University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2017

Neither Here nor There: Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence in Presidents of U.S. Accredited Universities Located in Foreign Countries

Jeff Bourgeois
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Bourgeois, Jeff, "Neither Here nor There: Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence in Presidents of U.S. Accredited Universities Located in Foreign Countries" (2017). *Dissertations*. 91.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/91>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

NEITHER HERE NOR THERE: TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND
CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE IN PRESIDENTS OF U.S. ACCREDITED
UNIVERSITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

by

Jeff Bourgeois

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2017

Dissertation Committee:

Christopher B. Newman, Ph.D., Committee Chair

Afsaneh Nahavandi, Ph.D., Member

Karen M. Lee, Ph.D., Member

James T. Harris III, D.Ed., Member

University of San Diego

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION SCIENCES

CANDIDATE'S NAME: Jeff Bourgeois

TITLE OF
DISSERTATION: NEITHER HERE NOR THERE: TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP
AND CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF U.S.
ACCREDITED UNIVERSITIES LOCATED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

APPROVAL:

Christopher B. Newman, Ph.D. Chair _____

Afsaneh Nakayandi, Ph.D. Member _____

Karen M. Lee, Ph.D. Member _____

James T. Harris III, DEd Member _____

DATE: April 12, 2017

ABSTRACT

The role of a university president combines the symbolism of an institutional ambassador with the leadership responsibilities of a private-sector executive. When considering the cultural context of the university and the culture of the surrounding community, the demands of the presidential position become far more complex. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation currently lists 42 colleges and universities with institutional-level accreditation located beyond the borders of the United States, and two more listed as candidates for future accreditation consideration. Presidents of the 44 internationally located universities bearing U.S. accreditation must negotiate the potential for tension between the many cultures at play, namely the culture of the host nation and the culture perpetuated by accreditation from one of the six granting regional accreditation organizations.

To understand how these university executives manage this balance, this study investigates the degree to which Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence (CQ) are demonstrated. The study also examines the ways in which students, staff, and faculty of two different universities perceive the leadership style of their president. An Explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods study was conducted. Presidents of international universities bearing U.S. accreditation completed a survey instrument to report the frequency of Transformational Leadership and CQ behaviors. Additionally, participants at two campuses participated in interviews and focus groups to investigate congruity with the results of the initial survey.

The findings suggest dimensions of Transformational Leadership and CQ are evidenced by these university presidents' leadership. This study argues that elements of the organizational and national cultures of these campuses may limit the ways in which these capacities are practiced and perceived. Where some dimensions of these constructs are easily recognized in the

leadership strategies of these presidents, it is just as clear that limited time, disjointed campus geography, and host community laws and regulations prevent the university executives from being perceived as wholly transformational.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing this dissertation has been an experience of growth and support. The invaluable assistance, enthusiasm, and faith in this project of a number of people—most notably the dissertation committee, brought this dissertation to its completion. Countless hours of inspiration, feedback, and encouragement from each of the committee members carried me through the process and I offer my deepest appreciation. Dr. Christopher Newman, Dr. Afsaneh Nahavandi, Dr. Karen Lee, and Dr. James Harris III each brought incredible insight into the many worlds colliding for this study. I am truly honored to have received incredible guidance from such a talented group of experts.

I am also grateful for the kindness of the many university presidents, students, faculty, and staff at the institutions highlighted in my research. Their willingness to complete the surveys, gracious participation in interviews and focus groups, and patience in hosting me whilst I collected data made this study possible. I cannot express enough thanks for their interest and encouragement in my efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
Background	2
Transformational Leadership	5
Idealized Influence	6
Inspirational Motivation	6
Intellectual Stimulation.....	7
Individualized Consideration.....	7
Transformational Leadership in Higher Education	7
Cultural Intelligence.....	8
Metacognitive CQ	9
Cognitive CQ.....	10
Motivational CQ.....	10
Behavioral CQ.....	10
Accreditation & University Leadership	11
Problem Statement	13
Purpose of the Study	14

Research Questions	15
Significance of the Study	16
Definition of Key Terms	17
Transformational Leadership	17
Cultural Intelligence	17
United States Accreditation.....	17
CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
Approach to the Literature Review	18
University Accreditation	20
U.S. Accreditation	22
International Accreditation.....	24
U.S.-Accredited Universities Located in Foreign Countries.....	28
University Presidents	30
Pre-Presidential Career Path.....	32
Gender and Racial Minority Representation Among University	35
Presidential Leadership	36
Transformational Leadership	37
Dimensions of Transformational Leadership.....	38
Idealized influence.....	38
Inspirational Motivation	38

Intellectual Stimulation.....	39
Individualized Consideration.....	39
Transformational Leadership in Higher Education	39
Measuring Transformational Leadership: The MLQ	40
Cultural Intelligence.....	41
Cultural Difference.....	41
Defining Cultural Intelligence.....	45
Measuring Cultural Intelligence.....	46
Implications for Practice	48
Conclusion	48
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	51
Explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods Design	51
Phase One Data Collection	52
Participants	53
The Survey Instrument	54
Evaluation of Scales and Indexes.....	56
Transformational Leadership.....	56
Cultural Intelligence	58
The Cultural Intelligence Scale	59
Independent Continuous Variables	60

Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence	60
Accreditation-Related Inspirational Motivation	61
Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation	61
Dependent Continuous Variables	61
Transformational Leadership	61
Presidential Challenge	62
Data Analysis	63
Descriptive statistics	63
Factor analysis	63
Linear Regression Analysis	63
Procedure	64
Phase Two Data Collection and Analyses	65
Collective Case Study Design	66
Participants	66
Participant selection	66
American University of Western Europe	67
Foreign Country University	68
Semi-Structured Interviews	69
Focus Groups	70
Document Analysis	71

Data Analysis	71
Ethical Research Assurance	73
Role of the Researcher	73
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	75
Demographics & Participant Sample.....	75
Education and Presidential Experience	76
Cultural Attributes	77
Participant Profile.....	78
Accreditation-Related Regression Analyses	78
Findings.....	78
Factor Analysis	78
Regression Analysis: Accreditation-related Idealized Influence and Transformational Leadership	79
Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Idealized Influence and presidential challenge .	79
Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Inspirational Motivation and Transformational Leadership	80
Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Intellectual Stimulation and Cultural Intelligence	80
Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Intellectual Stimulation and presidential challenge.....	81
Phase Two: Qualitative Data Collection.....	81

The American University of Western Europe.....	82
The campus.....	82
The president	83
Foreign Country University	84
The campus.....	84
The president	85
The academic dean	85
Current Campus Issues.....	86
Labor Laws	87
Growth and Expansion	87
Safety and Security Concerns.....	89
Transformational Leadership	89
Survey Results.....	90
American University of Western Europe	91
Idealized Influence	91
Inspirational Motivation	93
Intellectual Stimulation.....	94
Individual Consideration	96
Foreign Country University	98
Idealized Influence	99

Inspirational Motivation	100
Intellectual Stimulation.....	101
Individual Consideration	102
Cross-Case Analyses and Discussion.....	104
Cultural Intelligence.....	106
Survey Results.....	106
American University of Western Europe	107
Metacognitive	108
Cognitive	109
Motivational.....	110
Behavioral.....	111
Foreign Country University	112
Metacognitive	113
Cognitive	113
Motivational.....	114
Behavioral.....	115
Cross-Case Analyses and Discussion.....	116
Challenges Relative to Accreditation.....	117
The Challenges of U.S. Accreditation in a Foreign Country	117
Chapter Summary.....	118

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	120
Summary Results	120
Research Question 1a.....	122
Research Question 1b.....	123
Research Question 2a.....	125
Research Question 2b.....	126
American University of Western Europe	126
Foreign Country University.....	127
Common Themes	128
Differences Noted	129
Conclusion.....	129
Limitations	130
Contributions.....	132
Implications for Practice	133
Recommendations for Future Research	134
REFERENCES	137
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	147
APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL	150

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Standards Regarding Presidents and Leadership According To Regional Accreditation Agencies.....	12
Table 2: Keyword Search Results by Database	20
Table 3: Dimensions of Culture Across Sources	43
Table 4: Definitions of Cultural Intelligence Found in the Extant Literature.....	46
Table 5: Questionnaire Survey Items.....	56
Table 6: Elements of Transformational Leadership and Operational Definitions.....	58
Table 7: Responses: Distribution of U.S. Accredited Institutions Abroad by Regional Accreditation Affiliation.....	76
Table 8: Highest Degree Earned by Sample Participants	77
Table 9: Transformational Behaviors by Dimension as Reported in the MLQ-5x.....	90
Table 10: Cultural Intelligence Ratings by Dimension as Reported in the CQS.....	107
Table 11: Participant Responses to Survey Question 9	118

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. <i>The order of progression and components of the explanatory sequential design</i>	52
Figure 2. <i>Dimensions and Sub-Dimensions of Cultural Intelligence</i>	59

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

“The university president in the United States is expected to be a friend to the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislatures, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (especially law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of church” (Kerr, 2001, p. 22).

Often the face and the voice of the university, the role of the president combines the symbolism of a charismatic ambassador with the complexity of a sophisticated corporate CEO (Freeman, Jr. & Kochan, 2012). Interfacing with internal constituents such as members of the Board of Trustees, faculty, administrative staff, and students, as well as external stakeholders such as alumni, community partners, and foundations, the university presidency requires the practice of leadership in several different capacities and environments. In summation, the primary challenge of a university president is to achieve “harmonious” balance between the operations and aspirations of an institution within environmental constraints (Ikenberry, 2010).

The extant literature regarding university presidents has been criticized in lacking attention to campus conditions and culture (Dennison, 2001). While some research highlights the leadership of university executive officers (Basham, 2010; Klein, 2016), the focus lies within the context of stateside institutions. The introduction of foreign host cultures and the influence of the many cultures brought to campus by those who study or work there create unique questions of leadership at the institution (Lumby & Foskett, 2015). This study seeks to address those questions and the importance of cultural considerations in defining appropriate institutional leadership.

Background

Since 1999, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), a self-financed institutional membership organization with college and university presidents serving in the Council's leadership roles, has grown to include nearly 3,000 member institutions (Harclerod & Eaton, 2005). Of the 3,000 member institutions, there are currently 44 non-faith-based universities located beyond U.S. borders with applicant or full institutional-level accreditation by one of the six regional accreditation organizations: Higher Learning Commission, New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions on Higher Education, Middle States Commission on Higher Education, Southern Association of Colleges of and Schools Commission on Colleges, WASC Senior College and University Commission, Northwest Commission on Colleges Universities ("Directories - Regional Agencies," 2017)

Accreditation agencies in the United States have formally recognized universities located in foreign locations for decades, e.g. Africa, Asia, South America, and Europe. The first international institution to receive accreditation, the American University of Paris, was recognized by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) in 1973, followed by Franklin University Switzerland two years later in 1975 (CHEA, 2017). Many of the internationally located campuses were established long before receiving U.S. accreditation. The American University of Cairo, for example, was founded in 1919 and received U.S. accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in 1982 ("About AUC," 2016). By comparison, the American University of Paris welcomed its first class of students in September of 1962, ten years before acquiring accreditation from MSCHE ("AUP University History," 2016).

It is important to note the distinction between these independent campuses and branch or satellite campuses of a stateside university. Unlike an international branch campus, or IBC, where accountability, accreditation, and governance are extensions of a “mother institution” located within the geographic borders of the United States, the institutions discussed in the current study operate with no affiliation to any home base stateside location, and they retain complete institutional and financial control (Lane, Brown, & Pearcey, 2004; Naidoo, 2009). Further, while it is increasingly more common for foreign universities to bear programmatic accreditation for respective academic programs, such as Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation for business and accounting, or Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) recognition for engineering programs, these 44 institutions operate in accordance within institutional level accreditation standards set forth by one of the six United States regional accreditation organizations.

Institutions in foreign countries seek U.S. accreditation for a number of reasons, including perceived marketing and recruitment advantages, or to take advantage of the branding of accreditation and create a sense of “quality by association” with reputable American institutions (Brittingham, 2015). Using the notion of association, some foreign institutions equate the standard of their education with elite U.S. universities with whom they share regional accreditation (Blanco-Ramirez, 2015, p. 336). An institution receiving accreditation through the Western regional accrediting body, for example, might promote itself as bearing the same accreditation as elite schools such as Stanford University or the University of California Los Angeles.

While the academic standards may be easily recognizable as distinctly American, the culture of these universities is as complex and diverse as the cultures and environments in which

they are located. Obtaining U.S. accreditation does not mandate each foreign institution to offer the same programs; it will, though, require the university to adhere to a common set of standards necessary to maintain accreditation status (Altbach, 2003). Much like the variations that currently exist in stateside institutions, these universities may employ a system of general education requirements, credit systems and curricular structures of American higher education that seem to stretch a general definition of American-style higher education (Brittingham, 2015).

These 44 colleges and universities include two that are candidates for accreditation, and 42 that are fully accredited at the institutional level as of 2016. Each of the six major regional accreditation organizations lists a number of these institutions in their respective directories. While most of these campuses identify as private and not-for-profit, there are a small number of institutions, such as Abu Dhabi University and the American University in Dubai, operating with a for-profit status. Additionally, the Northern Marianas College in Saipan, and H. Lavity Stoutt Community College in the British Virgin Islands are among a handful of institutions classified as public institutions. Most of the universities in this study classify as liberal arts institutions, with a few specialization schools, such as Les Roches International School of Hotel Management in Switzerland. Athabasca University, based in Alberta, Canada, functions solely as an online university.

The mean number of undergraduate students enrolled at these campuses is 3,157, based on figures publicly accessible on institutional websites, and the median enrollment is 1,200. The smallest of these schools, Franklin University Switzerland, enrolls 360 undergraduates. Conversely, two of the U.S.-accredited universities in this research population enroll more than 10,000 undergraduates: Ming Chuan University in Taipei, and Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, Canada. In addition to the enrollment of full-time four-year degree-seeking students,

a number of these institutions also host a sizeable cohort of semester- or year-long study abroad students from stateside universities.

The subset of university presidents who oversee these campuses represents diverse personal and professional backgrounds brought to their individual positions. While some—like Stratsi Kulinski at the American University of Bulgaria, or Duranda Greene at Bermuda College—are serving at institutions from which they received a degree, most of the presidents have arrived at their current roles after completing their degree work at other institutions. In addition, the academic specializations of these presidents lacks a common theme.

Oceanography, Political Science, Archaeology, Law, and Comparative Literature are among the academic disciplines represented by current presidents. Confirming previous explorations of stateside university presidents (Jackson & Harris, 2005), a pilot study for this research revealed there is no prescribed or predicted route to the role of president of a U.S.-accredited university or college located in a foreign country.

Having highlighted the demographics and characteristics of these university presidents, the focus of this piece shifts to develop a foundational knowledge of leadership. Specifically, Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence provide initial constructs in understanding the strategies and resources employed by presidents of U.S. accredited institutions abroad. Used in previous research regarding stateside university presidents, Transformational Leadership (Basham, 2010) and the CQ concept of cultural adeptness (Robertson, 2005) set the focus of the current study in its investigation into the leadership of these unique international institutions.

Transformational Leadership

An often-studied leadership style, Transformational Leadership, in one form or another, appeared in the literature as early as 1973. It became an increasingly researched model in the

1980's following the influential work of James MacGregor Burns (Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Northouse, 2013). Appealing to the self-worth of followers, Transformational Leadership illuminates a sense of commitment and involvement extending beyond basic position expectations (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Viewed as notably effective, Transformational Leadership has been linked to follower satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Yukl, 1999).

Transformational Leadership happens when the leader engages and maintains a connection with followers (Northouse, 2013). A transformational leader can be described as one who “provides vision, instills pride, inspires confidence and trust, expresses important goals in simple ways, promotes intelligence, and treats everyone individually” (Fisher & Koch, 1996, p. 25). In contrast to Transactional Leaders, who demonstrate leadership through a sort of social exchange, transformational leaders seek to help followers grow through empowerment and creating alignment with the goals of the followers and the organization as a whole (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational Leadership as a construct incorporates four main components or factors: Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2013).

Idealized Influence

In this dimension, the Transformational Leader establishes herself as a role model for her followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). High moral standards and ethical conduct serve as the foundation for great respect and trust in the leader's abilities and a sense of common purpose among followers (Northouse, 2013).

Inspirational Motivation

By helping followers identify meaning in their work, Transformational Leadership motivates and encourages followers to maintain a sense of vision toward the future (Bass,

Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). High expectations and an emotional sense of commitment to the group typify this dimension of Transformational Leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Intellectual Stimulation

Yukl (1999) describes the dimension of Intellectual Stimulation as encouraging innovation and creativity. Transformational Leadership encourages followers to take risks and think independently in situations of problem solving (Northouse, 2013).

Individualized Consideration

Transformational Leaders remain attentive to the individual needs of followers, serving as mentors in the followers' growth and development (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2013). It is through this attention that a Transformational Leader views each follower as a whole person, assisting them in actualizing their full potential (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transformational Leadership in Higher Education

Used previously as a measure in the literature regarding university presidents, it has been suggested that Transformational Leadership allows presidents to establish an ethos of stability while engaging stakeholders in a meaningful, productive manner (Kezar & Eckel, 2008). A university president who demonstrates Transformational Leadership will motivate staff and faculty to achieve superior performance, higher job satisfaction, and higher levels of commitment to the institutional goals and vision (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Fisher & Koch, 1996). The results of a pilot study to this dissertation research revealed that each of the presidents in the qualitative phase of this study plans to retire in five years or less. Therefore, as transformational leaders seeking to develop followers' leadership capacities (Bass & Riggio, 2006), this particular style of leadership may be most beneficial to the future of their universities.

Because Transformational Leadership calls upon the leader to encourage followers to adopt a mutual sense of purpose and create a unique organizational culture (Hay, 2006), it benefits the leader to have the ability and resources to understand the many cultures influencing the organization. A university president with strong Cultural Intelligence will have the capacity to engage students, faculty, and staff with different backgrounds, worldviews, and behavioral norms (Wood & St. Peters, 2014). Finally, a university president demonstrating Transformational Leadership in a multinational environment may develop a Cultural Intelligence in order to become better equipped in managing the cross cultural issues that may arise in advancing the mission and values of the institution (Crowne, 2008; Hughes, 2011).

Cultural Intelligence

Cultural Intelligence (CQ), a relatively new construct, attempts to measure the traits, competencies, and behaviors of a person that facilitate an individual's ability to adapt and engage in appropriate interactions with persons from a different cultural background (Crowne, 2008; Earley & Ang, 2003; Peterson, 2011). With the rapid globalization of various industries, Cultural Intelligence is fast becoming a sought after quality in managers and workers in multiple sectors (Deng & Gibson, 2008; Lovvorn & Chen, 2011; Wood & St. Peters, 2014).

A multidimensional construct, Cultural Intelligence is an aggregate of several facets of an individual's knowledge (Earley, 2002). Originally developed in a similar structure to various aspects of multiple intelligence theories (Peterson, 2011; Van Dyne et al., 2012), Cultural Intelligence considers cognitive intelligence, practical intelligence, and communicative intelligence (Earley, 2002). The sum measure of four distinct dimensions (Ang et al., 2007; Earley & Ang, 2003; Rockstuhl, Seiler, Ang, Dyne, & Annen, 2011; Wood & St. Peters, 2014), Cultural Intelligence is recognized as a malleable competency that can be developed or lost with

the influence of intercultural experiences (Eisenberg et al., 2013; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2008). Aiming to facilitate an understanding of how an individual adapts and functions when facing new cultural situations (Van Dyne, Ang, & Livermore, 2010), a Cultural Intelligence profile includes metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral cultural intelligences (Earley & Ang, 2003; Rockstuhl et al., 2011; Van Dyne et al., 2012, 2010; Wood & St. Peters, 2014).

A person with a high Cultural Intelligence is better equipped for success, more motivated for cultural awareness, and will be better prepared for working across cultural and national boundaries (Deng & Gibson, 2008; Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008). Specifically, past research has revealed task performance, cultural judgment and decision making, intercultural negotiation, and organizational innovation are all positively influenced by a high level of cultural intelligence (Keung & Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2013). From a leadership perspective, higher levels of Cultural Intelligence will likely predicate international leadership success (Kim & Van Dyne, 2012).

Metacognitive CQ

This dimension of Cultural Intelligence reflects the awareness and monitoring of an individual's cognitive processes within an intercultural context (Van Dyne et al., 2012). Absent from the earliest models of Cultural Intelligence, the Metacognitive facet relies on knowledge and experiences to guide an individual in their awareness of cultural difference (Earley & Peterson, 2016). It is the part of a person's intelligence that allows them to make meaning of new cultural experiences (Wood & St. Peters, 2014). It is broken down further into subdimensions of planning, awareness, and checking, or reviewing assumptions in new situations (Van Dyne et al., 2012).

Cognitive CQ

Where the metacognitive dimension of CQ focuses on the awareness and monitoring of knowledge processes, the cognitive domain of Cultural intelligence relates specifically to the knowledge structures about culture and cultural difference (Van Dyne et al., 2012). It is in this capacity that an individual perceives and interprets variations in intercultural situations (Thomas, 2006). Increased knowledge regarding economic or political practices, values, and social systems contribute to higher levels of cognitive cultural intelligence (Ang et al., 2007).

Motivational CQ

Beyond having the intellectual resources necessary to adapt to a new cultural situation, a strong Motivational CQ enables a person to confidently persist in the face of intercultural adversity (Earley & Peterson, 2016). A Motivational CQ directs a person's energy in producing culturally appropriate responses (Earley, 2002; Van Dyne et al., 2012). Individuals with high Motivational CQ are keenly aware of the cultural preferences of others, and possess the ability (and the desire) to adapt mental models and cultural assumptions when engaging in intercultural interactions (Ang et al., 2007).

Behavioral CQ

The fourth dimension of Cultural Intelligence reflects the visible and perceived actions employed to fit different cultural contexts (Van Dyne et al., 2012). Including verbal and non-verbal behaviors, Behavioral CQ is grounded in a person's competence in choosing appropriate responses based on cultural values of specific situations (Ang et al., 2007). Those individuals with higher levels of Behavioral CQ are better equipped to take risks in new cultural settings, leading to greater learning potential in international and intercultural settings (Ng, Van Dyne, & Ang, 2009a).

It is understanding the cultural interactions and intersections of an organization where Cultural Intelligence promotes an individual's effectiveness (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). A university's culture, as well as the way in which it operates and is managed, is dictated in large part by institutional accreditation. United States accreditation requires an institution to conform to U.S. methods and standards of operation and educational delivery (Altbach, 2003). Further, leadership of the institution is subject to criteria defined by regional accreditation organizations. As with other standards for accreditation, institutions must continually provide evidence of the maintenance of these criteria as part of the ongoing institutional accreditation effort.

Accreditation & University Leadership

In addition to standards outlining academic and co-curricular experiences at each university, the regional accreditation agencies also provide requirements outlining university leadership, specifically the president. Table 1 shows each regional accreditation agency's stated presidential standards and recommendations necessary to maintain institutional accreditation. While some agencies make specific mention of the president's competencies and scope of responsibility, others refer only generally to institutional leadership or the president's position.

Table 1

Standards Regarding Presidents and Leadership According To Regional Accreditation Agencies

Accreditation Agency	President and Leadership Standard
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	Standard VII. The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituencies it serves.
New England Association of Schools and Colleges	<p>Standard 3.12. The chief executive officer, through an appropriate administrative structure, effectively manages the institution so as to fulfill its purposes and objectives and establishes the means to assess the effectiveness of the institution. The chief executive officer manages and allocates resources in keeping with institutional purposes and objectives and assesses the effectiveness of the institution. The chief executive officer assures that the institution employs faculty and staff sufficient in role, number, and qualifications appropriate to the institution's mission, size, and scope.</p> <p>Standard 3.13. In accordance with established institutional mechanisms and procedures, the chief executive officer and senior administrators consult with faculty, students, other administrators, and staff, and are appropriately responsive to their concerns, needs, and initiatives. The institution's internal governance provides for the appropriate participation of its constituencies, promotes communications, and effectively advances the quality of the institution.</p>
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	<p>Standard 2.A.9. The institution has an effective system of leadership, staffed by qualified administrators, with appropriate levels of responsibility and accountability, who are charged with planning, organizing, and managing the institution and assessing its achievements and effectiveness.</p> <p>Standard 2.A.10. The institution employs an appropriately qualified chief executive officer with full-time responsibility to the institution. The chief executive officer may serve as an ex officio member of the governing board, but may not serve as its chair.</p>
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	<p>Provision 3.2.11. The institution's chief executive officer has ultimate responsibility for, and exercises appropriate administrative and fiscal control over, the institution's intercollegiate athletics program.</p> <p>3.2.12. The institution's chief executive officer controls the institution's fundraising activities.</p>

Table 1 Continued

Accreditation Agency	President and Leadership Standard
WASC Senior College and University Commission	<p>Standard 3.6. The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.</p> <p>Standard 3.8. The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.</p>
Higher Learning Commission	<p>5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.</p>

Problem Statement

Since Altbach's 2003 commentary discouraging United States accreditation of foreign institutions, there has been only a trickle of publications regarding these institutions, and even fewer specifically focusing on their leadership. The recent empirical works of Blanco-Ramirez (2015, 2016) appear to have initiated an earnest discussion on the value these institutions bring to the existing body of literature. These works, though, present case studies on a narrow focus of issues on individual campuses, with specific attention paid to institutions in Mexico and Canada. Research regarding these colleges and universities as a worldwide collective has lagged behind.

