

LEADERSHIP STYLES OF CURRENT EXTENSION LEADERS

Lori L. Moore, Assistant Professor
University of Idaho

Rick D. Rudd, Associate Professor
University of Florida

Abstract

This study sought to describe the demographics and leadership styles of current Extension leaders, the individuals responsible for the day-to-day operations of Extension in each state, and to explain the influence of demographic variables on leadership styles. Of the 47 participants, 70.2% were male. The majority (80.9%) reported their ethnicity as white. The mean age of the participants was 54.5 years. The mean tenure in Extension was 22 years and the mean tenure in Extension leadership positions was 11.9 years. Over three-quarters (76.6%) of participants held a doctor of philosophy degree. Sixty percent held their highest degree in a social science discipline. Participants had previous experience in 3.19 leadership courses and/or workshops. Participants reported engaging in behaviors related to transformational leadership more often than those related to transactional or laissez-faire leadership. The best model for explaining transformational leadership style explained 13% of the variance and included ethnicity, tenure in Extension, and previous leadership development total score. The best model for explaining transactional leadership style explained 28% of the variance and included highest degree held, tenure in Extension, and previous leadership development total score. No model significantly explained the influence of demographics on laissez-faire leadership.

Introduction and Theoretical Framework

One aspect of leadership that has been extensively studied and well documented in leadership literature is leadership styles. Leadership style refers to the characteristic manner in which an individual leads others. Early conceptualizations categorized leadership styles as either autocratic, democratic, or laissez faire (White & Lippitt, 1960). In the late 1960s, Hersey and Blanchard identified four leadership styles through their work with the situational approach to leadership. A newer version of Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership model has been created (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985) that categorizes leadership styles as directing, coaching, supporting, or delegating. In the last 20 years, a new paradigm of leadership has emerged that shifted emphasis from the traditional, or transactional, models of leadership toward the study of transformational leadership. This theory

of transformational/transactional leadership served as the theoretical framework for this study.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was introduced by Burns (1978) and refined by Bass (1985). Burns viewed transactional and transformational leadership as a dimensional construct with the two at opposite ends of the same continuum. In contrast, Bass viewed them as complementary constructs, and as such, saw it possible, in fact almost necessary, for a leader to engage in both leadership behaviors. Transformational leadership is not a substitute for transactional leadership, but rather tends to add to its effectiveness (Bass, 1997). In other words, transformational leadership is an extension of the traditional transactional leadership, and leaders are most effective when they exhibit both styles. Transactional versus transformational leadership style has

become an important aspect in the overall study of leadership in that, according to Bass (1985), “the leadership of great men (and great women) of history has usually been transformational, not transactional” (p. 26).

The transactional leader works within the existing organizational culture of the group to recognize and clarify the roles and responsibilities of followers such that desired outcomes are achieved. These desired outcomes are achieved when the leader negotiates with followers an exchange relationship of reward for compliance (Bass, 1985). In other words, transactional leaders explain to followers what is required of them and then negotiate the compensation followers will receive if they meet the requirements, either the promise of reward for good performance or the threat of punishment for poor performance (Bass, 1990). Transformational leaders are individuals who motivate followers to do more than originally expected based on their original level of confidence towards accomplishing desired outcomes. Transformational leadership occurs when a leader: raises the level of awareness about the importance and value of desired outcomes, alters or expands the wants and needs of followers, and/or gets followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the group (Bass, 1985).

Bass’s (1985) original transformational/transactional theory included six factors. Subsequent research has yielded a nine-factor model including five indices of transformational leadership (idealized influence [attributed], idealized influence [behavior], inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration), three indices of transactional leadership (contingent reward, management by exception [active], and management by exception [passive]), and one index of laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2000b).

