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From the Editor’s Clipboard
Volume 12, Number 1 – Winter 2013

I always love the new year. It seems like a natural time to begin new things – you know, make changes. In 2013 you may notice a few changes to JOLE. The first change you may notice is the implementation of the Fast Track submission and tracking system. In the last 18 months, submissions to JOLE have grown tremendously. Managing submissions and the review process has become quite cumbersome. Fast Track will provide a more efficient submission and review process. Check the JOLE webpage for updates as we implement this process.

We have also begun the process of developing the Impact Factor for JOLE. The Impact Factor is a measure that reflects the average number of citations to recent articles published in a journal. Thompson Institute for Scientific Information tabulates the frequency that articles from a journal are cited over a two year period. This is actually a three-year process because we have to submit two current years to calculate the impact factor. Providing the impact factor is an important service to JOLE’s authors as more and more tenure and promotion committees have requested this information of their faculty.

DOI numbers (Digital Object Identifiers) are unique identifying numbers assigned to articles that insure that the article can always be found. This insures the permanency of digital literature. This is another long-term project that we will begin in 2013. Assigning DOI numbers to every article published in JOLE will take some time, but will truly bring JOLE into the digital age.

Are there some other things that we can do to improve JOLE for you as an author or reader? Please let me or other members of the Editing Managing Board know. Forty manuscripts were submitted for the Winter 2013 issue with 18 being accepted for publication – a 45% acceptance rate. This acceptance rate is higher than normal (usually 25-26%) but reflects the quality of the manuscripts being submitted to the journal. I hope that you find that these articles inform both your teaching and your perspective of leadership and leadership education.

Respectfully submitted,
Barry L. Boyd
Editor, JOLE
Commentaries

The Inaugural National Leadership Education Research Agenda: A New Direction for the Field
We begin the Winter 2013 issue with two commentaries. The first commentary is by ALE President, Tony Andenoro. Tony describes the process of developing the Inaugural National Leadership Education Research Agenda. The goal of the project is to create a guiding document to assist in further defining Leadership Education as a discipline and provide directional research priorities for that discipline. The commentary provides a foundational understanding and creates transparency for the process in an effort to solicit collaborative partnerships and dialogue that will ultimately provide more holistic research priorities and enhanced opportunities for scholarship within Leadership Education.

The Impact of Using a Survey Framework in Leadership Education: Is More Better?
In the next commentary, Samuels, Lindsay, Watola, Walliser, and Reimer suggest that education should focus on better preparing our leaders using a broad survey framework instead of a single leadership approach as the only basis for their development. The modern environment in which leaders operate is complex, dynamic, and ambiguous. In such contexts, it is better to have a full toolbox of leadership approaches. Leaders can then select the right tool or combination of tools for the occasion, rather than rely on a single tool for all occasions.

Research Features

Outstanding Practice Paper – 2012 ALE Conference
Appreciative Inquiry: A Tool for Organizational, Programmatic, and Project-Focused Change
Priest, Kaufman, Brunton, and Seibel outline the philosophy of appreciative inquiry (AI) as it applies to organizational development, illustrate AI practices associated with a five-stage model, and highlight three examples that can be used as models for leading change in a variety of organizational situations. The authors describe how they used AI to facilitate the strategic planning/organization process at Virginia Tech University.

Social Media Tools in the Leadership Classroom: Students’ Perceptions of Use
Odom, Jarvis, Sandlin, and Peek describe the advantages and disadvantages of using social media in the leadership classroom. One key advantage was that the use of social media increased the quality and efficiency of communications between the students and instructor.

Building Social Capital through Leadership Development
Social capital, once studied primarily in the social and political sciences, has become increasingly important in the organizational sciences as a mechanism for the creation and maintenance of healthy organizational life. Roberts’ study describes how leaders developed social capital through an action-learning process in a regional health system. She describes the implications of developing social capital in other contexts.

### Influences of Theory and Practice in the Development of Servant Leadership in Students

Massey, Sulak, and Sriram identify key elements in pedagogical frameworks that support and impede the leadership development of students and propose strategies to enhance the learning outcomes established for leadership development.

### Leadership Learning through Student-Centered and Inquiry-Focused Approaches to Teaching Adaptive Leadership

Haber-Curran and Tillapaugh describe a qualitative study that examined student-centered and inquiry-focused pedagogical approaches in a capstone leadership course. In this course, students’ understandings of the concept of leadership were broadened. Their findings suggest three prominent experiences as contributing to students’ learning.

### Examining the Intersections between Undergraduates’ Engagement in Community Service and Development of Socially Responsible Leadership

Soria, Nobbe, and Fink examined relationships between students’ engagement in community service in different contexts and their development of socially responsible leadership. Their findings suggest some avenues for participating in community service may be more effective than others.

### Elements of an Undergraduate Agricultural Leadership Program: A Delphi Study

Morgan, King, Rudd, and Kaufman sought the opinions of 15 agricultural leadership experts on what should be the objectives of agricultural leadership programs, what courses should be taught, the importance of internships, and the identification of potential careers for agricultural leadership graduates. Their findings are informative and may contribute to the national discussion of a leadership agenda.

### Socially Responsible or Just Plain Social?

Students in Greek Life are directed to demonstrate their leadership abilities, whether it is with their philanthropy of choice, within their chapter, or within the larger university setting. Mills and Bruce examined the leadership competencies of students who choose to become involved in Greek Life. Results of this study could be used to assist in driving the mandatory programming in Greek Life in an effort to create more purposeful and directed programming for this audience.
Texas FFA Officer Perceptions of Good Followership
Ferrell, Boyd, and Rayfield examined Texas FFA officers’ perceptions regarding the traits and characteristics that good followers possess. Their findings reveal that these young leaders have a limited level of understanding of what constitutes a good follower. In addition, male and female leaders exhibited noticeable differences in their descriptions of good followers. The study reveals implications for not only FFA, but other youth leadership programs.

What Brings People to Leadership Roles: A Phenomenological Study of Beef Industry Leaders
What role do volunteer peer leaders in non-formalized leadership roles play in membership-based organizations? Gordon and Ellis examined these roles in a beef industry organization and identified seven themes that identified the central phenomenon and seven traits that described leaders in the beef industry.

Theory Features

Contributing to the Development of Student Leadership through Academic Advising
McClellan discusses the role of academic advising as a strategic partner with classroom and extra-curricular leadership development programs. He discusses the similarity in advising outcomes and leadership development outcomes, and examines how the roles of academic advisors in higher education relate to leadership development, as well as how advisors can become intentional leadership educators.

Application Briefs and Cases

The Learning Journal Bridge: From Classroom Concepts to Leadership Practices
Maellaro notes that most reflective writing assignments only use the first two stages of Kolb’s experiential learning model. She describes a graduate learning journal assignment that incorporates all phases of Kolb’s model. The assignment’s success in creating a bridge between simply learning about leadership and actually putting leadership knowledge into practice is grounded in three learning theories, which are also discussed.

Analyzing Cultural Artifacts for the Introduction, Perpetuation, or Reinforcement of Moral Ideals
Williams describes an assignment that helps students better understand the development and socialization of moral behavior. The use of ethical artifacts
engaged students’ higher-order thinking skills in improving their conceptualization of moral development.

**Teaching about Leadership or Teaching through Leadership?**
Seger and Bergsten describe a process of practicing leadership in the classroom to teach leadership rather than simply teaching *about* leadership. Leadership is viewed more as a mutual relationship rather than certain personality traits of the leader.

**Teaching Followership in Leadership Education**
Raffo presents a lesson for teaching students about followership in contemporary society by including key concepts and follower characteristics followed by class activities and assignments designed to engage students in active learning and self-reflective processes.

**Why Does Leadership Exist?**
Before we can get into the How? And What? of leadership, Caufield suggests that we must first answer the Why? of leadership. Why does leadership exist? Caufield states that the answer to this question informs how we approach leadership development.
The Inaugural National Leadership Education Research Agenda: A New Direction for the Field

Anthony C. Andenoro, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Leadership Education
Agricultural Education & Communication
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL
andenoro@ufl.edu

Abstract

This commentary details the process aimed at developing the Inaugural National Leadership Education Research Agenda. The goal of the project is to create a guiding document to assist in further defining Leadership Education as a discipline and provide directional research priorities for that discipline. The commentary provides a foundational understanding and creates transparency for the process in an effort to solicit collaborative partnerships and dialogue that will ultimately provide more holistic research priorities and enhanced opportunities for scholarship within Leadership Education.

Introduction

In the 2007, the first iteration of the National Research Agenda for Agricultural Education and Communication created a foundation for communicating research priorities to stakeholders along with the “development, acceptance, and evaluation of creative solutions in agriculture and natural resources” (Osborne, n.d., p.2). However, the idea actually stemmed from an interaction that took place over a year prior to that in Washington DC. A group of well-established agricultural educators met to discuss a variety of legislative items impacting the field of Agriculture and more specifically Agricultural Education. During one of the meetings a lobbyist was present to collect perspectives and answer potential questions that the group might have. During the conversation the lobbyist noted that there was tremendous opportunity for this group considering what he had heard and observed. He asked them for a document that he could take to Capitol Hill later that afternoon that could provide perspective to the legislative decision makers. As the group looked at one another, they realized two things. First, that they did not have a document that provided the information that the lobbyist had asked for. This was concerning for them. And second, that they needed to construct a document that could serve in this capacity with the potential to create
tremendous opportunities for the field of Agricultural Education in the future. The group vowed that they would not allow an opportunity like this to pass and engaged in a collaborative process to develop a research agenda. The process yielded a document, which created innovative and positive direction for the field of Agricultural Education and Communication. The second iteration of this document was released in 2011 demonstrating progressive thinking and furthering the commitment to “inspiring the human dimension of global food and agricultural systems” (Doerfert, 2011, p.5).

This story provides context and perspective to the field of Leadership Education. In 2011, the Association of Leadership Educators with respect to this idea initiated the task of building a National Leadership Education Research Agenda. This commentary details the process for that ongoing effort.

**Justification**

When one attempts to define the merits of a discipline, he or she will normally examine the uniqueness of the body of knowledge represented within that discipline. However, this has been a difficult proposition for the field of Leadership Education historically. Primarily the difficulty to define the field lies in the interdisciplinary nature of leadership. Consider that at most universities, one will find some form of leadership education being taught in Colleges of Business, Agriculture, Engineering, Education, Liberal Arts, along with a large contingent of Student Affairs departments. This poses challenges for those who are attempting to define what Leadership Education is as a discipline, but it also creates an incredible opportunity. Through the diversity of perspectives contained in various academic and co-curricular departments, Leadership Education as a discipline finds broad trans-disciplinary application. The development of the National Leadership Education Research Agenda addresses that broad application in a manageable and strategic fashion. As the agenda guides the scholarship of Leadership Education as a discipline, it also defines it as a discipline.

Another challenge facing the field of Leadership Education is the general lack of research priorities aimed at guiding the scholarship within field. Although this creates opportunities for diverse publications with broad applications, it decreases the applied nature of the scholarship. Primarily, researchers within Leadership Education continue to ask and attempt to answer the fundamental leadership question: what makes an effective leader? This is accompanied by the tangible connections to decision-making, ethics, morality, and organizational culture. However, the more important questions facing the field of Leadership Education are who has changed because of this research and how will the research that we do impact those we serve? The National Leadership Education Research Agenda provides the underpinning for increasing the applied nature of the scholarship guiding the development of future leaders and managers through higher education.
The Process

“To know where we are going with leadership [education] research, we must know where we are, and where we have been—we must look backward and forward at the same time” (Hunt & Dodge, 2000, p. 453). The preceding quotation identifies the vastness associated with the challenge of defining the field of Leadership Education. Due to this, it was imperative to provide parameters to the direction that will shape the scholarship within the field. For the first six months of the process, discussions took place across disciplines exploring the vast array of discussions that had taken place concerning the scholarship of Leadership Education over the past decade. These discussions provided critical perspectives relating to the establishment of parameters that would guide the development process. Through a synthesis of the materials and perspectives gained through the discussions one question emerged:

- What are the fundamental problems and issues within the broad context of Leadership Education that should be addressed at the higher education level through research in the next five years?

This question is essential for achieving the two overarching goals of the agenda (a) to provide research priorities that can guide applied scholarship contributing to the development of future leaders and managers through higher education and (b) to provide key elements that further define Leadership Education as a discipline. Considering this, the following seven-phase process was initiated in May 2012.

Phase 1: Synthesis of Past Perspective – Previously, it was noted that a large number of discussions were held to solicit perspectives and develop parameters for the National Leadership Education Research Agenda. However, the discussions were also conducted to encourage collaboration. The collaborative nature of these discussions forced stakeholders to consider varying viewpoints, but it also reduced silos, established partnerships, and increased the likelihood of diffusion and adoption of this document. Organizations that participated in the conversations were the American Association of Agricultural Education (AAAE), American College Personnel Association (ACPA), Association of College Unions International (ACUI), Center for Creative Leadership (CCL), International Leadership Association (ILA), National Association for Campus Activities (NACA), National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), and National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs (NCLP).

Considerable documentation also was collected as a result of these discussions. Several white papers (Petrie, 2011; Doerfert, 2011; Osborne, n.d.), transcripts, and minutes from organizational meetings addressing similar initiatives, as well as other seminal research (Sowcik, 2012; Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010; Avolio, Wallumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Rich & Mengel, 2009; Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006; Bryman, 2004; Townsend, 2002; Lowe & Gardner, 2001; Conger, 1998; Parry, 1998; Insch, Moore, &
Murphy, 1997; Brungardt, 1996; Bresnen, 1995; Fleishman, Zaccaro, & Mumford, 1991) done addressing the direction of leadership education research were examined.

The documents detailing past discussions, perspectives from various organizations charged with addressing the idea of a research trajectory for Leadership Education, and the relevant literature were explored via a content analysis allowing for themes to emerge. These themes will provide the foundation for the future phases and ultimately, the development of the agenda.

Phase 2: Understanding Recommendations for Future Research in the Field – Graduate students at the University of Florida were charged with exploring the recommendations for future research listed within articles published from 2010-2012 in the *Journal of College Student Development, Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, Journal of Leadership Education, Journal of Leadership Studies,* and *Leadership Quarterly.* These journals were selected based on their reputational excellence and alignment with Leadership Education in a higher education context. A content analysis was performed identifying consistent themes. The themes provided timely perspectives and enhanced triangulation.

Phase 3: Leadership Education Summit – There are several engaged academicians conducting innovative and groundbreaking research in Leadership Education from an interdisciplinary perspective. Their perspectives are critical to this process and many of them will be collected via focus group discussions at a location and time to be determined. The documents, perspectives, and themes stemming from Phases 1 and 2 will provide a foundation and increased direction for the focus groups discussions. The respondents were purposively sampled for their ability to provide typical and divergent data and insights to capture the essence of the context; therefore, as a result invitations were extended to eight individuals that represented various organizations and disciplines (i.e., business, agricultural education, student affairs administration, etc.). Data will be analyzed using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and will provide insight into the establishment of the research priorities.

Phase 4: Document Development – The previous three phases and the data stemming from them will provide the foundation for the development of a draft document encapsulating the agenda. Triangulation will ensure that trustworthiness can be maintained and that varying divergent perspectives are collected about different perspectives (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993).

Phase 5: Confirmation – The document established through the previous phases will be vetted by preeminent scholars in the field of Leadership Education. Their perspectives will address opportunities for revision and create a holistic document grounded in the past and aimed at the future of Leadership Education as a discipline. Five scholars were invited to participate in this process based on their venerable engagement in and outstanding contributions to the field of Leadership
Education.

Phase 6: Revision – Revisions will be made based on perspectives gleaned from Step 5. A final draft will be developed and formatted for dissemination.

Phase 7: Dissemination – The agenda will be presented at the 2013 Association of Leadership Educators Conference in New Orleans, LA. Contributors will be asked to develop manuscripts addressing their perspectives of the agenda with respect to their area of Leadership Education (i.e., Education, Business, Agricultural Education, etc.) for a special issue of the *Journal of Leadership Education*.

**Conclusion**

The people of the United States face the perspective of a future riddled with an impending fiscal cliff, labor crisis, climate change, countless examples of questionable ethics in the private sector, and other considerable hardships. These uncertain times call for strategic and innovative measures to stem the tide of adversity. Quality leadership will be paramount as the nation attempts to set the foundation for the future. Leadership Education creates a foundation for promoting social justice and the potential to meet the needs of these trying times. It assists in the attempt to develop perspectives that will be critical for the establishment of community resiliency and collective consciousness of these and similar issues.