Schein (2010) states "cultural understanding is desirable for all of us, but it is essential to leaders if they are to lead" (p. 22). Similarly, Nahavandi (2008) asserts, "national cultural values of tolerance of ambiguity and perception and use of time affect how leaders view change" (p. 300). To understand how an institution of higher education that subscribes to multiple national cultures functions, it is helpful to establish an understanding of the dynamics of the institutional culture and its leadership (Schein, 2010). Because of the significant lack of literature regarding this unique set of institutions and their presidents, there is a need for an increased understanding

of their governance and leadership. Further study is warranted to allow a more effective assessment of the challenges faced by the chief administrators of these colleges and universities, as well as the leadership strategies employed to overcome them. As the leadership of these institutions becomes better understood and more clearly defined, stakeholders will be better equipped to take full advantage of the resources and educational opportunities these campuses offer to American higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to investigate the leadership considerations associated with guiding an institution located outside of the United States of America while it attempts to meet and maintain U.S.-based accreditation requirements. Despite the proliferation of publications on university presidents, the conducted literature review affirms that relatively few research studies have highlighted presidents in such unique institutional and cultural environments.

Specifically, in this study, I will explore the phenomena of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence demonstrated by the 44 presidents in the subset, and then investigate how these competencies manifest in the presidents of two U.S.-accredited institutions located internationally. By first employing a self-reporting survey instrument, the current study will invite presidents to reflect on their leadership behaviors and the frequency with which they demonstrate Transformational Leadership strategies and culturally intelligent behavior. Through conversations with university stakeholders and informal observations of campus life, I will be able to determine how students, staff, and faculty perceive these leadership approaches. By relying on multiple sources of data, a more robust picture of the presidents and their leadership

will emerge, providing a comprehensive understanding of how they navigate the institutional and national cultures over which they preside.

The names of the two universities examined in depth in the second, qualitative phase of this report have been changed to protect the identities of the participants. The pseudonyms Foreign Country University and the American University of Western Europe replace the actual institutional names. As Kezar and Eckel (2008) noted, “the discussion of institutional environment/culture and its potential impact on choice of leadership style suggests that presidents need to create a level of stability... on campus before they can engage people’s minds and hearts” (p. 429). This research seeks to examine the creation of stability while considering a profoundly exceptional cultural and institutional environment.

Research Questions

This study will be guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent are Transformational Leadership approaches employed by the presidents of U.S.-accredited universities located abroad?
 - a. How do presidents report the frequency with which they demonstrate Transformational Leadership?
 - b. What behaviors do associates and supervisees report that support or reject a transformational style of leadership?
2. To what extent is Cultural Intelligence demonstrated by the presidents of U.S.-accredited institutions of higher education located in foreign countries?
 - a. How do presidents report the frequency with which they demonstrate Cultural Intelligence?

- b. What behaviors do associates and supervisees report that support or reject presidential Cultural Intelligence?

Significance of the Study

Here, the differences of each university, the people assuming top leadership, and their unique perspectives render this study important and necessary. The distinctive qualities of the institutions and the presidents provide a myriad of important information regarding the leadership strategies and dilemmas faced by internationally located American-accredited universities. By considering multiple experiences and environments, the inherent triangulation “taps into different domains of knowing” (Mathison, 1988).

This study may serve key stakeholders at multiple levels within the organization of these institutions (e.g., students, alumni, governing boards, selection committees) in identifying those traits and characteristics most commonly associated with effective leaders of similar institutions. The results of this research will also afford presidents of these institutions (and other institutions where the cultural ethos of the community may create tension with the traditional university campus) insight into shared challenges and strategies in guiding their institutions.

In a more general sense, Madsen (2008) suggests that a study such as this can be helpful to those who are interested in developing the knowledge and competencies necessary for leadership charted throughout a similar career path in higher education. Finally, this study will serve to add to the literature relative to American higher education, which may prove useful in understanding these institutions as they become more relevant in conversations regarding various types of niche colleges and universities, and international education.

Definition of Key Terms

Before delving further into the literature or the current study, it is important to define key terms that have shaped this research. These terms guide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena investigated in this study, and ensure a consistent interpretation of subsequent findings, discussion, and implications.

Transformational Leadership. A leadership style characterized as one that “inspires followers with challenge and persuasion, providing both meaning and understanding... is intellectually stimulating, expanding the followers’ use of their abilities... (and) is individually considerate, providing the follower with support, mentoring and coaching” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 5).

Cultural Intelligence. An individual’s capability to adapt and adjust effectively to new cultural contexts and situations (Earley & Ang, 2003).

United States Accreditation. A process and recognition to assure and improve higher education quality, assisting institutions and programs using a set of standards developed by peers, and conveyed by six regional peer-member agencies (Eaton, 2006).

CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To better understand U.S.-accredited institutions located in foreign countries, and their presidents, this literature review was conducted to inform future research specifically focusing on the leadership of the men and women who serve in executive leadership capacities. The presidents of U.S.-accredited institutions located in foreign countries, as a distinct group of university leaders, offer a unique opportunity to explore the experiences, leadership, and Cultural Intelligence demonstrated in a truly international campus setting. The intercultural nature of the demands in their positions justifies research to further investigate the considerations influencing their sustainable success.

Approach to the Literature Review

In preparation of further research regarding these unique campuses and their leadership, four main areas of focus will be discussed for the purposes of this review of the literature: University Presidents, Accreditation, Transformational Leadership, and Cultural Intelligence. These areas will combine to guide this and future study, and advance the understanding of the executive leadership of U.S.-accredited institutions in foreign countries. Additionally, the methodologies of previously published studies will inform the research design of the current study.

Literature included here was determined through a process of thematic analysis, where concepts, ideas, and commentary were first coded to identify common or recurring themes, and then sorted according to relevance to the research topic. Specifically, analysis includes literature that meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. The study conducts empirical research on one or more facets of a single case or collective of U.S.-accredited universities located in foreign countries.

2. The study employs qualitative research methods, including individual interviews with presidents of universities and colleges in the United States.
3. The study focuses on the presidential career of university presidents.
4. The study includes qualitative data regarding effective leadership strategies and styles of university presidents.
5. The study was written and published in English.
6. The study provides relevant research and analysis of Cultural Intelligence.
7. The study provides relevant research and analysis of Transformational Leadership.
8. The study provides historical information, defines terms and parameters, or relevant commentary regarding institutional-level accreditation in the United States.
9. The study frames definitions, theory, and contextual references regarding cultural difference.

Multiple searches in Google Scholar, EBSCOhost Education Source, the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC), and ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Global databases were conducted to identify research selected for the review of the literature. Specific searches included various combinations of the keywords: “*university president*” + *leadership*, “*U.S. accreditation*” + “*foreign country*,” *U.S. university*, *Transformational Leadership*, and “*Cultural Intelligence*” + *leadership*. Search results that focused on high schools, international branch campuses, programmatic accreditation, international students and study abroad were excluded from the study. Table 2 displays the number of results found for each combination of key words according to the database used. Additional resources were also identified using reference lists at the conclusion of selected studies. When possible, articles and studies were downloaded into PDF format, and saved to the Mendeley reference manager software.

Table 2

Keyword Search Results by Database

Keywords	Google Scholar	Education Source	Education Administration Abstract	ERIC	ProQuest Dissertations & Theses
University President	2710000	16794	446	2000	10530
U.S. Accreditation	727000	721	55	112	263
U.S. University + Foreign Countries	1070	11	1	0	613
U.S. Accreditation + Foreign Countries	42	5	28	1	33
Transformational Leadership	124000	1070	213	1479	52285
Cultural Intelligence	13000	272	8	165	1385
Cultural Intelligence + Transformational Leadership	1050	1	1	1	433

University Accreditation

Before proceeding into further research regarding accreditation—in the United States and abroad, it is important to understand the concepts and implications of higher education accreditation. Accreditation is a practice to “assure and improve higher education quality, assisting institutions and programs using a set of standards” (Ewell, 2008, p. 1). It has become a key indicator of quality assurance of institutions of education worldwide (Collins, 2015). Validating an institution and its programs and qualifications has direct implications for students, prospective employers, society at large, and most importantly, for higher education (Knight, 2007). In the United States model, private, non-profit organizations designed specifically to assess quality and improvement carry out the accreditation process in all fifty states and ninety-five foreign countries (Eaton, 2006).

The extant literature is clear on articulating the ways quality in the realm of higher education is determined quite differently than with corporate world counterpart organizations. In academe, quality is not usually measured in tangible, “bottom line” figures, but instead by the alignment of the institutional mission with a set of outcomes valued by the university and external stakeholders (Kinser, 2011). One author notes that while some specialized accrediting bodies assess quality for specific programs, such as business or engineering, there has been a recent surge of importance placed on the institutional and national levels of accreditation (Knight, 2007). Much of the literature regarding accreditation is quick to point out the misleading “voluntary” participation of institutions in the United States to participate in accreditation. The reality of the process is that the federal government correlates eligibility for financial assistance with formal acknowledgement from a recognized regional accreditation body (Kinser, 2011).

While the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) lauds accreditation as both a valuable process and status, its value and effectiveness has been challenged in academic literature (Ewell, 2008). Collins (2015) argues that administrative, management, and policy practices are more often influenced by the requirements of accreditation than classroom instruction. Thus, he argues, that rather than having any sort of impact on educational quality, “it promotes mere conformity and... creates significant bureaucratic obligations, and takes up too much time” (Collins, 2015, p. 142). On a broader scale, there are those who view the process and definition of accreditation as political tools used to justify discriminatory practices regarding access to marginalized populations (Roberts, 2011). Regarding the American accreditation of foreign institutions, it has been suggested that accreditation processes are arbitrary, and pose a

danger for colleges and universities beyond the geographical borders that risk being trapped in long-term dependency (Blanco-Ramirez, 2015).

There are those, however, who take a less than contentious stance on the influence of accreditation. Oden (2009), as one example, views accreditation as a chance for institutions of higher education “to reflect on the depth and entirety” of their purpose and practice (p. 38). Where Collins (2015) views accreditation as an ill-defined benchmark or indicator of quality in which the indirect benefits may outnumber operational changes, another author sees it as an infrequent opportunity that should be handled professionally and thoroughly, providing valuable insight into how each facet of the university supports the educational mission (Oden, 2009).

U.S. Accreditation

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), a non-government agency, collectively recognizes six regional accreditation commissions for four-year institutions, each a self-governed and self-funded entity. According to the CHEA, “accreditation in the United States is a means to assure and improve higher education quality, assisting institutions and programs using a set of standards developed by peers” (Ewell, 2008, p. 1). The process of institutional accreditation is made up of three steps that generally take place on a multi-year cycle: a self-study, an external peer review, and a site visit from a qualified team of volunteers (Eaton, 2006). Different from the models of accreditation and quality assurance of other countries, United States accreditation operates independently of the national government, and is organized regionally (Ewell, 2008; Eaton, 2006; Knight, 2007). Accreditation in the U.S. also differs from other parts of the world in that it is forward-focused. In other words, plans for quality improvement and projections for enhancement are valued as much as the current status of an institution’s operation (Brittingham, 2009). In short, accreditation protects the mobility of

students, allows institutions access to federal funding sources, and ensures confidence in the credentials and employability of students (Eaton, 2006).

Regarding the technical value of accreditation in the United States, the literature provides clarification on what, exactly, accreditation status means. Altbach's commentary (2003) reminds us that the main purpose of U.S. accreditation system is to maintain a base of standard effectiveness in the many parts of the educational experience at every academic institution accredited. Touted as both a process and a status, CHEA points out these common standards address nearly all aspects of the institution, including faculty, student support services, finance and facilities, curricula and student learning outcomes to ensure that "students and the public can expect that a school or program lives up to its promises (Ewell, 2008, p. 2). The status and process of accreditation relies on common practices in providing the public at large with evidence of success and improvement within institutions of higher education (Ewell, 2008). To that end, it is important to remember that accreditation is not necessarily a measure of top achievement, but, rather, a set of standards outlining minimum quality (Altbach, 2003).

Although some critics of accreditation claim the process stifles innovation, it is recognized that accreditation has led to significant development of key education policy and initiatives such as curriculum changes, funding processes, and university governance procedures (Kezar, 2014). Another element of American accreditation championed in the literature is the process of peer review. In addition to the benefits to the institution undergoing the scrutiny of the review process, there lies "one of the best kept secrets of accreditation: that peer reviewers judge, but they also learn and carry that learning back to their own institutions" (Sanyal & Martin, 2007, p. 90).

One area regarding accreditation in which there is much agreement in the literature comes in proclaiming the United States system of higher education as being viewed as the quintessential model, largely because of the accreditation standards. Altbach (2003) notes that the U.S. model of higher education is the world's "gold standard," leading to a high international demand for American accreditation. Similarly, American accreditation and its corresponding model of education is described as "one of the most successful exports of the United States," and the most widely desired quality recognition in higher education (Blanco-Ramirez, 2015; Pavoncello, 2015, p. 112). A former president of a U.S.-accredited institution in the Middle East is quick to point out that institutions of higher education take full advantage of the opportunity to use accreditation to advertise their "American" educational offerings (Waterbury, 2003). Oden's (2009) favorable perspectives on accreditation continue as he notes that U.S. accreditation remains highly sought after despite the many inherent challenges that accompany it and the educational innovations emerging in other parts of the world. More will be discussed regarding U.S. accreditation of international institutions later in this literature review.

International Accreditation

The extant literature is not solely focused on accreditation in the United States. The concept of accreditation is the most widely used method of quality assurance, and has been recognized as an important part of higher education systems around the world (Sanyal & Martin, 2007). While individual countries and world regions support various models and systems of accreditation, it remains the focus of much literature because of its implications on the topic of quality assurance (Altbach, 2003). International quality assurance, or QA, has been defined in the literature as a "comprehensive term that refers to all of the policies, procedures, and activities that are used to validate and improve the performance of a higher education institution" (Kinser,

2011, p. 54). With the quickening pace of globalization driving to the recruitment and transferability of students, as well as the placement of graduates internationally, several authors are quick to point out the importance of international recognition (Altbach, 2003; Knight, 2007; Lane et al., 2004).

The concept of international quality assurance has been championed in the literature for the benefits it brings to students, scholars, and institutions wanting to share knowledge and expand their international agenda (Brittingham, 2015). One event recognized by much of the literature as a watershed moment in the journey toward a model of international accreditation is the 1999 Bologna Declaration. Subsequently, much of the literature focuses on this convention of European nations to devise a common set of standards of quality for institutions of higher education across the continent (Kinser, 2011).

Signed by Ministries of Education from over 30 European countries, the agreement seeks to provide a standard framework of quality assurance for European institutions of higher education (Sebkova, 2002). A primary objective of the Declaration was in creating convergence among the hundreds of existing accreditation structures throughout the diverse cultural landscape of Europe (Van der Wende, 2000). With so many different systems, structures, and cultures of education, the Declaration strived to bring some form of uniformity to the recognition of universities and their programs. Still, in the years following Bologna, there was little effort in any western European nation to advocate for a shared system of quality assurance in higher education (Sebkova, 2002).

The main objectives of the Declaration were to provide institutions and students with assurance of mobility within Europe and beyond, an agreed-upon standard of employability for students completing degree programs in universities within subscribing nations, and a transparent

system of self-regulation (Sebkova, 2002). Formal accreditation, however, was not an explicitly articulated outcome of the Declaration, though it did make mention of the need for systems of institutional evaluation, improvement, and certifications of quality (Haug, 2003). While supra-national quality assurance systems encouraged by the Bologna Declaration were originally intended to highlight the cultural and social dimensions of European institutions, recent shifts have resulted in an emphasis in institutional economic functions (Amaral, Rosa, & Tavares, 2009).

In the nearly two decades since the Bologna Declaration, several commissions, meetings, and conventions have resulted in the establishment of the European Quality Assurance Register (EQR) and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (Amaral et al., 2009). Membership in the independent, self-financed registry resembles accreditation in the United States in that it is, technically, voluntary and based on compliance with the pre-established requirements. With membership in the EQR, an institution gains recognition as a higher education provider with effective assessment and evaluation mechanisms for its academic programs and initiatives (Westerheijden, 2001).

The relatively new system of converged accreditation standards in Europe has not developed as rapidly as the Bologna Declaration member nations envisioned. The slow development has created less-than-ideal conditions for students and institutions alike (Van der Wende, 2000). Many countries view the idea of a shared accreditation system as a bureaucratic burden under which they would lose control and, more importantly, the distinct and defining elements of their own cultures—which often contradict or conflict with the quality assurance standards in other countries (Haug, 2003). As a result, the inconsistencies in quality and

qualifications have manifested a perceived isolationist environment in European higher education, as well as a lack of trust among institutions and nations (Haug, 2003).

Finally, the proliferation of so many accreditation structures has made the differentiation of them all nearly impossible for external stakeholders to discern. Westerheijden (2001) argues that the obvious danger in the absence of a convergence of quality assurance mechanisms has created a “jungle of accreditations” to replace a “jungle of degrees,” the value and difference of each growing increasingly unclear. This may hamper students wishing to transfer to a different university, enroll in graduate education, or gain employment. Mobility for students was an articulated objective of the 1999 Bologna Declaration, and continues to be a major argument for the success of a joint accreditation system. Similarly, it has been recognized that the current system makes it difficult for employers to compare qualifications of students graduating from different systems in different countries (Van der Wende, 2000). The lack of a European system of accreditation has structure has exposed significant inconsistencies among “quality” at nearly all levels—institutional, regional, national, and multinational (Haug, 2003).

Kinser (2011) discusses the notion of transnational quality assurance, and the failure to develop successful models quite extensively. This author cites the expansion of cross-border higher education as a top argument in advocating for international accreditation. He points out that multinational universities “pose numerous challenges to the traditional models of quality assurance that are designed to validate domestic higher education” (Kinser, 2011, p. 53). Kinser (2011) endorses the transparency practices outlined in the Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-Border Higher Education—an initiative sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Kinser’s view is not unique, as this, along

with other UNESCO involvement toward international quality assurance, has also been embraced elsewhere in the literature (Lane et al., 2004).

U.S.-Accredited Universities Located in Foreign Countries

Literature specifically regarding U.S.-accredited universities located in foreign countries is limited at best. These institutions have been largely overlooked by empirical studies focusing on American higher education. This may be attributed to typical institutional size—typical full-time enrollment figures may be as low as 360 students, or because of the difficulty in trying to categorize them. An American visitor to one of these campuses would quickly be able to discern the parts of the experience that are foreign, while a local of the host community would just as easily recognize the parts of the campus that are American.

By one account, the American colleges have been established abroad for more than a century, when the political, economic, and cultural presence of the United States in much of the rest of world was minimal (Moulakis, 2011). Today, the CHEA website database (2016) lists 42 institutions in foreign countries with institutional-level accreditation from one of the six U.S. regional accreditation bodies, and two more universities are currently engaged in the process of gaining accreditation. Categorized in the literature as *Independent Institutions*, these universities, most of which are liberal arts focused, operate independently with no connections or obligations to a “home institution” in the continental United States (Knight, 2006).

Because these American-style universities closely resemble stateside institutions in their operations and curricula, it has been argued that they are more effectively evaluated than other foreign institutions seeking United States accreditation (Altbach, 2003). There is, though, a bit of pushback as some authors seek to clarify what, exactly, constitutes American-style higher education. Brittingham (2015) predicts there “as many definitions as there are American

academics considering the question—maybe more” (p. 15). In her view, the implementation of credit systems, taught courses, and general education requirements does not adequately qualify as American-style (Brittingham, 2015).

While the amount of empirical research regarding U.S.-accredited universities in foreign countries is minimal, there is a fair amount of debate on the appropriateness of granting U.S.-based accreditation to non-U.S. institutions. Altbach (2003) is among the most clearly in opposition of these institutions, calling the practice a “bad idea,” in part because of the many contrasting educational systems and traditions abroad. Additionally, American-accreditation has been found to be generally misunderstood. A recent investigation into a Mexican university that boasts U.S. accreditation revealed that such recognition creates the misperception that these universities are somehow connected, or otherwise share equal status, with prestigious institutions through common accreditation recognition (Blanco-Ramirez, 2015).

In addition to the academic and curricular requirements necessary to maintain quality assurance with one of the six regional U.S. accreditation bodies, these institutions must also adhere to operational guidelines to facilitate the accreditation process. To that end, English is the primary language of each campus, and the governance and finance structures of each campus resemble those of a stateside university (Philip G. Altbach, 2003). English as the language of instruction offers the invaluable asset of the world's lingua franca while bridging linguistic differences of otherwise antagonistic groups (Moulakis, 2011; Pavoncello, 2015).

The most prevalent argument against the accreditation of foreign institutions, however, is the concern that the practice represents a form of educational imperialism (Philip G. Altbach, 2003; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2006). It is noted that U.S. accreditation reflects the history, norms, and values of the American higher education system (Altbach, 2003). This may prove damaging

to the local culture or “character” of the institution (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2006). In his commentary, Moulakis (2011) confronts this mindset, holding that “American universities abroad do not propagandize but rather impart what is most valuable about American achievements.” Similar to Pavoncello (2015), Moulakis (2011) extols this manifestation of higher education as America’s greatest export. He argues, these institutions contribute to cultural awakenings and promote lasting values of free inquiry, respect for the individual, and accountability (Moulakis, 2011). On a different level, another researcher posits American accreditation at the institutional level also gives these otherwise obscure independent institutions an international audience to which they can demonstrate their value (Blanco-Ramirez, 2015).

University Presidents

The role of the university president has been described as one of the most prestigious positions in American society (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001). The university presidency for all its responsibilities has also been a place where national leaders and Presidents of the United States, such as Woodrow Wilson, hone their political skills for future office (Padilla, 2005). And while the role of the university president has been equated to that of a corporate CEO (Ehrenberg, Cheslock, John, & Epifantseva, 2000), others have deemed the position much loftier, labeling university presidents as directing “carriers of civilization,” and “engines of change” (Rosser, 1990). Interfacing with internal constituents such as members of the Board of Trustees, faculty, administrative staff, and students, as well as external stakeholders such as alumni, community partners, and foundations, the university presidency requires the practice of leadership in several different capacities and environments. In summation, the primary challenge of a university president is to achieve “harmonious” balance between the operations and aspirations of an institution within environmental constraints (Ikenberry, 2010).

The recent literature on higher education and academe has increasingly focused on the role and career of the university president (Madsen, 2008). These executive leaders simultaneously report to and represent numerous stakeholders—boards of trustees, faculty, students, alumni, and the community—and often experience a unique vulnerability in the face of each while they attempt to lead and advocate for their respective institutions (Rosser, 1990). Pressure on the president also extends to specific duties of the multifaceted position. In addition to managing issues and growth on campus, the president plays an integral role in maintaining relationships and connections with off-campus constituencies (Fisher & Koch, 1996). Many authors concur that the university presidency in its current evolutionary state carries a vastly different set of demands and considerations than it did as recently as twenty years ago (Bok, 2014; Botstein, 1990; Ikenberry, 2010). Recent trends reveal more and more presidents face pressure to raise enormous sums of money in the form of private donations to run their campus (Kaufman, 2004). Often the accountability from multiple directions is a unique test in the wherewithal of the men and women who serve as president to resolve high-stake and high-profile issues with brilliantly (Fisher & Koch, 1996).

Because the university president is such a distinct and extraordinary position, it is not surprising that commentary regarding the position dominates the literature (Padilla, 2005). Many incumbent and former presidents take to the literature to reflect on the progression of their roles, as well as the necessity of innovative leadership strategies to meet the ever-changing demands of the university campus (Bok, 2014; Botstein, 1990; Ikenberry, 2010). The empirical research that does exist includes a noticeable presence qualitative methods. Specifically, a strong portion of the literature employs qualitative interviews used as part of case study research designs to explore the idiosyncrasies of presidential roles and leadership (Simon, 2009; Wolverton, Bower,

Beverly, & Maldonado, 2006). This may be affirmation of the ability of the case study investigator to “retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events,” and contribution to our knowledge of an individual (Yin, 2009, p.4). There is a more noticeable quantitative presence among the literature regarding pre-presidential career paths, but the bulk remains qualitative and commentary in nature (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Jackson & Harris, 2005).

As revealed in this literature review, the many studies appearing in the literature focus on a diverse group of presidents—with focus that includes women, and African American women, as well as a diverse set of institutions, including independent colleges, small colleges, religiously affiliated colleges, and a variety of Carnegie classifications. Still, the presidents of internationally located institutions bearing U.S. accreditation have been all but ignored. The lack of attention in the literature on this subset of leaders justifies further investigation into their pre-presidential and presidential experiences and perspectives.

Pre-Presidential Career Path

In addition to research on university presidents who have attained their position, there is a fair amount of interest in the career path that leads to the presidency (Madsen, 2008). Here, again, the literature gives a nod to the individualized nature of the journey to becoming a university president, warning that it would be “simplistic to say that everyone should follow a specific career path if he or she wishes to become a president” (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001, p. 214; Ross & Green, 2000). The findings of two different quantitative studies that employ descriptive research inquiry and survey methods respectively find that the journey to the presidency differs even more so for women and persons of color (Jackson & Harris, 2005; Song & Hartley III, 2012). In her phenomenological research of women presidents, Madsen (2008)

reports that none of the women participants in her study “had a specific career development plan that focused on becoming president throughout the majority of their careers” (p. 137). Still, it is widely noted that most presidents arrive at their positions having previously held posts that progressively establish them as leaders on campus, (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Cohen & March, 1974; Song & Hartley III, 2012).

Most university presidents’ experience is largely academic experience—which some argue fails to adequately prepare presidents for the increasingly important non-academic presidential tasks and responsibilities, such as institutional fundraising and advancement (Cohen & March, 1974; Kaufman, 2004). An often-cited study finds that only about 8% of presidents begin their executive roles following positions outside of the academic environment (Ross & Green, 2000). When considering only presidents of small, independent colleges, that number grows to 15% (Song & Hartley III, 2012). In the former study by Ross & Green (2000), it was reported that nearly 25% of American university presidents arrive to their current posts having served as a president at a different University. It is not uncommon for the pre-presidential career to include a measure of success obtaining grants and funding for academic research and facilities (Madsen, 2008).