Idealized influence is defined in terms of how followers react to the leader and his/her behavior. Leaders with idealized influence are admired and respected by followers and serve as strong role models. They have high standards of ethical and moral conduct and provide followers with a vision and sense of mission. Followers want to emulate leaders

who exhibit idealized influence (Northouse, 2001). According to Bass and Avolio (2000b), idealized influence can be seen as both a behavior and an impact, thus requiring two leadership scales: idealized influence (attributed) and idealized influence (behavior). Inspirational motivation is displayed by a transformational leader when he/she inspires and motivates followers to demonstrate commitment to the shared vision of the organization. Leaders who engage in this behavior clearly communicate high expectations to followers and increase team spirit and enthusiasm (Northouse). Intellectual stimulation is demonstrated by a transformational leader when he/she supports followers to be creative and innovative, try new approaches, and challenge their own beliefs and values as well as those of the leader and the organization. Followers engage in problem solving to find creative solutions (Northouse). Individualized consideration is displayed by a transformational leader when he/she provides a supportive climate, listens to followers, and acts as a coach and mentor. The leader pays attention to individual differences and treats individual employees in a caring and unique way. Leaders also help individuals achieve goals and grow personally (Northouse). Contingent reward refers to the engagement of leaders and followers in an exchange process in which effort by followers is exchanged for specific rewards. Objectives are agreed upon by both leaders and followers, and achievement of the objectives is positively reinforced (Northouse). Management-by-exception occurs when transactional leaders intervene to make some correction and generally involves corrective criticism and negative reinforcement. Management-by-exception can be active or passive. Transactional leaders engage in active management-by-exception when they closely monitor followers so they can detect mistakes and take corrective action and offer negative feedback. Transactional leaders engage in passive management-by-exception when they intervene with a follower only after standards have not been met or problems arise (Northouse). Laissez-faire leaders engage in laissez-faire behaviors when they abdicate responsibility, delay decisions,

offer no feedback, and make little or no effort to help followers satisfy needs, achieve goals, or grow personally. It is a "hands-off" approach to leadership (Northouse).

Conceptual Framework

Numerous studies have been conducted that addressed the relationship between demographics and leadership style. Krishnan and Park (1998) noted that demographic characteristics exert considerable influence on the leadership styles of top managers. Hambrick and Mason (1984) proposed that demographic traits such as age, tenure in an organization, functional area background, educational background, and degree of formal management training are all important aspects of leadership that influence organizational success.

Differences in the preferred leadership styles of men and women is perhaps one of the most well researched aspects of leadership. In their meta-analysis, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that women tend to use a more participative and inclusive style while men tend to use a more directive and controlling style. This indicates that women use more transformational styles while men use more transactional styles. This conclusion is supported by other studies that found women more likely to use transformational leadership than men and that men were more likely to use transactional leadership as their primary style (Druskat, 1994; Rosener, 1990).

Little empirical evidence exists in the study of ethnicity differences related to leadership styles. However, it is nevertheless important to consider ethnicity differences in leadership styles. As Alire (2001) pointed out, "minorities themselves view differences between white and minority leadership" (p. 97) and "for the most part, minorities think that they are held to a higher standard" (p. 99). Davis (1982) concluded that based on Burns' definitions of transformational and transactional leadership, the needs and experiences of the black population may dictate a greater emphasis on transformational leadership. This conclusion may suggest that black followers seek transformational leaders and that black

leaders tend to be more transformational. The latter has not been supported in empirical studies.

Several studies have examined the relationship between age and leadership style. Vroom and Pahl (1971) suggested that older managers in an organization may have a greater commitment to maintaining the status quo than younger managers and less favorable attitudes towards taking risks. Hambrick and Mason (1984) proposed that younger managers were more inclined to take risks than older managers. Taking risks instead of maintaining the status quo is one of the characteristics of leaders who engage in the transformational leadership practice "Challenging the Process" identified by Kouzes and Posner (1987).

Studies have also been conducted to assess the relationship between an individual's leadership style and their tenure within an organization. Hambrick and Mason (1984) proposed that the more tenure the leaders of an organization have, the more likely they are to have a greater commitment to maintaining the status quo. Similarly, Bantel and Jackson (1989) found that the more tenure of the top management team within the independent financial institutions they studied had, the more likely they were to resist innovation and organizational change.