As a discipline Leadership Education stands on the precipice of this uncertain future with the ability to significantly impact the nations’ capacity to navigate troubled times. The responsibility to develop strong leaders grounded in the values, perspectives, and competencies essential for addressing these issues will fall to those serving as Leadership Educators. The National Leadership Education Research Agenda provides direction for this responsibility. It will establish a plan for scholarship that will lead to the development of enhanced educational opportunities for those served through Leadership Education. The ultimate goal of this effort is to provide a research trajectory through a coordinated, purposive, credible, and strategic process that will ultimately lead to significant contributions within the field of Leadership Education. The agenda will provide perspective to leadership educators and further define the field. This is not only timely; it is necessary.
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“It is almost a cliché of the leadership literature that a single definition of leadership is lacking.” (Bennis, 2007)

This quotation by Bennis is bantered about quite often by leadership researchers and practitioners as a call to arms to get our proverbial act together and find some
common ground on what we are talking about when we refer to this construct
called leadership. On many levels it makes sense to have an agreed upon
definition or set of parameters when we refer to leadership. Yet, a recent trend
among leadership researchers is to further the proliferation of leadership types
that are continually showing up in the literature. Even a cursory view of the
leadership literature shows dozens of different forms of leadership (e.g., authentic,
servant, shared). While it is clear that certain contexts elicit or make more salient
certain leader behaviors, does that necessarily mean that we should continue
categorizing leadership based on the context in which it is enacted?

We do not think so. The modern environment in which leaders operate is
complex, dynamic, and ambiguous. In such contexts it is better to have a full
toolbox of leadership approaches. Leaders can then select the right tool or
combination of tools for the occasion, rather than rely on a single tool for all
occasions. Therefore, we suggest that education should focus on better preparing
our leaders using a broad survey framework instead of a single leadership
approach as the only basis for their development.

This brings up the issue of how we should prepare our future leaders. A quick
answer would generally consist of such things as education, reflection, training,
and application. While these are all important, and certainly have their place in
leader development, how one goes about delivering these to the individual is
much more complicated. Jenkins (2012) indicated that there are over 1500
leadership studies programs in existence. If one were to look at actual courses on
leadership, even this large number would swell considerably.

While Jenkins (2012) cogently explained the different pedagogical techniques that
exist in leadership classes today, we wondered about the content covered through
these techniques. For example, were they focused on broad over-arching theories
of leadership such as the Full Range Model of Leadership (Sosik & Jung, 2010)
or more specific theories such as crisis leadership? This is not a trivial distinction.
As educators should we focus on broad-based survey courses where students get
exposed to many different types of leadership or should we focus on a particular
type of leadership that we want them to apply? This may not be as critical for
leadership programs that offer many classes, as students can learn various aspects
of leadership through subsequent semesters. However, for those numerous
students that only take a single leadership course, this becomes crucial. Certainly,
this is not a new debate; this is a situation that plagues many different academic
disciplines.

In addition to optional leadership courses primarily for those who choose to major
in the topic, the United States Air Force Academy offers a core leadership course
required for all students. This single semester course focuses on a behavioral
sciences approach to leadership with concomitant application opportunities. The
underlying premise is that through exposure to the leadership literature and
helping create connections in their occupational and personal lives, students will
be better prepared to interpret future leadership situations. Our wide ranging survey framework covered six different areas – Contingency approaches, Full-Range Leadership Development Model, Skill/Competency-based approaches, Social Interaction approaches, Styles of leadership, and Trait-based approaches.

Given such a broad focus, we constantly wonder if we should instead use our semester to focus on one particular theory of leadership that students might be able to better master and utilize (e.g., Full Range Leadership Model). To address the issue, we decided to collect data to discover which approach resonated most among the students.

For their final course paper students identified and discussed the two approaches they decided were best, that is those two they found contributed most to their evolving personal theory of effective leadership. Students also identified and discussed one approach they decided was the worst or in other words the one that contributed least to their evolving personal theory of effective leadership. The results from 163 students enrolled in courses taught by five faculty members can be seen in Figure 1. The result are ordered from highest to lowest in terms of the approach students thought contributed the most (i.e., best) to their leadership development.

Figure 1
Percentage of students’ best and worst leadership approaches N = 163
It is first interesting to note that there are substantial votes for both the best and worst for each approach, except perhaps for the worst Full Range Leadership with only 2.5% of student choices. Also, the relationship between the best and worst choices is not clear. That is, if there truly was a best and worst overall approach, we would expect to see a pattern whereby the best approach would have the fewest amount of worst votes as demonstrated by the pattern for Full Range Leadership and vice versa. However, aside from Full Range Leadership, there does not appear to be a pattern for any other approach.

Full Range Leadership was by far the favorite approach, chosen as the best on 42.3% of the papers, while Trait theory was a distant second with barely half as many choices (21.5%). At the same time, Trait theory was by far thought to be the worst on 44.2%, while Style was a distant second with roughly one-third as many choices (16.0%).

The pattern on total frequency of chosen responses (i.e., all the times an approach was mentioned regardless) was also of interest. Trait (32.8%) was by far mentioned the most, followed by Full Range Leadership (22.4%) while Social Interaction (9.2%) and Style (11.0%) were chosen the least.

So, what does all this mean? It may indicate that each of the approaches resonated with some of the students: each was valued and thought to contribute most to their development. This seems to suggest that each of the approaches had some student connection, which indicates initial support for the survey approach to the course. Opinions about the different approaches were very much driven by each individual student, so the variety of approaches created a greater variety of student involvement and hopefully student learning.

Even though all approaches were chosen, it is interesting to note that the Full Range Leadership was chosen best by almost half of the students. This may be due to students seeing links in it to several of the other approaches (e.g., Full Range’s Individualized Consideration being similar to Social Interaction’s Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX); Inspirational Motivation linking to Trait theory’s extraversion). Perhaps more interestingly, only four students thought it was the worst approach. On the other hand, while Trait theory was heavily disliked by nearly half the students, it was also the second most popular for the best approach. This could be due to students’ beliefs and feelings about the inherent qualities of leadership, which Trait theory best supports. It also could be that Trait theory is perhaps the easiest to understand, and thus potentially the easiest to write about. Yet, a similar comment about simplicity could be made for the Skills development which was rarely picked in either category (12.9% overall).

These data clearly suggest that a broad survey approach can encourage engagement with the material from students with different leadership perspectives. Such a leadership course draws strength from a diversity of
approaches, allowing students to gravitate toward the approach that resonates with them. Thus, they begin to shape their own leadership with the lenses they choose to wear. Additionally, students may realize that there are other approaches, other lenses that other leaders may be choosing. Better students may also realize that to improve their own leadership, they may have to embrace approaches that they are not comfortable applying. The best students may ultimately realize while they gravitate to one or two approaches, all approaches can and should contribute to developing leaders. There is no single correct approach.

One way multiple approaches can inform each other is when they interact and provide greater insight to the leadership dynamic. For example, it may be of limited value to use Inspirational Motivation if you do not understand a Contingency approach like Situational Leadership Theory and your subordinates are enthusiastic beginners who need hands-on attention. Additionally, two congruent approaches can add strength to each other, informing each other in subtle, yet significant ways. For example, while Individualized Consideration is extremely important, it can be augmented by the greater specifics discussed in LMX theory.

However, the broad survey concept can create challenges for some students. Some, perhaps especially those not versed in the social sciences and humanities, may find a no clear solution answer to be frustrating. These students appeared to be confused by the number of approaches covered, and their overlap and divergence. They may have reactively rejected the science that leads to this outcome and regressed to an it is all common sense place, or worse, you are born with it or you are not viewpoint.

While this general approach to leadership education in this course seemed to have a positive impact on the students, one must be careful to generalize the results since this was applied to a single course versus an entire program. It is important to note that within our Behavioral Sciences Department, a Leadership and Organizations track includes an advanced course that takes the opposite philosophy: that is, an in-depth look at the Full Range Leadership Model which focuses on transformational leadership. Our belief is that once students who are interested in studying leadership have had the broad survey course, a detailed focus is absolutely appropriate.

In summary, while it is clearly important to understand effective pedagogies when teaching a leadership course, it is equally important to consider the framework that will be used. Such a framework will have a direct impact on what students take away from the course, and thus what students will most likely apply in their leadership experiences. Of course, this is not an experimental design and we have not been able to isolate causality or every potential variable. Further research should look into issues such as primacy versus recency, complexity of approaches, students’ pre-existing positions, and other related issues. By using a broad framework of approaches to teach leadership, students can benefit by
finding those approaches that best align with their own views of how they themselves lead. And capturing students’ imagination certainly makes it more likely they will take the extra step of bringing the knowledge from the classroom into their lives.

NOTE: The views expressed in this article are those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect those of the United States Air Force Academy or the Department of Defense.
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Abstract

This practice paper describes how leadership education faculty and students at Virginia Tech have facilitated change through the use of appreciative inquiry (Ai) at the departmental level, program level, and project level. Appreciative inquiry has been found to be a useful tool for leadership educators, as its foundation in social constructionist philosophy aligns with contemporary leadership and learning theories. This paper outlines (a) the philosophy of Ai as it applies to organizational development (b) illustrates Ai practices associated with a five-stage model, and (c) highlights three examples that can be used as models for leading change in a variety of organizational situations. The authors suggest that leadership educators are uniquely positioned to serve academic communities as
facilitators of change by bridging theory and practice in pursuit of new ways of knowing and working together.

**Introduction**

“There is no power for change greater than a community discovering what it cares about.” Margaret Wheatley (2002)

Change is often a central focus in the study of leaders and leadership; indeed, dealing with change is a core task of a leader. Kotter (1996) painted a picture of significant change that is happening within organizations and emphasized the role of the leader in the success or failure of transformational change processes. Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky (2009) described change driven by adaptive challenges – problems that cannot be clearly defined or addressed through known solutions and standard operating procedures. Instead, such challenges often require significant shifts in thinking and practice across the organization. Pink (2006) echoed a societal shift in thinking from logical to conceptual – from specific, task-oriented thinking to inventive, big-picture thinking capabilities. Adaptive leaders are needed to respond to complex change through culture-shaping efforts that help organizations thrive, give people enough challenge to approach change without fear, and to develop leadership capacity (Heifetz et al., 2009). Klein, Rice, and Schermer (2009) emphasized an urgent need for a restorative response to rapid global change, asserting that “the place to begin is with those who exercise the most power, authority, and influence, namely our leaders” (p. 1). Leaders must do more than just respond to and manage change, They must engage and facilitate transformational efforts at multiple organizational levels. At the heart of the Social Change Model (SCM) of leadership is the goal of creating change to benefit the common good (HERI, 1996).

The higher education institution is tasked with multiple missions, including the preparation of leaders who can engage the complex challenges of a changing world. Ayman et al. (2003) suggested that “as our universities stretch beyond traditional academic subjects to focus on leadership, personal growth and development, and even values, higher education is positioned to play a more pivotal role in the development of a leadership culture in our society” (p. 220). Transformative educational practices are needed to “equip learners to engage in dialogue, to see difference as a source of learning…and to engage critically with local or global issues” (Androetti, 2010, p. 245).

Ironically the organizational systems within these institutions are often resistant to transformative change. Leaders in administrative and academic roles can easily fall into patterns of technical problem solving approaches towards adaptive challenges, as opposed to mobilizing new patterns of thinking and working. Strategic planning efforts are common in higher education and often times occur around times of transition in leadership, or in response to program assessment. In
order to best serve the changing needs of faculty, students, and stakeholders, higher education leaders need strategic planning tools that encourage transformative change. Appreciate inquiry (Ai) has emerged as such a tool, offering not only a set of strategies for planning, but also a guiding philosophy for organizational development.

Appreciate Inquiry is an especially useful tool for leadership educators, as its foundation in social constructionist philosophy aligns with contemporary leadership and learning theories. Leadership educators are uniquely positioned to serve academic communities as facilitators of change by bridging theory and practice in pursuit of new ways of knowing and working together.

The purpose of this paper is to describe how leadership education faculty and students at one university have facilitated change through the use of Ai at the departmental, program, and project level. Specifically the authors will:

- Describe the philosophy of Ai as it applies to organizational development.
- Describe the Ai practices associated with a five-stage model.
- Highlight three in-process case examples that can be used as models for leading change in a variety of organizational situations.

**Background**

Appreciative inquiry emerged in the late 1980s as an iteration of the action-research approach to organizational development (Cooperrider & Srivasa, 1987). Cooperrider and Srivasa suggested that the problem-oriented worldview of traditional action-research methodology limited its generative capacity; that is, the potential ability to help social systems evolve, adapt, and creatively alter patterns over time. Inspired by the potential of unifying theory and practice for the purpose of social change, they proposed that an Ai approach was a more suitable mode of inquiry in a post-industrial society. Appreciate inquiry has evolved into an organizational development approach to change management, understood most commonly as a process-based method that supports organizational transformation (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stravos, 2008).

Rooted in social constructionist philosophy, Ai is “more than a method or technique…it is a way of living with, being with, and directly participating in the varieties of social organizations we are compelled to study” (Cooperrider & Srivasa, 1987, p. 131). The theoretical underpinnings of Ai are expressed through five key principles:

- First is the constructionist principle which emphasizes the connection between social knowledge and organizational destiny (Cooperrider et al., 2008). For leaders to be change agents, they must be able to overcome conventional or habitual ways of thinking, and “unleash the imagination”
(p. 8) of individuals and groups in order to conceive and construct the future.

- The principle of simultaneity recognizes that “inquiry is intervention” (Cooperrider et al., 2008, p. 9). The process of inquiry is part of the change process itself. They note it is essential for the change agent to articulate questions that set the stage for what is discovered, resulting in stories out of which the future is constructed.

- The poetic principle is a metaphor for understanding human organizations. Thinking of organizations as an “open book” (Cooperrider et al., 2008, p. 9) allows for their stories to continually be co-authored. Therefore, there are endless choices for the focus of inquiry.

- The anticipatory principle suggests that an organization’s image of the future is a powerful mobilizing agent of current behavior (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Organizations exist because their leaders share a common discourse or imagination of who they are, how they function, and what they will become. Therefore, this collective imagination is an important resource for generating constructive organizational change.

- Finally, the positive principle suggests that human organizations are affirmative systems – they respond best to positive thought and knowledge (Cooperrider et al., 2008). The momentum for lasting and effective change comes from positive affect through the use of affirmative guiding questions that promote group building.

Together these five principles “clarify that it is the positive image that results in the positive action, [and that] the organization must make the affirmative decision to focus on the positive to lead the inquiry” (Cooperrider et al, 2008, p. 10). The principles provide the necessary foundation for understanding the practice of Ai, as described through a stage-based cycle, referred to as the 5-D model (Donnan, 2005).

The 5-D model is a series of coordinated stages (see Table 1) by which the Ai practitioner guides an organization towards a vision and desired goals centered around a positive core (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Defining the affirmative topic is considered the first step in the Ai process. Critical to this stage is choosing and clarifying the focus of inquiry. This initiates the discovery stage, in which participants identify and appreciate the positive core through sharing life-giving stories. As the organization discovers its potential and higher purpose, it moves into the dream stage, where the participants create a clear, results-oriented vision that enhances the positive core. In the design stage, participants create bold statements of possibility for the ideal organization, creating structures to enact the positive core. The final stage, called the delivery or destiny stage is where implantation happens. In this stage, new ways of thinking and new actions not only increase productivity, efficiency, and performance, but result in organizations that operate with an “appreciative eye” (Cooperrider et al, 2008, p. 47). This process is meant to be ongoing, resulting in new affirmative topics that guide further inquiry. There are a variety of ways that inquiry interventions can be
structured. It is important to note that 5-D model is a more contemporary version of the model; many sources depict only the four primary stages, beginning with the discovery stage. Stratton-Berkessel (2010) clarified the purpose, task, and deliverables or outcomes of the four primary stages (see Table 1), which can be helpful for practitioners as they navigate the inquiry process.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage and Key Question</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Defining&lt;br&gt;&quot;What is the focus of inquiry?&quot;</td>
<td>Discover and appreciate personal and organizational “high point” stories and experiences.</td>
<td>Gathering stories and key ideas that identify the organization’s “positive core.”</td>
<td>Stories as evidence of values and best practices; greater sense of openness and listening skills, builds trust, generates positive energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discovery&lt;br&gt;&quot;What gives life?&quot;</td>
<td>Co-create visions of all the elements participants want to introduce into communities or workplaces.</td>
<td>Clear statements and images of members “idealized” organization; increased creativity; amplifies voices of hope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dream&lt;br&gt;&quot;What might be?&quot;</td>
<td>Choose the design elements that will support and develop the organization structures to bring the dream to life.</td>
<td>Participants identify which projects they want to be a part of to make the dream happen.</td>
<td>Begin to submit basic project plans for consideration and refinement; begin to see shifts in behavior and mindset; increased empowerment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design&lt;br&gt;&quot;How can it be?&quot;</td>
<td>Sustain momentum in organization; build capacity of participants to continue the process themselves.</td>
<td>Continued learning and adapting, consider new iterations of the cycle, engage in possibility thinking and looking for “opportunities” vs. problems.</td>
<td>Participants become “appreciative leaders” who champion self-sustaining change; cultural shift towards strength-based appreciative practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Cooperrider et al., 2008; Donnan, 2005; Stratton-Berkessel, 2010, p. 33-34.