Birnbaum and Umbach (2001) note that a majority of university presidents reach their positions by taking the traditional path of the scholar. The earlier findings of Cohen and March (1974) as well as later by Song and Hartley III (2012), affirm this perspective, revealing that, historically, many presidents begin their career as instructors, and through a series of promotions and advancements, work their way into the role of the university president. There are, though, some notable exceptions here. In their study, Jackson and Harris (2005) found that most African American women serving as president tend to arrive to the position from outside of higher

education or a different university. In addition, while the “academic career ladder” may involve movement from one university to another, the academic path is not always viewed as the most beneficial (Cohen & March, 1974). One author argues that the traditional scholarly career may bestow certain academic credentials, however boards would be better served focusing on presidential candidates with more non-academic experience, and a strong willingness to adapt to the position (Kaufman, 2004).

As one might expect, most university presidents in the United States hold a Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001). More than sixty years ago, Wetzler (1954) reported only 43% of presidents held a terminal degree. In the decades since, this percentage has nearly doubled. A recent study commissioned by the Council of Independent Colleges reports the percentage of doctorates among presidents to be much higher at 80% with nearly a third of those degrees in the fields of education or higher education (Song & Hartley III, 2012). These degrees, more than any other, have been identified as those that best equip university presidents with the foundational communication, critical thinking and personal networking skills needed to be successful in their positions (Freeman & Kochan, 2012). One study cites 65% of presidents as endorsing a liberal arts education as “probably the best kind of preparation” for a university president (Wetzler, 1954, p. 441).

Cohen and March (1974) found that most university presidents have a measureable degree of familiarity, and articulate an alignment of personal values with the institutions they are ultimately chosen to lead. Elsewhere in the literature, it is suggested that this is no coincidence. Rather, presidents are chosen for their ability to be representatives of the missions, values, and populations associated with the campus communities they serve (Ross & Green, 2000).

Gender and Racial Minority Representation Among University

The current literature reveals that positions of university president are overwhelmingly held by white men (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Cohen, 1974). Further, the underrepresentation of women extends to the literature and study regarding university leadership (Jackson & Harris, 2005; Wolverson et al., 2006). Although women and persons of color are increasingly guiding institutions of higher education, the literature has yet to reflect this shift (Madsen, 2008). The discrepancies in the gender make up of university presidents remains noticeable despite the fact that women outnumber men in terms of earning advanced degrees (Song & Hartley III, 2012). The so-called “pipeline to the presidency” has only recently begun shift in terms of the demographics of university leaders, despite the historic gross imbalance (Fisher & Koch, 1996). Ross and Green (2000) found that one-fourth of all newly hired college and university presidents in 1998 were women. Among small, independent colleges, the number of women executive leaders remained at a relatively similar level more than a decade later (Song & Hartley III, 2012).

When making the same consideration for minorities, the demographic shift is happening at a much slower rate. In the aforementioned study by Ross and Green (2000), it was reported that the percentage of minorities among new president appointees in 1998 was only 13%, and comprised only 11% of all university presidents. Overall, it is agreed that presidential leadership positions are highly situational, and often differ according to institutional type (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Fisher & Koch, 1996). This observation, though, does little to justify the continued underrepresentation of women and minorities among university leadership (Ross & Green, 2000). Jackson and Harris (2005) point out a lack of preparation and role models, and call for increased efforts by institutions of higher education to recruit and encourage women and minorities in the pursuit of presidential roles.

Presidential Leadership

Amid the proliferation of scholarly literature on the subject of leadership, the topic of executive leadership in higher education remains largely overlooked (Madsen, 2008). Understanding presidential leadership is an important part of understanding change while advancing institutional policy (Kezar & Eckel, 2008). While competence has been cited in the literature as a “cornerstone for an effective presidency,” leadership has been labeled the core competency, or most important resource of a successful president (Ikenberry, 2010; Wolverton et al., 2006, p. 135). Effective university and college presidents are often discussed in the same context as leaders of business, government, and military arenas, where the differences between them tend to “exist in shades rather than clear contrasts” (Fisher & Koch, 1996, p. 19). Some authors take the comparison a bit further by suggesting that leadership approaches in higher education should resemble those of the corporate world to improve institutional decision making and response time (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Nahavandi (2008) asserts that an accurate evaluation of leadership in any setting requires taking stock of the roles and functions of the leader. Even within higher education, it is understood that leadership is a contextual concept, and that definitions of effective leadership vary according to institutional environment (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

Presidential leadership, it is commonly reported, is often a culmination of skills and competencies developed during their pre-presidential career path (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001; Madsen, 2008). One quantitative study relying on the American Council of Education (ACE) survey of university presidents determined that, following their beginnings as faculty and instructors, many presidents are aided by a career that takes them to positions of progressively increasing administrative responsibility (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001). Another study with the

aim to explore the experiences of “high-level women leaders in developing the knowledge, skills, and competencies that have assisted them in getting and maintaining positions of influence in higher education,” also finds that building experience combined with establishing influential relationships are the most effective means of acquiring the skills, competencies, and leadership habits necessary for success as a president (Madsen, 2008, p. 7). Without such experience, the heavy responsibilities and demands of the executive role have the potential to be intimidating and, possibly, overwhelming (Fisher & Koch, 1996).

While Madsen (2008) suggests that presidential styles fit into a variety of leadership models, a number of studies have proposed that a transformational approach to leadership is most effective in the higher education arena (Fisher & Koch, 1996; Kezar & Eckel, 2008). Transformational leadership, as defined by Bass (1985), occurs when a leader inspires followers to see the beyond their own self-interests for the betterment of the group by instilling awareness and acceptance in the mission of the organization. Kezar and Eckel (2008) argue that employing Transformational Leadership motivates staff and faculty, while maintaining the wellness of the organizational infrastructure. Additionally, this type of leadership approach allows the president to take more risks than a transactional style of leadership (Fisher & Koch, 1996). Ironically, the transformational president satisfies the individual desire for the sense of accomplishment resulting from affecting healthy change in the campus community (Madsen, 2008).

Transformational Leadership

First introduced in the literature by James MacGregor Burns in 1978, the concept of Transformational Leadership has remained a widely studied model for the past three decades (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 2003; Crawford, Gould, & Scott, 2003; Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Transformational Leadership is a values-based leadership approach that seeks to empower

followers to an awareness of organizational goals allowing them to perform beyond expectations (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 2003; Hartog et al., 1997; Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008; Northouse, 2013). Transformational Leadership emphasizes the individual roles and needs of followers in realizing the goals and mission of the organization (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Crawford et al., 2003; Fisher & Koch, 1996; Hartog et al., 1997; Kauffman, 1980). It is widely written that Transformational Leadership involves more than individual, or even a series of, technical changes, and promotes “higher order change” encouraging innovation, development, while shifting values, beliefs, and attitudes (Basham, 2010; Burns, 2003; Crawford et al., 2003).

Dimensions of Transformational Leadership

The demonstration of Transformational Leadership is a combination of several behaviors and practices. Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, four distinct components of Transformational Leadership were identified: Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration (Avolio et al., 1999).

Idealized influence. In this dimension, the Transformational Leader establishes herself as a role model for her followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). High moral standards and ethical conduct serve as the foundation for great respect, admiration, and trust in the leader’s abilities and a sense of common purpose among followers (Northouse, 2013). Through putting the needs of the followers before their own, leaders develop an identity founded in ethics and shared principles (Bass et al., 2003).

Inspirational Motivation. By helping followers identify meaning in their work, Transformational Leadership motivates and encourages followers to maintain a sense of vision toward the future (Bass et al., 2003). High expectations and an emotional sense of commitment to the group typify this dimension of Transformational Leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Intellectual Stimulation. Yukl (1999) describes the dimension of Intellectual Stimulation as encouraging innovation and creativity. Transformational Leadership encourages followers to take risks and think independently in situations of problem solving (Northouse, 2013).

Individualized Consideration. Transformational Leaders remain attentive to the individual needs of followers, serving as mentors in the followers' growth and development (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Northouse, 2013). It is through this attention that a Transformational Leader views each follower as a whole person, assisting them in actualizing their full potential (Avolio et al., 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transformational Leadership in Higher Education

As this study seeks to examine the leadership strategies of university presidents, it serves as a sort of call to investigate the presence of Transformational Leadership -- deemed most appropriate and needed, in higher education environments (Basham, 2010; Kezar & Eckel, 2008). Basham (2010) asserts that the elements of Transformational Leadership, specifically motivating and stimulating followers toward the collective mission, must be combined with a university president's "individual quality of commitment demonstrated with passion, intensity, and persistence" in order for that institution to achieve success (p. 150). Kezar and Eckel (2004) identify wrong decision-making processes, and not creating a culture of collaboration as direct paths to institutional failure. In another piece, these same authors warn that financial situations and community morale must be addressed in order for strategies of Transformational Leadership to have meaningful impact on campus (Kezar & Eckel, 2008). Finally, Basham (2010) proclaims Transformational Leadership as the key ingredient in institutional adaptation to meet the changing economic and academic environment. Because the worldwide landscape of higher

education remains somewhat fluid and evolving (Philip G. Altbach, 2010), Transformational Leadership is arguably the most accommodating approach for institutional leaders. With strong emphasis on followers' collective trust and commitment, Transformational Leadership underscores organizational change (Hay, 2006).

Measuring Transformational Leadership: The MLQ

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, or MLQ, has emerged as the widely accepted measure of Transformational Leadership (Basham, 2010; Bass & Riggio, 2006). It has been used in a multitude of organizational environments all around the world (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Measuring each of the dimensions of Transformational Leadership, the reliability and validity of the instrument has been celebrated in much of the literature (Basham, 2010; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Crawford et al., 2003; Northouse, 2013).

Worth noting are the challenges to the effectiveness and validity of the measure, as some critics claim the factors contained within the MLQ are not distinct factors (Northouse, 2013). One study, though, employed an Analysis of Moment Structures to investigate the integrity of the MLQ and found sufficient evidence to refute much of the criticism (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008).

An investigation into the leadership of U.S. accredited universities located in foreign countries that neglects the influence of culture renders itself incomplete. The international premise and diverse cultural makeup of the campus community that give these institutions distinctive value warrant the need to examine the navigation of potential cultural tensions. International law, quality assurance standards, personnel relations, and student enrollment present unique challenges to leadership that benefit from advanced levels of cultural competencies. The construct of Cultural Intelligence (CQ) may serve a university president in

demonstrating an awareness and adaptability in addressing the challenges of guiding a U.S. university abroad.

Cultural Intelligence

As the demands of leadership change to meet the needs of an increasingly globalized society, Cultural Intelligence has been lauded as one of the most necessary competencies for an effective and successful leader (Livermore, 2010, 2011; Ng, Van Dyne, & Ang, 2009b; Rockstuhl et al., 2011; Van Dyne et al., 2010). The idea of Cultural Intelligence helps in understanding why some individuals are more successful than others in the context of intercultural interactions (Van Dyne et al., 2012, 2010). Developed similarly to models of Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence, is specific to each individual (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Earley, 2002; Gelfand, Imal, & Fehr, 2008; Thomas, 2006; Van Dyne et al., 2012, 2010). Because Cultural Intelligence is not values- or personality-based, it is a malleable resource that can be developed through education, travel, intercultural experience and reflection (Eisenberg et al., 2013; Gelfand et al., 2008; Kim & Van Dyne, 2012; Livermore, 2011; Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2012). It is worth noting that a person's Cultural Intelligence level may also deteriorate if not nurtured (Peterson, 2011).

Cultural Difference

In order to provide a contextual reference for the concept of Cultural Intelligence, it is helpful to consider the influence of cultural difference. Arguably, two (or more) cultures—that of the host community and U.S.-accreditation—intersect to create the institutional culture of an internationally located American university. Nahavandi (2008) reminds us that one of the strongest influences on organizational culture is national culture. Additionally, the culture of American education is reflected in the U.S. system of accreditation (Philip G. Altbach, 2003).

Thus, the local culture and values are strongly represented by the faculty, students, and staff while the American ties remain strong through a constant connection with U.S. higher education (Waterbury, 2003).

It is because of this multinational institutional identity that investigating the cultural competencies, specifically Cultural Intelligence, in the university president is warranted. Their ability to understand and manage the influences of global and national forces has a direct and significant influence on the operations and sustainability of the institution (Rhoads & Tierney, 1992). To affect change and maintain quality standards of education and operation, these campus leaders must be keenly aware of the cultures and subcultures of the institution (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). In addition to the potential of competing cultural values within the campus dynamic, where, for example, considerations of uncertainty avoidance may influence institutional relationships, there exists a strong likelihood for contradiction with the culture of the host community with that of the U.S. accreditation. Where a host community may have salient practices regarding gender segregation, U.S. accreditation may dictate equal treatment. WASC makes specific mention of an “appreciation of diversity” in the educational process (*Diversity Policy*, 2016). Thus, it could be predicted that a president with higher levels of Cultural Intelligence will be a more effective leader in environments where cultural difference defines the institutional culture (Van Dyne et al., 2010).

Many scholars have attempted to categorize the dimensions of cultural difference. In the latter half of the last century, American anthropologist Edward Hall preceded many future empirical studies in identifying key cultural factors delineated by high- and low-context societies (Changing Minds, 2016). The work of Hall, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, as well as the seminal works of Hofstede and the longitudinal investigation of the Global Leadership and

Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) study conducted by Mansour Javidan and associates that began in 1994 commonly serve as the dominant scholarly works in defining culture. Table 3 outlines the commonality of the dimensions of each model of culture most frequently operationalized to demonstrate cultural difference. These dimensions incorporate organizational and societal values and practices (Javidan, House, & Dorfman, 2004). Based on the findings of worldwide collection of participant data, the tenets and definitions offer a significant amount of overlap among models (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; Javidan et al., 2004). While the names and labels of the dimensions may vary, Table 3 demonstrates commonalities in the factors that most often guide behaviors and decisions during intercultural interactions.

Table 3

Dimensions of Culture Across Sources

Dimension	Sources
Power Distance: the extent to which less powerful members of an organization within a country expect power distributed equally.	Hofstede et al, 2010; Javidan et al, 2004;
Uncertainty Avoidance: the extent to which members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguity or unknown situations.	Hall; Hofstede et al, 2010; Javidan et al, 2004;
Humane Orientation: the degree to which a collective encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, generous, caring and kind.	Javidan et al, 2004;
Collectivism (Institutional): the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action.	Hall; Hofstede et al, 2010; Javidan et al, 2004; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012

Table 3 Continued

Dimension	Sources
Collectivism (In-group): the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in organizations or families.	Hall; Hofstede et al, 2010; Javidan et al, 2004; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012
Assertiveness: the degree to which individuals are assertive, confrontational, or aggressive in their relationships with others.	Hall; Javidan et al, 2004;
Gender Egalitarianism: the extent to which collective gender roles are clearly distinct.	Hofstede et al, 2010; Javidan et al, 2004;
Future Orientation: the extent to which individuals engage in future oriented behaviors such as delaying gratification, planning, and investing in the future.	Hall; Javidan et al, 2004; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012
Performance Orientation: the degree to which a collective encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence.	Hall; Javidan et al, 2004; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012

The dimensions of cultural difference begin to define the areas of a multinational university that may require culturally competent leadership. Javidan, House, and Dorfman (2004) assert that organizational cultures reflect the social context in which they are rooted. Presiding over an institution of higher education with multiple cultural influences is highly complex and includes significant leadership challenges (Osland, Bird, Mendenhall, & Osland, 2006). The potential for cultural contradiction arises in nearly every level of the institution. As vibrant global institutions, foreign universities with U.S. accreditation blur national boundaries and define a need for dynamic leadership (Robertson, 2005). It is of paramount priority for presidents and administrators to maintain awareness of the differences among cultural groups on their campus, as well as remaining flexible and sensitive to the cultural implications of institutional policies (Rhoads & Tierney, 1992). By definition, a well-developed Cultural

Intelligence will equip the president with the cognitive and psychological resources necessary to practice these leadership strategies (Earley, 2002).

Defining Cultural Intelligence

Much like the construct of leadership, the concept of Cultural Intelligence lacks a universally agreed-upon definition (Schaffer & Miller, 2008). A number of these scholarly definitions are presented in Table 4. There is, however, wide acceptance of the multidimensionality of the construct. With some variation across definitions and models, Cultural Intelligence is presented with three main dimensions—cognitive, motivational, and knowledge, though some scholars have chosen to separate a metacognitive dimension from the cognitive (Earley, 2002; Earley & Ang, 2003; Ng et al., 2009b; Rockstuhl et al., 2011; Van Dyne et al., 2010; Wood & St. Peters, 2014). As one of the most often cited in the literature regarding higher education, Earley and Ang's (2003) definition will guide the research and discussion of the present study (Barbuto, Jay, Beenen, & Tran, 2015; Eisenberg et al., 2013; Ramis, 2010; L. G. Roberts, 2010; Wood & St. Peters, 2014).

Table 4

Definitions of Cultural Intelligence Found in the Extant Literature

Source	Definition
Peterson, 2004	The ability to engage in a set of behaviors that uses skills (i.e., language or interpersonal skills) and qualities (e.g., tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility) that are tuned appropriately to the culture-based values and attitudes of the people with whom one interacts.
Crowne, 2008	A capability that allows individuals to understand and act appropriately across a wide range of cultures.
Earley, 2002	A person's capability to adapt as he interacts with others from different cultural origins.
Earley & Ang, 2003	A person's capability to adapt effectively to new cultural contexts.
Livermore, 2011	The capability to function effectively in a variety of cultural contexts-- including national, ethnic, organizational, and generational.

Measuring Cultural Intelligence

Several instruments developed through empirical studies in the literature determine an individual's capacity to effectively manage intercultural situations. Fantini (2009) presents 44 different assessment tools and their espoused focus. Several authors lament the "vagaries of intercultural abilities" and the lack of consensus among researchers and the array of measuring instruments (Balcazar, Suarez-Balcazar, & Taylor-Ritzler, 2009; Fantini, 2009, p. 457). Research in several contexts has yielded a number of methods to assist business professionals, educators, and leaders of multinational organizations in measuring cultural adaptiveness according to defined constructs (Fantini, 2009). Some of the issues with the many different constructs and models of assessment are in the lack of reliability and the oversimplification of culture and cultural competence (Kumas-Tan, Beagan, Loppie, MacLeod, & Frank, 2007).

One construct considered for the current study was that of The global mindset concept considers various elements of cultural difference, such as power distance, uncertainty avoidance and future orientation to hypothesize effective behaviors, attitudes, and traits of global leaders in their attempts to implement change (Bowen & Inkpen, 2009; Nahavandi, 2008). The multidimensional Thunderbird Global Mindset Inventory (GMI) uses three capitals—social, psychological, and intellectual, to test an individual's “ability to influence individuals, groups, organizations, and systems that are unlike him or her on his or her own” (Javidan & Teagarden, 2011, p. 14). Ultimately, the GMI was considered too business-centric and its length somewhat prohibitive for use in this research of university presidents.

As this study includes an examination of Transformational Leadership, the extant literature supports the pairing of Cultural Intelligence. Previous empirical research has determined a link between the multiple intelligences of CQ with the dimensions of Transformational Leadership (Rockstuhl et al., 2011). Earley and Ang (2003) proclaimed what they deemed a “growing interest in the ways leadership manifests itself in various cultures” (p. 308). The combined investigation of CQ and Transformational Leadership of the current study was conducted in the spirit of that assertion. Accordingly, this research employs the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), largely because of its extensive generalizability across contexts, its tested psychometric properties, and its manageable length (Van Dyne et al., 2012).

This research addresses a significant gap regarding presidents of internationally located U.S. accredited universities in the literature. The heightened cultural implications of their locations, campus diversity, and operational environment intersect to create unique environments in which to lead. By examining the presidents of these institutions as they strive to maintain accreditation requirements, we can begin to understand the ways in which cultural tensions

influence university leadership. Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence form a research framework that will comprehensively guide the study. These constructs each have an established presence in the extant literature and appropriately investigate the issues of culture and promoting change on a university campus.

Implications for Practice

Study of this nature benefits multiple constituencies in higher education. For Boards of Trustees attempting to fill or advertise presidential vacancies, the results of such research may help to identify candidates most appropriately prepared for the rigor of the presidential position. Additionally, higher education professionals wanting to pursue a presidential career path may use this study to assist them in developing a career plan to successfully obtain a position as a college or university president. For current presidents as they attempt to define and clarify their leadership styles on campus, this study provides insight into those leadership styles and approaches identified as most valuable by their presidential peers.

Conclusion

As mentioned in the opening of this literature review, research regarding the leadership of U.S.-accredited colleges and universities located in foreign countries is sparse. While there appears to be a recent—yet still slight—increase in focus on these institutions, there is sufficient justification for additional research into the leadership of these distinct campuses. The themes explored in this review may help to guide and inform research of this unique subset of institutions of higher education. Additional study will serve to add to the literature relative to American higher education, which may prove useful in understanding these institutions and the leadership strategies employed to advance them as they become more relevant in conversations regarding various types of niche colleges and universities, and international education.

The literature reviewed justifiably warrants further research on the presidents of U.S.-accredited institutions in foreign countries. With much of the literature comprised of commentary and anecdotal accounts of somewhat similar models of transnational education, empirical study investigating the leadership of these colleges and universities is certainly justified. The methodological commonalities in previous empirical studies of the leaders of institutions of higher education suggest that a collective case study research design is appropriate and found to be most useful. Historical findings suggest commonalities in the areas of university presidents suggests Transformational Leadership behaviors are most advantageous in affecting change and implementing policy. Further, strategies of leadership of this style empower members of the campus community and instill a sense of pride in a common vision.

Additional review of the literature regarding Cultural Intelligence among executive leaders leads to greater effectiveness in multinational settings. A leader's awareness and ability to adapt in situations influenced by multiple cultural implications predicate the ability to further the mission of the group. With the salience of cultural difference at the 44 U.S.-accredited universities located internationally, CQ serves as a most useful competency for the presidents of these institutions.

With previous studies revealing relationships between Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence, implementing a research design seeking to investigate these competencies in presidents of multinational campuses aligns with the extant literature. However, as most of the literature investigates these phenomena on stateside campuses, a significant gap still exists in regards to the specific needs and leadership at U.S.-accredited universities abroad.

The significant lack of empirical studies dealing with these university presidents warranted deeper investigation. As pointed out by Bowen and Inkpen (2009), "global leaders

face even higher levels of cross-cultural complexity as the number of different country cultures and organizational subcultures in a change situation escalate” (p. 245). The present dissertation-level research on the global leaders of these institutions attempted to untangle some of the cross-cultural complexities that the respective presidential roles demand.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This study addresses the lack of empirical evidence regarding the leadership approach and Cultural Intelligence of a unique subset of university presidents. The questions guiding this explanatory sequential mixed-methods research are:

1. To what extent are Transformational Leadership approaches employed by the presidents of U.S.-accredited universities located abroad?
 - a. How do presidents report the frequency with which they demonstrate Transformational Leadership?
 - b. What behaviors do associates and supervisees report that support or reject a transformational style of leadership?
2. To what extent is Cultural Intelligence demonstrated by the presidents of U.S.-accredited institutions of higher education located in foreign countries?
 - a. How do presidents report the frequency with which they demonstrate Cultural Intelligence?
 - b. What behaviors do associates and supervisees report that support or reject presidential Cultural Intelligence?

Explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods Design

As this study sought to capture both the practices and opinions of presidents as well as the perceptions of campus stakeholders, a Mixed Methods approach guided data collection and analysis. In this study, the quantitative and qualitative methods “complement each other and allow for a more robust analysis” (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006, p. 3). An explanatory sequential methodology uses qualitative data to assess trends, relationships, or rational emergent in the quantitative results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). To investigate the degree of

Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence, and to gather personal perspectives relative to leading an unique institution of higher education, a researcher-designed survey instrument that included the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x) and Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) was distributed to the 44 presidents of foreign universities maintaining U.S. accreditation at the institutional level during November of 2016. In order to gain insight into specific observed manifestations of a Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence, a qualitative component of the research involved in-depth interviews and focus groups with students, staff, and faculty at two institutions in addition to observations and document analyses. Figure 1 illustrates the progression of the implemented explanatory sequential research design.

Figure 1. The order of progression and components of the explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Phase One Data Collection

The initial quantitative phase of data collection was comprised of a researcher-developed survey instrument. Since the presidents are all located in countries other than the United States, a web-based survey instrument using Qualtrics Survey Software was determined most beneficial to the study. In addition to facilitating international contact more quickly and less expensively than mail surveys and less time-intensively than individual telephone conversations, use of the web-based program allowed the university presidents to complete the survey at a time that best

suited their availability. In an attempt to encourage the presidents to participate, an initial email was sent by the president of the researcher's institution. I contacted participants via email messages composed in and sent from the Qualtrics portal. Opening with a brief explanation of the purpose of the research, the initial Qualtrics message invited participants to access the survey through an embedded link that took them directly to the presidential leadership and Cultural Intelligence survey instrument.

Since the survey intended to investigate these presidents as a collective rather than individually, the participant's anonymity is maintained. This anonymity, however, proved to be a major obstacle in accurately and comprehensively reporting the findings of the qualitative data. Without revealing the university's local culture, it is difficult to fully grasp the influence of local and national culture on the leadership and operation of the institution.

Participants

Participants in this study were current presidents of American-accredited universities located in foreign countries. Each of the 44 presidents was contacted and invited to participate. Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014) propose "surveying everyone in the population may be useful when (resources are) large enough to also minimize coverage, nonresponse, and measurement error, or when the population is so small that the additional costs of surveying everyone are fairly negligible" (p. 82). Additionally, the inclusion of all of the presidents in the population would help to ensure higher levels of confidence in the statistical significance of the quantitative findings. Names and contact information of presidents had been obtained through publicly available information.

The Survey Instrument

Beginning with measures of Cultural Intelligence and Transformational Leadership, the questions included in the survey instrument evolved from a review of the current literature, specifically previous research relative to executive university leaders. Survey items sought to investigate presidents' education, work histories, and perspectives on the demands of the presidential position. Following a peer review process involving ten other students enrolled in the Leadership Studies Ph. D. program at the institution attended by the researcher, several questions included in the survey instrument were revised and adjusted. The peer review process identified question design issues such as double-loaded questions, the order of items in the survey, language articulation, and concerns regarding the clarity of the survey questions.