Tenure has also been addressed from the perspective of how long an individual has served in a leadership position. Spotanski and Carter (1993) reported no significant difference in leadership styles of agricultural education department executive officers when grouped by years of experience in the leadership position.

Educational background has received considerably less attention than other demographic variables within the literature. Findings of a study conducted by Sykes (1995) suggested that program discipline from which County Extension Directors (CEDs) came significantly influenced their self-perceptions related to transformational leadership styles. Sykes reported that CEDs from home economics and 4-H program backgrounds perceived themselves to demonstrate more leadership behaviors than CEDs from agricultural program backgrounds. Sykes also reported that the

type of degree, beyond a bachelor's degree, had no significant influence on the self-perceived leadership styles of the CEDs in her study.

Transformational leadership practices can be taught and learned (Bass, 1990, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 1987) and therefore, it is an important consideration in the context of training and development. When leadership training and development is viewed from a transformational leadership perspective, Payne, Fuqua, and Canegami (1997) reported that when trained, there is no difference between the transformational leadership behaviors of men and women. However, when untrained, men will use a more task-oriented or transactional style, while women will tend to use a more consideration-oriented or transformational style.

Studies focusing on leadership have been conducted with different groups in Extension (Cobb, 1989; Holder, 1990; Lowery, 1996; Moore & Jones, 2001; Sykes, 1995). However, none have focused on the individuals in the senior-most leadership positions within the organization. Therefore, questions remain as to what kind of leaders are in these positions. What is the predominant leadership style of senior leaders in Extension? What are the demographic characteristics of the group? What relationship exists between the demographic characteristics and leadership styles of senior Extension leaders?

Purpose and Objective

The study was part of a larger study that sought to identify and describe the leadership styles and skills of Extension leaders and explain the influence of demographics on their leadership styles and skills. Although much research has documented the individual relationships between demographic variables and leadership styles, little has been done in an attempt to explain the combined influence of demographics on leadership styles. Therefore, the specific objectives of the present quantitative study were:

1. To describe current Extension leaders in terms of selected demographics.
2. To describe current Extension leaders in terms of their leadership styles.
3. To explain the influence of demographics on Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire leadership styles.

Research Methods and Procedures

Population and Sample

This study used an *ex post facto* correlational design. The target population for this study was all of the state Extension directors and administrators at 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions responsible for the day-to-day operation of the Cooperative Extension Service within their state. Each individual listed in the CSREES Directors and Administrators Directory (April, 2002) was contacted via e-mail about the nature and purposes of this study. These individuals were contacted because many of the individuals listed in the directory function as the administrative head of Extension rather than the director or administrator who is in charge of the day-to-day operation of the organization. The individuals contacted were asked to confirm that they were in charge of the day-to-day operation of Extension, or to provide the name and contact information of the individual who was. Based on the responses to these e-mails, a list of 80 current leaders was compiled and served as the population frame for this study.

There were 49 responses from the population frame of 80 current leaders for a response rate of 61.25%. Two responses did not contain usable data and were removed from the database. The remaining 47 respondents were used in the data analysis. Nonresponse error can be a threat to the external validity of a study anytime a response rate below 100% is achieved (Lindner, Murphy, & Briers, 2001). To address nonresponse error in this study, early and late respondents were compared

for statistical differences (Ary, Jacobs, & Razaveih, 1996; Lindner et al.; Miller & Smith, 1983). Late responders were defined as the later 50% of the respondents (Lindner et al.). There was no statistically significant difference between early and late responders.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used to collect data in this study. The first instrument was a demographic instrument developed by the researcher. The data collected included the gender, ethnicity, age, position, degrees held, educational background (major program area), tenure in years within the Extension system, tenure in years in a leadership position within the Extension system, previous positions held within the Extension system, and exposure to previous leadership training of current Extension leaders. Previous exposure to leadership training was divided into three sections: (1) college leadership courses, (2) leadership workshops provided by non-Extension trainers, and (3) leadership workshops provided by the Cooperative Extension System. Each experience listed was given a value of one point. Participants who described entire degrees in leadership were given five points. Sub-total scores were created for each of the three areas. These self-reported experiences were summed to create the previous leadership development total scores. The demographic instrument was evaluated by a panel of experts for content and face validity prior to data collection.