Busche and Kassam (2005) suggested that Ai’s transformative potential comes from focusing on changing how people think rather than what they do. Rather than emphasizing action-plans, Ai supports self-organizing change processes that flow from new ideas (Busche & Kassam). The outcomes that distinguish Ai from other organizational development interventions are that Ai results in new knowledge, models, and theories that are co-constructed by participants. Appreciative inquiry results in a generative metaphor; that is, provocative statements that create new possibilities and compel new action (Busche & Kassam).
Schall et al. (2004) argued that appreciative inquiry can help us more effectively understand leadership. “Given the roots of appreciative inquiry in constructionism, and an emerging trend to see leadership as a social construct, appreciative inquiry emerges as one of the most appropriate methodological frameworks to pursue empirical work on leadership” (p. 148). Modern conceptions of leadership emphasize relational perspectives and the process of leaders and followers working together to create positive change (Drath, 2001; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2005; Rost, 1993). Fairhurst and Grant (2010) described the convergence of social constructionism and leadership, resulting in an approach that places increased emphasis on the ability of both leader and follower to co-constructed reality through the processes and outcomes of social practices. Drath & Palus (1994) proposed that leadership is primarily a meaning-making process within social communities. They note that meaning-making happens when “members develop psychologically” (p. 22), when “new forms of practice are created” (p. 22), and as structures evolve which provide “new ways of bringing the community into relationship with one another” (p. 22) and the world. From a relational perspective, leadership is not merely a possession of a leader, but an aspect of the community or organization. It is a communal capacity and achievement (Drath, 2001). Of interest is the question, “How do people working together in teams, organizations, and communities bring leadership into being?” (Drath, p. xvi).

After studying a variety of leadership education programs, Eich (2008) found that high quality leadership programs engage in “research-grounded continuous program development” (p. 184). In particular, the use of a systems-thinking approach allows programs to act on research about learning, program development, and leaders. Eich indicates this happens when (a) program development utilizes current leadership and learning models and (b) practitioners and students engage in program improvement together using a variety of assessment and feedback tools. Further, Eich notes that these actions help students and faculty gain a scholarly, research-grounded perspective that they can apply in their own practice.

Middlebrooks and Allen (2008) emphasized the need to help students make connections between models and theories of leadership and the activity and practice of leadership. As leadership programs employ the Ai model, they create moments of learning for administrators, faculty, staff, and students. There is an opportunity to not only learn about the theory involved, but to also experience the theory in practice. Throughout the Ai process, educators and students are generating new theories and knowledge to guide new practices within their own communities. This bridge between theory and practice influences the development of identities as department, program, or project members. As Eich (2008) explained, “Students’ self-concept and leadership identity development is advanced through program alignment with the students’ development and program standards to uphold” (p. 184). The change is not just programmatic, it
involves the transformation of identities of all who are involved. Appreciative inquiry is not just about changing structures, but constructing new patterns of thinking that promote adaptability in our response to complex challenges.

Description of Practice

The leadership education faculty at Virginia Tech has been utilizing Ai in ongoing strategic planning and organizational development projects at three levels. The following case examples overview the context and goal of each strategic planning project and describe how facilitators and participants engaged in the Ai process.

Organizational and Department Strategic Planning

During the 2011-2012 academic year two different academic departments at Virginia Tech approached the authors of this paper for guidance on facilitating departmental retreats. Both had recently completed formal departmental reviews and were considering where to focus their efforts to move forward. The retreats were scheduled to include both faculty and staff and there was a conscious desire to approach the retreat in a way that would improve the sense of community in the department. Perceived boundaries between faculty and staff members can sometimes inhibit communication, so the approach needed to include an increased emphasis on open communication. The World Café Method was identified as a potential tool for promoting and facilitating open communication. World Café is an educational strategy that facilitates collaboration and shared meaning-making through interactive dialogue. The use of powerful questions focuses inquiry, surfaces assumptions and biases, and opens up new possibilities for ideas and meaning (Brown et al., 2005). According to World Café Community Foundation (n.d.), World Café can take a variety of forms, but generally includes the following components:

- Setting: Creating a hospitable place, usually cafe style round tables with at least four chairs at each table. Flipcharts or butcher block paper and markers are set at each table, with the invitation to doodle, draw, and create.
- Welcome and Introduction: The facilitator or host opens with a welcome and introduces the World Café process and in this case, also the Ai process. Setting the context gives purpose that helps focus both the content and provides support to the process of the dialogue (Brown et al., 2005).
- Small Group Rounds: Conversation takes at each table during multiple timed rounds (i.e., 10-20 minutes each, depending on the context and purpose). At the end of each round, group members will move to different tables, creating a cross pollination effect as participants develop new connections and relationships (Brown et al., 2005). Usually one person stays at the table as a host for the next round by welcoming the new group and providing a brief recap of the previous round.
Questions: A signature aspect of the World Cafe is an exploration of “questions that matter” (Brown et al., 2005, p. 78). Each round of dialogue is prefaced with a question or series of questions designed for the specific context and desired purpose of the session. This of particular importance in Ai, as the questions set the stage for what is discovered. A single question may be used for more than one round or questions can be sequenced to provide a guide for discussion.

Harvest: At various intervals, usually after the small group rounds, individuals are invited to share insights or other results from their conversations with the rest of the large group. The emerging collective understanding is often captured graphically and textually on flip charts at the front of the room. (World Café Community Foundation, n.d.)

In the design stage the facilitator and key administrative faculty identified the affirmative topic as defining signature work for growth and distinction within their respective departments. The World Café Method was used to facilitate both the discovery and dream stages of Ai during the department retreats. The discovery stage was guided by the following prompts:

- Best Experience: Share about the best times that you have had with the department. Looking at your entire experience, recall a time when you felt most alive, most involved, or most excited about your involvement. What made it an exciting experience? What helped to make it possible? Describe the event in detail.
- Interpretation: What is it about this department – its structure, systems, processes, policies, staff, leaders, strategy – that create conditions where success can flourish?

The dream stage was guided by the following prompts:

- Achievements: It is 2016, and you are preparing for the next [external] review. What are you highlighting as the department’s achievements?
- Wishes: If you had three wishes for the department, what would they be?

Both stages were completed during morning sessions totaling less than three hours. The retreats continued with afternoon sessions focused on the design stage of Ai, guided by an action planning worksheet to generate a list of desired results, actions needed, resources needed, and target date for completion. Participants volunteered to serve in smaller work groups to set goals and design vision-based strategies to guide departmental practices.

Program Level Strategic Planning

In spring 2011, four undergraduate honors students conducted an informal program assessment of a Leadership Living-Learning Community program at Virginia Tech utilizing the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) self-study for Student Leadership Programs (CAS, 2009). The finding they reported...
implied that the mission, values, and learning objectives of the community were not clearly stated and did not fully express students’ experience in the program, and did not encompass the overall impact on their leadership development. The learning community has had three director transitions over the past four years. There was general confusion among stakeholders over what the program was and was for. The interim director and undergraduate academic coordinator initiated a strategic visioning process to reconsider the mission statement, create a vision statement, and identify core values and learning outcomes to guide the program into its next stage of life. The Ai approach seemed most appropriate to be able to encompass and honor historical perspectives while encouraging the generation of new possibilities that express and expand the program’s value within the Virginia Tech campus and the Department of Agriculture and Extension Education.

A faculty member who was not directly involved in the program served as the facilitator so that the program’s leaders could engage as full participants in the dialogue. However, the design stage was initiated by the interim director, residential director, academic coordinator, and faculty facilitator. Through several meetings they determined the focus of the inquiry would be – the future of the Residential Leadership Community (RLC). The first two-hour visioning session held in spring 2012 also utilized a World Café format and focused on the dream and discovery stages. A total of 20 individuals from multiple stakeholder groups participated including university alumni, faculty/instructors, administrators, residence life staff, current students, and program student leaders. The discovery stage began by discussing, “What gives our community life?” The following questions served as a discussion guide:

- What were your best experiences related to each of our core areas?
- What do we do well in each of our core areas? What works?
- What do you value most about each of these core areas? Why are they important components of the program?

Transitioning into the dream stage, participants envisioned, “What might be?” The following questions guided discussion:

- What are our hope and aspirations for students who participate in the Residential Leadership Community?
- What does full engagement in each of these areas look like?
- What other elements could add to/enhance the RLC experience?

Data was captured through observations and by participants during each World Café round on flip charts and later summarized into a written document. A smaller group of volunteers including some of the initial group, as well as other key program stakeholders, were recruited to form a work group to review the data and begin the next stage (i.e., design). The goal of this stage was to craft a vision statement, goals, and learning objectives to guide the program for the next three to five years.
Project Level Planning

A signature component of an introductory freshman-level leadership course at Virginia Tech is focused on student-led service experiences. During the fall 2011 semester students worked in small groups to identify a campus or community organization with whom they could partner for at least four hours of direct service. While students found this to be an overall valuable experience, feedback showed that the process itself was confusing and at times frustrating for students, peer leaders such as teaching assistants, and faculty. The director desired to do a more in-depth assessment of the experience to create recommendations for revisions. She recruited two peer leaders (i.e., sophomores) and an intern (i.e., junior) who had been part of the service project experience to lead an Ai process. The peer leaders would receive honors credit thorough their participation.

The team decided that focus groups would be the most effective method of inquiry because they are more efficient than individual interviews and create a social context for dialogue and interaction. They could also tailor questions specifically toward each specific group identified as students, faculty, peer leaders, and program staff. The director and the students met several times to discuss the objectives and review concepts of Ai. They worked through the design stage together, identifying the guiding topic of inquiry as, “The successful integration of service learning in [leadership class].” A basic focus group protocol was scripted to engage participants in a combined dream and discovery stage. They followed a prescribed flow of questions which included (a) opening questions to set the tone and energy, (b) topical questions related to the affirmative statement, and (c) closing questions focused on a positive future vision (Cooperrider et al., 2008). Some examples of these topics included:

- Opening: What do you value or appreciate most about the opportunity to learn leadership as part of this program?
- Topical: Please share a story of something that went really well (i.e., a high-point) during the project planning or event that made you feel really alive, challenged, or effective.
- Closing: It is a year from today and you are talking to the new freshman class about their project experiences. What do you hope they tell you about the experience?

Experiences and Lessons

An important consideration of Ai is that it is an on-going process. These Ai cases were initiated over a six-month period and long-term results may not be fully realized for quite some time. However, we are able to discuss the experiences and preliminary outcomes of the initial stages of the process.
In each example, the design stage was initiated by the facilitator and key administrative leaders. We found this to be most efficient and useful in recruiting participants because we could clearly articulate the topic of the discussion. Rather than taking up retreat and meeting time determining the focus of inquiry, we were able to spend more time explaining the philosophy setting context and clarifying the higher purpose behind the Ai process.

In all of our examples we found that the discovery and dream stages paired well. There are a variety of methods that can be used to gather stories and envision the future; however, we feel that the World Café and focus groups were effective strategies to include a lot of people in a relatively short amount of time. As a result of creating contexts in which participants were given a voice in the visioning process, we were able to generate a greater sense of connection, openness, and trust in the various groups.

The program and project level inquiries are just now entering the design stage; however, the departmental level Ai process is now well into this stage. After one departmental retreat the participants followed up on the creation of targeted goals with weekly lunch-and-learn style work group meetings to encourage continuous collaboration. This simple act of weekly meetings is an example of changed behavior as a result of the Ai process. The potential for long-term success is due to the fact that this was participant-initiated, not an administrative mandate. As participants are empowered to create and carry on the work of the organization with a strengths-oriented perspective and Ai practice, they themselves become appreciative leaders (Schiller, Holland, & Riley, 2001).

**Recommendations and Implications**

Whitney, Trosten-Bloom, and Radan (2010) define the term “appreciative leadership [as] the relational capacity to mobilize creative potential and turn it into positive power…to make a difference in the world” (p. 3). Appreciative inquiry provides a useful solution for organizations that desire to break out of the problem-oriented mindset and embrace a strengths-based philosophy. The value of Ai lies in its philosophy and practice. We believe leadership educators are uniquely positioned to bridge theory and practice through the use of Ai models, influencing our ability to effectively train and develop students and also influence positive change in our organizations. From these case examples, we offer the following implications:

- Because Ai pushes against the grain of traditional problem-solving approaches that dominate organizational development, practitioners may encounter resistance to the approach. For example, participants may be eager to skip over early stages to get to the solutions. Educating participants on the philosophy and value of the process is important in changing mindsets and creating openness in dialogue which is necessary for the co-construction of new possibilities.
• While an outside facilitator may be a helpful resource for the initial stages of the Ai cycle, it really becomes the job of the leader to sustain positive change. Appreciative inquiry may itself be considered a transformational process because it promotes changes in how people think and what they do (Bushe & Kassam, 2005). Within leadership education, Ai could be a force for transformational leadership development. For example, as participants engage together in the work of leadership in dealing with change, they may develop higher levels of motivation and performance.

• Through Ai, we can gain insight into the social construction of leadership, in particular how groups make-meaning of their experiences in social communities and enact change practices. Appreciative inquiry is poised to emerge as an important methodology for leadership research (Schall et al., 2004).

• There is the potential to explore Ai as an identity formation process. As Ai shapes organizational identity, participants’ sense of self, belonging, and view of their role within the organization is also shaped through the construction and alignment of the shared vision, goals, and standards. In the process of constructing what could be the participants are also becoming leaders who are able to enact that preferred future.
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Abstract

Social media is becoming more prevalent in the higher education classroom. As part of an ongoing study, the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications at Texas A&M University surveyed leadership students about their perceptions of their level of comfort and frequency of use of social media tools and the advantages and disadvantages that these students perceived when social media was used in the leadership classroom. A total of 79 students were surveyed in two upper level leadership courses. Facebook was the social media tool students were most comfortable with and used most frequently.
Advantages included social media helping increase quality and efficiency of communication between students and the instructor, social media as a technological norm, access to class information, ease of collaboration, and stronger social connections between classmates. Disadvantages revolved around issues of use of and access to social media.

**Introduction**

As technology and social media use by students becomes more prevalent, educators, especially in higher education, are seeking ways to use such tools to remain relevant and appropriate to their audience. Little research exists that indicates how to harness the students’ use of social media tools in the leadership classroom and what impacts it could have on leadership education and the its application. Fidishun (2000) found “it is possible to create lessons that not only serve the needs of students to use the latest technology but also focus on their requirements as an adult” (p. 76). As adults college students are increasingly required to be self-directed with their time, attention, and effort. Learning models that are andragogical or those that focus on adult learning as opposed to the learning of younger students contend that adults develop their own means of attaining knowledge and that they are intrinsically motivated to learn. One way that informal learning occurs now is through public pedagogy, or the learning that takes place informally through social media (Freishtat & Sandlin, 2010). Social media uses are widely varied in higher education classrooms and include blogging (Gifford, 2010), the use of wikis (Laru, Naykki, & Jarvela, 2012), social annotation (Novak, Razzouk, & Johnson, 2012), and the use of Facebook and Twitter (Settle, Telg, Irani, Rhoades, & Rutherford, 2011). Researchers have found that a carefully planned application of a social media tool can have a great influence on student learning and engagement with material (Gifford, 2010; Laru et al., 2012; Novak et al., 2012); these findings could have implications for the processing and application of learned material in the leadership classroom.

**Literature Review**

**Pedagogical to Andragogical Learning**

A myriad of teaching approaches have been identified, studied, confirmed, and refuted. The two overarching theories that address teaching approaches are pedagogy and andragogy. A pedagogical approach to education is generally teacher-centered; learners have minimal to no role in the eight-step process model of education (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005). On the other hand, andragogy is a mutual educational process that is facilitated by the educator. Learners are active participants in all aspects of their education, from the planning to the evaluation (Knowles et al., 2005). Fidishun (2000) found that “to facilitate the use of andragogy while teaching with technology we must use technology to its fullest” (p. 78).
Educators who understand the needs of adult learners and the core learning principles of andragogy will be better able to engage adult audiences. According to Knowles et al. (2005), there are six core adult learning principles – learner’s need to know, self-concept of the learner, the learner’s prior experience, readiness to learn, orientation to learning, and motivation to learn. Adult learners must be involved in the education process; they must be active seekers, participants, and evaluators.

Higher education pushes students to become increasingly self-directed. The Staged Self-Directed Learning Model indicates that learners move from dependent, interested, and involved, to self-directed learners (Grow, 1991). Educators in this process begin as an authority figure and, in the end, are merely consultants or delegators. Few undergraduate students can be expected to efficiently function at the stage four, self-directed learner capacity, due to the nature of higher education and mass information delivery. In stage three, however, the involved learner is educated by a facilitator. It is in this stage that social media can be used for the facilitation of discussion and group projects. At earlier stages, social media can be used by instructors to point students to certain parts of a text, asks pointed questions about models or articles found online, or to illustrate ways that instructors process and think about the material students are studying (Brown, 2012). All of these strategies promote independent engagement with course content.