With the understanding that the demands of a university president likely leave a limited amount of time and availability for survey participation, and the knowledge that “length above all other considerations, is a huge cost of being a respondent,” (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014, p. 32), the survey was designed with brevity in mind. Quick completion was a key consideration to encourage participants to respond to the entirety of the survey instrument. As such, nearly all of the questions were formatted as multiple choice—allowing a single or multiple responses, requiring minimal mouse clicks and web page navigation on the part of the participant. Interactive “sliders,” also known as *visual analog scales*, were used in the design of many of the questions to provide a rapid and convenient visual reference for the participants to choose from a set of limited points along a continuum (Dillman et al., 2014). To facilitate easy and clear input of responses for the multi item scale, a matrix design was chosen since the points on the scale remain constant for each item. Similarly, the “skip logics” function was implemented, when possible, to allow respondents to progress through the survey without

exposure to follow up questions that were not applicable. For example, a participant who indicated they had no previous experience as a university president in question number two would not be required to view question number three in which respondents are asked to specify institution and duration of previous presidential roles.

The survey instrument contained five categories of questions with each type associated to at least one specific research question. Measuring Cultural Intelligence, the Likert-scale questions of the CQS investigated the frequency with which presidents exhibit specific behaviors. Similarly, the MLQ-5x also used Likert-scale questions to determine presidential reporting of the frequency of behaviors reflective of Transformational Leadership. Additional questions developed by the researcher delved into personal and professional histories and challenges faced by the presidents. These questions were especially helpful in drawing conclusions and comparisons in their experiences managing cultural and accreditation expectations. The final question was included to assist the researcher in identifying potential areas for investigation in future research projects regarding U.S.-accredited universities located in foreign countries. Table 5 presents the distribution of each category of question, as well as the source of the questions and select sample items included in the instrument.

Table 5

Questionnaire Survey Items

Categorical Name or Construct	Number of Survey Items	Sample items	Source
Demographic Information	16	Number of years as president number of countries lived in, number of languages spoken, highest degree earned, etc.	Researcher
Cultural Intelligence	16	I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interaction, I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures, etc.	Cultural Intelligence Scale
Presidential Challenge	17	Fundraising, Budget, Board Relations, Accreditation, Crisis Management	Researcher
Presidential Preparedness	17	Fundraising, Budget, Board Relations, Accreditation, Crisis Management	Researcher
Transformational Leadership	20	I articulate a compelling vision of the future, I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission, etc.	Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X - Short Form

Evaluation of Scales and Indexes

Transformational Leadership. Recognized as those that “provide vision, instill pride, inspire confidence and trust, express important goals in simple ways, Transformational leaders promote intelligence, and treat everyone individually (Fisher & Koch, 1996, p. 25). The extant literature indicates increasing evidence supporting the effectiveness and universal utility of Transformational Leadership. As such, Transformational Leadership has been lauded as the most effective and appropriate approach in the environs of higher education (Kezar & Eckel, 2008). It is worth noting that this forward-thinking manner of leadership directly relates to the process of accreditation. WASC, as one example, articulates the necessity for institutional

leadership to “consider the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future”(“Handbook of Accreditation Revised,” 2013). The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) also equates adherence to accreditation as the result of the “expression of confidence in an institution’s mission and goals, its performance, and its resources” (“Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation,” 2015).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x – Short Form (MLQ) has been used extensively in research of leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Measuring four constructs of Transformational Leadership—idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, the MLQ has been referred to as the best and most widely used assessment of this leadership approach (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). The instrument used in this dissertation research contains the 45 questions of the MLQ-5x to investigate the levels of Transformational Leadership practiced by the presidents of foreign universities bearing U.S. accreditation. Measured with the use of a multi item scale, the questions in this study require each presidential participant to report the frequency with which they demonstrate behaviors of Transformational Leadership. When considered in summation, higher frequencies of these behaviors indicate higher levels of Transformational Leadership demonstrated.

Used with permission of the authors, the 45 items of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, MLQ-5x, explore the level of Transformational Leadership in the approach of the presidents according to the four facets identified in Transformational Leadership theory. These items will later ground the questions used during qualitative interviews and focus groups. Operationalization of the facets of Transformational Leadership is reflected in the estimation of the frequency of suggested behaviors along a scale ranging from never (0) to nearly always (4).

Cited as the most widely used instrument in measuring Transformational Leadership, the MLQ-5x has been found to demonstrate generally high reliability: a previous study determined strong Cronbach's alpha values at .86 (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Table 6 defines the specific dimensions of Transformational Leadership investigated by the survey instrument (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Table 6

Elements of Transformational Leadership and Operational Definitions (Bass & Riggio, 2006)

Element	Operational Definition
Idealized Influence (attitudes and behaviors)	An admired, respected, trusted leader who serves as a role model for followers
Inspirational Motivation	A leader who challenges followers and instills a strong sense of commitment and pride in the organization
Intellectual Stimulation	A leader who encourages innovation and creativity in followers, encouraging followers to view problems differently
Individual Consideration	An acceptance by a leader of individual needs typified by personalized interactions and mentoring relationships

Cultural Intelligence. In the survey instrument used for the current study, the twenty items in question six seek to measure the level of Cultural Intelligence reported by the presidential participant. The Cultural Intelligence Scale, or CQS, is a measure widely used in the corporate and non-profit sectors. Consent to utilize the CQS in this study was obtained from the proprietary organization. Specifically, for the purpose of this construct, Cultural Intelligence is defined as “a person’s capability to adapt to new cultural contexts” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 59). Because these presidents operate in a number of different cultural contexts, this definition is appropriate in the assessment of their Cultural Intelligence. Operationalization of the construct comes in the determination of a level agreement associated with hypothetical situations with cross-cultural contexts (Bowen & Inkpen, 2009).

In the extant literature, the concept of Cultural Intelligence lacks a clear definition (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Gelfand et al., 2008). There is, however, significant agreement regarding the notion that a Cultural Intelligence is a valuable resource for leaders required to navigate change across multiple contexts on local and international levels (Deng & Gibson, 2008; Earley, 2002; Earley & Ang, 2003; Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007; Livermore, 2010, 2011; Lovvorn & Chen, 2011; Ng et al., 2009a; Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2012). The measure of Cultural Intelligence is the summation of four dimensions (see Figure 2).

Metacognitive	Cognitive	Motivational	Knowledge
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • Awareness • Checking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture - General • Culture - Specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intrinsic Interests • Extrinsic Interests • Self-efficacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal Behavior • Non-Verbal Behavior • Speech

Figure 2. Dimensions and Sub-Dimensions of Cultural Intelligence (Van Dyne et al., 2012)

The Cultural Intelligence Scale. Developed according to concepts found in the literature regarding intelligence and intercultural competency, the Cultural Intelligence Scale, or CQS, first appeared in 2007 (Livermore, 2011; Van Dyne et al., 2008). Today, the CQS is recognized as the most widely used instrument in the study of Cultural Intelligence (Gelfand et al., 2008). Using 20 questions, the CQS measures Cultural Intelligence across four dimensions—Metacognitive, Cognitive, Motivational, and Behavioral (Ang et al., 2007; Eisenberg et al., 2013; Livermore, 2010; Wood & St. Peters, 2014). These four robust dimensions derived from rigorous pilot testing with undergraduate business students, university faculty, and corporate executives (Van Dyne et al., 2008). With wide practical implications, the CQS has contributed to corporate training sessions, business courses, and other self-awareness programs designed to support individuals with international leadership assignments (Van Dyne et al., 2008).

Much of the literature regarding the CQS cite its extensive validation and broad research use to support claims of generalizability across multiple samples, global populations, and cultural variations (Livermore, 2011; Van Dyne et al., 2012). The Cultural Intelligence Scale is said to have excellent reliability ratings exceeding 0.70, as well as predictive validity (Livermore, 2011). According to the proprietary website for the CQS, Cronbach's Alpha values for the instrument are strong, where "reliabilities of the four-factors and sub-dimensions exceed the standard cutoff of .70" ("Academic Construct Validity," 2016).

A major criticism of the CQS comes in its self-reporting design. Here, researchers have suggested that "the use of the scale assumes that individuals can accurately assess their own CQ levels, yet there is abundant evidence that people are overconfident in assessment of their own skills and abilities" (Gelfand et al., 2008, p. 384)

To determine total Cultural Intelligence, the scores from each dimension are averaged together (Livermore, 2010). A higher score corresponds to a higher level of competence in adapting across cultures (Earley, Ang, & Tan, 2006). According to Earley (2002), high levels of Cultural Intelligence reflect higher personal efficacy in engaging others and afford an individual with a greater likelihood in succeeding in multicultural environments. Kim and Van Dyne (2012) build on this by asserting that Cultural Intelligence predicates international leadership success.

Independent Continuous Variables

Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence. Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence is a constructed variable resulting from the factor analysis. It captures accreditation criteria relating to realistic and appropriate institutional mission and goals (e.g. Middle States Commission, 2015; WASC, 2013) that align with a subset of the idealized influence construct of

transformational leadership (items 14 and 34). The Cronbach's alpha for these two items was .749, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations).

Accreditation-Related Inspirational Motivation. Accreditation-Related Inspirational Motivation is a constructed variable resulting from the factor analysis. It captures accreditation criteria relating to institutional commitment to integrity, planning, and improvement (e.g. Middle States Commission, 2015; WASC, 2013) that align with a subset of the idealized influence construct of transformational leadership (items 9, 23, 26, and 36). The Cronbach's alpha for these four items was .853, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations).

Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation. Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation is a constructed variable resulting from the factor analysis. It captures accreditation criteria relating to an institution's regard for differing perspectives and diversity of thought (e.g. Middle States Commission, 2015; WASC Diversity Policy, 2013) that align with a subset of the idealized influence construct of transformational leadership (items 2 and 8). The Cronbach's alpha for these two items was .799, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations).

Dependent Continuous Variables

Transformational Leadership. The Transformational Leadership variable used in this study is the mean of the ratings from the twenty items used to measure the four transformational leadership constructs (8 idealized influence, 4 inspirational motivation, 4 intellectual stimulation,

and 4 individual consideration) defined by the creators of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x with a slight modification to the scale. The Cronbach's alpha for these twenty items was .886, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations).

A scale of 1 to 5 was used to indicate frequency levels ranging from never (1) to frequently, if not always (5) as opposed to the original 0 to 4 scale. Respondents were not privy to the scale values when they completed the questionnaire.

The *Cultural Intelligence* variable used in this study is the mean of the ratings from the twenty items used to measure the four dimensions of cultural intelligence (four metacognitive, 6 cognitive, 5 motivational and 5 knowledge). The Cronbach's alpha for these twenty items was .984, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations). A seven-point Likert scale was used that ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Respondents were not privy to the scale values when they completed the questionnaire.

Presidential Challenge. The Presidential Challenge variable used in this study is a constructed variable resulting from the factor analysis (items 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 16, 17). It captures accreditation criteria relating to specific responsibilities of the president in the areas of community relations, student life, strategic planning, or budget management (e.g. Middle States Commission, 2015; WASC, 2013). The Cronbach's alpha for these seven items was .917, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations).

A four point Likert scale was used: not at all challenging (4), somewhat challenging (3), noticeably challenging (2), and extremely challenging (1). In using this scale, the researcher defines a challenge as being a difficult task for the president, therefore warranting a lower score if a facet is extremely challenging and a higher score if a facet is not at all challenging. Respondents were not privy to the scale values when they completed the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics. The data for the first and second research questions, as well as the supporting research questions, were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Specifically, each research question and the associated survey questions were analyzed to determine mean scores, median values, and frequencies of distribution for each measure, Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence.

Factor analysis. Factor analysis was used in this study to reduce the number of variables identified as accreditation attributes. I used SPSS to run an exploratory factor analysis on eight Transformational Leadership survey items that I identified as closely aligning with accreditation criteria. A principal component analysis was the extraction method used, along with a Varimax rotation method with Kaiser Normalization. Three constructs were present (i.e. eigenvalues greater than one) and I defined them based on the transformational leadership constructs to which they were subsets. A similar process was followed on the seventeen presidential challenge items, resulting in the principle-constructed variable of Presidential Challenge Accreditation.

Linear Regression Analysis

A linear regression model was used to estimate the coefficients of a linear equation for an independent variable (Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence, Accreditation-Related

Inspirational Motivation, or Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation) predicting the value of a dependent variable (transformational leadership, presidential challenge level, or cultural intelligence). To satisfy regress analysis requirements (Triola, 2010), I used SPSS to generate scatter plots of the standardized values of the random sample paired data points to determine if there were any outliers and then to verify that the points approximated a straight-line pattern.

Procedure

Employing a web-based survey instrument was advantageous for this research since it facilitated the data collection process quickly and at low cost (Dillman et al., 2014). To emphasize the value of the study, and to appeal to the presidential cohort, an initial email was drafted and distributed from the president of the researcher's university. This email introduced the study to the population, and outlined the proceeding research and process. Through Qualtrics Survey Software, participants then received an email from the researcher explaining the nature of the research, as well as directions to participate in the current study. Sent in late November 2016 to accommodate the passing of the general spike in activity traditionally accompanying the beginning of the academic year, participants were encouraged to complete the survey before January 18, 2017. Dillman et al., (2014) also recommend a well-timed email reminder as the survey closing date draws near to maximize response rate. Approximately ten days after the initial distribution, participants received personally addressed follow-up emails supplying the survey URL, thanking them for their participation, and reminding them of the upcoming deadline.

Because the population size ($N=44$) is quite small, the likelihood of over- or underrepresentation of any one demographic becomes a leading consideration. To minimize nonresponse bias, the researcher attempted to strengthen a sense of connection with the

participants, emphasizing the saliency of the research topic, and ensuring a minimal cost or time commitment involved to participate. The researcher attempted a holistic approach in designing an instrument and composing related email communication (Dillman et al., 2014). As part of the holistic approach, the use of the Qualtrics Survey Software and the University of San Diego formatting theme established a perception of a legitimate, trustworthy source, and technological accessibility across a variety of devices. Additionally, the use of multiple communication pieces emphasized the utility of the research for members of the higher education community in supporting and understanding the presidential role at foreign universities with institutional-level American accreditation.

Phase Two Data Collection and Analyses

The quantitative procedures outlined above should adequately address research questions 1 and 2. The second half of this explanatory sequential mixed methods design analyzed of qualitative data collected at two U.S.-accredited universities located in foreign countries to gain a more robust understanding of the manifestation of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence behaviors. The results from the initial quantitative survey administration informed the design of on-site interviews and focus group protocol to answer research questions 1a and 2a. In this collective case study, each university and its respective president participant was treated as an individual case embedded in a similar context (Glesne, 2006). The researcher attempted to collect unique perspectives, explore professional experiences, and gather the cultural values and practices of each participant and those of students, staff, and faculty who regularly interact with the president. Because the qualitative data collection was grounded in, and informed by the findings of the quantitative first phase, it was expected that the specific design would evolve during the course of the study.

Collective Case Study Design

The follow-up qualitative investigation of this study relied on a collective case study design. According to Yin (2009), the case study design is optimal in that it reveals contemporary phenomena “in depth and within its real life context, especially when these boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 18). The use of multiple presidents would identify contrasts and generalizations about the leadership approaches and strategies to maintain the role as executive leader within a similar context (Merriam, 2009). Glesne (2006) describes the collective case study as several cases that allow the researcher to “investigate a phenomenon, a population, or general condition” (p. 13). Since the study was intended to gather perceptions of the presidents’ decision-making, observed interactions, and descriptions of their leadership, a collective case study offered “insight and illuminate meanings” (Merriam, 2009, p. 51).

Participants

The follow-up qualitative phase develops a collective case study to describe strategies and perceptions of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence of presidents of universities located in foreign countries with U.S. accreditation. To protect the identity of the presidents and their respective institutions, pseudonyms are used in lieu of actual names. The American University of Western Europe (AUWE) and Foreign Country University (FCU) will serve as the case institutions. Each president reports to a board of trustees—comprised of attorneys, business professionals, and alumni—that is responsible for the overall policy direction of their respective university.

Participant selection. The university sites identified in this collective case study were determined using a purposeful sample strategy. First, both campuses have maintained accreditation for at least one complete accreditation cycle. Because the current research

attempted to compare and contrast findings, it was important to identify institutions sharing the same accreditation expectations. Each of the universities discussed maintains accreditation with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. In addition, because the study seeks to understand broad cultural differences in the perceptions and interactions with U.S. accreditation, diversity was sought in the demographics of each president participant—where one president identifies as a female U.S. citizen, the other identifies as a male with citizenship from the country in which the university is located. Finally, each campus is experiencing similar growth in its physical plant as well as in the number of student enrollment.

American University of Western Europe. The American University of Western Europe has maintained institutional accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) since 1973. AUWE obtained its most recent reaccreditation in 2015 (Middle States Commission on Higher Education Institutional Directory, 2016). With a current enrollment of 1,001 undergraduate students from over 108 nations and world regions, AUWE employs 129 full- and part-time faculty who represent 30 different countries (About AUWE Facts, 2016). According to the institutional website, AUWE compliments 26 undergraduate majors with 11 graduate programs.

Governed by a board of trustees with 24 members, the American University of Western Europe's president oversees six members of her cabinet (AUWE University Leadership, 2016). The six cabinet officers oversee traditional administrative functions including academic affairs, student affairs, communications, admissions, advancement, and finance. According to the institution's U.S. Tax Form 990 (2014), the most recent figures available, AUWE reports operational expenses equaling US\$32M—nearly US\$400,000.00 of which was presidential salary and compensation.

AUWE's president, who identifies as a United States citizen, has been a member of the AUWE community for more than a quarter century, and has served as its president since 2011. She received her terminal degree in Comparative Literature from an Ivy League university. She is a bit of a rarity among her executive peers in that of the 44 current presidents of U.S.-accredited institutions located internationally, only five are women.

Foreign Country University. Foreign Country University (FCU) is located in the historic center of the host country's capital city (Facts at A Glance, 2017). Like the American University of Western Europe, Foreign Country University is a liberal arts institution accredited by the MSCHE("Institution Directory," 2017). Having first received accreditation in 2003, FCU most recently renewed its accreditation in 2013 (Middle States Commission on Higher Education Institutional Directory, 2016). The university boasts an undergraduate enrollment of 1,000 students from over 70 countries (Facts at A Glance, 2016). Foreign Country University offers 13 undergraduate majors, taught by 100 faculty (Facts at A Glance, 2016).

Similar to AUWE, institutional governance at FCU begins with a board of trustees. The 28-member board appoints the president, who is charged with the task of managing the operations of the university (Board of Trustees, 2016). The president, a citizen of the country in which the university is located, has been the president of Foreign Country University since 2006, where he had been a member of the faculty and administration since 1990. According to the institution's U.S. Form 990 (2014), operational expenses for Foreign Country University were reported at just over US\$31M.

A review of institutional websites for the 44 current and candidate U.S.-accredited institutions of higher education located in foreign countries reveals the imbalance of gender in the presidency is far greater. Of these 44 presidents, only five (12%) are women, and even fewer

are persons of color. Whether due to national cultural values and practices, or a matter of second generation gender bias (Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013), the lack of diversity among presidents signals a generalizable and important issue for future investigation.

Semi-Structured Interviews

According to Merriam (2009), research interviews can be conducted using three variations of structure in their design. The three types of interviews discussed by Merriam—standardized, semistructured, and informal/unstructured—allow the researcher differing levels of flexibility in conducting the interview. The semistructured interview format suits this study for a number of reasons. Using this approach, interviews were guided with the use of several pre-determined open-ended questions, while allowing the researcher to respond to emerging situations, issues, and concepts (Merriam, 2009). In the event that respondents disclosed new information relevant to the purposes of this study, the researcher would then ask probing and clarifying questions to collect data that are more specific. Patton (2002) endorses the “interview guide” approach as one that allows a high degree of flexibility for the researcher to build conversation relative to emerging subjects, while keeping the focus on a predetermined subject. Interview guides consisting of initial questions are provided in Appendices D of this report. In addition to the university president at each research site, a minimum of four staff and four faculty were also interviewed for approximately 60 minutes. These staff and faculty contributors were selected based on their availability and willingness to participate in the research.

To accurately represent the presidents and university community members who participate in the study, interviews were audio recorded. When participant interviews had been completed—24 in all, the researcher transcribed each interview. Participant observation and

document analysis—to include reviews of university self-studies, institutional websites, and related documentation were also used to triangulate interview findings.

Focus Groups

As a qualitative research technique, a focus group is a group of participants assembled to provide perspective, observations, and insight based on experience with the subject of the research (Powell & Single, 1996). A key benefit of focus groups is “their explicit use of group interaction to produce data and insights that would be less accessible without the interaction found in a group” (Morgan, 1996, p. 2). Patton (2011) endorses the use of focus groups as an effective and efficient way to collect high quality data in a social setting where participants can contribute input against the context of others. While the number of questions and topics covered in a focus group may be limited, the focus group allow the researcher to gather the perspectives of a more individuals within finite time boundaries.

In order to investigate the observations and perceptions of leadership behavior in terms of Cultural Intelligence and Transformational Leadership, the researcher conducted one-hour long focus groups of students on the two separate campuses—the American University of Western Europe, and Foreign Country University. Recruitment of participants took place in advance of and during the site visits. A total of 15 participants were selected from a sample frame of students who are active in campus activities. While the small enrollment numbers of each campus afford students greater access to members of the faculty and administration, the expectation is that students who actively participate in campus programs and initiatives could provide more accurate insight into the leadership of the president. Finally, like the individual interviews for faculty and administrators, focus group conversations will follow a semi-

structured protocol to initiate conversation while allowing for emergent themes and topics (See Appendix B).

Document Analysis

In addition to the data collected from the reporting and perceptions of the members of each university's campus community, I reviewed various sources of documentation and investigated commonalities and supportive relevant information. Specifically, institutional websites of the American University of Western Europe and Foreign Country University, MSCHE and other regional accreditation standards manuals, and organization charts from each university were considered as valuable information in determining the values of the institutions and their leadership. In addition to providing context for each campus site, I used data from these documents to support the findings of the qualitative interviews.

Data Analysis

After visiting the research sites, an analysis of narrative approach was employed to compare and contrast the cases. The collected data was sorted, coded and analyzed (Glesne, 2006). Specifically, a thematic analysis of the collected information will begin with sorting information recorded from interview and focus group transcripts, notes and documents, then coding the data into pre-established and emergent categories.

Though it was anticipated that specific codes would emerge through multiple review processes of the data, an initial set of coding categories were derived from the stated research questions. To illustrate this point, the first research question— To what extent are Transformational Leadership approaches employed by the presidents of U.S.-accredited universities located abroad? —guided the initial coding to include dimensions of Transformational Leadership based on those defined by the Multifactor Leadership

Questionnaire: *charismatic influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration*. An analysis of these groups of data identified patterns, trends, similarities, and differences. As the analysis evolved, data coding expanded into additional categories as it was determined to *support* or *reject* a demonstration of each dimension. Further coding also tracked findings according to the dimensions of Cultural Intelligence—*metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral*. As with the data codes associated with Transformational Leadership, CQ codes were also expanded to identify data according to a *support* or *reject* premise. These sixteen codes organized the data according to the dimensions of each construct. I used a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to arrange and store the data. Glesne (2006) describes this sociological process as the “organization of what was seen, heard, and read to make sense of what was learned” (p. 147).

Trends and patterns extracted from the categories and themes used in this qualitative study were expected to provide sufficient data to adequately answer each of the research questions of this study. Triangulation of the collected information allowed the researcher to proscribe appropriate, generalizable meaning to the findings across the cases used in this study. Specifically, interview participants were invited to respond to previously provided information. As an example, participants at Foreign Country University were asked, “Would it surprise you to hear that another person described the president as a good negotiator?” When possible, interview results were also triangulated with university documents, including web pages regarding university mission, values, and other institutional facts. The emergent results from the qualitative phase of this dissertation study were then determined to reflect or deviate from, as well as further elaborate the more general findings of the initial quantitative data collection (Ivankova et al., 2006).

Ethical Research Assurance

In accordance with University of San Diego procedures, approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained. This approval ensures the ethical treatment of all subjects in the study, and recognizes minimal or no potential for harm resulting from research participation. In accordance with the ethical standards established by the IRB, each participant received advanced written notification regarding the volunteer nature of their participation, as well as the opportunity to withdraw from the study at any time.

Role of the Researcher

The values and experiences of the researcher may prove relevant to the process and content of this study. Patton (2002) states that “the perspective that the researcher brings...is part of the context for the findings” (p. 64). Additionally, a sense of reflexivity in which the researcher adopts a reflective, self-aware and ownership of perspective to maintain a conscious attentiveness to the lens through which the research is conducted (Patton, 2002). This section will attempt to begin the process of reflexivity, and explain the evolution of the research interest.

After starting a career in Higher Education, I had accepted an administrative position on Semester at Sea— a transnational experience for undergraduate students during which a circumnavigation of the world stops at 13 different countries. My first international experience, Semester at Sea ignited a curiosity and a passion for exploring the many different cultures of the world. Since completing my voyage, my career has focused on facilitating discoveries of the world, and helping students to see their own world through different cultural and culturally sensitive lenses.

The shift in my career included a five-year professional stint at Franklin University Switzerland—one of the 44 institutions included in the population of this study. For five years,

my position included establishing opportunity for students to connect with members of the university—faculty, staff, other students, and members of the surrounding community. This was made even more challenging with the various different cultural values and practices intermingling at every level of contact. Hosting a full time enrollment of less than 400, the small but intensely culturally diverse student population, combined with a faculty and staff population featuring dozens of cultural representations, and a surrounding community that was decidedly Swiss-Italian, created the opportunity for interesting exchanges and interactions. Often, rather than the many layers of culture coexisting with each other, it would seem that these cultures were existing coincidentally of one another. During many situations, the programs and policies of the university underwent several iterations to accommodate the friction between multiple cultures at play.