The second instrument, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 2000a), was used to gather information on the self-perceived leadership style of participants. The MLQ instrument was developed by Bass and Avolio (2000a) and was published by Mind Garden, Inc. The 45-item instrument contained nine leadership scales (five transformational, three transactional, and one laissez-faire) and three outcome scales. Each item was on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). Each of the leadership style scales had four items. Scores for each of the nine scales were the average scores for the items in each scale.

Transformational leadership styles scores were derived by averaging all of the scores from the items contained in the Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration scales, a total of 20 items. Transactional leadership styles scores were derived by averaging all of the scores from the items in the Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception (Active), and Management-by-Exception (Passive) scales, a total of 12 items. Because Laissez-Faire Leadership is the only scale measuring non-leadership, the non-leadership style score was equivalent to the Laissez-faire Leadership scale score.

Reliability and validity of the MLQ 5X instrument were established by the authors. Bass and Avolio (2000b) report reliabilities for each of the scales ranging from .74 to .91. Bass and Avolio (2000b) have also documented the construct validation process associated with the MLQ 5X. An early version was evaluated by an expert panel, and their recommendations were included in the final instrument development. Since that time, 14 samples have been used to validate and cross-validate the MLQ Form 5X (Bass & Avolio, 2000b).

Data Collection and Analysis

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the demographic instrument were administered to current Extension leaders at the same time following the Tailored Design Method of Dillman (2000). This method included a system of up to five compatible contacts with each individual selected for participation in the study.

Data were analyzed using the SPSS[®] statistical package for Windows[™]. In instances where participants did not respond to a particular item, the missing value was replaced with the mean for that item during analysis (George & Mallery, 2001). Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and measures of central tendency were used to describe current Extension leaders in terms of their demographic characteristics and leadership style. To explain the influence of demographic variables on the leadership styles and skills of current

Extension leaders, the researcher used backward multiple regression to build three explanatory models: (1) Transformational Leadership Style, (2) Transactional Leadership Style, and (3) Laissez-Faire Leadership. Multiple regression is one of the most widely used statistical techniques to determine the correlation between a criterion variable and a combination of two or more predictor variables (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). When conducting multiple regression analysis procedures, there should be 15 subjects for every variable included in the model (Gall et al.). Therefore, a maximum of three

variables were included in the regression models.

Results

The first objective was to describe current Extension leaders in terms of selected demographics. Of the 47 participants, the majority were male (70.2%, *n* = 33). In terms of ethnicity, 80.9% (*n* = 38) were White, 14.9% (*n* = 7) were Black or African American, 2.1% (*n* = 1) were Asian, and 2.1% (*n* = 1) were Hispanic or Latino. Table 1 shows the gender of participants by ethnicity.

Table 1
Gender of Participants by Ethnicity (N=47)

Ethnicity	Gender				Total	
	Male		Female		<i>n</i>	%
	<i>n</i>	% of total	<i>n</i>	% of total		
Asian	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1
Black or African American	6	12.8	1	2.1	7	14.9
Hispanic or Latino	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1
White	25	53.2	13	27.7	38	80.9
Total	33	70.2	14	29.8	47	100.0

Age and tenure are presented in Table 2. Age of participants ranged from 44 to 66. The mean age of the participants was 54.5 years. Age was not reported by one participant. Tenure within the Extension system ranged from three to 37 years with a mean of 22.1 years. Tenure in Extension leadership positions ranged from one year to 26 years with a mean of 11.9 years.

doctor of philosophy degree, 12.8% (*n* = 6) had a masters degree, 6.4% (*n* = 3) had a doctor of education degree, 2.1% (*n* = 1) had a specialist degree, and 2.1% (*n* = 1) had a doctor of veterinary medicine degree. The academic major of each participant's highest degree was classified as either a bench science degree or a social science degree. Over half (59.6%, *n* = 28) had a social science degree.