As noted by Bloom’s Taxonomy (cited in Marzano & Kendall, 2008), self-directed learners must also be cognitively, affectively, and physically stimulated to process information. Cognitive learning involves information retention, comprehension, application, and analysis. Affective learning includes learner attitudes and the manner in which the learner values and emotionally processes information. Physical, or psychomotor learning, is learning through movement and motor-skill use. The use of social media engages all three of these domains. Through the posting of information, learners are able to cognitively apprehend material and affectively process the information. Students are also able to share their cognitive and affective responses through discussions and conversation threads. Students may seek articles, websites, videos, or even create videos to share via social media tools. This active engagement with the learned information extends students’ learning into the psychomotor domain.

Learners who feel a sense of ownership in their education are more motivated to learn (Platz, 1994). Platz advocates the use of the Student Directed Learning model. This model is presented as a supplementary educational tool for use with younger students. In assessing the needs and desires of adult learners, as presented by Knowles et al. (2005), the Student Directed Learning model also meets the educational needs of adult learners, as well as students who are developing self-directed learning skills. This model is implemented in four stages: examples, student selected-teacher activities, student selected-student activities, and student directed planning. By developing student confidence and subject matter
competence and establishing teacher expectations in the first three stages, learners are prepared to develop their own learning activities in stage four (Platz, 1994).

Uses of Social Media in the Higher Education Classroom

The use of social media in the classroom is a method that combines andragogical teaching methods and increasingly self-directed learning. Williams and McClure (2010) found that “faculty must be open to modifying their teaching methods” (p. 94). They also found that information delivered via public pedagogy or popular media as an educational tool, increased knowledge retention. Guthrie (2009) found that by embedding learning in a technology framework, students “were able to learn beyond the learning outcomes” (p. 135).

Social media tools are changing the way students learn and how teachers teach in higher education. Brown (2012) found that university instructors could be classified into three categories when it came to perceptions of the potential of social media to make an impact on class activities. Some instructors perceived that it was not useful at all, which agrees with Settle, Telg, Irani, Rhoades, and Rutherford (2011) who found that instructors did not want to deliver course content through social media. Other groups in Brown’s (2012) study were open to content delivered by either tutors or by instructors. A German study showed that as much as one-fifth of student-populated social media groups have some sort of knowledge exchange function, but that students who were further along in their studies were less likely to participate in these types of groups (Wodzicki, Schwammlien, & Moskaliuk, 2012). Wodzicki et al. concluded that social media was better suited for informal learning than for formal learning. A Chinese study suggested that there was a definite link between the use of social media and gains in cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning domains (Yan, Tian, Vogel, & Kwok, 2010). Considering leadership students specifically, Wisniewski (2010) found that they are resistant to traditional pedagogical techniques and they seemed to prefer digital paradigms.

Uses of social media in university settings vary widely. One group of professors developed software which would allow them to integrate social media with large section lectures to make them more interactive. Their students were able to chat with each other about class content, submit questions to the professor during the lecture, and vote on which questions should be answered first (Chao, Parker, & Fontana, 2011). Dabbagh and Kitsantas (2012) recommend that personalized learning environments which can be adjusted to each individual student’s needs should be implemented to emphasize student-centered learning design. One means of promoting interaction between students through the use of social media is through a tool known as social annotation (Novak et al., 2012). This tool is used so that groups of students can collaborate on projects, critique writing, and discuss readings.
Blogging is another social media tool used in higher education. Gifford (2010) used blogs in a leadership class to promote higher level thinking and found that students who blogged earned more points in class than those who did not. Blogging can be used to promote self-reflection which is important to leadership development (Roberts & Dyer, 2008). Laru et al. (2012) found that the number of blog posts by students was the most influential factor on student success in the class, though this class focused more on the use and development of wikis than on the production of a blog. However, Top (2012) found that students participating in blogging perceived that blogging did not have any great effect on their learning. Top (2012) also suggests that building community among students in an online environment should be a priority for an instructor. Other researchers suggest that people need to be aware of the levels of intimacy associated with the influx of social media into the modern world and work to promote a new understanding of intimacy as being genuinely present with others, either through social media or face-to-face (Van Manen, 2010).

Use of social media can help or hinder the achievement of student learning outcomes. The type of social media tool used varies by the desired outcome. Settle et al. (2011) found that 28.4% of instructors used Facebook and only 7.8% used microblogs such as Twitter for communicating with students. Instructors in that study noted that these two formats were the least desirable modes of transmitting content to students. It has been noted that some social media tools are well-suited for promoting learning and others are not (Brown, 2012). Brown wrote that social media should be used to promote student-centered learning. Content-driven exercises found on many e-learning sites may not promote students taking responsibility for their own learning (Dabbagh & Kitsantas, 2012). Lack of student knowledge of computer technology can hinder the achievement of student learning outcomes when social media is used. Several studies have found that students, and in particular agriculture students, are not as savvy with technology as expected (Skurat-Harris, 2010; Johnson, Ferguson, & Lester, 2000; Johnson, Ferguson, & Lester, 2004, Johnson & Warlow, 2004). Thomas, Davis, and Moss (2008) explain a process used in agricultural extension in which instructors were trained in the use of blended online environments and described the program as a success for those instructors. While Thomas et al. aimed his work at training instructors, Novak, Razzouk, and Johnson (2012) balance that concern by focusing on training for students in the particular social media tool to be used in the class. This approach could bring increased success for students because Top (2012) found that computer knowledge was the strongest predictor of student learning in a course using social media.

While the applications of social media vary, and there are still those who are resistant to incorporating these tools into university coursework, many different kinds of benefits have been found for students using social media in their classes. With a push for efficiency in higher education (Franklin & Van Harmelen, 2007) and an increase in constructivist paradigms being applied in university settings (Wisniewski, 2010), using social media in a carefully designed setting (Laru et al.,
2012) with support and training for both instructors (Thomas et al., 2008) and students (Novak et al., 2012) can make social media a way for students to learn to connect among themselves (Top, 2012) and connect on a deeper level with course content (Laru et al., 2012).

Need for Study

Social media tools have been identified as an effective educational platform (Laru et al., 2012; Top, 2012) and social media tools are already being used in the leadership classroom at Texas A&M University and elsewhere. Several leadership theories and approaches such as transformational leadership, situational leadership, and leader-member exchange (LMX) focus on the notion of relating to and connecting with followers. Leadership is a relational process and involves connections with individuals (Bass, 2008). There is a need to better understand the perspective of students and how to connect with them through the use of social media tools in the leadership classroom. This study sought to identify for leadership educators the potential impacts, implications, and recommendations for the use of social media in leadership courses based on the perceptions and needs of leadership students themselves.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is based on Tu and McIsaac’s (2002) expanded findings of the variables contributing to social presence theory (see Table 1). Social presence theory was originally developed within the social science fields as a means of explaining the degree of salience, meaning the state or quality of being present that exists between two communicators using a specified communication medium (Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976). Short et al. proposed that communication mediums differ in their degree of social presence which affects how people interact. People perceive some communication media as having a higher degree of social presence than others. Many researchers have studied social presence theory and ways to measure this phenomenon (Gunawardena, 1995; Gunawardena & Zittle, 1997; Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000; Rourke, Anderson, Garrison, & Archer, 2001; Swan, 2003; Hughes, Ventura, & Dando, 2007). Tu and McIsaac (2002) developed an instrument that measures social presence via four constructs – social context, online communication, interactivity, and privacy. Social context refers to social processes, settings and purposes that affect social presence such as social relationships, task complexity, task interdependence, and environmental uncertainty. Online communication involves the user’s expertise in language used and application of it in online experiences. Interactivity includes those activities through which the communicator and communication medium interact and how often feedback occurs. The privacy construct is the degree to which the communicator and communication medium allows for privacy. While the Tu and McIsaac measure of social presence took into account many variables of social presence, they also concluded social presence was more complicated and
warranted further study. Table 1 illustrates the variables that they determined contributed to social presence.

Table 1
Variables Contributing to Social Presence Theory Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>I. Social Context</th>
<th>II. Online Communication</th>
<th>III. Interactivity</th>
<th>IV. Privacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Familiarity with recipients</td>
<td>Keyboarding and accuracy skills</td>
<td>Timely response</td>
<td>Formats of CMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assertive/acquiescent</td>
<td>Use of emoticons and paralanguage</td>
<td>Communication styles</td>
<td>Access and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Informal/formal relationship</td>
<td>Characteristics of real-time discussion</td>
<td>Length of messages</td>
<td>Patterns of CMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trust relationships</td>
<td>Characteristics of discussion boards</td>
<td>Formal/informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social relationships</td>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>Type of tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Psychological attitude toward technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Access and location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>User’s characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tu and McIsaac’s (2002) variables contributing to social presence dimensions serve as a framework for examining the degree of presence among teachers and students when utilizing social media tools in a leadership course. Additionally, through the application of a carefully designed plan to incorporate social media into the higher education classroom, instructors can effectively engage students at lower levels of Grow’s (1991) model, raising their level of engagement with course content. This effectively helps students transition away from a pedagogical model toward an andragogical model (Knowles et al., 2005), helps students engage course content on a deep level (Laru et al., 2012), and provides students with a means of connecting in a meaningful way with each other and the instructor through social media (Tu & McIsaac, 2002). University level students are engaging in social media regularly for informal learning (Wodzicki et al., 2012), but their perceptions of social media use in the leadership classroom have yet to be explored. Brown (2012) noted that leadership students seemed to prefer
digital learning approaches, but student engagement in a mixed teaching design when formal learning strategies, social media, and digitally formatted learning experiences are incorporated, need to be studied to satisfy both the educator and the learner.

**Purpose and Objectives**

This study explored student perceptions of the use of social media in a leadership course, their current use of social media, and their comfort level with specific social media tools. Specific objectives of the study included:

- Describe participants in terms of their comfort level with specific social media tools.
- Describe participants in terms of their current use of specific social media tools.
- Describe the perceptions of students enrolled in selected leadership courses about the use of social media in the classroom.

**Methods**

This study uses a parallel mixed method approach which incorporates both qualitative and quantitative strands, as outlined by Morse (2003). Parallel mixed designs are designs where “mixing occurs in a parallel manner, either simultaneously or with some time lapse; planned and implemented [qualitative] and [quantitative] phases answer related aspects of the same questions” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 151).

**Population and Sample**

The population frame for this study was undergraduate students enrolled in two leadership courses at Texas A&M University with a total population frame of 92 students. A census was attempted in both courses and the instrument was administered to each student present on the class day it was given. The final sample consisted of 79 responses. The first course was a personal leadership development course \((n=49\) students\), and the second course was an upper level leadership elective course \((n=30\) students\).

**Instrumentation**

The instrument for this study consisted of two parts. The quantitative section addressed student perceptions regarding comfort level with and current use of social media tools (Facebook, Twitter, blogging, and Wiggio). In the qualitative section, students were asked to describe their perceived advantages and disadvantages of the use of social media in the classroom. A team of leadership
scholars at Texas A&M University analyzed the content and face validity of the instrument.

Additional descriptive data was also collected. Students were asked to indicate gender, race, grade expectation, and current GPA. The instrument also included questions about student employment and cell phone ownership. Additional items asked about frequency and mode of Internet access.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

In an effort to sample the entire population frame undergraduates in two leadership courses were given time to complete the instrument during class. The instrument was administered during class and no identifying information was collected from the student to connect them to their responses. Two separate processes were involved in the parallel mixed method study analysis (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009) – qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis and quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Each method will be presented separately.

The qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis, a “technique that enables researchers to study human behavior in an indirect way, through an analysis of their communications” (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010, p. 457). Specifically, this study used an open coding technique (Strauss, 1987). The open coding technique, the constant comparative method, includes four stages (a) comparing units applicable to each category, (b) integrating all categories and their properties, (c) delimiting the theory, and (d) writing the theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Each participant was assigned a unique numerical identifier, and then participants’ responses were analyzed and grouped into themes. Participants were asked to list advantages of using social media in a class and then to list disadvantages. Responses were assigned a numerical and letter identifier. An example of the coding – 3A, the number represents the participant; the letter represents if the response was an advantage (A) or disadvantage (D). Participant responses were analyzed to determine themes using words, phrases, and sentences as the units of analysis.

Quantitative data consisted of responses from participants on questions related to the comfort level and frequency of use of the following social media tools: Facebook, Twitter, blogging, and Wiggio. Participants were asked to rate their comfort level and frequency of use of the social media tool using a five-point summated scale. Quantitative data were entered into SPSS version 17.0 for analysis and the data were examined using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics allow researchers to describe and give general information about a specific group using the gathered data (Black, 2001). An analysis of the data included means and standard deviations for each social media tool.
Findings

The first objective of the study was to describe students’ perceived comfort level with certain types of social media tools. Students were most comfortable with Facebook ($M = 4.35$, $SD = .96$). Students were less comfortable using Twitter ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 1.31$). Wiggio ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 1.05$) and Blogging ($M = 2.37$, $SD = 1.07$) were the types of social media with which students were least comfortable (see Table 2). Due to the relatively large standard deviations, mode and range of scores was also reported because of the potential for the mean to be misleading.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Students’ Perceived Comfort Level with Social Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Tool</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$Mode$</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiggio</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogging</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale: 5 = very comfortable, 4 = comfortable, 3 = neither uncomfortable nor comfortable, 2 = uncomfortable, 1 = very uncomfortable.

The second objective of the study was to describe participants in terms of their current frequency of use of a specific type of social media. Students reported that Facebook was the type of social media used most frequently ($M = 3.91$, $SD = .93$). Twitter ($M = 2.11$, $SD = 1.41$) was used less frequently by students. Blogging ($M = 1.39$, $SD = .63$) and Wiggio ($M = 1.37$, $SD = .64$) were the types of social media reported by students as used least frequently (see Table 3). Due to the relatively large standard deviations, mode and range of scores was also reported because of the potential for the mean to be misleading.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Students’ Perceived Frequency of Use of Social Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Tool</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$Mode$</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogging</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiggio</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scale: 5 = as often as I can throughout the day, 4 = daily, 3 = once or twice a week, 2 = less than once or twice a week, 1 = have never used.
The last objective of the study sought to describe the perceptions of students enrolled in selected leadership courses about the use of social media in the classroom. Students were asked to list advantages and disadvantages of the use of social media in the classroom. As the qualitative results of this study were analyzed, six key themes emerged in regards to the advantages and five key themes emerged from disadvantages associated with the implementation of social media into leadership education courses.

### Advantages

Responses provided by the students showed they were open to the idea of using social media outlets as a tool in leadership classes and saw them as a benefit. Six themes emerged as the responses were analyzed. The first advantage the students reported was the expected increase in quality and efficiency of communication that would occur as a result of the use of social media in their leadership courses. Furthermore, they mentioned an increase in the rate at which information could be shared or provided. One respondent noted social media would allow for “faster streaming of information to the students” (60A), and another indicated it is “a practically instantaneous way to receive info” (53A). Many respondents indicated they believed social media would allow them to do a better job of staying in contact with others, including with other students in the class and even the professor. One student wrote this “allows for painless communications” (61A) and another mentioned that it “makes interaction between students and teachers much easier” (40A).

The second theme within advantages was social media as a technological norm. Many participants cited this as their reason for believing social media tools could be beneficial. A majority of the students in this study were already active on Facebook, Twitter, or another social media website. Social media use in the classroom makes it possible to “relay messages quickly in a realm that people use constantly” (50A). One student thought this could possibly improve student performance in the course because “students are more likely to check assignments/class page when on a social media site due to the fact that they check their accounts multiple times a day” (66A). It would also provide an enjoyable outlet for students to use as a networking tool within the class. These websites “add a little ‘fun’ by incorporating one of today’s biggest and most popular social media contributions” (19A).

Dissemination of information in regards to class context and management was another prominent theme which emerged as an advantage. The responses showed many of the individuals believed social media would help them stay connected to what was going on in the course and also help keep them in touch with members from their group project teams. One respondent indicated that this would allow students to easily “keep up with due dates on assignments or missed assignments through other classmates” (38A).
Ease of collaboration that is a direct result of social media also emerged as a theme. The use of these tools means “group scheduling is easier” (5A), and groups “can communicate at any time” (45A). In addition to effective communication and team collaboration, social media can allow students to engage a “peer group to help solve problems” (32A).

Respondents indicated a belief that social media tools are a way to network and form stronger connections with their classmates. Social media allows individuals to “get to know people on a deeper level” (35A) and is an effective way to “bring the class together” (63A).

Students viewed social media as being an effective learning tool. Respondents noted that social media “can make class time more impactful” (8A), “motivate students to keep up or be more engaged in the course work” (70A), and “appeal to students with different learning styles” (70A). Most of the responses reflected the idea that using social media in a leadership education course would improve communication, collaboration, and networking.

**Disadvantages**

While advantages do exist, there are also disadvantages that should be taken into consideration. The students described potential downfalls that could result from the use of social media in leadership education. Five key themes emerged.

Many students responded that social media use in a classroom setting could be a distraction as a learning resource. If students were to misuse social media tools, it would “make for more of a distraction than a tool” (21D). Respondents expressed a preference for maintaining separation between education and their social lives. By integrating the educational and social functions of social media, participants would not have “separation from personal life” (19D).

