his vision	3.97	1.010
5) He has achieved his vision of greater academic quality in students	3.99	1.010
6) He has achieved his vision of greater academic credentials of faculty	3.84	1.064
7) He helps others also own a vision for the college	3.00	.000
8) His vision has helped Brand the institution	2.99	.076
Total	3.90	.570

Means and standard deviation were computed for each of eight items in "Innovator" dimension that were identified as being leadership effectiveness for the university president. The total mean scores of *Innovator* was (M=3.99, SD=0.754). Related to interpreted scores, *Innovator* was in high level. Out of 8 items of the instrument, 8 items were in high level, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness in "Innovator" dimension

Items	Means	SD
1) He has assembled other innovators on his team	3.99	.076
2) He promotes innovation in all areas of the institution	4.00	1.001
3) He has good entrepreneurial skills	3.99	1.010
4) He has negotiated innovation and resistance to change effectively	4.00	1.001

5) He has creatively made the institution more efficient and effective	3.99	.0760
6) He knows how to courageously face the challenges of innovation	3.99	1.001
7) His innovation has led to the creation of new revenue streams	3.99	1.010
8) He understands that creative change is essential for institutional survival	3.99	1.001
Total	3.99	.754

3.2 Question Two: Do president leadership effectiveness as perceived by participants differ based on their gender (male, female), and job role (faculty member, staff)?

3.2.1 Gender: t-tests were used to examine the difference in means between male and female participants in each dimension of president leadership effectiveness Scale. Table 8 show that there was significant difference at the 0.05 level between male and female participants in the (*Team Builder*) in favor of male ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.125$), that mean male participants perceived president leadership effectiveness in Team Building better than female participants did.

Table 8: t-Test, means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness as perceived by participants based on their gender (male, female)

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Relationally Strong	Female	158	3.37	0.028	1.544	343	0.124
	Male	187	3.38	0.000			
Adaptive Change Agent	Female	158	4.07	0.667	0.555	343	0.579
	Male	187	4.11	0.635			
Good Fit	Female	158	3.55	0.236	0.689	343	0.491
	Male	187	3.56	0.185			
Team Builder	Female	158	2.96	0.170	2.930	343	0.004*
	Male	187	3.00	0.125			
Visionary	Female	158	3.86	0.579	1.286	343	0.199
	Male	187	3.94	0.561			
Innovator	Female	158	3.98	0.760	0.243	343	0.808
	Male	187	4.00	0.752			
Total	Female	158	3.63	0.151	2.549	343	0.011*
	Male	187	3.66	0.087			

3.2.2. Job: t-tests were used to examine the difference in means between faculty members and staff participants in each dimension of president leadership effectiveness Scale. Table 9 show that there were significant differences at the 0.05 level between faculty members and staff participants in the (*Adaptive Change Agent*, $M=4.67$, $SD=0.29$), (*Good Fit*, $M =3.73$, $SD=0.07$), (*Visionary*, $M=4.39$, $SD=0.30$) in favor for faculty members. While the significant differences at the 0.05 level between faculty members and staff participants in the (*Team Builder*), and (*Innovator*) in favor for staff.

Table 9: t-Test, means and standard deviation of president leadership effectiveness as perceived by participants based on their Job role (faculty member, staff)

	Job	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Relationally Strong	Faculty member	131	3.38	0.00	1.108	343	0.268
	Staff	214	3.37	0.02			
Adaptive Change Agent	Faculty member	131	4.67	0.29	18.253	343	0.00*

	Staff	214	3.74	0.54			
Good Fit	Faculty member	131	3.73	0.07	16.156	343	0.00*
	Staff	214	3.45	0.19			
Team Builder	Faculty member	131	2.87	0.07	13.110	343	0.00*
	Staff	214	3.05	0.14			
Visionary	Faculty member	131	4.39	0.30	17.051	343	0.00*
	Staff	214	3.59	0.47			
Innovator	Faculty member	131	3.31	0.75	18.248	343	0.00*
	Staff	214	4.41	0.63			
Total	Faculty member	131	3.73	0.05	11.146	343	0.00*
	Staff	214	3.60	0.126			