In terms of the highest degree held by study participants, 76.6% (*n* = 36) had a

Table 2
Age and Tenure of Study Participants (N=47)

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum
Age	46	54.5	4.89	44	66
Tenure in Extension	47	22.1	9.20	3	37
Tenure in Extension Leadership	47	11.9	7.17	1	26

Participants had previous experience in an average of 3.19 leadership courses/workshops (Table 3). When separated by

type of experience, participants reported involvement in an average of 1.30 leadership courses in college, 1.11

leadership courses/workshops conducted by non-Extension presenters, and .93 leadership

courses/workshops within Extension.

Table 3
Previous Leadership Training Scores (N=47)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum
College leadership courses	1.30	1.90	0	5
Non-Extension leadership courses	1.11	1.40	0	5
Extension leadership courses	0.93	1.44	0	5
Previous leadership development total	3.19	3.28	0	5

The second objective was to describe current Extension leaders in terms of their leadership styles. Mean scores of the nine leadership scales measured by the MLQ 5X as well as Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style scores are presented in Table 4. Of the nine scale scores, the highest mean scores was reported for the Inspirational Motivation ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .48$) scale and the Idealized Influence (Behavior) ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .48$) scale, both

transformational leadership scales, and the lowest mean score was reported for the Laissez-Faire Leadership ($M = .50$, $SD = .49$) scale, the non-leadership scale and no-leadership style. In terms of overall style, participants had the highest mean scores for Transformational Leadership Style ($M = 3.41$, $SD = .35$), followed by Transactional Leadership Style ($M = 1.79$, $SD = .41$) and Laissez-Faire Leadership ($M = .50$, $SD = .49$).

Table 4
MLQ 5X Leadership Scale Scores and Leadership Style Scores (N=47)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Minimum	Maximum
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	3.16	0.48	2.00	4.00
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	3.53	0.48	1.75	4.00
Inspirational Motivation	3.54	0.44	2.00	4.00
Intellectual Stimulation	3.35	0.44	2.25	4.00
Individualized Consideration	3.48	0.41	2.50	4.00
Transformational Leadership Style	3.41	0.35	2.20	3.90
Contingent Reward	3.15	0.56	2.00	4.00
Management-by-Exception (Active)	1.20	0.82	0.00	4.00
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	1.02	0.60	0.00	2.25
Transactional Leadership Style	1.79	0.41	0.92	2.83
Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.50	0.49	0.00	1.67

Note. Scale: 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, 4 = frequently, if not always.

The third objective was to explain the influence of demographic variables on leadership styles. Backward multiple regression of the demographic variables on Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire Leadership Styles scores was performed.

Transformational Leadership Style
In terms of individual relationships

between the independent variables and Transformational Leadership Style, none of the demographic variables had a significant relationship with Transformational Leadership Style. However, when combined, ethnicity, tenure in Extension leadership position(s), and leadership development total score yielded the best model for explaining the influence of demographic variables on Transformational Leadership Style.

Regression analysis revealed that the model significantly explained Transformational Leadership Style, $F(3, 42) = 3.20, p < .05$. The R^2 for the model was .19 and adjusted

R^2 was .13. Unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each variable are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Backward Regression Explaining Transformational Leadership Style Score (N=47)

	B	SE	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.83	0.25		11.23	0.00
Ethnicity	0.10	0.04	0.35	2.48	0.02
Tenure in Extension leadership position(s)	0.01	0.01	0.19	1.32	0.19
Leadership development total score	0.03	0.02	-0.28	-1.95	0.06

Note. Demographic variables were dummy coded for analysis.

Transactional Leadership Style

In terms of individual relationships between the independent variables and Transactional Leadership Style, tenure in Extension, $r = -.49, p < .05$ and degree classification, $t = 2.11, p < .05$, were significantly related to Transactional Leadership Style. However, when combined, participants' highest degree, tenure in Extension, and previous leadership development total score yield the best model

for explaining the influence of demographic variables on Transactional Leadership Style. Regression analysis revealed that the model significantly explained Transactional Leadership Style, $F(3, 42) = 6.81, p < .05$. The R^2 for the model was .33 and adjusted R^2 was .28. Unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each variable are presented in Table 6.