While it may appear that the vast majority of college-aged students use social media regularly, there are still individuals who do not. One respondent suggested that instructors “make [social media use] optional” (37D). Respondents were concerned with keeping up with multiple social media sources. One student stated, “I would hate to have missed important info if I were not able to always check all of the outlets” (40D).

Several respondents chose not to use social media because they are not comfortable with the technology. A respondent stated, “Students or instructors who are unfamiliar with social media sites could be placed at a disadvantage” (3D). Respondents were concerned that non-use of social media could lead them to have a less successful experience in the classroom. While it may appear that most students are comfortable with social media, “people who are not comfortable are less likely to use the tools” (29D).
Loss of classroom interface is another disadvantage that emerged from the students’ responses. Some believe that using social media tools “seems to defeat the purpose of sitting in a classroom” (6D). Respondents reflected that the use of social media could “make it feel more like an online class” (11D) and “take away from a ‘professional’ setting” (20D).

Respondents also noted problems with Internet access and consistency in the specific type of social media tool used in the course. One participant said, “Everyone takes the Internet for granted and those of us that are without it then have to do more to contribute” (12D). Another respondent commented, “Not everyone uses the same type of social media” (8D). Most students indicated that social media disadvantages include misuse, non-participation, possible unfamiliarity with the specific tool, and the loss of classroom interface.

Conclusions

The notion of relating to and connecting with followers is central to several theories and approaches to leadership such as transformational leadership, situational leadership, and leader member exchange (Bass, 2008). As leadership educators attempt to model the way for their students, they can model the behavior of attempting to connect with and relate to students through the use of social media. Because social media has become so integral to the lives of students, it seems imperative that leadership educators seek to understand how they can integrate social media into their courses in order to be relevant and relate to their students.

Students in two upper-level leadership courses were asked to provide feedback about social media use in the leadership classroom. The collected data were both quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative data were used to describe the students in terms of their perceived comfort level with social media and frequency of use of social media tools. The qualitative data explored the perceived advantages and disadvantages of social media use in the leadership classroom.

In assessing the students comfort level with social media tools, students reported a higher comfort level with Facebook than with Twitter, Wiggio, or blogging. A majority of students said they were comfortable with Facebook. With regard to students’ frequency of social media tool usage, students reported more frequent use of Facebook than with Twitter, blogging, or Wiggio. A majority of students said they used Facebook daily. Based on Facebook being reported by students as having the highest comfort level and highest frequency of use, Facebook could be a viable option for connecting and communicating with students.

Students reported both advantages and disadvantages in regards to the use of social media tools in the leadership classroom. Advantages included social media tools helping increase quality and efficiency of communication between students
and the instructor, social media as a technological norm, access to class information, ease of collaboration, and stronger social connections between classmates. Students reported social media tools could be used effectively in the leadership classroom.

These findings confirm that the social context is critical to creating social presence when using online media (Tu & McIsaac, 2002). Students emphasized the importance of connecting with each other and with instructors through social media for communication about class content, group activities and to cultivate social connections. These findings also confirm that interactivity is critical to creating social presence when using online media (Tu & McIsaac, 2002). Leadership students in these classes noted that information exchange was quick and that they could communicate at all times of day about class projects.

Disadvantages were also reported by the students. Disadvantages included social media potentially becoming a distraction, issues related to the level of social media use by the students, the level of comfort with specific types of social media, loss of classroom interface, and problems with Internet access and consistency in the specific type of social media tool used in the classroom. Disadvantages revolved around issues of use of and access to social media.

The disadvantages students listed relate primarily to one piece of the social context construct in Tu and McIsaac’s (2002) work with online media. Students must have a positive psychological attitude toward technology and toward the particular social media tool being used.

Some students stated that the use of such technology was an advantage because everyone was using social media; however, other students did not share the same outlook. They reflected that they wanted to maintain a distinction between personal and academic life, or that they were unfamiliar with the tools being used and feared losing out on opportunities to contribute to the class because of non-use.

**Recommendations**

In this study students were more comfortable with and most frequently used Facebook as a social media outlet. In accordance with Wisniewski’s (2010) findings that leadership students prefer digital learning outlets, students in this study perceived social media to be a technological norm. Instructors using social media in their classroom should encourage students to contact people in the class through Facebook, disseminate course information, and collaborate and connect socially using this social media tool.

Although many students in this study are comfortable with various social media tools, others indicated that they are not as comfortable using these outlets. Top (2012) found that computer knowledge was the strongest predictor of learning in a
course using social media. Therefore, in accordance with Novak et al. (2012), it is recommended that in-class training in the use of social media outlets may be beneficial for the success of some students.

Many professors would already agree that social media is a constant distraction in the classroom. What used to be passing notes has become updating statuses and tweeting. It would be difficult for students to use social media in class and only focus on it as it relates to that particular course; this could be damaging the valuable classroom interface. Therefore, it is imperative for the instructor to create a sense of social presence as described by Tu and McIsaac (2002). Top (2012) also suggests that creating a sense of community in an online environment will aid in the success of social media as an educational tool.

In fulfilling students need for a sense of community, creating a comfortable social media environment instructors increase the probability that students will be successful in using social media as a formal learning tool (Tu & McIsaac, 2002). As a part of the Social Presence Theory, attitude toward technology and access to technology are also issues that must be addressed. It is the recommendation of this study that social media components be made optional or even supplemental so that students who do not have regular access to the Internet or are not a part of a social media community may still be engaged in the course content. It is important to question whether or not it would be acceptable to force these students to become active in social media, preserving student choice as to whether they want to take part in this aspect of the class.

This freedom of choice in how students choose to acquire their information is in line with the andragogical models of Knowles et al. (2005) and Platz (1994). It allows students to gain a sense of ownership and control of their education. The online format also increases instructors’ ability to guide the students from a lower level in the Staged Self-Directed Learning Model to become a level four self-directed learner as described by Grow (1991) and by using strategies suggested by Brown (2012).

Future research should include a post-perception study after the use of social media in a leadership course to examine any change in perceived comfort level and frequency of use of social media tools. Future studies may also include the comparison of critical thinking and content retention between courses using social media tools and courses not using social media tools. Studies may also include how instructors may guide non-users of social media to attain higher levels within the Staged Self-Directed Learning Model (Grow, 1991).

This study was limited to students in two leadership courses at Texas A&M University. A broader study would include more upper level leadership courses and courses across the university that integrates social media in their courses.
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Abstract

Social capital, an important mechanism for the creation and maintenance of healthy organizational life, may be developed through initiatives such as leadership development as effective leadership development not only enhances individual effectiveness, but serves to build relationships, coordinate actions, and extend and strengthen the social network. An ongoing iterative process which engages all participants such as action learning can facilitate this process. This research supports the connection between leadership development and social capital based on an extended action learning engagement in a healthcare system.

Introduction

Social capital, once studied primarily in the social and political sciences, has become increasingly important in the organizational sciences as a mechanism for the creation and maintenance of healthy organizational life (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Timberlake, 2005; Cohen & Prusak, 2001). Putnam (2001) defined social capital as “the connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (p.19). Cohen and Prusak (2001) further elaborated in their definition when they wrote that “the stock of active connections among people: the trust, mutual understanding, and shared values and behaviors that bind the members of human networks and communities and make cooperative action possible” (p. 4).

High levels of social capital have been shown to have a positive impact on multiple facets of organizational life including individual career success, compensation and placement, employee recruitment and retention, team effectiveness, interdepartmental resource exchange, product innovation and entrepreneurship, as well as external relationships with suppliers, regional production networks and other firms (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Oh, Labianca, & Myung-Ho, 2006). Higher levels of trust, common frames of reference, shared goals, and the cooperative spirit associated with high levels of social capital can result in better knowledge sharing, lower transaction costs, lower turnover costs, greater coherence of action (Cohen & Prusak, 2001), and greater intellectual capital (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Individuals not only have greater access to
information, but also greater power, influence, and control to get things done when they leverage their social capital across boundaries between organizational units. In addition, strong networks build solidarity and facilitate resolution of disputes and grievances (Adler & Kwon, 2002). However, although there are numerous positive effects, negative manifestations of social capital can result in ethnocentrism, sectarianism, corruption and the inhibition of innovation or risk taking (Putnam, 2001; Adler & Kwon, 2002).

Putnam (2001) suggested that there are two types of social capital; bonding, which facilitates strong inwardly focused fairly homogenous groups, and bridging, which extends outward to include many diverse constituencies. Both serve useful purposes. Bonding social capital provides social and psychological support for its members creates solidarity and facilitates reciprocity. Bridging social capital can facilitate information dissemination and linkage to external resources. The notion of social capital has also been associated with more contemporary forms of leadership (King, 2004) as the definition of leadership has expanded from a set of traits residing in one individual, to a function of the collective (Barker, 2001; Dachler & Hosking, 1995; Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001; Rost, 1991; Raelin, 2003).

Although the benefits of social capital have been documented, it is nonetheless difficult to build (Timberlake, 2005; Adler & Kwon, 2002; Prusak & Cohen, 2001). Organizational leaders can however, expand social capital by building trust through transparency and authentic leadership, providing time and space to create connections and facilitate personal conversations, and establishing recognition and reward systems that support and reinforce collaboration (Nahapet & Ghoshal, 1998; Prusak & Cohen, 2001). Leadership development may serve as one effective strategy for building social capital by not only enhancing effectiveness of the individual leader, but also by serving to build relationships, coordinate actions, and extend and strengthen the social network (Day, 2001; Day & Harrison, 2007). Van de Valk’s (2008) review adds further clarity to the relationship between leadership development and the social network and encourages additional study. This research supports the connection between leadership development and social networking through an action learning process in one healthcare system.

**Leadership Development through Action Learning**

Organizations intending to build effective leadership capacity need to develop both individual human capital as well as collective social capital. Development of both individual leaders and collective leadership is needed (Day, 2001; Day & Harrison, 2007; Van Velsor & McCauley, 2004). Leader development according to Van Velsor and McCauley (2004) is defined as “the expansion of a person’s capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes...those that facilitate setting direction, creating alignment, maintaining commitment in groups of people who share common work” (p. 2). Individuals must become cognizant of
their own values, develop greater self-awareness and an ability to continuously learn, think, and act creatively and strategically (Day, 2001; Van Velsor & McCauley, 2004).

According to Van Velsor and McCauley (2004), leadership development addresses the collective and encompasses “the expansion of the organization’s capacity to enact the basic leadership tasks needed for collective work” (p. 18). Leadership is developed through building interpersonal skills, social awareness, mutual respect, and trust. If organizational leaders can shift their viewpoint of leadership from a characteristic residing in an individual to a phenomenon that is a property of the whole system, and if they can create opportunities for connection, then leadership capacity and therefore social capital will be enhanced (O’Connor & Quinn, 2004).

Due to its collaborative nature action learning is well suited to facilitate leadership development (Coghlan, 2004; Day, 2001; Raelin & Coghlan, 2006; Torbert, 1994). If one intends to develop collective capacity, then a collective process must be utilized to do so (Raelin, 2006; James, Mann, & Creasy, 2007). Action learning, originally introduced by Revans (1980), is a model of experiential learning in which participants learn by incorporating programmed knowledge with questioning insight. Central to the process is its cyclical nature, an engagement with real issues, a process of inquiry that attempts to uncover all aspects of a particular issue in question, exploration of potential resolutions through action and reflection, and promotion of a group dynamic that encourages critical reflection and learning (Revans, 1998). According to Revans (1980), “action learning is about real people tackling real problems in real time, observing the impartial discipline of the business setting and looking after a lot of people” (p. 309). The use of external experts is minimal, and participants take control of their own learning (Zuber-Skerrit, 2002). Conversations between members serve as the cornerstone of this process to construct new meaning and transform collective experiences into personal, group, and organizational knowledge (Baker, Jensen, & Kolb, 2005; King, 2003; Raelin, 2001).

The outcomes of action learning programs can include improved strategic thinking ability, understanding group processes and organizational change, improved understanding between sections of the organization, development of leadership skills, and more ideas for future projects (Zuber-Skerrit, 2002). In addition, as participants work on their own issues, they develop stronger relationships, are more in control of the information, and are empowered to act in the future. This process can increase each member’s capacity to collaborate as the individual develops a sense of self-efficacy, meaning, and responsibility. At the group level mutual inquiry can promote critical thinking, team learning, and enhanced interpersonal interactions (Raelin & Coghlan, 2006). The social networks that develop based on the collective experiences, shared values, and mutual trust creates an organizational infrastructure that supports information
dissemination well beyond the completion of the consulting engagement (Bradbury & Reason, 2003; Day, 2001).

The LEAD Program

The Leadership Education and Development (LEAD) program was established six years ago at a regional health system (Health Systems). The program, explicitly intended to develop leadership at all levels for increased personal and organizational effectiveness, was offered initially to all members of the management team and subsequently expanded to include coordinators, team leaders, and other interested employees. The content incorporated into the programming, as well as its delivery, was the result of a collaborative effort between the university and the members of hospital administration from the Human Resource and Organizational Development departments.

Program participants came from all disciplines within Health Systems and represented a variety of departments; patient care, diagnostics, administrative support, ancillary services, and off-site satellite facilities. The tenets of action learning served as the springboard for the leadership development process in this project. Each cycle of the LEAD program consisted of a series of meetings, each lasting three hours, convened every other month over a six month period. Each workshop not only provided the theoretical background and a platform for skill development at the individual level, but also an opportunity for members to share learning, give and receive feedback, and to develop action plans for the future. Two levels of programming were offered and included topics such as personality, servant leadership, communication and conflict management, coaching and performance management, delegation, change management, and appreciative inquiry. Participants in the program were organized into small groups, and encouraged to discuss how this could be applied in their setting. In addition, upon completion of each session participants were encouraged to put into practice a relevant concept and then share their experience when they reconvened at the next session. Each subsequent session began with a review of the concepts from the prior session, a dialogue around how the concepts were put into use, and the successes or challenges that arose. Care was taken to ensure that topics addressed were consistent with the organization’s mission and values.

Key issues that emerged during conversations were also shared with members of the hospital executive team when appropriate. Subsequent programming and topics for further discussion were later refined based on participant feedback. Over time the sessions became more collaborative and, according to the participants, as they became more familiar and comfortable with each other the peer-to-peer conversations and sharing emerged as one of strong features of the program. A total of 110 individuals grouped into three cohorts participated in at least one level of the LEAD program. Two of the three cohorts completed both levels of the LEAD program. The third cohort only completed the first phase prior to program suspension due to economic reasons.
Methods and Data Collection

This study engaged action research as the primary means for gathering data, making sense of that data, and revising programming as needed. Action research, due to its participative nature as well as adoption of an inside-out perspective, is well suited to study leadership development as it unfolds, as a contextually-driven, reflective, and relational process (Coghlan, 2004; Torbert, 1994, 2004). Since we have primarily employed an action learning approach in the leadership development program, it is only fitting that a similar action-oriented approach be used as the primary research method.

According to Coghlan and Brannick (2005), action research cycles through various stages from diagnosis to action planning to taking action and evaluating the results. The process is iterative as well as reflective. Process, results and, key elements of learning are continually refined by the group as data is generated over time. Action research is also collaborative in that both the researcher and group decide upon issues to study, create strategies for action and reflect upon results. In addition, the outcome of action research not only benefits the client, but enhances the development of the researcher and contributes to a broader knowledge base (Reason & Torbert, 2001).

Working collaboratively with members of the administrative team, several opportunities for cyclical planning, data collection, action, and reflection were developed. Each process is briefly described below. Although leadership development research may involve conventional quantitative analyses, this study employed the use of narrative and dialogic approaches because the participants were as involved in the process as the researchers (Raelin & Coghlan, 2006; Raelin, 2006; Bradbury & Reason, 2001; Wenger, 2000). The use of multiple cycles and venues serves to provide credibility to the findings.

Process 1: Workshop Sessions

Each workshop, designed to use an action learning approach (Raelin, 2006), provided an opportunity for members to learn new concepts, share issues, collaborate to solve problems, become more familiar with larger organizational issues, and become better acquainted with each other. Upon conclusion of each session, participants were requested to complete and submit a short feedback form. During the last session of each level of programming participants were additionally requested to reflect upon the series, discuss key element of what they learned, offer ideas for subsequent sessions, and begin to engage in action planning. Although ideas were discussed collectively, members of all groups were again requested to complete a feedback form to ensure all voices were heard. Both sets of forms were analysed for key themes and the data generated was shared with members of the administration to refine format and content going forward.
Process 2: Lunchtime Inquiry Group

A group of approximately 12 managers who were actively involved in the program met monthly during lunchtime over a five-month period. Sessions were loosely based on the cooperative inquiry approach outlined by Heron and Reason (2001), recorded, transcribed and analysed using the methodology suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998). The intention was to create a more intimate setting whereby the group could further delve into the collaborative learning process, explore issues around leadership, garner feedback about the formal LEAD programming, gain insight into larger organizational issues, and perhaps develop strategies for change. After each session a report was created and shared with the group at the next session for validation. The reports also served as a way to maintain focus and follow up on key issues. Moreover, they triggered further dialogue, reflection, sharing, and learning.