I began to look at the situation from a leadership perspective, curious how the leadership of the university might (or could) consistently manage a balance of cultural sensitivity with a distinct campus identity. Knowing that the leadership of the institution has an opportunity to guide the interactions of and within the organization, I grew interested in exploring the resources and strategies campus presidents could employ to navigate questions of culture. My subsequent enrollment in a Leadership Studies program allowed me to apply theory and concepts to the context of this cultural and leadership inquiry.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Demographics & Participant Sample

From the 44 presidents contacted for participation in this research, fifteen did not respond to multiple invitations, two people declined to participate, and five began the survey but did not complete it. These cases were omitted from analysis, yielding a 50% response rate and a sample of 22 participants. Reflective of the high percentage (89%) of male presidents at U.S. accredited institutions abroad, 21 (95%) of the 22 respondents were male. The mean length of the presidents' current terms was five years and ten months. The range of experience included newly appointed presidents and a maximum term reported at 14 years. It is also worth noting that since the administration of the survey, two presidents have stepped down from their respective post.

Regarding accreditation affiliations, the sample participation reflects the distribution of representation across the six regional agencies with internationally located universities in their respective member directory. Table 7 displays the distribution of accredited institutions by regional accreditation affiliation in the total population of internationally located U.S. accredited universities and those included in the participant sample

Table 7

Responses: Distribution of U.S. Accredited Institutions Abroad by Regional Accreditation Affiliation

Regional Accreditation Affiliation	Population Institutions		Sample Institutions	
	N	Percent	n	Percent
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	18	41	10	45
New England Association of Schools and Colleges	12	27	7	32
Western Association of Schools and Colleges	5	11	2	9
Southern Association of Schools and Colleges	6	14	2	9
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	3	7	1	4
Higher Learning Commission	0	0	0	0

Education and Presidential Experience

The presidents represented in the participation sample brought with them a variety of education and work histories. While a strong majority of the presidents had no prior experience leading an institution, three (14%) of the participants reported having served as a university president prior to their current post. Each of these participants had served as the chief executive officer at a different institution for five years or more. Their academic areas of specialization included political science (9%), higher education (9%), engineering (14%), ocean sciences (4%), international relations (4%), applied mathematics (4%), human resources (4%), law (9%), business and marketing (14%), organizational development (4%), linguistics (4%), and anthropology (4%). One president (4%) reported having a “non-academic” background and three (14%) did not report an area of academic specialization. Regardless of their reported focus or specialization in an academic discipline, participants reported their level of education. Table 8 shows the highest degree earned by the participants in this sample.

Table 8

Highest Degree Earned by Sample Participants

Degree	N	Percent
Doctorate	11	50
Masters	5	23
Bachelors	1	4
Other/Professional Certificate	2	9
No Response	3	14

Cultural Attributes

The presidential survey also collected data regarding the cultural attributes of the presidents. Nineteen (86%) reported their country of citizenship with eight (42%) indicating they were citizens of the host country to their institutions, four (21%) had reported United States citizenship, and the remaining seven (37%) held citizenship from other countries or maintained multiple citizenships.

The language skills of the presidents were also explored in the survey. As might be expected, these presidents are a multilingual group. The mean number (with standard deviation in parenthesis) of languages spoken was 2.63 (1.19), with a median of three languages. While most (73%) reported a native or high level of proficiency with the language of the institutional host culture, one president (4%) indicated no ability to speak the local language.

Previous studies have found an individual's level of Cultural Intelligence to be strengthened with international experiences such as living abroad (Tarique & Takeuchi, 2008). These presidents reported that they had had a significant amount of experience living in multiple countries leading up to their current position. The mean number of different countries in which these presidents reported living was 2.95 with a median of three.

Participant Profile

From the data presented above, the profile of a typical participant has been developed. The typical survey participant is a male university president who speaks English and two other languages and has lived in three different countries. This typical president's current position is their first presidential role and they have served as president for nearly six years.

Accreditation-Related Regression Analyses

To determine the extent to which regional accreditation standards promote Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence, linear regression analyses were conducted where language articulated from accreditation requirements as a framework for the creation of independent variables. These variables the regression analysis yielded results indicating positive linear relationships with specific dimensions of the two constructs that were statistically significant. The following section details the statistical analyses performed and relevant findings.

Findings

Factor Analysis. A review of the literature suggests accreditation criteria alignment with transformational leadership qualities. Therefore, I reviewed all of the transformational leadership (TL) qualities and identified eight survey items that closely aligned with accreditation criteria (i.e. items relating to goals, vision, mission, purpose, re-examining critical assumptions, seeking differing perspectives, and considering the moral and ethical consequences of decisions). I conferred with an accreditation expert on my campus to validate the list. I then used SPSS to run an exploratory factor analysis on these eight items (TL items 2, 8, 9, 14, 23, 26, 34, and 36) to identify the constructs that were present. A principal component analysis was the extraction method used, along with a Varimax rotation method with Kaiser Normalization.

Three constructs were present (i.e. eigenvalues greater than one) and I defined them based on the transformational leadership constructs to which they were subsets. I labeled construct one as “Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence” (TL items 14 & 34), construct two as “Accreditation-Related Inspirational Motivation” (TL items 9, 23, 26, 36), and construct three as “Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation” (TL items 2, 8). These three constructed variables serve as independent variables in the analysis of the survey data. A similar process was followed on the seventeen presidential challenge items, resulting in the principle-constructed variable of “Presidential Challenge Accreditation” (Challenge items 2, 4, 7, 10, 15, 16, 17). These five constructed variables relate U.S. accreditation requirements to the concepts of Transformational Leadership and specific challenges of the presidential role.

Regression Analysis: Accreditation-related Idealized Influence and Transformational Leadership. The regression analysis revealed a strong positive statistically significant linear relationship between the independent variable “Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence” and the dependent variable “Transformational Leadership”, $R^2 = .394$, $r = .628$, $F = 11.05$, $t = 3.323$, $p = .005$, 95% CI [.229, 1.026]. For each standard unit increase in Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence, there is a .628 standard unit increase in overall Transformational Leadership. As presidents strive to maintain accreditation requirements regarding realistic and appropriate institutional mission and goals, they also are increasing their exhibition of Transformational Leadership strategies relative to the dimension of Idealized Influence.

Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Idealized Influence and presidential challenge. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant linear relationship between the independent variable “Accreditation-Related Idealized Influence” and the dependent

variable “Presidential Challenge” $R^2 = .061$, $r = -.247$, $F = 1.109$, $t = -1.053$, $p = .307$, 95% CI $[-.743, .248]$.

Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Inspirational Motivation and Transformational Leadership. The regression analysis revealed a strong positive statistically significant linear relationship between the independent variable “Accreditation-Related Inspirational Motivation” and the dependent variable “Transformational Leadership”, $R^2 = .374$, $r = .612$, $F = 10.175$, $t = 3.190$, $p = .005$, 95% CI $[.207, 1.017]$. For each standard unit increase in Accreditation-Related Inspirational Motivation, there is a .612 standard unit increase in overall Transformational Leadership. As presidents strive to maintain accreditation requirements regarding institutional commitment to integrity, planning and improvement, they also are increasing their exhibition of Transformational Leadership strategies relative to the dimension of Inspirational Motivation.

Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Inspirational Motivation and presidential challenge. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant linear relationship between the independent variable “Accreditation-Related Inspirational Motivation” and the dependent variable “Presidential Challenge”, $R^2 = .374$, $r = .040$, $F = .027$, $t = -.164$, $p = .872$, 95% CI $[-.551, .472]$.

Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Intellectual Stimulation and Cultural Intelligence. The regression analysis revealed no statistically significant linear relationship between the independent variable “Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation” and the dependent variable “Cultural Intelligence.” $R^2 = .057$, $r = -.238$, $F = 1.019$, $t = -1.009$, $p = .327$, 95% CI $[-.735, .259]$.

Regression analysis: Accreditation-related Intellectual Stimulation and presidential challenge. The regression analysis revealed a strong positive statistically significant linear relationship between the independent variable “Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation” and the dependent variable “Presidential Challenge”, $R^2 = .254$, $r = .504$, $F = 5.785$, $t = 2.405$, $p = .028$, 95% CI [.062, .946]. For each standard unit increase in Accreditation-Related Intellectual Stimulation, there is a .504 standard unit increase in Presidential Challenge level. As presidents strive to maintain accreditation requirements relative to an institution’s regard for diversity of thought and differing perspectives, they also are increasing their ability to address the challenges specific to the presidential position.

These findings are important because they provide evidence of the linear relationship between U.S. accreditation standards and an overall Transformational Leadership approach by university presidents and specific presidential challenges. As presidents’ strive to maintain accreditation requirements, they also increase their exhibition of Transformational Leadership and their ability to address challenges specific to their executive role.

Phase Two: Qualitative Data Collection

It is helpful to first provide context of each of the universities visited as part of the qualitative phase of this research study. As noted earlier, each university maintains accreditation recognition from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Student enrollment figures are just over 1000 students on each campus. There are, though, certain elements of the university that are unique to each campus. A brief profile of each campus may contribute to a more accurate and complete view of the universities included in the current study.

The American University of Western Europe

The campus. The American University of Western Europe (AUWE) is an American liberal arts institution set among the boutiques and foreign embassy buildings of a trendy neighborhood in a European capital city. As there is no contained campus grounds, AUWE currently occupies a number of buildings, each located a few blocks from the next. Aside from the traditional street number markers near the front entrances, there are no signs or banners identifying the buildings or indicating the presence of the university at all. In fact, the unassuming appearance of the campus administration building hides the activity inside as it blends with the neighboring buildings.

Inside the multi-story main administrative building, a reception desk serves as the first point of contact for all who enter. The minimally decorated lobby features racks of university publications and informational materials. In this building, the president's office is located among a number of other campus departments including campus marketing, various deans' offices and conference rooms.

The president's office is a large and welcoming space. Her desk, hidden by books and papers, is flanked by large wall unit bookshelves. The president is quick to offer a cup of tea to visitors and extends an invitation to sit at a meeting table or in the more comfortable sofa and sitting area. Large windows look out over historic buildings of the neighborhood outside.

At another building five minutes away, a turnstile gate moderates the flow of entry past the security guards to the front door. A large, open lobby leads visitors past the fashionable and popular campus café, where students enjoy American style burgers and coffee drinks, to the guest registration desk and central stairwell winding its way to multiple floors of classrooms and faculty offices. Generally, faculty will share office space with colleagues in their academic

department. Much like the interior of campus buildings found at most stateside universities, posters publicizing everything from intramural sports to social justice fundraisers and internship opportunities are plastered on bulletin boards throughout the hallways and common areas.

The president. AUWE's president is an energetic American woman who has been with the university for over 25 years. Her ascent to the role of president began as a faculty member in the literature department, then progressively climbing to a deanship, then eventually provost and president. She is known to be very well spoken in English as well as the language of the host country. Extremely personable and charismatic, the president is proud share personal stories about the achievements about her children, or about the university. As the president and someone who has spent a lifetime as part of the university community, many people recognize her as one of AUWE's most effective and enthusiastic ambassadors. This personable extends beyond her role as a host to visitors to her office. The staff at AUWE lauds the president for writing letters to members of the university community each year in addition to monthly letters to students' parents.

AUWE's president is also known for frequently engaging with the students. One student from the Republic of Georgia told of how the president interacts with students in an unassuming way. "To be honest, I didn't even really know that (she) was the president for a while... because I would see her everywhere." Her enthusiasm for the student experience and her commitment to the success of the university are significant reasons why she enjoys a positive relationship with the institution's board of trustees.

This president is an ardent advocate of social justice and gender equality, and recently facilitated a student program to empower women on campus. Members of the Student Government Association (SGA) joked that the university president was excited that the SGA

executive board was female. She is also outspoken about student initiatives to assist local refugee families and works closely with a student organization whose aim is to raise awareness and support for refugees.

At AUWE, there is much agreement that it would be difficult to imagine the university without this president. Deeply and personally committed to the university, she proclaims being the university's president as an "act of love." She is so committed, in fact, that a number of staff and faculty had recently approached her, requesting that she slow work less and delegate more for the sake of self-care. These same faculty and staff noted that members of the institution's board of trustees also expressed concern for the president's sustained work-life balance, commenting on the workload the president assumes for herself.

Foreign Country University

The campus. Similar to the American University of Western Europe, Foreign Country University lacks a contained campus with defined boundaries. Instead, a number of buildings in close proximity serve as the university "campus." In addition to the president's office, the main building, a former abbey, houses classrooms, faculty and administrative offices, a computer lab, and a number of student gathering spaces. A few blocks away, a student residence houses over 200 students and a small but well-equipped fitness room. Approximately half a kilometer in the opposite direction, another leased property houses more administrative offices, classrooms, and the campus dining hall. The dining hall is very typically American with a coffee bar and cafeteria-style service featuring pizza, salad, and a daily menu featuring hot entrees and desserts.

The president's office at FCU is minimally decorated and reflects a traditional working space with large bookshelves, a meeting table, and the president has oversized desk. The office

is centrally located in the main building, and many faculty and staff noted the open door policy maintained by the executive.

The president. Very much a product of his culture, the president identifies as a native of the host country. More specifically, the president hails from the region of the country in which the university is located. His local identification affords him a familiarity and credibility with local officials, this familiarity also translated to a perception of increased collegiality with faculty from the region surrounding the university. One faculty asserted that “those who are (from the region), and speak (local) slang, get along with him much better. They have more of a relationship with him. Whereas, since I am not part of that, I feel like my relationship with him is more formal.”

Having received a terminal degree at a prestigious university in the United States, this president, too, is known for his communication skills. Those who work closest to him recognize him as charismatic and “a fantastic writer in both languages, and... very eloquent.” His relationship-oriented manner is also very reflective of his culture, and affords him a level of flexibility in managing personnel decisions. This president views interactions with the individual as more important than interpretation of policy. His Chief of Staff shared that he “doesn't like to have things written down on paper, because once it's written down, it is not flexible anymore.”

The academic dean. While the focus of the current study is on presidential leadership, it is important to introduce the role and influence of the academic dean on the campus of Foreign Country University. Acting as the chief academic officer of the university, the academic dean is a key element of the president's leadership scheme, and was mentioned in nearly every interview conversation with faculty. While the president has a productive and professional relationship

with the dean, numerous faculty disclosed “difficulties with the relationship between the dean and the faculty that caused problems over the last few years.”

A number of faculty and staff expressed dissatisfaction with the level to which the president relied on the dean. One staff member suggested, “She does a lot more for him than she should. She is all over the place. She's micromanaging a lot.” Faculty also echoed this sentiment. One professor commented, “when it comes to academics, he, I think, he got a little too codependent with the dean and let the dean run the show.” During a recent situation involving the promotion of a number of faculty members, the president was seen as letting “the dean do whatever she wanted without checking in on what was actually going on, and the faculty got really angry. They were upset about what was going on between the dean and the faculty.”

The academic dean, who identifies as an American woman, was characterized as dramatically less charismatic than the president, and far more rigid in her interpretation and enforcement of university policy. One faculty suggested the tensions are rooted in gender differences. The female professor noted referred to a time when “there was a very different reaction to this person (the academic dean), who works harder than anyone else for the University, being a woman... but when the Dean made the announcement it was not only open to debate, it was also open to a kind of nasty criticism.

Current Campus Issues

The core of this research highlights the intersection of cultures and the challenges that may result. It is in overcoming these challenges when leadership emerges. Each of the campuses visited during the qualitative data collection stage of research indicated the presence of

a current number of institutional challenges. Most prominent were matters of safety and security, human resources, and growth in student enrollment and university physical plant.

Labor Laws. Each campus struggles with maintaining a balance between the U.S. work ethic and foreign labor laws. One campus, with a combined staff and faculty of approximately 300 shared the presence of five different labor union groups. A result of national labor regulations at each site, the number of part-time adjunct faculty grossly overshadowed the number of full-time faculty. However, while part-time faculty made up a strong majority of the faculty ranks, they were less likely to attend and participate in faculty senate and other campus-working committees.

According to the faculty and staff at Foreign Country University, the tax structures for non-resident employees require federal withholdings of as much as 35%. One long-time staff member described the law as “agonizing.” The high tax rates and low adjunct salaries combine to make attracting and retaining qualified faculty one of the most salient institutional issues. To help assist faculty in navigating the tax regulations, the president created a financial legal assistance office on campus. Employees who have taken advantage of the assistance program describe it as friendly, wise, and professional.

Growth and Expansion. Current enrollment figures, academic programs, and physical space of each campus, though reflective of much growth in recent years, have been targeted as key areas in which these universities hope to increase. Both of the universities included in this research had articulated an institutional goal of increasing student enrollment figures by as many as 300 students.

In recent years, each institution forged partnerships with stateside institutions to host overflow students from the stateside institutions’ incoming class. These students enroll in and

attend courses at the foreign campus. Then, following a successful completion of the first year, those students would then transition to the stateside university with all of their academic credits intact. This collaboration allows the foreign institution to maintain heightened student numbers and revenue on a yearly basis.

While the visiting students may ensure anticipated levels of student tuition revenue, this arrangement was often cited as having noticeable implications on the campus ethos. The visiting students were repeatedly identified as less academically focused, less involved in campus activities, and less likely to be loyal alumni of the foreign institution. Many of the degree-seeking students at each institution indicated frustration with the ways this created a second—and sometimes contradictory—dimension to the student culture.

To further facilitate growth in the student population, each campus shared preparations for new academic programs. At the American University of Western Europe, the introduction of a digital humanities program was discussed, and Foreign Country University shared details of a graduate-level program in Art History.

Increases in the number of students present on campus also creates the need for expanded facilities. Both institutions were working with external agencies and local governments to add buildings to their campus footprint. The American University of Western Europe has plans to open a new student center before the start of the next academic year. Adding the new building and continued efforts to improve the campus infrastructure were viewed by a member of the faculty as positively contributing to a sense of pride among members of the university community.

Similarly, FCU is in the final stages of acquiring two new facilities. This growth initiative includes the purchase of one building to house administrative offices, and the long-term

lease of a multi-story building to will add multiple classrooms, faculty offices, and student residential space. An executive administrator at FCU predicted the acquisition of new buildings would position the university favorably for the next president in continuing to grow student enrollment. Finally, the notion of expansion was cited multiple times on each campus as a major component of the “legacy” of each of the university presidents.

Safety and Security Concerns. With international incidents of terrorism attacks happening across the globe in recent months, student security is a very salient issue for both of the campuses visited. Potential threats to the safety and security of the students could have significant implications on student enrollment and the universities’ ability to attract prospective students. Contracted security guards stand watch outside of the entrance to each campus facility, checking the identifications of every visitor and campus community member 24 hours each day. Guests to the campuses must also produce a photo ID and register with the security team.

At Foreign Country University, one staff member shared details of a safety initiative undertaken by the university because of a decision that appeared to be influenced largely by American cultural practices. The installation of sprinklers and fire prevention systems, though not required by host community law, was included in a recent renovation of a student residential facility. A student affairs staff member suggested the upper-level decision to install sprinklers was made, not only “for safety reasons, but for cultural reasons and legal reasons in America, where you are required to have them.”

Transformational Leadership

Measured across five dimensions, Transformational Leadership is a process that motivates followers to achieve beyond their own self-interests, and generates awareness for the mission, values, and purpose of the organization (Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997;

Northouse, 2013). To answer Research Question 1-- *To what extent are Transformational Leadership approaches employed by the presidents of U.S.-accredited universities located abroad*, the following sections will detail the cases of Foreign Country University and the American University of Western Europe. Following a brief overview of the collected results from the self-reporting presidential survey, this collective case study of AUWE and FCU will be considered in a process where each case is presented individually, followed by a cross-case analysis to highlight emergent commonalities, patterns, and contrasts in the findings (Yin, 2009).

Survey Results

As part of the initial quantitative measure, the MLQ-5x, measures the extent to which an individual demonstrates Transformational Leadership behaviors. With a 5-point (1= Never to 5=Frequently, If Not Always) Likert-type scale, presidents reported the frequency with which they display behaviors of Transformational Leadership. Table 9 displays the results of the self-reporting behaviors of Transformational Leadership.

Table 9

Transformational Behaviors by Dimension as Reported in the MLQ-5x

Dimension	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Idealized Influence	19	3.63	4.88	4.28	.38
Inspirational Motivation	19	3.25	5.00	4.38	.62
Intellectual Stimulation	19	3.00	5.00	4.04	.66
Individual Consideration	19	2.33	5.00	3.85	.66
Total TL	19	3.57	4.81	4.17	.40

Overall, the presidents report a strong tendency toward behaviors of Transformational Leadership. With low variation among responses, there is general agreement regarding most of the individual dimensions of the leadership construct. As reported in the presidential survey, Inspirational Motivation was identified as the most prevalent dimension. Operationalized in

items focusing on the presidents' optimism for the future and confidence in the organizations' ability to achieve articulated goals, this dimension speaks to the ability of each participant to generate a sense of pride among the members of the university community. Conversely, these executive leaders identified a propensity for Individual Consideration with a mean score that corresponds to behaviors that occur less than "most of the time."

Following the preliminary analysis of the quantitative results, qualitative interviews were conducted to further investigate the manifestation and observable behaviors of Transformational Leadership in presidents of two different U.S.-accredited universities located internationally. Here, the researcher attempted to find evidence of Transformational Leadership behaviors through the perceptions and perspective of various university community members.

American University of Western Europe

The Transformational Leadership demonstrated by the president of AUWE very much reflects the results of the quantitative presidential survey. Overall, the staff, faculty, and students view her as a charismatic and enthusiastic leader who engages the members of the university community in decision-making processes. She is well liked and well respected in her university, and has a productive relationship with the board of trustees. The members of the campus community recognize her achievements and contributions to the university, and admit the institution will certainly be challenged in finding a successor.

Idealized Influence. Establishing an identity as a role model (Crawford et al., 2003), and instilling a sense of confidence and sense of mission in the community serve as the initial steps in moving followers from self-serving behaviors to a collective effort supporting the common good (Klein, 2016). Overall, the presidents who participated in the initial survey of this research report strong frequencies of this behavior. Qualitative interviews investigated ways in

which the participants felt and observed a sense of pride associated with being at the university, and the level to which they viewed the president as a role model or mentor.

In creating a sense of pride and shared vision at the university, the president has made noticeable change since inheriting a campus in transition. When the president first stepped into the executive role, the university was considering drastic measures to remain financially viable. The previous president had begun a process of forfeiting the AUWE's independent status to become a satellite campus of a stateside university, which had severe implications on the morale of the staff and faculty. The reputation of the institution suffered, and it became known as a lesser academically rigorous institution for affluent American teenagers.

Residual effects of the previous president are still evident. Faculty and staff will outright admit that there is a lack of pride in the community. There is a greater sense of pride associated with the city surrounding the institution than in the institution itself. One full-time professor who had been at the university for a number of years shared that she does not consider a sense of pride or happiness associated with the university, but that friends, family, and colleagues from outside the institution find it exceedingly interesting that she lives in one of the most romanticized cities in Europe.

Another full-time faculty member, who identifies as a native of the host country, took issue with the use of the word "pride." Instead, this professor insisted, "there's a curiosity, there's an interest that I would say was not there when I first came to the university." Other faculty expressed agreement, describing the current campus climate as one in evolution: "I wouldn't say that we have instilled a sense of pride, but it's sort of on the way to pride."

In addition to shifting the sense of community and purpose with the employees of the university, the president also attempts to instill awareness and enthusiasm for her vision with the

student population. At the beginning of each term, she addresses the incoming students, and makes frequent appearances at student senate meetings. Both of these forums allow her to announce future plans and changes, as well as inform students about developments with new university properties and programs.

Inspirational Motivation. There is no question that the president of AUWE has a tremendous emotional and personal investment in the future of the university. This investment allows her to speak to the meaning and purpose to her vision (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Her leadership style and role as the university president was often described as maternal, nurturing, and familial. Her adoration for the institution guides her interactions with the staff and faculty, and her maternal reputation instills confidence in her followers, and may manifest itself in times of crisis or uncertainty (Klein, 2016). To speak to the president's demonstration of Inspirational Motivation, participants were asked to reflect on times when they felt empowered by the president. While much of the conversation began with descriptions of financial support for academic programs, respondents were encouraged to identify specific situations in which they personally experienced feeling inspired by the president to reach beyond their potential.

A few years ago, a high-ranking student affairs professional left his post without notice. In the effort to reestablish stability on staff, the president leaned on a newer, younger member of the student affairs staff. When challenge and uncertainty reached a tipping point, the staff member recalls receiving a surprisingly curt, but effective, inspirational speech from the president. "She's very good at having talks... I could not get the motherly type (of conversation) that I wanted. Instead, I got 'this is a power vacuum, there's no team. This is how I need you to be here.' And you don't like getting that kind of talk. It's like getting yelled at by your grandmother." In drawing the parallel to the grandmother relationship, the staff member

recounted a story in which she had grown accustomed to receiving support and affirmation from the president, and then met a situation in which the president attempted to redirect the focus to the greater good of the institution through expressions of disappointment and frustration.

Intellectual Stimulation. It has been suggested that elements of this dimension of Transformational Leadership overlap with elements of Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation (Yukl, 1999). The difference arrives in the shift of the aim of motivating behavior. Here, there is a judgement-free space created where followers are motivated to engage in problem-solving methods that respect organizational values, but may seem unorthodox (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). In determining the degree to which the president of AUWE demonstrates this dimension of Transformational Leadership, community members were asked to share their perspectives on ways they were encouraged to contribute new ideas, as well as ways the president embraced innovation and creativity.

For an American liberal arts university in the heart of Europe, the many unique and nuanced challenges require innovative thinking and creativity at all levels of the organization. The presidents participating in the survey included in this research report a relatively high frequency in which they demonstrate innovation in leadership and problem solving. AUWE's president, again, performs the roles of position in a way that is supported by the findings of the presidential survey—she excels in this area. Her followers recognize the many times in which she has attempted to view situations from different angles, and they embrace her willingness to challenge staff, faculty, and students to engage in her process. The faculty and staff are also keenly aware that their unique existence as a university requires this kind of innovation for institutional survival. Here, the president asks hard questions about the needs and trends of

students, pushing her staff and faculty to adopt a business-oriented way of thinking rather than the traditional or classical perspectives of higher education.