Table 6
Backward Regression Explaining Transactional Leadership Style Score (N=47)

	B	SE	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.75	0.27		10.01	0.00
Highest Degree	0.09	0.05	-0.24	-1.91	0.06
Tenure in Extension	0.02	0.01	-0.48	-3.61	0.00
Leadership development Total Score	0.02	0.02	-0.18	-1.33	0.19

Note. Demographic variables were dummy coded for analysis.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Regression analysis using the demographic variables did not yield a model that significantly explained Laissez-Faire Leadership. None of the variables exhibited significant individual relationships with Laissez-Faire Leadership.

total population frame of 80 Extension leaders. In the total population, 71.25% ($n = 57$) were male. When analyzed by ethnicity, white males still comprised the majority of participants. In this study, 53.19% ($n = 25$) were white males, 27.66% ($n = 13$) were white females, 12.76% ($n = 6$) were Black or African American males ($n = 6$), and there was 2.13% of each Asian males ($n = 1$), Hispanic or Latino males ($n = 1$), and Black or African American females ($n = 1$). Although the majority of participants were white males, findings of this study are nonetheless encouraging in that they show more diverse populations serving in senior leadership positions within Extension. In a

Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Females and minorities are underrepresented in Extension leadership positions. In this study, the majority of participants (70.2%, $n = 33$) were male. This finding is actually very representative of the

study by Clark (1992), of the 90.9% ($n = 70$) of the state directors of the Cooperative Extension Service that participated in the study, 91.4% ($n = 64$) were male, as compared to the 70.2% in the present study. Thus, there are more females in senior leadership positions within Extension today than there were a decade ago.

In this study, 59.6% of participants held their highest degree in social science degrees as opposed to bench science degrees. This finding is encouraging in that it showed that Extension leaders are becoming more diverse in terms of educational background, whereas traditionally, leadership positions within the organization were held by bench scientists. It must be pointed out, however, that this study only classified participants according to their highest degree. It is possible that some of the participants who held their highest degree in a social science held other degrees in bench science disciplines. If they were promoted to a leadership position in Extension from a state specialist position, for example, it is quite possible that their academic home was actually in a bench science discipline rather than a social science discipline.

Participants were fairly similar in terms of their leadership style. They engaged in Transformational Leadership Style behaviors more often than they engaged in Transactional Leadership Style behaviors. The mean score for Transformational Leadership Style was $M = 3.41$, $SD = .35$ and the mean score for Transactional Leadership Style was $M = 1.79$, $SD = .41$. The possible range of scores was from zero (not at all) to four (frequently, if not always). Participants in this study were engaging in transactional leadership behaviors once in a while to sometimes and engaged in transformational leadership behaviors fairly often to frequently, if not always. Using transformational leadership as a theoretical base, the fact that participants reported engaging in both types of behaviors at least every once in a while is to be expected, thus supporting the notion that it is necessary for leaders to engage in both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. This finding is important in that it shows the leaders are not trying to replace one leadership style with

the other, but rather are using both. They are using transformational leadership more often and thus, are augmenting the effects of transactional leadership, a major premise of transformational leadership theory. However, because the MLQ 5X is a self-reported instrument, additional research should be conducted using the instrument with superiors and subordinates to validate the self-reported data of participants.

Although demographics did not significantly influence Transformational Leadership Style on an individual basis, ethnicity, tenure in Extension leadership position(s), and previous leadership development total score collectively explained 13% of the variance in Transformational Leadership Style. With the exception of tenure in Extension and degree classification, demographics did not significantly influence Transactional Leadership Style on an individual basis, yet participants' highest degree, tenure in Extension, and previous leadership development total score explained 28% of the variance in Transformational Leadership Score. These findings suggest that factors other than those included in the present study are responsible for explaining the majority of the variance in Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles. Thus, Extension could benefit by recruiting leaders with diverse backgrounds without dramatically influencing the leadership styles of the individuals within leadership positions. It must be noted, however, that little variance existed within the leadership styles of the participants which could suggest that an individual's leadership style, rather than demographics, is what determines whether or not they become a senior leader within the Extension system. Perhaps those individuals with very different leadership styles never assume leadership positions within the organization.