Process 3: Periodic Meetings with Administrative Personnel

A series of meetings with members of the administrative team were conducted in order to share and clarify findings, establish mutual goals, determine additional areas of study, and discuss any other program matters. This group served as the action research team and sounding board for the entire program.

Process 4: One-on-one Dialogues with Participants

In addition to the inquiry group, conversations were held with 11 additional program participants to gather their insights, impressions, key elements learned, and suggestions. All dialogues were recorded, transcribed, and analysed for key themes. The group included representation from clinical, support, and satellite facilities of Health Systems.

Process 5: Personal Observations and Reflections

Immediately after each encounter or session, impressions, thoughts, and personal reflections of the author were captured via recording. Recordings of each personal entry were transcribed and analysed for key themes and what was learned as well as unanswered questions going forward in the process.

Results and Program Outcomes

Although much has been written about leadership development, Collins (2001) noted that little work has been done to assess the effectiveness or outcomes of leadership development initiatives. Because leadership development encompasses multiple levels from the individual to collective, it only follows that assessment of the outcomes should occur using various levels as well (Day, 2001; Leatt &
Porter, 2003; Yammarino, Dansereau, & Kennedy, 2001). Therefore, this section addresses development that occurred at individual as well as collective levels such as the group and organization. Intragroup relationships suggesting bonding social capital as well as interdepartmental bridging social capital are illustrated as well as changes effected within the organization. The key outcomes are summarized in Table 1 and representative comments have been italicized.
Table 1
Outcomes of the LEAD program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD program outcomes (Cohorts 1 and 2) (N=58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Leader Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change management, change processes (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reconceptualization of leadership (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appreciation of diversity (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “gave me great insight into myself and others”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I needed to understand that each person brought different traits and abilities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development, behavioral changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better communication/listening skills (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More involvement, delegation and empowerment of staff (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “given up some of my “power” and allowed others to step in”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change in leadership style/approach (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intragroup Development (bonding social capital)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “We have become a better team by better communication”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Greatest learning has been in the discussions with my coordinators after they return from class”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I have listened to the staff’s ideas and complaints and perceptions of situations to come up with a better resolution as a group”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I have learned to let go and trust staff to handle projects”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergroup/Organization Development (bridging social capital)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of connections (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “getting together in this class does bring the group closer together”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I have become aware that others face the same issues that I do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “new resources and support system”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “would like to explore ways to foster group connections beyond LEAD”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better interdepartmental communication (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “more transparent and willing to dialogue”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Improvements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better meeting management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhanced communication structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional training procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development of new manager mentoring program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual Leader Knowledge Acquisition and Relational Skills Development

Since an action learning approach was utilized, individuals were able to learn what was relevant to them, reflect upon that learning, and use that information back within their own setting. The data suggested that both cohorts experienced several of the same learning points which included a reconceptualization of the notion of leadership, better understanding and appreciation of style and generational differences, and a more complete understanding of the process of change management. In addition, junior team leaders with less experience from the second cohort reported that they had developed more self-confidence and comfort within their roles as leaders.

The LEAD Program participants also reported that they had developed additional relational skills. Participants from both cohorts noted better communication skills, increased involvement and empowerment of their staff, more delegation, and a shift to employing more developmental forms of performance management such as coaching and mentoring. In addition to self-reports of learning and behavior change, the junior team leaders in the second cohort had the opportunity to share their observations of changes that they had noticed in their own managers who had gone through the program previously. Their reports also corroborated the self-reports of more communication, involvement and delegation – “I can definitely tell a difference in how he talks with staff, and listens to them more, and just his responses back and how they’re worded has made a big difference. (J)”

Group Intradepartmental Dynamics, Processes and Bonding Social Capital

A theme which frequently emerged throughout the meetings related to a concern with relationships within individual departments or units. Teambuilding, dealing with dysfunctional group dynamics, employee performance, coaching, and delegation were all discussed. One manager implemented a department-wide career ladder and noted that this had helped retain entry-level employees. Another reported that she had changed the physical layout of her unit to promote more dialogue and collaboration between caregivers and support personnel. Several participants reported that they have seen better teamwork within their department. Others noted more collaborative problem solving and a willingness to share leadership.

Tenure within a leadership role also affected the focus of the participants. The first cohort consisted of fairly experienced managers and directors. As the program was offered to others in the organization, subsequent cohorts consisted of less experienced team leaders. Those who had been in a management position for some time appeared to focus more on global organizational issues while those who were relatively new had concerns that were much more locally focused. For
example, the participants in the less senior, second cohort were much more interested in how the programming would help in the immediate context of their team, and conversations centered on personal struggles in making the transition to a leadership role, internal operational issues such as staffing and training, relationship building through better communication, addressing generational issues, improving morale, and facilitating more involvement of their team members. One group of team leaders actually left a session only to return later with a new staffing plan for the third shift. Another team leader worked with her group to develop a strategy for training nurses how to operate a new piece of diagnostic equipment.

The first cohort, consisting of more senior managers, discussed some of the same challenges; however, this group went further to grapple with issues dealing with organizational policies and procedures. Topics explored included the logistics and challenges associated with implementation of a new 360 evaluation process, exploration of a new process for conducting meetings across the organization, development of a process for scheduling meetings, perception of changes in organizational culture, and consideration of a system-wide mentoring program for new managers. This group also expressed some frustration with the organization and was quick to call attention to those administrators who did not model behavior consistent with concepts presented in the LEAD program.

**Organization Development of Leadership and Bridging Social Capital**

The LEAD program facilitated the growth of the individual leader as it supported the development of connections necessary for the practice of collective leadership, both of which are necessary for effectiveness (Day, 2001; Day & Harrison, 2007; Raelin, 2003; James, Mann, & Creasy, 2007). Bartol and Zhang (2007) suggested thinking of leadership development outcomes in terms of the creation of multiple linkages or networks which can foster more effective processes in three very important ways: task accomplishment and problem solving (task), career advancement and mentoring (career), and friendship and emotional support (support). In this case, the creation of connections was seen as one of the major outcomes of the LEAD program as the appreciation for having the opportunity for dialogue and collaboration repeatedly emerged. The importance of connectivity, bridging professional practice silos, particularly in a historically fragmented organization such as a hospital, cannot be underestimated:

- **Task accomplishment and problem solving**

  “and I really like getting together with the other leaders in the organization and just hearing how they deal with things and learning some other techniques and dealing with things. The most helpful part to me in working through, like, a situation, you know, how you handle this. But I like that kind of group thing” (JE).
• Career advancement and mentoring

“I think it’s very, very helpful to be able to hear from your peers with any organization, the same struggles that they are going through, how they approach things, how you deal with it, and it has also been very helpful too because then the people have dealt with it they know about, well there was this policy or this. It’s kind of little tidbits of information to help you along the way or to give you ideas and also to practice” (JU).

“One of the cool things about LEAD is getting to know others who we might not otherwise have known. I am going to point at R. Before LEAD, I didn’t spend much time with R. I didn’t know her and I’ve gotten to know her. That is a real positive because she has a wealth of knowledge and information and I can use her comfortably as a resource in my work life. I never would have had that so you know the positive things from the group and from the LEAD courses is that I am learning more and more about these people that I see every day. You don’t know or appreciate that much. So it’s given me an opportunity there” (L).

• Friendship and emotional support

“I think that we are starting to understand what’s going on in everybody’s department and you are starting to get that bond the more we meet – again the power of that group. You know the other managers and now you feel that you can support them if they wanted it” (V).

“I like it because when you have a chance to listen to other people in the hospital that are having the same issues that you are having, it’s almost like a relief. You’re having these struggles with whether it be employees or whether it be problems within your department, not necessarily people, but computers or whatever, and you have people who have those same issues. You can say, okay, it’s not just me” (R).

“I think what it is, is we don’t understand each other until we get to know each other. I have no clue what the x-ray guy does all day. I don’t have a clue what the ER guys do, and they don’t have a clue what I’m doing. I think once we start talking to each other and we meet each other, that we gain that respect from each other” (T).

The members of the first, more senior cohort, appeared to be a much more connected group from the very beginning based on the ease and frequency of interaction. This was not surprising as they routinely worked together on various task forces within the hospital. Members routinely consulted with each other when working through problems as well as for emotional support. The members of this cohort have also disclosed that they were ready to develop their network
even further and were willing to take action on certain organizational projects such as taking responsibility for the weekly meeting forums, developing a new manager mentoring program, working through holiday coverage issues, building trust between each other, and working more closely with upper administration. Some incidents of collective sense-making occurred as participants discussed changes in organizational structure and key personnel, the dialectic of empowerment within the context of a formal hierarchal structure, and organizational strategies for leveraging their time more effectively (i.e., meetings, emails, schedules). As several of the managers noted, they had begun to work from a systems-thinking perspective by involving others from outside of the unit when appropriate.

Initially the members of the second cohort, consisting of less experienced team leaders and coordinators, did not appear to be as connected to each other as the first group. Since the majority of their focus up until the point of the program was directed internally, this was to be expected as members most likely did not have much opportunity to interact or collaborate outside of their own department. Over time, however, members became more acquainted, developed trust in each other, and began to work through multiple problems together.

**Discussion**

The process of leadership development has emerged in this organization in a manner that includes the growth of individual leaders as well as the development of collective leadership capacity and social capital. Multiple cycles of action learning and inquiry can facilitate this process. This paper provides a unique contribution to the leadership development literature by integrating not only the individual leader but the development of social capital, ultimately increasing the capacity to stimulate organizational change.

**Leader Development**

In order for effective leadership to emerge, one must begin with the development of the individual first. This phase is addressed in most traditional leader development programs and focuses on building individual knowledge and skills (Day, 2001). Implicit notions of leadership and an internal focus are gradually replaced by more collective concepts (Lord & Hall, 2005; Rooke & Torbert, 2005). In the earliest sessions of the LEAD program, one discovers new ways of thinking about leadership, develops appreciation for differences, and assimilates more effective relational and managerial skills. Initially less experienced participants may struggle with thinking of themselves as a leader; however, over time the concept of leader becomes a part of one’s identity. This can enhance one’s sense of self-efficacy, empowerment, and intrinsic motivation to stretch beyond one’s comfort level to try new behaviors (Lord & Hall, 2005; Raelin, 2006). Development of a more collaborative style allows for the individual to engage others in problem solving, learning, and information sharing which sets
the stage for increasing connections and network development, all of which are hallmarks of contemporary notions of leadership.

Development of Leadership and Social Capital

The collaborative nature of action learning provides relevance, encourages reflection, and helps to develop interdisciplinary relationships or networks that continue even after the programming is finished (Raelin, 2006; Raelin & Coghlan, 2006; Torbert, 1994). The expansion of interdisciplinary networks can result in increased social capital which is essential to individual, group, and organizational effectiveness (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Bartol & Zhang, 2007; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; King, 2004; O’Connor & Quinn, 2004). The development of social capital involves not only the creation of new connections and the enhancement of relational dynamics such as respect, trust, shared norms, values, and expectations, but also allows for a cognitive recognition of a collective identity through shared language and meaning making (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

One of the distinctive aspects of the LEAD program that evolved over time was the focus on building relationships and collaborative learning. Participants reported not only developing better relationships within their department (i.e., bonding social capital) but they also emphasized the importance of the new relationships built across departmental and functional lines (i.e., bridging social capital). In this context, the value of the collaborative process may be fourfold:

- Assistance in the transition to leader through the establishment of a new peer group which transcends practice boundaries or organizational silos – As a manager incorporates the notion of leader into her identity, she finds it necessary to shift her affiliation with a particular peer group from one that is discipline specific (e.g., nurse, technician) to one that is interdisciplinary and position specific (manager, director). As (S) noted, “we talk about departments being in silos, but it is really easy for us to become one person silos.” And (P) elaborated “so the only group that I have to talk to sometimes IS this group. You know, I can’t address my employees the same way that I would address some of my friends. Why I think this group is so important is because I think that we are pretty much colleagues and peers.”

- Provision of psychological safety – Edmundson (1999) noted the importance of psychological safety to team learning. The supportive environment provided by the LEAD program may provide a degree of psychological safety for some members to take risks and share their dilemmas, ultimately enhancing the learning of all. In addition, they can serve as sounding boards to work through issues that might otherwise be too sensitive to discuss in other arenas (Raelin, 2006). As (R) noted in one of our meetings: “nobody wants to call another director and say ‘you know, I am really not good at this what should I do?’ In a group setting,
you are getting a lot of tools and a lot of ideas on how to solve difficult issues”

- Development of a stronger network through creation of communities of practice or learning communities which can assist in problem solving, professional skill development, and the transfer of best practices (Senge, 2004; Wenger, 2000) – Communities of practice can help build social capital by serving as an internal clearing house for identifying those individual who have knowledge related to a particular issue, allowing for increased access to information as well as alternative perspectives, and connect newer members to resources necessary for them to be successful (Akdere & Roberts, 2008; O’Connor & Quinn, 2004). Several members noted that they have learned a great deal from their colleagues and have recognized that they have more in common than originally perceived, grappling with many of the same issues such as problematic employees, budgetary constraints, or organizational policies. This recognition has helped members feel more connected, supported and willing to share information. In addition, members have reported a greater appreciation and understanding of issues not affecting their immediate areas. A community of practice which joins together participants from different professional disciplines may also help alleviate some of the isolation and fragmentation issues found in healthcare organizations as noted by Ranga and Rousseau (2006).

- Creation of relational space – Bradbury and Reason (2001) asserted that the creation of relational space precedes the development of collaborative work between different organizational entities. This appears to be important even within the context of one organization such as Health Systems due to the fragmented nature of healthcare institutions in general. As members develop trust, peer-to-peer learning becomes possible. Over time the connections can result in collaborative efforts and action across the organization.

**Organizational Impact**

Effective leadership development processes should also enhance organizational capability for meeting complex challenges that are larger than any one set of individuals (Raelin, 2003). O’Connor and Quinn (2004) maintained that expanded leadership capacity which allows for multiple responses to any given situation is essential to organizational health and survival. This increased capacity becomes evident through organizational changes and improvements in performance such efficiency and productivity gains, process improvements, innovation and adaptation, or improved employee relations (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2005). These changes became evident at Health Systems as well. Several new initiatives emerged from the conversations held within the sessions including a new meeting management procedure, the revision of an organizational communication
processes, and the development of additional training for a new performance management system. Participants also reported that they would like to continue their network development beyond the scope of the program, offer programming to everyone within the system, and continue to collaborate to resolve organizational issues going forward.

**Limitations and Need for Further Study**

Although members of both cohorts reported that they had begun using more collaborative approaches; therefore, future studies should involve the use of social network analysis (Raelin, 2006; Mayo, Meindl, & Pastor, 2002). Elements of social networks that may assist in ascertaining network growth include network density or the number of ties within an organization, strength or frequency of ties, symmetry or directionality of exchanges, and degree of centrality or the number of ties that can be attributed to each member. In addition, social capital can be further assessed by determining the levels of trust within an organization as well as the exploration of norms and shared narratives (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

**Conclusion**

Social capital, an important mechanism for the creation and maintenance of healthy organizational life, may be developed through initiatives such as leadership development as it works to develop the individual leader and foster collective leadership. An ongoing iterative process such as action learning which engages all participants can facilitate the development of bonding social capital between members within a group as well as bridging social capital by strengthening the relationship between groups, departments, or disciplines. Working across disciplines will help to facilitate greater organizational learning, creativity, and process gain.
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Abstract

This paper explores the extent to which the leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities of upper-year student leaders on one private, United States college campus developed as a consequence of their education and experience as an extended orientation leader. Findings reveal that compared to leadership education in the classroom, leadership development is limited by experiences that do not include intentional reflection. We identify key elements in pedagogical frameworks that support and impede the leadership development of students and propose strategies to enhance the learning outcomes established for leadership development.

Introduction

For more than 100 years orientation programs have sought to support new students as they transition from high school to college by connecting them with upper-year undergraduate student mentors (Busby & Strumpf, 2006). Today, orientation, and increasingly extended orientation, programs are common on university and college campuses across North America (Pike & Kuh, 2005). In fact, 96% of colleges have some type of orientation program for new first-year or transfer students (Barefoot, 2005).

Although orientation programs vary in design, scope, and scale (Daddona & Cooper, 2002), they all serve as a conduit to the higher learning community (Busby, Gammel, & Jeffcoat, 2002). For many new students orientation programs
are an important introduction to the academic community. They are designed to connect new students to campus and provide information about institutional expectations and supports (Busby, Gammel, & Jeffcoat, 2002; Moxley, Najor-Durack, & Dumbrigue, 2001; Upcraft & Farnsworth, 1984).

Despite the prominence of orientation programs on university and college campuses, relatively little empirical research has comprehensively examined the outcomes associated with these initiatives (Mayhew, Vanderlinden, & Kim, 2010). Indeed, the breadth and scope of orientation programs has created challenges in providing consistent and reliable information about the influence of such programs on student success and retention. Of the limited research examining orientation, the majority has focused on the learning outcomes of new students. These studies found students who attend orientation report stronger social connections, greater commitment to the institution, and have higher retention rates and academic achievement at the end of their first year (King & Wessell, 2004; Pascarella, Terenzini, & Wolfe, 1986; Upcraft & Farnsworth, 1984).