One key way in which the president of the American University of Western Europe moves change on campus comes through creative external funding opportunities. To encourage her faculty to take risks and develop new pedagogy, she brought grant funding on campus through the Mellon Foundation—a foundation dedicated to the recognition of “ambitious and path-breaking work” in higher education (“About the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation,” 2017). Securing the grant resources, the president encouraged her faculty to create new projects, interdisciplinary partnerships and pedagogical methods. Similarly, this type of advancement from the president continues her record of introducing new programs and initiatives for more than a decade. Fifteen years ago, she developed a cross-disciplinary first-year seminar that remains successful, and, more recently, in the Spring of 2017 a newly hired digital humanities professor joined the campus.

When student retention figures began to decline, the president initiated an initiative to reverse the trend. Under her leadership, the campus adopted a new perspective in finding resolution. “Instead of focusing on why students were leaving,” the president says she wanted to know “what kinds of students were staying.” By identifying the student profile of a successful four-year student at AUWE, the university experienced a steady increase in student retention. This was viewed by many of the faculty as a very typical approach by the president. “She is a great believer in, our kind of student, who loves to travel, and is very curious about the world... they may not be the superstar student, but then they come here and they find their fit.” Finding the fit, and then articulating it to maximize student and institutional potential, the president

assigned the profile the name “global explorer.” Now, each student application is assigned a “fit score,” to determine for how long the student could thrive in the AUWE environment.

This president takes energy from the people around her no matter their position in the university. At a recent student event for women leaders on campus, the president engaged in conversation with a small group of students. When an idea sprang from the discussion, the president was quick to act and exclaim, “We should do this!” A student described the president as one who can identify and encourage good ideas from other people. “You can see that in every email that she sends... she will mention how great the organizations are and how much they have done.” Faculty and staff built on this idea of embracing a group think method of creativity. One faculty member praised the environment created where, “We are all at once able to express our opinions in our new ideas... she creates participation.” The president’s contagious energy lifts the energy levels of the people around her.

It would appear the president of AUWE demonstrates Intellectual Stimulation to a degree as high as, and in all likelihood higher than, the presidents participating in the quantitative survey. With a collective mean ranking of 4.04, the presidents report a high level of confidence in their ability to instill innovation on their respective campus. The responses highlighted above provide evidence that AUWE’s president clearly appreciates non-traditional approaches to issues regarding enrollment and recruitment, student opportunities, and institutional stability.

Individual Consideration. In some cases, reflecting the results and responses of the presidential survey does not necessarily support the demonstration of Transformational Leadership. As the survey results indicate, presidential interactions with individual members of the university do not happen as often as frequently as might be expected at a small institution. While the president of the American University of Western Europe has been known to have

many successful individual connections involving nurturing and mentoring relationships, this remains one dimension of Transformational Leadership practices that may not manifest in tangible, observable ways. Here, the investigation relied on participant responses regarding the frequency and depth of personal interactions with the president. As most participants could easily identify group situations or committee appointments that involved presidential contact, the researcher probed for those times when presidential contact focused on individual needs.

Clearly, the AUWE president has demonstrated the ability to consider the needs of individuals under her leadership. Many people suggested that, “You just *want* to listen to her.” Alluding to her charismatic and adaptive nature, people who spend time with the president suggest that, “She makes you feel like you’re the only person in the room.” This response arrived early in the research, and when subsequent interviewees were asked if they would agree with this statement, responses fell only in the range of affirmation, including faculty who agreed with “absolutely,” “definitely,” or a staff member who concurred by saying “I would say that, yes.” Even students will point out how they have seen the president’s enthusiasm for interacting with them, and spending time to get to know as much of them as possible.

However, developing these connections and mentoring relationships takes time. Time, though, is not an abundant resource in regards to the life of a university president. Too often, the day-to-day responsibilities of running a campus interfere with the more relationship-oriented opportunities of mentoring, teaching, and developing the strengths of others. With a mean score of 3.21, “I spend time teaching and coaching” was the lowest mean of any item on the MLQ-5x in the presidential survey. In speaking with the community members of the American University of Western Europe, it was clear that their president could also spend more time mentoring.

As pointed out earlier, the AUWE president uses committees and workgroups quite often. The disadvantage to relying on collaboration comes in compromising the number of opportunities for individual excellence. Repeatedly, faculty lamented the fact that they could go extended amounts of time without interacting with the president. One faculty member in her third year of association with AUWE shared that she had not had a meaningful interaction with the president during her first two years on campus. Another professor had a similar story, reporting, “Certainly I see her often, but outside committees I think I see her maybe twice a year.” All too often in the eyes of the faculty and staff, communication from the president looks like the impersonal exchange of technical information and campus updates of mass emails.

Beyond the limitations of the logistics associated with a busy schedule, a few members of the community, primarily faculty, indicated the president’s intense personality prevented them from seeking those connections with her. One American female member of the faculty who was relatively new to the campus described a constant level of caution in her interactions with the president. Specifically, she described it as, “This sort of emotional presence that when you feel like it’s all personal. I want to have a working relationship that doesn’t boil down to betrayal.”

For another faculty member, that caution translated into respect. Here, the professor, who identified as neither American or as a citizen of the host country, respects the power dynamic established in his relationship with the president. “I never forget about the power dynamic,” he reported. Even when the president insists on a less formal tone, there are those who maintain a clear boundary that stays away from collegiality.

Foreign Country University

A native of the host country and region to the university, the president of FCU employs a relationship oriented persona and style of leadership indicative to his culture. His pleasant and

gracious presence is endearing, and many on campus claim a deep admiration because of his intellect and wisdom. One of his closest advisors shared that the president exhibits a fair amount of insecurity about his relationship with the board of trustees. In actuality, the advisor shared that the board of trustees “adores him,” and often commends him for his leadership of the institution.

Nearly everyone who participated in this research noted his open-door policy for anyone—staff, faculty, and students, to his office. A staff member in the alumni and development administrative unit of the university shared that many alumni will return to campus and specifically plan to informally spend time with the president. Worth noting, the president’s engagement with students grew a little more direct this past academic year when he became the advisor for the campus chess club.

Idealized Influence. The literature asserts that our institutions have value, and institutional leaders “must articulate that value and achieve adequate understanding and support” (Kauffman, 1980, p. 114). During the qualitative interviews, participants were prompted to discuss ways in which they had come to know and support the president’s vision. Responses suggest that the president of FCU demonstrates the skill and ability to garner understanding and support in larger group settings. He is seen as most effective when he is speaking to groups, whether formally at a board meeting, or informally at the annual campus holiday gathering. “He is really... a good communicator. He is inspiring.” His ability to articulate goals and vision were repeatedly cited as most helpful in realizing support from the faculty. “He does a good job of communicating at faculty meetings that we are part of this bigger goal and this is what we are striving for.” With the collective of university presidents reporting a high level of demonstration

of this facet of Transformational Leadership, it was anticipated that this would be reflected in the president of Foreign Country University.

Repeatedly, the president's command of language served as the foundation of his ability to articulate his vision for the university. A professor who grew up in the region described the president's ability to adapt his vocabulary to fit the situation. "Every time, he never uses the same words. He always changes as if he had studied the nature of the audience. He is the one who comes prepared." Another faculty member lauded the president's use of the English language, saying, "His English is perfect." Finally, the Chief of Staff for the campus described the president as a "fantastic writer in both languages, and (he) is very eloquent."

Finally, a number of recent personnel issues, including recent changes to national working regulations and tax structures, have resulted in a strained sense of community. The decrease in morale primarily affects the faculty, but it permeates at all levels of the university. Even students were able to speak to some of the dissatisfaction of part-time faculty who were hoping for higher salaries and improved status on campus. While the president has implemented some policy to help alleviate the anxiety felt by the large majority of adjunct faculty, this is clearly one situation that the president experiences great challenge. Struggles with government relations and policy are by no means exclusive to the president of Foreign Country University. Recall that "government relations" was one of the most recognized challenges of the quantitative survey, reported by more than 64% of the presidents responding to the survey as either *moderately challenging* or *extremely challenging*.

Inspirational Motivation. The spirit of Inspirational Motivation lies in motivation and encouragement (Klein, 2016). Framing the leader's vision in a way that instills confidence in followers and arouses a sense of team spirit drive this dimension of Transformational Leadership

(Bass et al., 2003). The president of Foreign Country University uses many opportunities to build a sense of optimism around what his staff considers a “courageous” vision and plans for the university. For many faculty members, the president’s delivery style demonstrate this dimension of Transformational Leadership. “He has a certain charisma as a leader he’s very smart. He’s very intellectual, and when he speaks he is able to put things into a really good perspective.” When asked to elaborate on his communication style, two faculty provided examples of the way the president presents his view of the university. His plans, they said, “are not presented as ‘whether you like it or not,’ but instead as ‘Isn’t this exciting! This is something we are going to be able to do!’ So I think he is really strong in that area... Eliminating any doubt about his confidence.” Other faculty expressed similar observations, noting that the president would take advantage of faculty senate meetings to help the faculty “feel like we are part of the bigger questions.”

It is interesting to note that participants often added a bit of commentary in their responses, tempering the optimism with a hint of negativity. “He always stresses that the university is a great institution are the faculty are what make it a great institution. In addition, you can always say, ‘That is the pie in the sky. We are not paid very much, who cares if the president says this,’ but it does make a difference.” Interestingly, one of faculty members questioned the authenticity of the president’s optimism in attempting to inspire the campus. “Sometimes he uses phrases like, ‘we are the Harvard (of the region),’ and we are so far from Harvard. He likes to say that to inspire us, but I do not think he really believes that.”

Intellectual Stimulation. This dimension of Transformational Leadership speaks to the leader’s ability to encourage creativity among followers through reframing problems and challenging traditional approaches to situations (Bass et al., 2003). The staff and faculty at

Foreign Country University easily described the president's demonstration of this dimension on their campus. "He gives us... a foundation, angle, or an ambition. Then, we build a skeleton around it with ideas and propositions."

When it comes to encouraging the staff to practice creativity in problem solving, the faculty and staff regarded the president as "Supporting anything that's going to be different or apart from the routine event." Together with the Academic Dean, the president is viewed as a leader who welcomes the proposal of creative situations. The faculty and staff admit that their proposed ideas, "Don't always go over well, and they can be very direct in saying that they are not interested or don't like them, but he usually always listens."

A certain amount of risk-taking is involved in the Intellectual Stimulation dimension of Transformational Leadership. With growth and expansion a major element of the president's vision, the Academic Dean acknowledged the amount of risk associated with the acquisition of new buildings. Here, she points out the inherent uncertainty in predicting the universities ability to sustain new facilities. By creating more of these challenges, the president accepts the risks involved in keeping the university and relies on his knowledge of trends at his campus, and in higher education in a broader sense.

Individual Consideration. In a bit of a departure from the results of the quantitative presidential survey relative to other dimensions, interview participants regarded the president of Foreign Country University as a mentor much less frequently than most *of the time*. In fact, the qualitative examination of the current study would suggest this president demonstrates Individual Consideration behaviors much less than the mean scores of the presidential survey would indicate. This dimension of Transformational Leadership calls to attention the presidents' ability to create opportunities for followers' individual development while interacting with followers in

a mentoring manner (Avolio et al., 1999). The Individual Consideration element is a defining part of Transformational Leadership. According to Bass & Riggio (2006), attending to the needs and potential of the individual completes the profile of an authentic Transformational Leader.

Limited availability and access appear to be the primary obstacles in achieving more individual connections with members of the campus community. According to one staff member, the president lacked the familiarity needed for any sort of mentoring relationship. “I do not personally see him as a mentor, because a mentor someone to me as someone who is close to me, who knows who I am.” One other staff member expanded on the notion of relationships with the president lacking depth, revealing that most interactions consisted of “small talk or jokes.” At least three other informal conversations and formal interview discussions with other staff members revealed a strong agreement with this statement. Similarly, many of the interview participants were unable to give any examples of the president acting as a mentor or counsellor to anyone else’s individual development. “I do not know if I would say a role model, but I do know that people see him is sort of the steady-guiding figure... I do not think that he puts anyone under his wing and explicitly grooms them.” This sentiment was reflected in multiple other interviews, suggesting the dimension of Individual Consideration was noticeably absent in the presidents leadership.

A staff member who recently graduated with a degree from FCU recalled his experiences as an undergraduate, “being just a student you would have only a little interaction with the president, other than being present for the speeches that he does.” This staff member continued to articulate a motivation to connect more with the president, but immediately suggested the president’s schedule does not afford much opportunity for personal interaction. “I would like to

have more personal interaction with him... I would like to use him as a resource or mentor. But he does seem a little too busy.”

Still, some members of the community suggest that character or personality may also be contributing factors. They view the president as less developmental in his approach and more focused on the technical matters of his position. When one faculty member sought university recognition for contributions he had made when his department was short-staffed, the president instead offered him some unexpected advice. “He said, ‘Well, you should never do anything unless you are asked to by your superiors.’ I didn't like the way that he handled it. I felt terrible at the end of the meeting.”

A member of the staff who was passionate about social justice issues and gender equality had also often had interactions with the president that left her feeling vulnerable and unappreciated. “Do you know what? He really doesn't empower me at all. I have to empower myself, looking past and fighting against a lot of jokes about my character and my activism.” She cited a few examples of times when the president was not only unsupportive of her personal interests in social justice, but also rather judgmental.

Cross-Case Analyses and Discussion

A number of commonalities is evident in the Transformational Leadership behaviors of these two presidents, as reported by the members of their respective communities. These commonalities, for the most part, also appear to reflect the results of the quantitative survey returned by nearly half of the entire population of presidents of U.S.-accredited universities abroad. Those self-reported results support the perception of these presidents' high achievement in the Idealized Influence and Intellectual Stimulation dimensions of this leadership model. The

results of this qualitative investigation also agree with the low presence of Individual Consideration—the lowest mean score in any dimension measured in the survey instrument.

Each of these presidents had been recognized as possessing great communication skills. Their strong command of the English language and the language of their host community allowed them to appeal to stakeholders from both of the dominant national cultures at their institution. Both demonstrated a high level of competency in navigating the local laws regarding temporary workers and part-time faculty, real estate and property law and campus expansion, and implementing university programs and initiatives to remain sustainable and competitive.

Based on observations and collected data, one of the greatest obstacles to a presidential leadership is in the geographic layout of each “campus.” At both of the sites included in this study, classrooms, academic departments, and administrative offices were spread over and separated by a number of city blocks. Staff and faculty talked about the disconnected campus in a way that suggested an insurmountable divide. Many participants cited this as a cause for a significant absence of interaction with the university president. “I never go to the main building,” or “It’s very rare to see the president in this building” were common sentiments. It appeared that the geographic disconnect of the university prohibited frequent face-time or personal interactions with the chief administrator, and that most communication came in the form of email blasts and group messages. The literal and figurative distance between most stakeholders and the president prevented much of the individual attention that is crucial to the demonstration of Transformational Leadership.

It would appear dangerous to discount the presence of Transformative Leadership behaviors based on evidence of a few interactions. It seems quite likely these incidents could be isolated and equate to nothing more than bad timing, miscommunication, or a case of the

president having a bad day. While the faculty, staff, and students at each institution were clearly able to identify situations in which the president achieves a level of Transformational Leadership and those in which they do not, the literature does not suggest that leading in this light less than all the time eliminates all consideration for this style of leadership.

Cultural Intelligence

To address Research Question 2, the initial quantitative phase of this study incorporates the Cultural Intelligence Scale. The preliminary quantitative results from the 22 presidential participants then informed the construction and delivery of qualitative efforts at two specific universities. Unsurprisingly, the self-reported results of the 20-question CQS reflected advanced levels of CQ. Additionally, stakeholders within each university were able to identify specific observed behaviors that would further support findings of high levels of Cultural Intelligence in the university president.

Survey Results

The Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) uses 20 questions to assess the Cultural Intelligence of each individual according to the four dimensions of Cultural Intelligence—Metacognitive, Cognitive, Motivational, and Behavioral CQ. Similar to the MLQ-5x, the CQS also employs a Likert-type scale. Here, each president was asked to indicate the level with which they agree to a series of statements (1= Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree). As a summation of the four dimensions, a higher aggregate score of all the dimensions reflects a higher level of Cultural Intelligence. Results of the quantitative CQS administration are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Cultural Intelligence Ratings by Dimension as Reported in the CQS

Dimension	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Metacognitive	19	1.00	7.00	5.50	1.43
Cognitive	19	1.00	7.00	4.97	1.51
Motivational	19	1.00	7.00	5.72	1.37
Behavioral	15	1.00	7.00	5.27	1.47
Total CQ	15	1.00	6.95	5.31	1.28

Mean scores in each dimension of the presidents' Cultural Intelligence were generally high. While the Motivational CQ levels reflected the highest mean scores, Cognitive CQ was noticeably lower than Metacognitive and Behavioral CQ. When individual items within the dimension were scored and analyzed, the lowest means were reflected relative to marriage systems, arts, and culture. Conversely, highest reported scores were found in the items concerning confidence in personal ability to navigate new cultural situations.

American University of Western Europe

Having served in her position for over a decade, and ascending after more than a decade in other positions, the president of AUWE has had nearly a quarter of a century of experiences to refine and develop her Cultural Intelligence. In addition to raising her children in the university's host country, she also spent many of the formative years of her childhood there as well. The daughter of Catholic and Canadian mother, and a father who was Jewish and Russian, this self-identified third culture kid celebrates her "family of difference" and her parents' "citizen of the world" perspective as the foundation for a lifetime of passion for cultural difference. As suggested by Tarique and Takeuchi (2008), her international and intercultural experiences beyond those of her life as an educator have equipped her with a Cultural Intelligence that appears to serve her well in her professional position.

A main caveat of Cultural Intelligence comes in intercultural communication and language proficiency. Fluent in two languages, the president of AUWE comfortably transitions from English to the language of her host community—sometimes within the same conversation. Her command of multiple languages serves as a major asset in leading with Cultural Intelligence.

Metacognitive. Individuals who demonstrate a high Metacognitive CQ possess an awareness of the needs and preferences of others in their interactions (Ang et al., 2007). With a personal history of living in the country in which her university is located and in the United States, the president of AUWE had a bit of a head start on understanding the different values and practices of each culture. Compared to her colleagues who participated in the presidential survey, the president of the American University of Western Europe would likely score at the high end of the range of responses the faculty, staff, and students on campus all easily recognize her adaptability in intercultural situations, claiming, “She has the right persona for each occasion.”

One of the faculty, who identifies as a native of the host culture, articulated her perception of the president as at once being both “definitely American,” and “strongly international.” The professor shared the president’s ability to assess intercultural situations as “quite brilliant.” The president is so confident in her familiarity with cultural difference, this professor mentioned an occasional need to remind the president that not everyone can transition or adapt as easily or as quickly as she does. “She understands that it can lead to interpersonal difficulties, and issues, and moving out of those... She is able to figure out what the issues are, and pull that out, asking herself, ‘how do I address the issues and reach a certain person?’” This type of awareness of cultural difference in her interactions demonstrates an exceedingly high

level of Metacognitive CQ in the president of AUWE. This is reflective of the relatively high levels of this CQ dimension as reported in the presidential survey.

Cognitive. Interestingly enough, Cognitive CQ was the lowest reported mean (4.97) among presidents who participated in the quantitative exploration of this study. Beyond knowing the existence of difference, Cognitive CQ “combines knowledge attained through education and experience that represents the normalized values, behavioral patterns and customs held in various cultures” (Wood & St. Peters, 2014, p. 561). Here, understanding definitions and traditions around concepts such as work, time, or family would serve a president of a U.S.-accredited institution operating in a foreign environment. Again, the qualitative results gathered at the American University of Western Europe suggest this president operates at a higher level of Cognitive CQ than those who participated in the survey.

Much of the president’s perceived high functioning ability to navigate the diverse cultural interests at AUWE reflects her experience in the host culture. According to the members of her staff, “She has been here for such a long time. She has raised children in (this country), she really gets (the culture). She understands (the country).” Similarly, they call upon her experience at a stateside liberal arts institution as basis for her familiarity with the culture of American higher education. Her extensive experience in both cultures allows her to anticipate the implications of her interactions in each context.

The president of AUWE demonstrates a strong Cognitive CQ when dealing with stakeholders from cultures other than the ones represented by institutional accreditation or its host community. Faculty and staff point out her ability to recognize and effectively manage interactions with students and, more importantly, parents of AUWE students. The faculty presented a situation illustrating the president’s competency.

She knows we are dealing with students from across the globe. She will take one approach with a student from Africa, dealing with a health issue for example, and that would be a different conversation then we would have with parents in California.

A large component of this approach is evidenced in her ability to communicate and unpack the issues at hand. In such situations, the faculty and staff identify a unique talent in listening to parents from all around the world, and isolate the core concerns amidst the differences in language and values.

The president of the American University of Western Europe recognizes the benefits of maintaining cultural balance in the student population. In a way that is directly reflective of her Cognitive CQ, the president strives to maintain a balanced mix of students admitted from the United States and those from other countries. A professor of History describes this as “a certain kind of feel to an American liberal arts university.” The president of the university prioritizes that feel by moderating a balance in the student demographics. “We need to have a minimum number of students from America somewhere between 30 and 50%... If we get over 50% it doesn't work, if we get below 30% it doesn't work.” The parts that will not “work,” are primarily the co-curricular offerings that rely on student participation. Student Government, for example may not function in the spirit of an American university experience if there are not enough students familiar with the concepts of student organizations.

Motivational. Unsurprisingly, presidents of U.S.-accredited universities located in foreign countries report the Motivational CQ as the highest dimension of their Cultural Intelligence. A mean score of 5.72 suggests this group of presidents has the drive to engage in situations of cultural difference, as well as the willingness to learn from those interactions (Wood & St. Peters, 2014). People with higher Motivational CQ would have increased confidence levels when approaching culturally diverse situations (Ang et al., 2007).

To illustrate the Motivational CQ of the president of AUWE, consider, again, the perspective of the student from the Republic of Georgia. On a campus where the campus population includes 108 nationalities, the president maintains a reputation as a woman who “really wants to interact with the students and get to know as much of them as possible.” She understands and embraces the value of diversity on campus, and actively works to promote it.

The aforementioned balance of student demographics also speaks to the president’s desire to ensure a culturally diverse climate for students. She understands the educational value in bringing diverse perspectives and ways of thinking to campus, and wants her students to thrive in an international environment.

Behavioral. The Behavioral dimension of Cultural Intelligence focuses largely on an individual’s ability to adjust to appropriate actions when interacting with people from different backgrounds (Eisenberg et al., 2013). Specifically, Behavioral CQ encompasses a person’s capability to engage verbal and nonverbal communication to fit a particular situation (Ang et al., 2007). It has been well reported throughout this investigation that the American University of Western Europe has a president admired for her communication skills. It makes sense, then, that she would exhibit a recognizably high level of Behavioral CQ.

A woman from the country in which AUWE is located told about a time when the President was in a discussion with a university administrative unit and another faculty member from the host country. She described the conversation as “flipping back-and-forth between English and (the local language),” and gave high praise to the president for her ability to maneuver the multilingual situation:

Sometimes you want to monopolize and take control of the conversation by having it in your dominant language, and the (local) professor would flip into (the local language), and the president would just stay right with her. She would not be dominated by that, and she made her point. She would stay within the formality of what is required, but still make her point.

The most telling description of the ways in which the president of the American University of Western Europe came in a complimentary description of the above situation. Following her depiction of the conversation, the local faculty member described the president as handling the situation “with such grace.” This exemplifies the ability of an individual with a high Behavioral CQ to present a set of skills and behaviors associated with creating a positive impression and a sense of fitting in (Ang et al., 2007). Earley (2002) asserts that this type of role modeling is a critical part of a strong Behavioral CQ that can have significant impact on an organization.

Foreign Country University

With a recognizably local family name, the president of FCU studied in the Middle East, and earned his doctoral degree from a prestigious university in the Midwest of the United States. Many people on campus believe his local roots combine with multiple transnational experiences to strengthen his understanding of higher education as well as his overall Cultural Intelligence. Stakeholders are quick to point out that, “he is very international.” Multiple stakeholders on campus referred to an eloquence in both the language of the host country as well as English. Because of his proficiency in each language and culture, the members of the campus view the president as the ideal person for his position. “I think he understands because he was educated in the United States, but he is (from the host community), and in some ways he's the perfect bridge between those two worlds.”

Metacognitive. An important facet of Metacognitive CQ is in the awareness of cultural thinking and knowledge of those with whom one interacts (Van Dyne et al., 2012). For the president of Foreign Country University, significant and meaningful experiences in multiple cultures afford him a strong awareness of different cultural tendencies. As one faculty member suggested, this serves the president well in that, “he has this ability to see both cultures or both sides of the institution.” Additionally, the faculty acknowledge the president’s cultural balancing act. “He has just been dancing between two worlds.” This ability to “dance” allows the president to identify and understand those cultural nuances involved with leading his university.

Cognitive. Operating as an American-accredited liberal arts university in a foreign country involves inherent challenge. Certain local and national policies and norms may be at odds with the spirit of this institution. As we have seen above, labor laws are one of the more immediately impactful factors affecting university personnel.

In many of the countries in which universities with U.S. accreditation operate, there may be challenges in gaining recognition from the host country to be able to operate and serve students at a sustainable level. Some countries may not extend exemption from obligatory military service to private or foreign universities. Others may not subscribe to a foreign measure of quality assurance when considering graduate admissions or government employment. Nearly all of the universities in the population must navigate visa and resident permit regulations to allow foreign students the ability to attend. In the case of Foreign Country University, all of these examples have influenced the university’s ability to recruit students locally. Because the president of FCU understands the cultural values and expectations of the place in which his university is located, his campus understands and embraces his ability to keep the campus relevant within the greater community. One faculty member shared an opinion that the

president's has demonstrated an exceptional ability "to mediate a (host country) government that has never been that interested in this university." Another faculty member expanded on the perception of the president's adept navigation of cultural differences.