4. DISCUSSION:

When studying effective presidential leadership in higher education in Hashemite University, six categories of attributes and practices emerged. This data created a profile of a leader who is: (a) relationally strong, (b) an adaptive change agent, (c) a good fit with the institution, (d) an effective team builder, (e) a visionary, and (f) an innovator (Boyce, 2003; Denton & Moore, 2009; Dittmar, 2009; Donnelly, 1995; Fincher, 1997; Julius, Baldrige, & Pfeffer, 1999; Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Oosting, 1985).

When addressing the president's top strengths, results of study reveals that the overall top category is Adaptive Change Agent. Five Out of eight items in this category were as high levels include uses data to raise difficult questions, effectively utilizes other influencers to produce change, led to others engaging in solutions to problems, produced new structures and sustained improvements, and effectively communicates the need for change.

The second highest categorical mean total is the president as "Innovator", with eight of eight in this category were as high levels include: promotes innovation in all areas of the institution, negotiated innovation and resistance to change effectively, assembled other innovators on his team, good entrepreneurial skills, creatively made the institution more efficient and effective, knows how to courageously face the challenges of innovation, creation of new revenue streams, creative change is essential for institutional survival. There was very much innovation at the institution during the presidents period, and the significant innovation, especially new programs and partnerships, has occurred.

The third highest category mean total is the president as "Visionary", with six out of 8 items in this category were in high levels, include: communicate vision well, provides motivation for others to take action, moved the school forward in enrollment growth, academic quality in students, inspires others with his vision, and academic credentials of faculty.

The forth category is the president as "Good fit", with four out of 8 items in this category were in high levels, include: built upon past institutional strengths, skills which are compatible with the needs of the institution, actions align with the school doctrinally, models spiritual maturity. Leaders who fit well with the mission, identity, and culture of the school are appreciated and trusted (Denton & Moore, 2009). At Hashemite University, one's values, worldview, and personal lifestyle matter a great deal (Hayes, 2005).

The fifth category is the president as "Relationally Strong", with one out of 8 items in this category was in high levels, include: an effective listener. A picture of a president who is welcoming and interested in others, Listening well is stressed as an important relational skill for a president (Kezar & Eckel, 2008), and this clearly is a key reason why this president is well liked and highly respected. Attributes identified as medium include humility, respectful of others, kindness, warmth, and appreciation. Humility is a quality which builds trust with others (Julius, Baldrige, &

Pfeffer, 1999). These attributes collectively give a great deal of insight into the person and character of this president. During the president's tenure he has worked very hard to communicate the school's desire to serve the community. Other business and community organizations regularly use the campus facilities and are invited to participate in many campus events.

The sixth category is the president as "Team Builder", with one out of 8 items in this category was in high levels, include: assists the Board in their development as a team. When looking at the study results, it is difficult to know if the medium and low levels of some items ranking for the Team Builder category are because of the President's team as a whole, or directed toward a number of specific individuals on the team. Dittmer (2009) speaks to the importance of a president having a senior team which is both competent and united around a common vision.

Male participants perceived president leadership effectiveness in "Team Building" better than female participants did. Also, significant differences were found at the 0.05 level between faculty member and staff participants in the (Adaptive Change Agent), (Good Fit), (Visionary) in favor for faculty members. While the significant differences at the 0.05 level between faculty member and staff participants in the (Team Builder), and (Innovator) in favor for staff.