The learning outcomes associated with orientation programs, however, extend beyond those attributed to new students. Universities typically employ upper-year undergraduate students as orientation leaders or mentors to facilitate the orientation experiences of the incoming class. One of the primary reasons cited by universities for using upper-year undergraduate students is to develop the leadership skills and abilities of student leaders. While student leadership development is frequently stated as an outcome of orientation programs, little research examining the leadership development of student leaders has been conducted.

With this study we seek to address this gap in the literature by critically examining the leadership development of students participating in a leadership course and a subsequent experiential learning program (i.e., leadership opportunity). We explore the extent to which the leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities of student leaders at one private, research intensive, U.S. university developed as a consequence of their education and experience as an extended orientation leader. We examine the integration of servant leadership and experiential learning in the development of student leaders participating in extended orientation programs. The findings of this study will inform student leadership educators and provide evidence for measurable outcomes related to leadership development in an experiential setting. We also identify key elements in pedagogical framework that support and impede the leadership development of students, and propose strategies to enhance the learning outcomes established for leadership development.
Experiential Learning and Leadership Development

The extended orientation program in this study was founded on the concept of servant leadership, a philosophy of leading that embraces service to others (Keith, 2008). The primary directive for a servant leader is that the leader is called to serve first, and second to lead. Rather than embracing the power structure inherent in hierarchical leadership positions, the measure of a servant leader’s capacity is found in the growth of the followers (Greenleaf, 2002; Keith, 2008). Although empirical research in the field of servant leadership is lacking, many conceptual models have been proposed. The components of the models vary, but central to each is the qualities of empathy, foresight, stewardship, calling, trust, credibility, and most importantly service (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Liden, Wayne, Zhaa, & Henderson, 2008; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008). These models posit that service behaviors are used to build trust in leadership skills, which thereby leads to a position of influence built upon service to the followers (Joseph & Winston, 2005).

Servant leaders must embody attributes of a servant such as vision, honesty, trust, appreciation of others, and service (Russell & Stone, 2002). When a servant leader demonstrates these core beliefs consistently over time, the message inspires followers’ trust (Joseph & Winston, 2005). Servant leaders remain servants even after reaching a position of power. Leadership is a learning process for servant leaders, as opposed to a set of in-born characteristics (Brown & Posner, 2001). Leadership is, therefore, developed, relational, contextual, and worthy of rigorous self-examination and study. It is through the process of leading that servant leaders make mistakes, and through intensive reflection upon these mistakes, servant leaders engage in learning opportunities that help refine their leadership style. As a result, servant leaders emerge as more equipped for future leadership developed through practice and reflection.

In this study we use Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning model as a theoretical framework for assessing the leadership development process of student leaders. Kolb applied experiential components to learning theories to conceptualize a cyclical pattern of conception, action, concrete experience, and reflection (see Figure 1). This type of learning is flexible and mutable; ideas are intended to change as experiences change. Kolb’s model can begin at any point in the cycle, as long as the emphasis is on the cyclical nature of the model. Thinking about concepts, theories, and ideas occurs during the abstract conceptualization phase. After learning about the theory or concept, learners enter the action stage which involves putting theory and concepts into practice. The next stage includes reflection and feeling. During this phase the theory and action are compared to assess whether the learner needs to modify the theoretical knowledge to fit the experience or if the learner can accept the actual experience as a match to the existing theory (Kolb, 1984). Once a learner determines a method for reconciling theory and practice a reflection period occurs. Reflection may be considered an incubation period for thinking through new problems and considering the
previous learning. Reflection leads into another iteration of the cycle by integrating together practice and theory.

Figure 1
Kolb’s (1984) Learning Cycle

In the extended orientation program examined in this study, students began the learning cycle at the conception stage of Kolb’s (1984) cycle. All student leaders were required to register and pass a leadership development course prior to their summer leadership experience. The course required students to demonstrate comprehension of the leadership development theories taught in the course. The focus of the leadership course was the role of a servant leader and students were taught the behaviors and values associated with the leadership style.

All four stages most likely occurred in the classroom, but its emphasis was the conception stage of Kolb’s (1984) model. After completion of the course, students served as leaders during an extended summer orientation program. Again, although multiple stages could have occurred in the summer experience, the emphasis was the action stage of learning. Student leaders were charged with helping new students begin their transition to campus and to the expectations of higher education. Student leaders were expected to effectively communicate to incoming students the core values of the institution’s new student experience – connection, identity, reflection, friendship, and tradition.

Measuring Student Leadership Development

Four research questions guided our examination of the leadership development of students serving as extended orientation leaders. These questions were related to instrument development, comparing leadership outcomes before and after the leadership course, comparing leadership outcomes after the course to the
leadership practice experience, and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of leadership education and practice. They were:

- Does an instrument designed to measure college student leadership outcomes meet psychometric standards for construct validity and reliability?
- To what extent did the classroom experience contribute to growth in leadership outcomes for student leaders of the extended orientation program?
- To what extent did the leadership practice component contribute to leadership outcomes when compared to the classroom experience?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the design of leadership education and practice for student leaders of extended orientation programs?

The demographics of the sample may be found in Table 1.

Table 1
Demographics of student leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (n=239)</th>
<th>After Formal Instruction/Conception (n=197)</th>
<th>End of Program/Concrete Experience (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43% (n=103)</td>
<td>44% (n=87)</td>
<td>66% (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57% (n=136)</td>
<td>56% (n=110)</td>
<td>35% (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18.8 years (.9)</td>
<td>19.0 years (.9)</td>
<td>19.6 years (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>19% (n=38)</td>
<td>19% (n=38)</td>
<td>3% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held at least 1 leadership position during formal instruction</td>
<td>81% (n=194)</td>
<td>85% (n=167)</td>
<td>88% (n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonged to 2 or more student organizations</td>
<td>75% (n=179)</td>
<td>80% (n=158)</td>
<td>81% (n=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>68% (n=167)</td>
<td>68% (n=133)</td>
<td>75% (n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12% (n=27)</td>
<td>12% (n=23)</td>
<td>13% (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>12% (n=26)</td>
<td>12% (n=24)</td>
<td>6% (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4% (n=7)</td>
<td>4% (n=7)</td>
<td>3% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/ Multiracial</td>
<td>4% (n=12)</td>
<td>5% (n=10)</td>
<td>3% (n=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to attrition, the sample declined over the course of the study.

The instrument used in this study was designed by a faculty member who teaches leadership development in order to measure elements of servant leadership. Three professionals who work with student leaders provided feedback on the content validity of the instrument. The survey consisted of a custom student leadership survey containing 38 Likert-type questions designed to measure different aspects of servant leadership development including theoretical knowledge, leadership
style, leadership competence, and interpersonal skills. Each item was scored from 1 – not representative at all to 7 – extremely representative.

All students who were accepted to serve as extended orientation leaders participated in a pre-test measure of their leadership knowledge, skills, and experiences. This provided baseline information, which was subsequently compared with two repeat measures administered at the following stages of Kolb’s (1984) learning cycle – (a) after the formal class (conception), (b) at the end of the program. To address the variation in participation at each time point, two independent analytical procedures were conducted. The first procedure was after the formal class experience and the second at the end of the program.

To determine construct validity, exploratory factor analysis in SPSS was used to establish composite variables representing elements of servant leadership from the leadership survey. Factor analysis is a procedure used to reduce a large number of manifest or measured variables into subsets of latent or unmeasured variables that may be representative of specific constructs (Field, 2009). This analysis was selected because the instrument had no prior psychometric data. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on all 38 original survey items using alpha factoring with promax rotation to maximize the reliability of resulting factors. Alpha factoring with a Kaiser’s criterion of 1 was used because the study utilized repeat-measures to determine growth in servant leadership development. When using repeat-measures, the higher reliability of the factors allows the researcher to draw conclusions about changes in factor values. Promax rotation was selected because the latent variables (i.e., depth of relationships, personal calling) used to formulate servant leadership are likely to be related (Keith, 2008).

All the assumptions for factor analysis were met. The correlation matrix from the analysis did not show any variables with correlations over .6 which supports the absence of multicollinearity. This was confirmed by Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2 (406) = 4222.97, p < .001$ which indicated all correlations were significantly greater than 0. Combined with the results of the correlation matrix and the value of the determinant of the R-matrix (0.00094), the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity supports the use of factor analysis (Field, 2009). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value (KMO = .88) as well as the individual item values (KMO > .5) also supported the use of factor analysis with the sample. Paired sample $t$-tests were used to test the difference between means for individuals at the baseline and after the formal classroom instruction on each of the five factors created through exploratory factor analysis and the sixth factor, servant leadership. The same procedure was applied to the means after formal classroom instruction and the means at the end of the experience. A paired sample $t$-test was used because it accounts for the lack of independence between scores from a pre- and posttest on the same individual. As multiple $t$-tests were used, a Bonferroni correction was applied to ensure the cumulative or familywise error rate was below .05 (Field, 2009). A Bonferroni correction creates a more conservative test for significance and increases the likelihood of rejecting a true effect, also known as a Type II error (Field, 2009).
Results

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in five factors with eigenvalues over Kaiser’s criterion of 1 and the five factors accounted for 40% of the variance. The scree plot was ambiguous showing inflexions at two factors as well as five factors. Table 2 shows the factor loadings for the five-factor solution after promax rotation. The items retained for each factor suggest that factor 1 represents recognition of strengths in self and others, factor 2 represents depth of relationships, factor 3 represents community and leadership, factor 4 represents recognition of individual differences, and factor 5 represents a personal calling. An additional factor of servant leadership was added to the five factors created through factor analysis. The additional factor was not supported by the factor analysis, but contained content relevant to the current study and was supported by the servant leadership literature. The items associated with servant leadership were important to assess given the framework of the intervention course.
Table 2: Factor Loadings for the Five Factor Solution After Promax Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I observe a group, I am able to recognize how others do or do not experience a sense of connection within the group.</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to recognize the strengths of others and how they contribute to the larger good.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I utilize my strengths while working with others to accomplish goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to define my own strengths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I observe a group, I am able to recognize how others contribute to the group with their strengths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how I can develop a mutually beneficial relationship with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I can judge and interpret the level of depth in my relationship with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the importance of helping others intentionally seek out authentic friendships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the importance of relationship-building (investment in others).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively educate others about the value of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In leading, I identify with the concept of relational leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a contributing member of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an understanding of a variety of theories and perspectives on leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate the differences among individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I can help others gain an appreciation for individual differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate differences among groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the concepts of personal calling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can articulate my own personal calling based upon current life experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have reevaluated my calling based upon life experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues | 1.60 | 7.75 | 1.86 | 1.42 | 1.24 |

% of variance | 5.4 | 26.7 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 4.3 |

Note: Some items not retained due to factor loading below 0.3 or anti-image correlation values below 0.5.
The items associated with servant leadership were important to assess given the framework of the intervention course. Since the items were not retained through the factor analysis, there is a possibility the items measure more than one construct. The five factors retained from the factor analysis in addition to the constructed factor of servant leadership may provide information about the changes occurring in the participants over the course of the intervention. The means and standard deviation for the variables retained after the factor analysis are reported in Table 4 by Kolb’s (1984) stages and Table 3 reports the same information for the constructed factor of servant leadership.

Table 3
Items Used to Create Servant Leadership Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Baseline Mean (SD) (n = 239)</th>
<th>After Formal Course/Concept Mean (SD) (n = 197)</th>
<th>End of Experience/Concrete Experience Mean (SD) (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In leading, I identify with the concept of servant leadership.</td>
<td>6.0 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.2 (1.0)</td>
<td>5.7 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership influences my decision making when approached with leadership situations.</td>
<td>5.7 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>5.6 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I apply the knowledge I have gained about leadership to practical experiences as I lead at Baylor.</td>
<td>5.6 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.1 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.2 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I apply the knowledge I have gained about leadership to practical experiences in my life.</td>
<td>5.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.3 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since coming to this institution, I feel my leadership capabilities have progressed.</td>
<td>5.8 (1.2)</td>
<td>6.4 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.8 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see that it is my duty to mentor other leaders and help them develop their leadership skills.</td>
<td>5.2 (1.2)</td>
<td>5.9 (1.0)</td>
<td>5.8 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mentored other leaders to help them develop their leadership skills.</td>
<td>4.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>5.2 (1.3)</td>
<td>5.0 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a leader, I see the value of practicing reflection in my learning process.</td>
<td>5.7 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.1 (1.0)</td>
<td>5.9 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have identified some practices of reflection that work well for me.</td>
<td>5.0 (1.4)</td>
<td>5.8 (1.1)</td>
<td>5.7 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale from 1 - Not representative at all to 7 Extremely representative.
Table 4  
Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Survey Items Retained After Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Baseline Mean (SD)</th>
<th>After Formal Course/ Conception Mean (SD)</th>
<th>End of Experience/ Concrete Experience Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a contributing member of a community.</td>
<td>5.6 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>5.7 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate differences among individuals.</td>
<td>6.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.3 (0.7)</td>
<td>6.5 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I can help others gain an appreciation for individual differences.</td>
<td>5.5 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.0 (0.8)</td>
<td>5.8 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I observe a group, I am able to recognize how others do or do not experience a sense of connection within the group.</td>
<td>5.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.2 (0.8)</td>
<td>6.4 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively educate others about the value of community.</td>
<td>4.4 (1.2)</td>
<td>5.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>5.4 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate differences among groups.</td>
<td>5.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.0 (0.8)</td>
<td>6.1 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the importance of relationship-building (investment in others).</td>
<td>6.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>6.6 (0.7)</td>
<td>6.7 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how I can develop a mutually beneficial relationship with others.</td>
<td>6.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.4 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.5 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I can judge and interpret the level of depth in my relationships with others.</td>
<td>6.0 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.2 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.5 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the importance of helping others intentionally seek out authentic friendships.</td>
<td>6.0 (1.3)</td>
<td>6.3 (0.8)</td>
<td>6.5 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an understanding of a variety of theories and perspectives on leadership.</td>
<td>5.1 (1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In leading, I identify with the concept of relational leadership.</td>
<td>5.8 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.1 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.1 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the concept of personal calling.</td>
<td>6.2 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.4 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.6 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can articulate my own personal calling based up current life experiences.</td>
<td>5.7 (1.4)</td>
<td>5.9 (1.3)</td>
<td>5.8 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have reevaluated my calling based up current life experiences.</td>
<td>5.5 (1.6)</td>
<td>5.9 (1.3)</td>
<td>6.2 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to define my own strengths.</td>
<td>6.0 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.3 (0.8)</td>
<td>6.6 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to recognize the strengths of others and how they contribute to the larger good.</td>
<td>5.7 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.2 (0.7)</td>
<td>6.6 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I utilize my strengths while working with others to accomplish goals.</td>
<td>6.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>6.2 (0.8)</td>
<td>6.3 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I observe a group, I am able to recognize how others contribute to the group with their strengths.</td>
<td>5.5 (1.0)</td>
<td>5.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>6.2 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale from 1 - Not representative at all to 7 - Extremely representative.

The means and standard deviations for the variables included in each stage of the study may be found in Table 2. Results of the paired samples t-tests may be found in Table 5. Significant differences after the Bonferroni correction were found between pretest and posttest (before and after the leadership course) scores on the following factors: servant leadership, community and leadership, individual differences, and personal calling. No significant difference was found for the
recognition of strengths factor and the depth of relationship factor. However, prior to the Bonferroni correction, significant differences were also found in recognition of strengths in self and others ($p = .026$), as well as in depth of relationships, $p = .010$. In addition, no significant changes were found between the posttest and end of experience means on any factor, but growth was observed in the following factors – (a) recognition of strengths in self and others, (b) depth of relationships, (c) recognition of individual differences, and (d) personal calling. To determine the practical significance of the changes in the statistically significant factors of servant leadership, effect sizes were calculated using $r$ and are reported in Table 5. The effect size values may be interpreted as a 0.10 as a small effect, 0.30 as a medium effect, and 0.50 as a large effect (Kirk, 1996). Effect sizes were not included for non-significant findings.

| Table 5 | Results of Paired Samples $t$-tests for Factors From the Leadership Survey |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Factor                | Baseline to End of Formal Instruction | End of Formal Instruction to End of Program |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Servant Leader        | $t (50) = -5.66 ***; r = .60$    | $t (29) = 0.15$                |                       |
| Recognition of strengths in self and others | $t (50) = -2.27$                         | $t (29) = -1.63$             |                       |
| Depth of relationships | $t (50) = -2.68$                         | $t (29) = -0.51$             |                       |
| Community and leadership | $t (50) = -4.68 ***; r = .56$        | $t (28) = 0.22$              |                       |
| Recognition of individual differences | $t (50) = -4.90 ***; r = .57$         | $t (29) = -0.19$             |                       |
| Personal calling      | $t (50) = -3.26 **; r = .42$        | $t (29) = -1.16$              |                       |

*Note: The asterisks may be interpreted as follows: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.|

**Discussion**

**Conception through Classroom Instruction**

Kolb’s (1984) learning cycle proposes four key stages in the experiential learning process. As mentioned prior, these four stages overlap in development processes and cannot be strictly segregated. However, different components of educational programming in college can each emphasize a different stage of the learning cycle. We conceptualized our study accordingly. Analysis from this study first demonstrated that the instrument we utilized to measure student leader learning outcomes was both valid for the current purpose and reliable. Further analysis revealed that the formal classroom instruction contributed to the leadership development of the extended orientation leaders. We found that the classroom instruction, which represented the conception stage in Kolb’s learning cycle was particularly effective. Student leaders grew in their understanding of a variety of theories and perspectives on leadership with an emphasis on relational and servant-leadership. The instructional course introduced the theory and practice of servant leadership. This finding supports Eyler’s (2002) argument that formal classroom instruction is an effective approach to teaching leadership theory. More specifically, students who have received formal instruction on a leadership theory
consequently interpret their actions and others reactions through that theoretical lens. In the context of this study, course material focused on servant leadership and there was a significant positive change in students’ understanding of that theory ($t(50) = -5.66, p < .001, r = .60$). This ($r = .60$) is a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). It indicates that 36% of the growth in student knowledge may be attributed to the formal class instruction, which reflects the conception stage of Kolb’s (1984) learning cycle. This indicates that the conception stage of the learning cycle emphasized by the leadership course was highly effective for producing leadership development in student leaders.