I think he is the right president for this institution. It's an American institution in the heart of (a European city). So... spending 10 or 15 years in the United States, has given him these sort of capacity to understand and to mediate between these two different worlds.

Motivational. Motivational CQ has been labeled the most adaptive and advanced facet of Cultural Intelligence (Barbuto et al., 2015). Motivational CQ refers to an individual's capability and desire for sustained learning in new cultural situations, leading to higher levels of confidence and adaptability (Eisenberg et al., 2013). Even if the president of Foreign Country University does not know the explicit articulation of cultural intelligence, he clearly understands the importance of the construct, and values its contextual benefits for students. The academic dean for the institution described the president's vision as an effort of "more different cultures coming together to realize the importance of their own culture and to embrace that identity... by communicating those positive and fascinating aspects with our students." She went on to describe the president's appreciation for a "sort of soup of nationalities." In this type of encouragement, the president clearly demonstrates a vision to nurture students' Motivational CQ in a safe and supportive environment.

Relative to his own experience, another staff member observed ways in which the president struggles in his own adaptability to cultural situations.

We have two board meetings every year-- one in the Fall here on campus, and then a New York meeting in the Spring. And it is a full schedule of meetings in New York City. It's a very noticeable difference how he interacts even with the same people when he is here on his turf and when we are in New York. I mean there is a lot of babysitting that we have to do to make sure he is calming down, to make sure that he is OK. He starts bringing up things about his age and his health, but his health is excellent.

When individuals relocate to unfamiliar cultures, they often experience stress because environments are unfamiliar and confusing (Ang et al., 2007). This example suggests that even the president of an international university who otherwise demonstrates a high Cultural Intelligence struggles with adapting to the demands of certain culturally diverse situations.

Behavioral. The final facet of Cultural Intelligence, Behavioral CQ measures an individual's capability to link the various types of knowledge and exhibit situationally appropriate actions including verbal and non-verbal behaviors such as culturally appropriate vocabulary, intonation, and body language (Ng et al., 2009a). It is well reported that the president of Foreign Country University excels in communicating in multiple languages—"He is well spoken, he speaks wonderfully." A faculty member and longtime colleague of the president tells of the president's talent to "really work both sides of the Atlantic very effectively." Accordingly, his Behavioral CQ likely exceeds the already high levels of those reported in the presidential survey.

The president's communication style deviates from the traditional (and somewhat stereotypical) manner of communication associated with his national identification. Specifically, the president comes from a culture with strong non-verbal tendencies. Emphatic hand motions and gestures animate the spoken word in an almost organic fashion. Certain specific hand gestures are recognized and used in combination with specific verbal cues. This president, though, is "not very typically (from the host country), because he does not move his hands a lot like we do... he relies on just the words that he uses." This may be the product of being removed from his native culture for an extended period of time, combined with new communication habits and behaviors acquired from engaging in other cultures.

In addition to what he says, the staff and faculty acknowledge the president's persuasiveness and charisma when interacting with Americans. His ability to adjust was noted by one staff member:

He is very able to convince the Americans with the way that he says things. He just seems to pick different pieces of the university that are here that are real, that can satisfy the needs of the areas in question-- before the audience asks.

Extending the construct of Cultural Intelligence to include interactions across cultures other than national—organizational for example, the president's adaptable behavior often shifts in conversations with members of a particular order. The board of trustees, donors, or distinguished visitors like ambassadors or dignitaries necessitate a different version of the president. One advisor and staff member pointed out that, "There's a different way that he interacts. There's more formality." Due in part to his cultural identity, which features specific language rules and vocabulary structures to accommodate formality, the president understands the demands of various cultural contexts.

Cross-Case Analyses and Discussion

The two cases of presidents at American University of Western Europe and Foreign Country University present robust opportunities to highlight the Cultural Intelligence of presidents of U.S.-Accredited universities located in foreign countries. With both having lived in multiple countries, and each achieving advanced proficiency in multiple languages, these two presidents make a compelling case for the benefits of bringing a high CQ to the president position. With the presidents who participated in the presidential survey reporting a mean Cultural Intelligence rating of 5.31, this population of university presidents represents a group of executives who reflect strong overall CQ. The two presidents examined in the qualitative

investigation of the current study are representative of their presidential counterparts of other U.S. accredited universities abroad.

Challenges Relative to Accreditation

As part of the quantitative presidential survey, one section asked participants to identify the degree to which a number of responsibilities of their position poses challenge. From the list of 17 responsibilities, presidents were invited to rate the level of challenge associated with each according to a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from *not at all challenging (4)* to *extremely challenging (1)*. The list of responsibilities identified as *noticeably* or *extremely* challenging included items such as fundraising (74%), crisis management (68%), government relations (63%) and accreditation issues (58%).

Conversely, the survey presented the same list of responsibilities, and asked participants to state the degree to which they felt prepared to meet those challenges when they first began their position as president. Using another four-point Likert-type scale, presidents reported their associated level of preparedness ranging from *very unprepared* to *very prepared*. Among the top responses identified as those for which presidents felt *very unprepared* or *somewhat unprepared* were accreditation issues (42.03%), fundraising (36.84%), campus infrastructure (36.84%) and parent relations (33.33%).

The Challenges of U.S. Accreditation in a Foreign Country

At the core of this study lies the challenge in balancing the expectations of U.S. accreditation with the cultural values and practices of a non-American host community. The potential for contradiction between the two cultures presents each institutional leader with unique, idiosyncratic challenges not faced by traditional stateside university presidents. To examine just how challenging this balancing act can be, the quantitative presidential survey

included an item to measure participants' perception of the degree of challenge they face in maintaining this sort of cultural harmony. Question 9 of the survey asked presidents, "How challenging would you say it is to balance the expectations of your host community with the standards of your United States institutional accreditation?" Over three-quarters of respondents regarded this task as *moderately* or *very* challenging. This supports the notion that the tension between the two cultural influences is salient and worthy of investigation. Table 11 displays the full results from the survey Question 9.

Table 11

Participant Responses to Survey Question 9

Response	n	Percent
Extremely challenging	0	0
Very challenging	4	22
Moderately challenging	10	55
Slightly challenging	1	6
Not challenging at all	3	17

Note. Survey question 9: "How challenging would you say it is to balance the expectations of your host community with the standards of your United States institutional accreditation?"

Chapter Summary

The findings of this research have provided evidence to support the presence and influence of Transformational Leadership behaviors and Cultural Intelligence in the leadership approaches of the presidents of U.S. accredited institutions abroad. Each of the presidential participants in the initial quantitative survey of this research reports strong demonstrations of both of the leadership constructs. There is strong evidence to support the notion that presidents exhibit behaviors of Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, and Intellectual Stimulation. However, the perceptions of faculty, staff, and students suggest a notable absence of Individual Considerations, and the unclear synergies of all the dimensions. The findings of the qualitative phase of this study are congruent with those of the quantitative findings. Thus, the perceptions

of campus community stakeholders generally corroborate the self-reported perspective of the university presidents.

A review of the findings provides adequate insight into the Cultural Intelligence of the presidents. The presidents report a high level of each dimension of CQ, and these levels are confirmed in the perceptions of the students, staff, and faculty. With proficiency in multiple languages, as well as high levels of experience in international contexts, these university presidents exhibit strong capabilities necessary to manage and affect change within the culturally diverse environments of their respective internationally located U.S. universities.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The primary goals of this study were to further the very recent introduction of these universities in the current body of literature. In an attempt to build on the recent works of researchers like Blanco-Ramirez, the current research aimed to further call attention to the importance of these institutions in conversations regarding the internationalization of higher education in the United States. Specifically, it was the aim of this researcher to contribute an understanding of the unique leadership challenges and styles that presidents of US accredited American universities abroad face. Because of their unique environment and multinational context, these institutions provide distinct challenges to an already difficult and complex role of university president. This study focused on the importance and impact of demonstrating approaches of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence in allowing the presidents to be effective.

The results show that presidents not only possess high levels of Cultural Intelligence, but also engage in leadership strategies and interactions with the university community that reflect a high CQ. This research has also found that Transformational Leadership may not always be the most perceived style of leadership among these presidents. By disaggregating the model into individual dimensions, one can identify the areas in which these presidents deviate from Transformational Leadership. If, as suggested in the literature, Transformational Leadership most appropriately moves a higher education environment toward progress and success, this type of analysis serves to recognize areas to be addressed.

Summary Results

Overall, the constituents at each university could readily cite examples of Transformational Leadership behavior. The students, staff, and faculty recounted situations

when the president addressed the campus in groups or in whole with the intention of highlighting the university mission and values. Seen as eloquent and motivating in speech, these executive leaders effectively communicate an enthusiastic sense of vision for their respective campus. Whether in implementing new policy to maintain sustainable student enrollment figures, in acquiring new facilities to enhance the campus infrastructure, or in guiding programmatic efforts to create new opportunities for students, the executive leaders proficiently convey a message of growth, value, and progressiveness to the multiple university stakeholders. In motivating the campus community and establishing a strong vision for the future, these practices highlight the implementation of the Inspirational Motivation, Idealized Influence, and Intellectual Stimulation dimensions of Transformational Leadership.

Despite the small size of the university communities included in this research, the executive leaders struggled in providing individual attention, or mentoring relationships, to the various stakeholders. While some of the staff, faculty, and students expressed a preference to increase individual contact with the president, the president's busy schedule and the limited availability of faculty and staff were most often cited as prohibitive in accommodating more meetings of this type. A common theme at both institutions visited echoed in the typical multiple responsibilities of each faculty and staff of a smaller institution. Each faculty and staff were called on to perform multiple roles in their respective positions. In addition to heavy course loads, faculty served on multiple campus committees ranging from provost search committees, to curriculum review committees and accreditation working groups. Staff, too, often multiple responsibilities that might otherwise be divided among multiple administrative roles. As an example, the Assistant Dean of Students may serve as the sole staff member for numerous areas such as new student orientation, student conduct, residence life, first year

programs, student athletics, and parking. The presidential role also reflected strong heterogeneity in responsibilities including fundraising, teaching, advising student organizations, liaising with local governments, and strategic planning.

Research Question 1a

The quantitative survey results reveal that university presidents of U.S.-accredited institutions located in foreign countries frequently implement practices of Transformational Leadership. Collectively, the presidents report strong tendencies in the dimensions of Idealized Influence, and Inspirational Motivation. These findings are reinforced and further supported by the results of the regression analyses conducted as part of this study. As presidents strive to maintain accreditation requirements regarding realistic and appropriate institutional mission and goals, as well as institutional commitment to integrity, planning, and improvement, they also are increasing their exhibition of Transformational Leadership strategies relative to the dimensions of Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation. These dimensions show a strong relationship with the standards of institutional accreditation. It is through these two facets of Transformational Leadership that these university executive officers exhibit ethical values-based practices to instill a sense of shared vision and common purpose, and motivate the campus community to rally around a hopeful and achievable vision for the future (Keung & Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2013).

The presidents of these unique universities report moderate levels of Intellectual Stimulation and Individual Consideration. These university leaders report behaviors of mentoring and coaching as the least frequently demonstrated among all the facets of Transformational Leadership. Among the constructs of Individualized Consideration, presidents responded as frequently helping individual team members in developing their strengths, as well

as in regarding individuals as more than their role within the collective. But when the behavior shifts to include higher investments of time and attention, the presidents acknowledge that their personal investments remain relatively low.

Research Question 1b

The two case studies and focus groups were used to address this question. In one case, in her second decade as president of the American University of Western Europe, the president has developed a style and a reputation for empowering individuals and groups within her campus community. Whether supporting a student from the Republic of Georgia to plan and host a community program celebrating her culture and heritage, or securing financial resources to establish a research institute for an academic department, the president of AUWE facilitates a sense of pride in the institution and a collective buy in to her vision for a sustainable, academically rigorous and reputable liberal arts institution. Her goal to consolidate the campus footprint while expanding academic programs displays a strategy to position the institution for a future growth and expansion.

Her passion and contagious enthusiasm for the university exhibit an unmatched commitment to the future of the institution. As noted by several members of the campus community, her identity and the identity of the university are intertwined. This extends to the care she takes in leading with consideration to each person on campus. The president of AUWE has strong advocacy views, and actively empowers each level of the institution to contribute to the common good. She supports students in their individual pursuits, and attends to the unique needs and requests of parents.

The president role models a strong sense of resourcefulness and innovation. In taking command of sagging retention and enrollment, she approached the matter from an angle of

attracting and keeping a particular type of student. Rather than attempting to fix what might have been deemed broken, she, instead, chose to exploit what was effective and build marketing and admission efforts around the “global explorer.” Similarly, the development of a first-year student initiative signaled her commitment to the success of new students and maintenance of the institutional lifeline.

In the second case, as the survey results would predict the staff, faculty, and students at FCU report lower levels of mentoring and nurturing connections with the president. While many participants frequently recognized the president for his ability to deliver inspiring addresses and appeals to groups such as the faculty senate, a limited number of evidence suggests the presence of relationships with individual members of the community. Those relationships that do exist would most often take place among his closest advisors and those who share his cultural identity.

Beyond the dimension of Individual Consideration, respondents in the qualitative phase of this research identified specific behaviors reflecting the components of Idealized Influence, Intellectual Stimulation, and Inspirational Motivation. Specifically, the president takes advantage of committees and group environments to communicate his vision and assert his confidence in the future of the institution. Speaking in front of the staff during the annual holiday gathering, faculty meetings, and offering financial support for necessary resources were the most frequently offered examples of the president’s focus on creating a sense of shared purpose. Securing new facilities to accommodate institutional growth, supporting the introduction of new academic programs, and approving the formation of student diversity groups convey a message of confidence and optimism for the future of the university.

In support of Intellectual Stimulation, the president of FCU often encourages the input of his staff during decision-making processes, and involves them in the planning of university

growth. These practices afford the opportunity of the president to gain different perspectives in the resolution of university challenges. Forging partnerships with other institutions to recruit students and ensure healthy enrollment figures, as well as the development of graduate programs demonstrates a creative approach to traditional challenges. The regression analysis conducted in the quantitative phase of this study yielded results that confirm the relationship between Intellectual Stimulation behaviors and challenges specific to the role of the university president. As presidents strive to maintain accreditation requirements relative to an institution's regard for diversity of thought and differing perspectives, they also are increasing their ability to address the challenges specific to the presidential position.

Relative to Inspirational Motivation, this president relies heavily on communicating an idealized portrait of the university. In comparing the institution to popular elite campuses while addressing stakeholders creates an aspirational sense of achievement and status. His charismatic and engaging command of multiple languages allows the president to appeal to multiple constituents in articulating his enthusiasm and passion for the university and its future.

Research Question 2a

With the presidents of this sample group reporting a mean executive experience, duration of five years and ten months, and the mean number of countries in which they have lived at three, it is not surprising that they report high levels of Cultural Intelligence. The mean score of each dimension of CQ measured in the survey reflected strength in the presidents' abilities to plan, assess, and adapt in cultural situations. The thought processes in recognizing difference, and a deep understanding of the requirements of different cultural situations are reflected in each of the CQ results for this sample. A linear regression analysis, however, reveals no findings with

statistical significance in the relationship between levels of Cultural Intelligence and requirements of institutional accreditation.

It is unimaginable that these presidents would not derive a sense of energy from interacting with people from different backgrounds. Considering the numbers of cultures represented by internal demographics and external interests, the president position requires a person to thrive in intercultural communication. Further, having reached the presidential level of one's career, it seems that a mastery of language—or multiple languages in this case, and communication competencies would be inevitable.

Research Question 2b

American University of Western Europe. The president of AUWE has a mastery of multiple languages. Her ability to engage in a number of settings with a wide range of demographics reflects her adaptability in multiple situations. Drawing on her personal experiences in growing up in and then raising a family in the host country, her familiarity with the local norms and values. With exposure to multiple cultures for much of her life, she navigates the expectations of diverse crowds with ease. She changes her approach and adjusts her communication style to fit her audience, and asserts herself in various contexts. Dealing with staff and students from around the world, followers of this university leader readily recognize her adaptability and commitment to multiculturalism.

In assisting a faculty member with navigating the resident permit process, as well as negotiating with local labor unions, the AUEW's president has a clear understanding of the requirements placed on the university and its members by the host country. Maintaining institutional recognition on a national level demonstrates her commitment to the local status of an institution with a multinational identity.

The Cultural Intelligence and awareness of the benefits of cultural diversity are prioritized high on the president's agenda. In addition to her own direct interactions with the individual stakeholders, AUWE's executive leader strives to maintain a healthy mix of diversity among the student demographics. In identifying a target ratio of American and non-American students, she protects the organizational value of student organizations and other mechanisms of an American liberal arts college experience. She understands the need for student opportunities, and thoughtfully moderates the environment necessary for these opportunities to flourish.

Foreign Country University. With meaningful and transformative experiences in multiple countries and world regions, the president of FCU possesses the life experience to support a high level of Cultural Intelligence. His language abilities afford him the opportunity to better assess the cultural landscape and maneuver the nuances of culturally diverse situations.

Similarly, his ability to shift his tone and level of formality in his interactions with other people, such as the board of trustees, or esteemed campus visitors, demonstrates an adaptability at the group and organizational level of culture. His cognitive understanding of cultural values surrounding definitions of beauty and artistic appeal manifests in acquiring properties known to have a certain elegance. The president is keenly aware of the ways in which the visual aesthetics of the campus will feed into the public image of the institution.

The president's Metacognitive CQ becomes evident in his communication style, as he remains eloquent and well spoken in different languages. Many members of the FCU community admire him for the way he "dances between two worlds" in managing the American elements of the university in harmony with those parts reflective of the host culture.

Common Themes

In examining the findings from each case study, one can identify common themes that emerge between the presidential leadership of the American University of Western Europe and Foreign Country University. Shared practices and behaviors in support of a Transformational Leadership style and Cultural intelligence are revealed in the findings of the qualitative phase of the current research. The most evident commonality in the two presidents comes in their advanced proficiency and noted articulation in multiple languages. Stakeholders in both communities frequently cited their respective president's command of language. Often described as charismatic, or diplomatic, or charming, each president understands the power of language and uses it to their full advantage. Reflective of the ways in which the extant literature reports positive influences on overall CQ, the presidents also rely on their multiple culture identities in navigating legal requirements of maintaining and growing their university. Making accommodations for local labor laws and guiding their university's growth with the acquisition of new properties, each president demonstrates an attitude of Idealized Influence that is informed with high levels of Cognitive CQ.

Finally, the presidents share an ability to maintain a balance in the cultural and national diversity on their respective campus. In identifying a sustainable and productive blend of cultures on campus, each president embraces different perspectives and invites new ways of thinking to the fabric of the community. Moderation in the student enrollment figures and a certain level of diversity in faculty and staff demographics allow the presidents of FCU and AUWE to offer an appropriate amount of challenge and familiarity for the members of their community.

Differences Noted

A review of the findings also reveals some noted differences in the leadership strategies of each president involved in this research. Interestingly, gender seemed to play an influential role in the perceptions of each president's leadership. Where the president of AUWE was referred to as nurturing or maternal, her counterpart at FCU was often referred to with less of a paternal perspective. He was more often referred to as diplomatic or in the light of a political leader. This may speak to the cultural differences surrounding gender roles and stereotypes in respective host communities.

Beyond the manifestation of gender differences, the presidents also differ in their levels of Individual Consideration. While they both present themselves most effectively in group settings, it is the president of AUWE that demonstrates more behaviors of this Transformational Leadership dimension.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study provides evidence to suggest behaviors reflective of the constructs of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence play a key role in the overall leadership of these universities. Additionally, there is ample evidence to suggest these strategies influence the maintenance of U.S. accreditation on these campuses. In these findings, there was general agreement among the presidents in nearly every dimension of the two constructs, but differences emerge from the perspectives of the students, staff, and faculty they lead. Perceptions of Transformational Leadership and Culturally Intelligent behaviors appear to differ based on the individual's personal and professional connection with the president. Whether due to limited resources, the disjointed geographic constraints of the physical "campus," or cultural contradictions, this study presents evidence to affirm Kezar and Eckel's (2008) claim that

Transformational Leadership is the most appropriate in the environment of American higher education. However, although there was considerable agreement in the observed demonstration of each dimension of Cultural Intelligence by the university presidents in this study, perceptions of Transformational Leadership were greatly influenced by the dynamics and distance of individual relationships with the president.

Limitations

This study compares the experiences and perceptions of the presidents of American-accredited universities located in foreign countries. As with any research effort, it is appropriate to recognize the limitations associated with this research. One limitation is in the low response rate for the initial quantitative phase of the study. In addition to allowing the researcher the opportunity to conduct any sort of inferential statistical analyses to determine the presence of correlation between the constructs of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence, higher participation among the presidents would ensure a greater level of transferability in the findings.

While the presidents all currently play the role of executive leader of their respective institutions, it was anticipated their current responsibilities, styles and approaches could be considered rather personal and somewhat idiosyncratic. Additionally, the cultural environments of the campuses that they lead are vastly different from one another, creating additional layers of individuality to the participant experience. Because these campuses selected for the qualitative phase of this research are both located in Western Europe, some might argue the cultural implications may not be generalizable to counterpart universities in other world regions. However, Donmoyer (1990) endorses a process by which generalizability is considered through the psychological lens of expanding, enriching and understanding the social constructs of the

roles of the participants rather than strictly through scientific constructs. Finally, a level of selection bias may influence the findings of the proposed study. The absent data from presidents who do not complete and return the initial survey may prevent the study from identifying a comprehensively accurate set of implications.

The self-reporting nature of the quantitative measures presents the risk of inaccuracy in the findings. If the presidents responded in a socially desirable manner, the scores for each construct could be overstated. Similarly, diversity of cultural values surrounding work and time, or definitions regarding professional boundaries or otherwise acceptable behavior among respondents may result in inconsistent benchmarks for each participant. While the qualitative phase of the research provided a level of triangulation mitigating much of the possibility for inflated or inconsistent scores, providing brief and objective contextual descriptions of terms like “sometimes,” or “once in a while,” may assist future researchers in achieving congruence and accuracy in responses.

A limitation also exists in the degree of honesty and candor of the participants in the qualitative phase of the investigation. Despite a high level of care taken to assure each participant their identities would be protected, and their participation would have no influence on their individual standing in the university, some of the responses appeared to be less than completely forthcoming. Observable hesitation before providing responses to interview questions might also suggest a level of apprehension in providing a complete perspective or opinion on the part of some respondents. Future research may include a research design that is ethnographic in nature to garner a more authentic perspective.

Contributions

An important strength of this research is its contribution to our understanding of presidential leadership in the context of the current study provides an initial introduction of these universities and their presidents to the body of scholarly literature. It compliments previous investigations of university presidents and their leadership approaches. As pointed out by Robertson (2005), “previous literature on the internationalization of U.S. higher education has concentrated on leadership competencies essential for the internationalization of institutions, not on those competencies required to lead an institution within a globalized society” (p. 7). Through using an explanatory sequential mixed methods design to investigate presidents’ Cultural Intelligence and Transformational Leadership and, this study attempts to address that gap.

This explanatory sequential mixed methods investigation begins to address the question regarding the degree to which presidents of U.S.-accredited universities in foreign countries demonstrate a Cultural Intelligence and a Transformational style of leadership. It attempts to answer the question of how a university president manages cultural tensions of an institution and the surrounding community with the cultural inferences and requirements defined by accreditation in the United States. This may be most visible as colleges and universities grow their geographic footprint with the introduction of international centers and branch campuses, as well as stateside universities where the local culture of the community may be vastly different from the campus ethos. By implementing a quantitative survey instrument to each of the 44 university executives presiding over foreign universities with institutional-level U.S. accreditation, this research explored the commonalities in the perspectives of the presidents as a collective. Through in-depth interviews and focus groups, this study offers practical insights into

the perspectives of multiple stakeholders within the institution regarding the competencies of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence.

This study also attempts to provide a bridge between the knowledge domains of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence in the realm of higher education. The integration of the two models may provide insight into the styles and approaches of university presidents, specifically those who execute their leadership in the context of extreme cultural difference.

Implications for Practice

The findings of the current study may serve boards of trustees and other constituents of foreign universities seeking to gain or maintain U.S.-accreditation in the selection of university executive leadership. Specifically, as these institutions seek to recruit presidents with the ability to effectively manage competing cultural interests. The findings of this investigation may serve to guide boards of trustees in developing search processes to recognize competencies of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence. Further, with more than three-quarters of presidents reporting that balancing the expectations of the host community with the standards of United States institutional accreditation is more than moderately challenging, identifying potential candidates with expertise in navigating accreditation requirements and strong cultural competencies would increase the likelihood of successful continuance of accreditation recognition.

Additional benefits may serve current presidents of universities whose campus culture differs dramatically from the culture of the community surrounding it. An affluent, exclusive private institution located among a marginalized, lower socioeconomic population may call on this research in modeling the management of a cultural tension different from national cultures.

The implementation of Transformational Leadership and culturally intelligent strategies could serve to create a broader sense of purpose among campus and community stakeholders.

It is not unreasonable for regional accreditation agencies to begin to consider criteria for review specific to these institutions and their leadership. Highlighting the necessity to negotiate multiple external forces as well as the value of the international experience may ensure sustainable quality academic environments for students. Ultimately, it may be concluded that if foreign institutions are to maintain U.S. accreditation recognition, additional requirements and standards should be implemented to safeguard the integrity of both the institutional organization and the accreditation recognition. Standards regarding the leadership of these institutions may begin to address the differences inherent in these universities.

Finally, this study may prove beneficial to higher education faculty and administrators who aspire to this niche presidency. The development and refinement of the two constructs at the core of this study may guide these rising professionals to assess the areas of their own leadership in which these constructs and strategies are absent from their repertoire.