5. CONCLUSIONS:

The major conclusions drawn from this research regarding a president of Hashemite University who lead the University to development as follows: The first is that this president functioned as an adaptive leader. In this case, the president did not come to the board, employees and other constituents with a self-generated plan to fix all the problems of the University. On the contrary, an adaptive leader refuses to simply provide solutions to problems but conceptualizes the problem and expects others to wrestle with and solve the problem. They guide but do not provide the solution themselves. Though this can be a long and at times frustrating process, effective adaptive leaders are able to help those whom they lead tolerate the tension so they do not become too overwhelmed or stressed.

A second conclusion is that this president built innovation in all areas of the university. This president is very strong innovator, and is viewed as a man of good entrepreneurial skills. When he became president in 2012, there was a great deal of resistance to change and innovation in general at the university. It was helpful that the president had already been employed by the institutions of higher education for 20 years, in roles of professor, department chair, dean and provost. Those who knew him well before his presidency knew him to be a man who knows how to courageously face the challenges of innovation and creatively made the university more efficient and effective.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH:

When considering future research on this topic, several suggestions come: One would be to do the same study, using the six or more effective presidential leadership categories and survey at other universities. Second, this would be a study using the same context but studying a different leader.

References:

- Al-Omari, A. (2013). The perceived organizational ethical climate in Hashemite University. *Asia-Pacific Education Research*, 22(3), 273–279.
- Alzyoud, S., & Bani-Hani, K. (2015). Social responsibility in higher education institutions: Application case from the Middle East. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(8), 122-129.
- Amey, M. J. (2006). Leadership in higher education. *Change*, (38)6, 55-59.
- Barblan, A., Daxner, M. & Ivosevic, V. (2007). *Academic malpractice: Threats and temptations*. Bologna: Bononia University Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.

- Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The 'L' Word in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.
- Birnbaum, R. (1987). *The implicit leadership theories of college and university presidents*. Baltimore, MD: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED292408).
- Boyce, M. E. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, (28)2, 119-136).
- Denton, R. A., & Moore, J. E. (2009). How boards go wrong-and right: Observations on the search and selection of college presidents. *The Presidency*, (12)3, 34-37.
- Dittmar, J. K. (2009). Against all odds: An investigation into the transformation of Waynesburg College. *Christian Higher Education*, (8), 85-114.
- Donnelly, J. C. (1995). *Successful long-term college presidents and the positioning of their institutions*. San Francisco, CA: Annual International Conference of the League for Innovation in the Community College and the Community College Leadership Program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED387167).
- Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). *En route to transformation. On change: An occasional paper series of the ACE project on leadership and institutional transformation*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED435293).
- Eckstein, M.A. (2003). *Combating Academic Fraud: Towards a Culture of Integrity*. Paris: IIEP, UNESCO.
- Eddy, P. L. (2003). *The influence of presidential cognition and power on framing change at community colleges*. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association.. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED480123).
- Eddy, P. L., & Van Der Linden, K. E. (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education: New visions of leadership or same old "hero" leadership? *Community College Review*, (34)5, 5-26.
- Fincher, C. (1997). *Presidential leadership and institutional mission*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Annual EAIR Forum. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED411734).
- Julius, D. J., Baldrige, J. V., & Pfeffer, J. (1999). *Why some academic leaders are more influential and effective than others*. Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education. Winnipeg, Manitoba: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED445619).
- Kezar, A. J. (2000). Pluralistic leadership. *Journal of Higher Education*, (71)6, 722- 742.
- Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. (2002). Examining the institutional transformation process: The importance of sense making, interrelated strategies, and balance. *Research in Higher Education*, (43)3, 295-328.
- Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: Examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership Education*, (11)4, 379-405.
- Michael, S. O., Schwartz, M., & Balraj, L. (2001). Indicators of presidential effectiveness: A study of trustees of higher education institutions. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, (15)611, 332- 346.
- Osland, A., & Ankeny, M. (2007). The tug-of-war between cash flow and institutional values in a college-seminary merger. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, (16), 103-123.
- Slater, C. L., & Martinez, B. J. (2000). Transformational leadership in the planning of a doctoral program. *The Educational Forum*, (64)4, 308-316.