This was a census study of state directors and administrators, in which the majority of the participants were white males. Additional research needs to be conducted with a larger population that perhaps includes more diversity. This study looked only at senior leaders and did not examine specific factors related to the

development of an individual's leadership style. It is possible that individuals in the senior leadership positions were promoted to those positions because they emulated the leaders who preceded them, rather than as a function of their demographic characteristics. Additional research needs to be conducted with leaders at all levels within the organization to determine if gender or ethnicity has an effect on the leadership style of other organizational leaders.

References

- Alire, C. A. (2001). Diversity and leadership: The color of leadership. *Journal of Library Administration*, 32(3/4), 95-109.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Bantel, K. A., & Jackson, S. E. (1989). Top management and innovations in banking: Does the composition of the top team make a difference? *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 107-124.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend the organization and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000a). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire (Form 5x)*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000b). *Technical report, leader form, rater form, and scoring key for the MLQ Form 5x-short*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, Binghamton University.
- Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, D., & Zigarmi, P. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager*. New York: William Morrow and Co.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Clark, R. W. (1992). Stress and turnover among Extension directors. *Journal of Extension*, 30(2), Retrieved May 2, 2002 from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1992summer/rb1.html>
- Cobb, D. W. (1989). *Leadership effectiveness of county extension directors: A comparison of perceptions between county extension agents and county extension directors within the North Carolina agricultural extension service*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.
- Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. (2002, April). State Extension directors and administrators directory. Retrieved May 20, 2002, from <http://www.reeusda.gov/hrd/state.pdf>
- Davis, K. E. (1982). The status of black leadership: Implications for black followers in the 1980s. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18(3), 309-322.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic church. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 99-119.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers USA.

George, D. & Mallery, P. (2001). *SPSS® for Windows® step by step: A simple guide and reference 10.0 update* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193-206.

Holder, S. L. (1990). *Leadership style and leadership behavior preferences of cooperative extension faculty*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Krishnan, H. A., & Park, D. (1998). The influence of top management team leadership on corporate refocusing: A theoretical framework. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(2), 50-61.

Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 42(4), 43-53.

Lowery, C. M. (1996). *Leadership behaviors and job performance of county extension directors in the North Carolina cooperative extension service*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. L. (1983). Handling nonresponse issues. *Journal of*

Extension, 21(5). Retrieved May 2, 2002 from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1983september/83-5-a7.pdf>

Moore, M., & Jones, J. (2001). Cracking the concrete ceiling: Inquiry into the aspirations, values, motives, and actions of African American female 1890 cooperative Extension administrators. *Journal of Extension*, 39(6), Retrieved April 29, 2002 from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2001december/rb1.html>

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Payne, K. E., Fuqua, H. E., & Canegami, J. P. (1997). Women as leaders. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(4), 44-63.

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-125.

Spotanski, D. R., & Carter, R. I. (1993). Self evaluation of leadership practices and behaviors used by department executive officers in agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 34(3), 17-25.

Sykes, W. D. (1995). *County extension directors' perceived behavior as a manager or leader as compared to county extension agents' perceptions of CEDs' behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

Vroom, V., & Pahl, B. (1971). Relationship between age and risk taking among managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55, 399-405.

White, R. K., & Lippitt, R. (1960). *Autocracy and democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

LORI L. MOORE is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education at the University of Idaho, 1134 W 6th St., P.O. Box 442040, Moscow, ID 83844-2040. E-mail: lmoore@uidaho.edu.

RICK D. RUDD is an Associate Professor in the Department of Agricultural Education and Communication at the University of Florida, P.O. Box 110540, Gainesville, FL 32611-0540. E-mail: RRudd@ufl.edu.