Recommendations for Future Research

Several recommendations for further research can be made as a result of this study. Replication or extension of this explanatory research involving presidents of U.S. accredited universities located in foreign countries may answer questions regarding other cultural and leadership factors.

On a technical level, increasing presidential participation in any future research could only be viewed as significantly advantageous. By increasing the number of respondents to the quantitative instruments of Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence, future researchers would gain the ability to perform statistical analyses and determine the degree to

which these constructs correlate. Further inferential or parametric analyses may provide a more accurate and comprehensive snapshot of the benefits of leadership behaviors and attitudes measured by the MLQ-5x and CQS.

Cultural Intelligence is a developmental construct. As such, levels of CQ may show increase over extended periods. Because both of the presidents included in the qualitative phase of this study have served in their positions for more than a decade, and since they each worked in various capacities at their universities for over a decade leading up to their presidencies, it would be advantageous for future research to highlight the Cultural Intelligence of presidents with less institutional experience. As each campus community has grown extensively familiar with their respective president, it is possible to suggest they have overlooked any previous behaviors or demonstrations lacking in CQ. The very positions the presidents hold may contribute to their CQ development. Thus, current perceptions of culturally intelligent behavior may have influenced any historical memories or recall. Perhaps a longitudinal study including multiple administrations of the CQS for new(er) presidents of a U.S.-accredited university abroad would shed light on the ability of the president to grow within this capacity.

While this study employed the CQS measure for Cultural Intelligence, the CQS 360 was not used. Instead, semi-structured interviews sought to examine the perceptions of key campus stakeholders. Including the use of the CQS 360 instrument could ensure a quantitative reference with which to begin the qualitative analysis. It could be argued the expectations of students, faculty, and staff supported levels of Cultural Intelligence congruent to the reported levels of the presidential participants.

In addition, not all leaders are transformational leaders. Future research could highlight non-Transformational Leadership to establish comparative interactions with community

stakeholders. This would allow the premise of Transformational Leadership and its fit for higher education to be examined more extensively.

Finally, the in-depth nature of the qualitative study in this research is limited to an examination of only two European campuses. Additional investigations in this area will expand the base of knowledge and information regarding the management of cultural tensions that may exist on U.S. universities abroad. Future research projects regarding these universities may wish to include greater cultural diversity in the sample frame of a qualitative phase of study.

Transferability aside, improving the diversity of sites may allow insight into how cultural environments and definitions influence perceptions of leadership. With both campuses included in the current study located in Europe, the limited variation of cultural difference may have influence on the findings.

REFERENCES

- About AUC. (2016). Retrieved September 21, 2016, from <http://www.aucegypt.edu/about/about-auc>
- About the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. (2017). Retrieved March 11, 2017, from <https://mellon.org/about/>
- Academic Construct Validity. (2016). Retrieved February 26, 2017, from <https://culturalq.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/LVD-Academic-Validity.pdf>
- Altbach, P. G. (2003). Academic Colonialism: Accreditation of Foreign Universities. *International Higher Education*, 5–7.
- Altbach, P. G. (2010). Why Branch Campuses May Be Unsustainable. *International Higher Education*, 58, 2–3.
- Amaral, A., Rosa, M. J., & Tavares, D. a. (2009). Supra-National Accreditation, Trust and Institutional Autonomy: Contrasting Developments of Accreditation in the United States and Europe. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21, 18. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=EJ865341>
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of Cultural Intelligence: Definition, Distinctiveness, and Nomological Work. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *The Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 3–15). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.-Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural Intelligence: Its Measurement and Effects on Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation, and Task Performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3, 335–371. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
- AUP University History. (2016). Retrieved September 21, 2016, from <https://www.aup.edu/university-history>
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *Mind Garden*, 29. <http://doi.org/10.1037/t03624-000>
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* Bass & Avolio Van Muijen & Koopman House & PodsakoV, 72, 441–462. <http://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>
- Balcazar, F. E., Suarez-Balcazar, Y., & Taylor-Ritzler, T. (2009). Cultural competence: Development of a conceptual framework. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 31(14), 1153–1160.

- Barbuto, J. E., Jay, J., Beenen, G., & Tran, H. (2015). The role of core self-evaluation , ethnocentrism , and cultural intelligence in study abroad success. *International Journal of Management Education*, 13(3), 268–277. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2015.07.004>
- Basham, L. M. (2010). Transformational And Transactional Leaders In Higher Education. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 6(6), 141–152.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207–218. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (Second). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Beechler, S., & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a Global Mindset. *Advances in International Management*, 19(7), 131–169. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027\(07\)19006-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-5027(07)19006-9)
- Birnbaum, R., & Umbach, P. D. (2001). Scholar, Steward, Spanner, Stranger : The Four Career Paths of College Presidents. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 203–217. <http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2001.0001>
- Blanco-Ramirez, G. (2015). US accreditation in Mexico: quality in higher education as symbol, performance and translation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(3), 329–342. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2013.871236>
- Bok, D. (2014). The questionable priorities of university presidents. *Change*, 46(1), 53–57. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2014.867214>
- Botstein, L. (1990). The College Presidency: 1970–1990. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 22(2), 34–40. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1990.9939192>
- Bowen, D. E., & Inkpen, A. C. (2009). Exploring the Role of “Global Mindset” in Leading Change in International Contexts. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45(2), 239–260. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0021886309334149>
- Brittingham, B. (2009). Accreditation in the United States: How did we get to where we are? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2009(145), 7–27. <http://doi.org/10.1002/he.331>
- Brittingham, B. (2015). American Accreditation of Foreign Universities: Proceed with Caution. *International Higher Education*, 33, 14–15.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming Leadership: A new pursuit of happiness* (First). New York, NY: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- CHEA. (2017). Accredited Institutions. Retrieved April 5, 2017, from <http://www.chea.org/4dcgi/chea/search/index.html?MenuKey=main>

- Collins, I. (2015). Using international accreditation in higher education to effect changes in organisational culture: A case study from a Turkish university. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 14(2), 141–154. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1475240915592589>
- Crawford, C. B., Gould, L. V., & Scott, R. F. (2003). Transformational Leader as Champion and Techie: Implications for Leadership Educators. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 2(1), 57–73.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (Second). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crowne, K. A. (2008). What leads to cultural intelligence? *Business Horizons*, 51(5), 391–399. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2008.03.010>
- Deng, L., & Gibson, P. (2008). A Qualitative Evaluation on the Role of Cultural Intelligence in Cross-Cultural Leadership Effectiveness. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(12), 181–197.
- Dennison, G. M. (2001). Small Men on Campus: Modern University Presidents. *Innovative Higher Education*, 25(4), 269–284. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.sally.sandiego.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=4ac71efc-0211-40e6-b3d5-c031f30a0616%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4214>
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys : The Tailored Design Method* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley and Sons.
- Directories - Regional Agencies. (2017). Retrieved April 5, 2017, from http://www.chea.org/4DCGI/cms/review.html?Action=CMS_Document&DocID=197&MenuKey=main
- Diversity Policy. (2016). WASC Senior College and University Commission Diversity Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.wscuc.org/content/diversity-policy>
- Earley, P. C. (2002). Redefining Interactions Across Cultures and Organizations: Moving Forward with Cultural Intelligence. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 24, 271–299.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, P. C., Ang, S., & Tan, J.-S. (2006). *CQ: Developing Cultural Intelligence at Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, P. C., & Peterson, R. S. (2016). The Elusive Cultural Chameleon : Cultural Intelligence as a New Approach to Intercultural Training for the Global Manager, 3(1), 100–115.
- Eaton, J. S. (2006). An Overview of U.S. Accreditation, (June), 1–12.

- Ehrenberg, R. G., Cheslock, John, J., & Epifantseva, J. (2000). *Paying Our Presidents: What Do Trustees Value? NBER Working Paper Series* (Vol. Working Pa).
- Eisenberg, J., Lee, H., Bruck, F., Brenner, B., Claes, M., Mironski, J., & Bell, R. (2013). Can Business Schools Make Students Culturally Competent? Effects of Cross- Cultural Management Courses on Cultural Intelligence. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 12(4), 603–621.
- Ewell, P. T. (2008). *US accreditation and the future of quality assurance: A tenth anniversary report from the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Council for Higher Education Accreditation*.
- Fantini, A. E. (2009). (2009). Assessing intercultural competence: Issues and Tools. In *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 456–476). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fisher, J. L., & Koch, J. V. (1996). *Presidential Leadership. ASHE Higher Education Report*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.sally.sandiego.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&sid=7363c994-4871-496b-bb37-cf05c1eb7e27%40sessionmgr4004&hid=4214>
- Freeman, S., Kochan, F. K. (2012). Academic Pathways to University Leadership: Presidents' Descriptions of Their Doctoral Education. Retrieved February 14, 2016, from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.sally.sandiego.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=7363c994-4871-496b-bb37-cf05c1eb7e27%40sessionmgr4004&hid=4214>
- Gelfand, M. J., Imal, L., & Fehr, R. (2008). Thinking Intelligently about Cultural Intelligence: The Road Ahead. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *The Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications*2 (pp. 375–387). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Handbook of Accreditation Revised. (2013). Retrieved April 5, 2017, from <https://www.wscuc.org/content/2013-handbook-accreditation>
- Harclerod, F. F., & Eaton, J. S. (2005). The hidden hand: External constituencies and their impact. In P. . Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the 21st century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 251–285). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Hartog, D. N. Den, Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership : An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 19–34.
- Haug, G. (2003). Quality Assurance/Accreditation in the Emerging European Higher Education Area: a possible scenario for the future. *European Journal of Education*, 38(3), 229–240. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00143>

- Hay, I. (2006). Leadership of stability and leadership of volatility: Transactional and transformational leaderships compared. *Academic Leadership*, 4(4).
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). A Study Of Values, Beliefs, and Norms Across the IBM Corporations. In M. Minkov (Ed.), *Cross-cultural analysis: the science and art of comparing the world's modern societies and their cultures* (pp. 201–216). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hughes, R. (2011). Strategies for Managing and Leading an Academic Staff in Multiple Countries. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (155), 15–25. <http://doi.org/10.1002/he>
- Ibarra, H., Ely, R. J., & Kolb, D. M. (2013). Women Rising: The Unseen Barriers. *Harvard Business Review*, (September), 1–8. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2013/09/women-rising-the-unseen-barriers/ar/1%22#>
- Ikenberry, S. O. (2010). The Changing Demands of Presidential Leadership. *Trusteeship*, 18(6), 25–28.
- Institution Directory. (2017). Retrieved April 5, 2017, from http://www.msche.org/institutions_directory.asp
- Ivankova, N. V, Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3–20. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>
- Jackson, S., & Harris, S. (2005). African American Female College and University Presidents: Career Paths to the Presidency. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, 3(4), 235–253.
- Javidan, M., House, R. J., & Dorfman, P. W. (2004). A Nontechnical Summary of GLOBE Findings.pdf. In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 29–48). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Javidan, M., & Teagarden, M. B. (2011). Conceptualizing and Measuring Global Mindset. In *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 6, pp. 13–42). Bradford, GB: Emerald Group Publishing. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Kauffman, J. F. (1980). *At the Pleasure of the Board*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education (ACE).
- Kaufman, B. (2004). Juggling Act: Today's college or university president must be a champion fundraiser and a strong internal leader. *University Business*, 7(7), 50–52.
- Kerr, C. (2001). *The Uses of the University* (Fifth). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keung, E. K., & Rockinson-Szapkiw, A. J. (2013). The relationship between transformational leadership and cultural intelligence A study of international school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(6), 836–854. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-04-2012-0049>

- Kezar, A., & Carducci, R. (2009). Revolutionizing leadership development: Lessons from research and theory. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Rethinking leadership in a complex, multicultural, and global environment: New concepts and models for higher education* (pp. 1–38). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(4), 379–405. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13603120802317891>
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting Today's Governance Challenges. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(4), 371–399. <http://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2004.0022>
- Kim, Y. J., & Van Dyne, L. (2012). Cultural Intelligence and International Leadership Potential : The Importance of Contact for Members of the Majority. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 61(2), 272–294. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00468.x>
- Kinser, K. (2011). Multinational quality assurance. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 155, 53–64.
- Klein, L. B. (2016). *Understanding the Experiences of Non-Traditional University Leadership in Higher Education: A Qualitative Study Using A Triangular Theoretical Approach*. Oakland University.
- Knight, J. (2007). Cross-border higher education: Issues and implications for quality assurance and accreditation. *Higher Education in the World*, 24(3), 134–146. <http://doi.org/10.1177/102831530263002>
- Kumas-Tan, Z., Beagan, B., Loppie, C., MacLeod, A., & Frank, B. (2007). Measures of cultural competence: examining hidden assumptions 82(6), 548–557. *Academic Medicine*, 82(6), 548–557.
- Lane, J. E., Brown, M. C., & Pearcey, M.-A. (2004). Transnational Campuses: Obstacles and Opportunities for Institutional Research in the Global Education Market. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2004(124), 49–62. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ir.131>
- Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S., & Boyacigiller, N. a. (2007). What we talk about when we talk about “global mindset”: Managerial cognition in multinational corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(2), 231–258. <http://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400265>
- Livemore, D. (2010). *Leading with Cultural Intelligence: The New Secret to Success*. New York, NY: AMACOM.
- Livemore, D. (2011). *The Cultural Intelligence Difference: Master the One Skill You Can't Do Without in Today's Global Economy*. New York, NY: AMACOM.
- Lovvorn, A. S., & Chen, J.-S. (2011). Developing a Global Mindset : The Relationship between an International Assignment and Cultural Intelligence, 2(9), 275–283.

- Lumby, J., & Foskett, N. (2015). Internationalization and Culture in Higher Education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 1–17. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549978>
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 13–17.
- McBurnie, G., & Ziguras, C. (2006). *Transnational education: Issues and trends in offshore higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (Second). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morgan, D. L. (1996). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moulakis, A. (2011). What the U.S. Government Can't Do Abroad, Colleges Can. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Muenjohn, N., & Armstrong, A. (2008). Evaluating the Structural Validity of the Evaluating the Structural Validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Capturing the Leadership Factors of Transformational-Transactional Leadership. *Contemporary Management Research*, 4(1), 3–14. <http://doi.org/10.7903/cmr.v4i1.704>
- Nahavandi, A. (2008). *The Art and Science of Leadership* (Fifth). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Naidoo, V. (2009). A Stock Take of Current Activity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(3), 310–330. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308317938>
- Ng, K.-Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2009a). *Developing Global Leaders: The Role of International Experience and Cultural Intelligence*. *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 5). Elsevier. [http://doi.org/10.1108/S1535-1203\(2009\)0000005013](http://doi.org/10.1108/S1535-1203(2009)0000005013)
- Ng, K.-Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2009b). From Experience to Experiential Learning: Cultural Intelligence as a Learning Capability for Global Leader Development. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(4), 511–526. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2009.47785470>
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Sixth). New Delhi, India: Sage.
- Oden, R. A. (2009). A College President's Defense of Accreditation. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (145), 37–45. <http://doi.org/10.1002/he>
- Osland, J., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., & Osland, A. (2006). Developing global leadership capabilities and global mindset: a review'. *Handbook of Research in International Human Resource Management*, 197–222. <http://doi.org/10.4337/9781845428235.00017>
- Padilla, A. (2005). *Portraits in Leadership: Six Extraordinary University Presidents*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

- Pavoncello, F. (2015). The Globalization of education. *Longitude*, 151, 112–115.
- Peterson, B. (2011). *Cultural Intelligence : A Guide to Working with People from Other Cultures*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press. Retrieved from <http://o-site.ebrary.com.sally.sandiego.edu/lib/copley/reader.action?docID=10448436>
- Powell, R. A., & Single, M. (1996). Focus Groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 8(5), 499–504.
- Ramis, M. (2010). Cultural Intelligence in the School. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 15(2), 239–252.
- Rhoads, R., & Tierney, W. (1992). *Cultural Leadership in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED357708>
- Roberts, D. (2011). *U.S. Accreditation of Universities in the Gulf Cooperation Council*. New York, NY.
- Roberts, L. G. (2010). Looking beneath the tip of the iceberg : cultural intelligence in international education. *International Schools Journal*, XXX(1), 38–46.
- Robertson, L. B. (2005). *American Higher Education in a Global Society: a Study of Presidential Leadership*. Kent State University.
- Rockstuhl, T., Seiler, S., Ang, S., Dyne, L. Van, & Annen, H. (2011). Beyond General Intelligence (IQ) and Emotional Intelligence (EQ): The Role of Cultural Intelligence (CQ) on Cross-Border Leadership Effectiveness in a Globalized World. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(4), 825–840.
- Ross, M., & Green, M. F. (2000). *The American College President: 2000 Edition*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education (ACE).
- Rosser, J. M. (1990). The Role of the University President in Realizing the Multicultural University. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 34(2), 223–231. <http://doi.org/10.1177/07399863870092005>
- Sanyal, B. C., & Martin, M. (2007). Quality assurance and the role of accreditation: an overview. *Higher Education in the World*, 3–17. Retrieved from <http://upcommons.upc.edu/handle/2099/8095>
- Schaffer, M., & Miller, G. (2008). Cultural Intelligence: A Key Success Factor for Expatriates. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *The Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 107–125). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Sebkova, H. (2002). Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Europe. *Higher Education in Europe*, 27(3), 239–247. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0379772022000014961>

- Simon, L. A. K. (2009). The University President: Balancing Competing Demands. *The Presidency*, 12(1), 1–4.
- Song, W., & Hartley III, H. V. (2012). A study of presidents of independent colleges and universities, 1–48.
- Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation. (2015). Philadelphia, PA: Middle States Commission on Higher Education.
- Tarique, I., & Takeuchi, R. (2008). Developing Cultural Intelligence: The Roles of International Nonwork Experiences. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *The Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 56–70). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Thomas, D. C. (2006). Domain and Development of Cultural Intelligence: The Importance of Mindfulness. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 78–99.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
- Triola, M. F. (2010). *Elementary Statistics* (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2008). Development and Validation of the CQS. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *The Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (pp. 16–38). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Livermore, D. (2010). Cultural Intelligence: A Pathway for Leading in a Rapidly Globalizing World. *Leading across Differences*, 131–138.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Ng, K. Y., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M. L., & Koh, C. (2012). Sub-Dimensions of the Four Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence: Expanding the Conceptualization and Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(4), 295–313. Retrieved from
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.libproxy.unitec.ac.nz/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=03601790-aaf4-42a5-92a0-6cfaaac02d94%40sessionmgr4009&hid=4214>
- Waterbury, J. (2003). Hate your policies, love your institutions. *Foreign Affairs*, 82(1), 58–68.
<http://doi.org/papers2://publication/uuid/FD384793-26DF-460C-809B-09EE8B46B0A1>
- Westerheijden, D. F. (2001). Ex oriente lux?: National and multiple accreditation in Europe after the fall of the Wall and after Bologna. *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), 65–75.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/13538320120045094>
- Wetzler, W. F. (1954). A Look at the President of the Small College. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 25(8), 439–456.
- Wolverton, M., Bower, Beverly, L., & Maldonado, C. (2006). Leading Ladies: Women University and College Presidents: What They Say about Effective Leadership. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, 4(2), 125–140.

- Wood, E. D., & St. Peters, H. Y. Z. (2014). Short-term cross-cultural study tours : impact on cultural intelligence. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(4), 558–570.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Fourth). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An Evaluation of Conceptual Weaknesses in Transformational and Charismatic Leadership Theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285–305. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00013-2](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00013-2)

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

The following protocol will be used to guide the individual interviews in the qualitative phase of the study. Interviews will be recorded for follow-up and reference to ensure accurate representation of participant experience.

Date: _____ Time: _____

Interviewee: _____

University/Position: _____

Introduction Script (to be read at the beginning of each interview):

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today regarding your experiences and observations regarding the president of your university. As you may remember, I am currently conducting a study to explore the Transformational Leadership traits and behaviors of presidents of U.S.-accredited universities located in foreign countries. Your participation in this brief interview will help to understand the ways in which your president demonstrates Transformational Leadership and a Cultural Intelligence will contribute greatly to this exploration. This interview should only take about an hour.

Remember your participation in this interview is completely voluntary, and you may choose to discontinue the interview at any time. Additionally, you are not obligated to share any information that you might be uncomfortable in sharing. Choosing to not participate in all or part of this interview will have no influence in your position at this university. Any information provided and/or identifying records will remain confidential and kept in a locked file in my office and/or password-protected computer file for a minimum of five years. All data collected from you will be coded with a number or pseudonym (fake name), and your real name will not be used. The results of this research project may be made public and/or quoted in professional journals and meetings, but information from this study will only be reported as a group, not individually.

Finally, I would like to ask your permission to record this interview to accurately represent your answers and responses when reporting the results of my research. Once the research is complete, and the reporting of findings is nearing completion, I can provide you the opportunity to give feedback on the accuracy of the information relative to your experience.

If you have any questions or need clarification during our conversation, please do not hesitate to ask, but I would encourage you to answer the questions as best you can based on your initial perceptions and interpretations.

Questions

1. Tell me about your interactions with the president...
2. What are some changes the president has made that you have seen or experienced?
3. I would like to get a sense of how the president works collaboratively to solve problems or make change. Tell me about a time when you have seen him/her seek different perspectives from other people. ...from people with different cultural backgrounds?
4. On whom would you say the president relies the most for advice and support?
5. In what ways do you think the president offers reassurance to the university community that issues and obstacles will be overcome? Give me an example of an issue the campus is facing now, and what is being done to find resolution...
6. I am interested in knowing a time when you have felt empowered by the president...
7. How does your president act as a mentor and role model?
8. Describe a situation in which you think the president has demonstrated exceptional leadership...
9. How has your president changed during the time that you have known/worked with him or her?
10. In what ways has the president helped you to grow or develop professionally?
11. What are some of the ways you have seen the president navigate the balance of being a U.S. institution in a foreign culture?

Note: Additional questions will be included to examine the variations in the data collected during the previous quantitative phases of the study. Specifically, questions will seek to investigate participants' experiences with the university president individually or as part of a group.

Final Remarks and Closing Script (to be read at the conclusion of each interview)

Thank you for your participation. I truly appreciate your willingness to take the time to talk about your experience, and your responses will be a valuable addition to my work. If you have any questions about the research or if you would like to add any other information or insights, please feel free to contact me by email at jeffb@sandiego.edu, or 619.994.1655. Alternatively, you may also contact my academic advisor, Dr. Christopher Newman at cnewman@sandiego.edu.

APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

The following protocol will guide the focus group interviews in the qualitative phase of the study. Interviews will be recorded for follow-up and reference to ensure accurate representation of participant experience.

Date: _____

Time: _____

Participants: 1:

2:

3:

4:

5:

6:

University:

Introduction Script (to be read at the beginning of each interview):

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today regarding your experiences and observations regarding the president of your university. As you may remember, I am currently conducting a study to explore the Transformational Leadership and Cultural Intelligence traits and behaviors of presidents of U.S.-accredited universities located in foreign countries. Your participation in this brief interview will help to understand the ways in which your president demonstrates Transformational Leadership and a Cultural Intelligence will contribute greatly to this exploration. This interview should only take about an hour.

Remember your participation in this group is completely voluntary, and you may choose to discontinue your participation at any time. Additionally, you are not obligated to share any information that you might be uncomfortable in sharing. Choosing to not participate in all or part of this interview will have no influence in your academic or other standing at this university. Any information provided and/or identifying records will remain confidential and kept in a locked file in my office and/or password-protected computer file for a minimum of five years. All data collected from you will be coded with a number or pseudonym (fake name), and your real name will not be used. The results of this research project may be made public and/or quoted in professional journals and meetings, but information from this study will only be reported as a group, not individually.

Finally, I would like to ask your permission to record this interview to accurately represent your answers and responses when reporting the results of my research. Once the research is complete, and the reporting of findings is nearing completion, I can provide you the opportunity to give feedback on the accuracy of the information relative to your experience.

If you have any questions or need clarification during our conversation, please do not hesitate to ask, but I would encourage you to answer the questions as best you can based on your initial perceptions and interpretations.

Questions

1. How frequently does the president interact with students? How many of the students on campus would recognize the president in an unofficial setting?
2. What things does the president do to empower students on this campus? How does the president encourage creativity and innovation among students?
3. In what ways does the president communicate the mission and values of the university?
4. How have you seen the president embrace the cultural diversity of the university? Strengthen it?
5. If I were to ask students about their perspective on the university president, how might their answers be different than if I asked the same to faculty and staff?
6. Tell me about a time when the president offered you support...
7. When you heard that you would be participating in a group interview focusing on your university president, what are some things that you wanted to make sure you talked about? (Personal stories and interactions, observations, etc.)

Note: Additional questions will be included to examine the variations in the data collected during the previous quantitative phases of the study. Specifically, questions will seek to investigate participants' experiences with the university president individually or as part of a group.

Final Remarks and Closing Script (to be read at the conclusion of each interview)

Thank you for your participation. I truly appreciate your willingness to take the time to talk about your experience, and your responses will be a valuable addition to my work. If you have any questions about the research or if you would like to add any other information or insights, please feel free to contact me by email at jeffb@sandiego.edu, or 619.994.1655. Alternatively, you may also contact my academic advisor, Dr. Christopher Newman at cnewman@sandiego.edu.

Institutional Review Board

Project Action Summary

Action Date: March 18, 2016

Note: Approval expires one year after this date.

Type: ☐ New Full Review ☒ New Expedited Review ☐ Continuation Review ☐ Exempt Review
☐ Modification

Action: ☒ Approved ☐ Approved Pending Modification ☐ Not Approved

Project Number: 2016-03-152

Researcher(s): Jeff Bourgeois Doc SOLES
Dr. Robert Donmoyer Fac SOLES

Project Title: Neither Here nor There: Presidents of American-Accredited Universities Located in Foreign Countries

Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence with the student researcher.

Modifications Required or Reasons for Non-Approval

None

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited review at any time.

Dr. Thomas R. Herrinton
Administrator, Institutional Review Board
University of San Diego
herrinton@sandiego.edu
5998 Alcalá Park
San Diego, California 92110-2492