Concrete Experience for Extended Orientation Leaders

While the focus of the classroom instruction was on the development of student leaders through knowledge, the intention of the summer experimental component was to continue student leader development through the application of theory. In this study, however, their learning appeared to stagnate. Student leaders grew in theoretical knowledge from the course component but did not continue to grow in their understanding and application of servant leadership. This is indicated by the non-significant change between conception and concrete experience ($t(29) = 0.15, p > .05$). In fact, student leader scores on the factor related to theoretical knowledge actually decreased between these two stages in Kolb’s (1984) learning cycle.

Reflection as Part of the Experience

One explanation for lack of continued development during the experiential component is that the intentional focus of the experience did not include reflection on either the concrete experience itself or the prior classroom experience. The reflection most often used in experiential components includes sharing impressions and feeling, but not an intentional link to the academic learning applied in the field experience (Eyler, Giles, & Schmiede, 1996). In the program studied here, the focus of the experience shifted from the development of student leaders to the transition of the new students they were serving. Indeed, the experiential component included very little intentional reflection, which according to Kolb (1984) is a key stage in the learning cycle.

An important discovery from this research is that learning tasks requiring construction of knowledge may benefit from experiential components, but the components need to include intentional reflection. Reflection is a critical part of any experiential learning initiative. The quantity and quality of reflection effects what students are able to know, do, or value at the end of their experience (Eyler, 2002). In the program examined in this study, formal reflection during the experiential component was limited to debriefing. Student leaders participated in a short group debrief every morning and one two-hour debriefing at the end of the program. These debriefs lacked some strong pedagogical components of reflection. They were conducted by a different instructor each time which limited
growth that is accomplished by consistency (Densten & Gray, 2001; Hatton & Smith, 1994). Also, debriefs focused on the well-being of the student leaders rather than including an intentional engagement of leadership development which limited the generation, documentation, and deepening of learning (Ash & Clayton, 2009). Although this amount and type of reflection may have been beneficial to students in other ways, it did not serve to enhance student leaders’ understanding of theories of servant leadership.

While student leaders’ did not deepen their understanding and application of servant leadership through the experiential component, their understanding and application of their personal calling did increase. Previous research indicated students do not make connections between service experiences and academic study unless the links are purposefully described (Eyler, 2002). In this extended orientation program during the active learning stage of Kolb’s (1984) model, student leaders facilitated small group discussions exploring personal calling and well-being. This informal type of reflection helped student leaders apply and practice their understanding of personal calling. The difference between the mean scores for personal calling after the formal instruction and at the end of the program was -1.16, indicating the last score was higher than the prior score. The student leaders continued to grow showing higher values for personal calling after the classroom and experiential component (see Table 5). This demonstrates the impact of informal reflection during and after the experiential component and reinforces both the need and the potential for additional formal reflection that helps students make links between the classroom learning and the practical experience.

**Limitations**

The use of self-report for developmental and cognitive gains by college students has been criticized due to the low correlations between the self-reported gains and direct measurement (Bowman & Seifert, 2011). The data for the current study was collected through self-report which may lead to an inaccurate measure of students’ development in leadership skills. According to Bowman and Seifert, students who strongly agree or strongly disagree have the lowest correlations between actual gains and reported gains. The students in the current study tended to score at the strongly agree end of the spectrum and, as such, may be less likely to accurately report leadership gains.

In addition, due to attrition the number of students participating in the baseline was much higher than the number of students completing the final iteration. This made the results more difficult to interpret. For example, the students choosing to respond to the follow up collection may differ on significant variables when compared to students who chose to drop out of the study. This may skew the results of the study because the students choosing to participate at each time point may differ significantly from those who choose not to participate. Notwithstanding these limitations, this study provides useful insight into the application of Kolb’s model to servant leadership development.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Experiential learning programs require intentional educational interventions throughout the learning cycle. In the current study the most significant growth in student leader development occurred when the most intentional educational interventions were present. Table 5 displays the results of the paired $t$-tests. Those results support significant changes during the classroom instruction, but not during the experiential component. The lack of growth during the experiential component may be related to stagnation and an incomplete rotation of Kolb’s (1984) learning circle. For example, the reduced growth during the experiential may be related to the lack of intentional educational interventions during the experiential component. Further research examining student leadership development through experiential learning would benefit from using Kolb’s model as an assessment framework.

Kolb’s (1984) learning cycle provides a strong theoretical basis for examining the design and outcomes of experiential leadership development programs. On college campuses leadership development programs frequently adopt a loose interpretation of experiential learning pedagogy. Findings from this study demonstrate that for these programs to be most effective, program design must include intentional instruction at each phase of the learning cycle. When instruction was most intentional, the learning was the greatest. As the focus of the program shifted from student leaders to the students being served, the leadership development of those involved flattened out. Leadership development programs that employ experiential approaches to learning should include more formalized connections between theory and practice. For example, student leaders may benefit from using a journal during the active stage that includes prompts requiring students to explore the connections between classroom learning and their leadership practice. Incorporating such intentional reflection into the learning cycle should significantly improve leadership development on college campuses. As the body of research examining pedagogies that facilitate student leadership development continues to grow, the extent to which experiential learning contributes to leadership development will become more evident.
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Abstract

This qualitative study examines student learning about leadership across three sections of a capstone course in an undergraduate leadership minor. Qualitative methods were informed by exploratory case study analysis and phenomenology. Student-centered and inquiry-focused pedagogical approaches, including case-in-point, action inquiry, and problem-based learning, informed classroom teaching and the classroom environment. Engaged in pedagogy steeped in a balance of challenge and support, students gained an increased sense of self, clarity of purpose and vocation, and integration of their leadership practices in and out of the classroom. Students’ understandings of the concept of leadership were also broadened; they recognized the importance of diverse perspectives and roles, began to understand leadership as systemic and interdependent, and emphasized relationship building. Findings suggest three prominent experiences as contributing to students’ learning – reflection, feedback, and engaging in the group process. Implications for leadership education are discussed and areas for future research are identified.

Introduction

Leadership development is a prominent outcome of higher education, evidenced by the emphasis on leadership in many institutional mission statements and the inclusion of leadership in student learning outcomes (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2009; Keeling, 2004). Over the past 30 years the number and types of programs existing to develop the leadership
capacity of students have increased, reflecting a variety of approaches to program
delivery and curriculum emphases within the classroom and outside of the
classroom through co-curricular initiatives (Komives, 2011). This growing
emphasis on leadership development in higher education begs the questions of the
best practices in teaching leadership and what students learn about leadership
through different leadership courses and programs. The current study examines
student leadership development and learning in an undergraduate capstone
leadership course.

Leadership Teaching and Learning

Leadership is embraced by many as a capacity, process, or ability that can be
learned and developed, and thus as something that can be taught (Daloz Parks,
2005; Northouse, 2007). As such, multiple teaching and facilitation strategies are
employed to address college student leadership outcomes (Haber, 2011; Roberts
& Ullom, 1989). As is demonstrated within the descriptive and conceptual
literature on leadership programs, leadership educators design and implement a
diverse array of leadership programs to address a variety of educational outcomes
(Brun gardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006; Scroggs, Sattler, &
Leadership education initiatives exist in the forms of leadership courses, minors,
majors, workshop series, retreats, certificate programs, peer leadership teams,
multicultural and women’s leadership programs, outdoor leadership programs,
service learning programs, and living-learning programs (Dugan et al., 2011;
Smist, 2011).

Research on leadership programs is also diverse, spanning an array of program
types and focusing on a variety of outcomes (Binard & Brungardt, 1997; Cress,
Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001; DiPaolo, 2002; Dugan, 2011; Eich,
2008; Posner, 2009; Williams & Townsend, 2003). The two most comprehensive
examinations of collegiate leadership programs are the Kellogg Foundation’s
Leadership in the Making project from the 1990s and the more recent Multi-
Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) (Dugan et al., 2011; Zimmerman-Oster
& Burkhardt, 1999). The Kellogg Foundation assisted with the surge of the
development of leadership programs in the past 30 years in helping fund 31
leadership programs, most of which existed on college campuses (Zimmerman-
Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Ten of the programs were examined in further depth to
identify the effectiveness of the leadership programs in enhancing participants’
leadership skills and knowledge. The findings suggested a number of significant
positive leadership outcomes (Cress et al., 2001).

The MSL is a national leadership study focusing on college student leadership
development and the impact of the collegiate experience on a variety of outcomes
including the eight values of socially responsible leadership (Komives & Wagner,
2009). Findings from the MSL suggested that shorter-term leadership experiences
(such as one-time workshops or retreats) had a more significant impact on
measures of socially responsible leadership than programs that were moderate-term or long-term in nature and that long-term leadership programs had a negative influence on these outcomes (Dugan & Komives, 2007). The researchers identified challenges in assessing the impact of such programs due to the vast diversity of leadership programs within the three categories of short, moderate, and long-term in addition to the varied leadership frameworks and assumptions about leadership guiding the programs.

Responding to this challenge, Dugan and colleagues (2011) conducted a subsequent study to further examine the influence of leadership programs by focusing more specifically on 16 different types of leadership experiences on the eight outcomes of socially responsible leadership. A number of the experiences such as leadership conferences, peer leadership teams, and multicultural leadership programs emerged as positive predictors for the leadership outcomes; some programs, including women’s leadership programs, living-learning programs, and outdoor leadership programs were identified as negative predictors for certain outcomes (Dugan et al., 2011). In their discussion of implications, the researchers suggest further investigation on “how leadership interventions are designed and delivered” (Dugan et al., 2011, p. 77). Specifically, they identify the need for additional qualitative inquiry on individual leadership programs and the nature of these experiences in order to “significantly enhance the quality of programs” (p. 78). The current study responds to this need, providing qualitative inquiry into key components of a capstone leadership course and the resulting student learning in the course.

Theoretical and Pedagogical Frameworks

There is a need for additional focus on pedagogical approaches to teaching leadership and the outcomes of these efforts. This study addresses this need, focusing on the pedagogical approaches used in a capstone undergraduate leadership course and examining students’ learning from the experience. While many theoretical underpinnings informed the course, the primary theoretical framework for the course was adaptive leadership (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). The pedagogical approach used to address the adaptive leadership framework pulled from multiple influences.

Adaptive Leadership

Adaptive leadership involves mobilizing people to address the ambiguous, significant challenges to which there are not readily available solutions (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). To do so, people must challenge their existing belief systems and behaviors as well as recognize the greater system and its dynamics that affect the leadership process. Using the metaphor of the dance floor and the balcony, Heifetz and Linsky (2002) contend that effective leadership involves the ability to understand a situation and its complexity with a balcony perspective while still being able to interact within the system and influence it by acting on the dance
With a myriad of increasingly complex and daunting challenges facing society today, leadership must encompass the recognition of multiple perspectives in understanding the world and various approaches to tackling these challenges. The traditional focus on leadership as a skill set or trait possessed by an extraordinary person is no longer appropriate and fails to address the leadership needs of today.

**Pedagogical Approach**

Teaching a curriculum that challenges traditional conceptions of leadership and promotes more contemporary and adaptive understandings of leadership calls for innovative pedagogical approaches. Higher education relies heavily on traditional pedagogical models that emphasize the memorization and recollection of information with minimal focus on critical examination, context, and application (Duch, Groh, & Allen, 2001a). Accordingly, students do not fully engage with the content and often “fail to develop the full battery of skills and abilities desired in a contemporary college graduate” (p. 4).

Thus, pedagogical approaches are needed that challenge traditional notions of teaching and learning, inviting students to help construct their learning and engaging students in the learning process. Such pedagogical approaches help empower students, encourage them to become invested in their learning, and facilitate the development of interdependent relationships with peers and instructors (Baxter Magolda & King, 2004; Duch, Groh, & Allen, 2001b; Millis, 2010). This reframing of teaching and learning is particularly relevant for the field of leadership education, characterized by holistic development concerned with preparing people to “be responsible, together, in an increasingly interdependent world” (Huber, 2002, p. 27).

Notable pedagogies used within leadership education that facilitate student engagement and empowerment in the classroom are action inquiry (Torbert, 2004), case-in-point teaching (Daloz Parks, 2005), and problem-based learning (Barbour, 2006; Cunningham & Cordeiro, 2006). Action inquiry engages students in reciprocal and mutual inquiry through reflecting in action on oneself, the situation, one’s relationships, and the system as a whole (Torbert, 2004). By simultaneously engaging in action and reflection, the instructor and students gain increased awareness which can lead to greater leadership capacity and organizational effectiveness. As a pedagogical approach, action inquiry invites students to make meaning of their experiences and shape their own learning and the learning of their classmates. Exposure to this type of learning equips students with valuable skills of inquiry and reflection while actively engaging in leadership.

Case-in-point pedagogy is similar to action inquiry, as it involves examining oneself, others, and the larger system while it is unfolding in action. Framed as a pedagogical tool to teach adaptive leadership, case-in-point pedagogy involves
focusing on the here and now by using the dynamics presently occurring with the group to examine and practice leadership (Daloz Parks, 2005). Through this students’ attention is drawn to the complex nature of systems in which leadership takes place – “made up of a number of different factions and acted on by multiple forces” (Daloz Parks, 2005, p. 7) and thereby, students examine their role within the system. This highlights for students the importance of examining one’s own perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors as well as collaborating with others to mobilize change.

The final pedagogical framework that creates an environment that empowers and engages students to learn is problem-based learning. In problem-based learning, students learn through engaging with complex and real-world problems. The problems require “collective skill at acquiring, communicating, and integrating information” (Duch et al., 2001a, p. 6) with an emphasis on critical thinking. This pedagogical approach allows students to bridge theory to practice through engaging with others and through gaining exposure to the complexity of adaptive leadership challenges.

**Methods**

In this study we sought to identify students’ learning about themselves, others, and leadership through their experiences in a capstone leadership course that focused on adaptive leadership and that involved innovative pedagogical approaches. To address this purpose, we employed two qualitative research methods that blended aspects of qualitative methodologies. The study reflected components of (a) exploratory case study analysis and (b) phenomenology. Integrating and blending aspects of methodological approaches is common within qualitative research (Creswell, 2007).

The use of qualitative case study was chosen due to fact that we, as researchers, were “interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing” (Merriam, 2009, p. 42). Merriam discusses the importance of a bounded system when using a case study approach, which for the purpose of this research was the students participating in the capstone course. One of the characteristics of qualitative case study analysis is that it is heuristic and “illuminate[s] the reader’s understanding of the phenomenon under study” (p. 44).

Phenomenology, which examines a phenomenon through a group of individuals’ lives experiences, also informed the study’s methodology (Creswell, 2007). The phenomenon in the case this study was the common experience of being in this student-centered and inquiry-focused leadership course; understanding common experiences, such as this specific course, is helpful in developing a “deeper understanding about the features of the phenomenon” (Creswell, 2007, p. 60). Together, phenomenology and case study methodology enabled us to explore multiple dimensions of our students’ learning and create a rich, deep description of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 1985).
Context and Participants

The capstone leadership course is the final core course in the Leadership Studies Minor at The University of San Diego. With a focus on adaptive leadership, the course is designed to provide an integrative and hands-on experience for students to apply their leadership learning to practice. Through the use of the case-in-point, action-inquiry, and problem-based learning the students are tasked with collaboratively taking responsibility for their learning. In other words, their leadership “problem” is to work together to create the course. The course description, outcomes, and some assignments are provided. The class determines the other aspects of the course including expectations, assessments, activities, and assignments. The instructor serves in a facilitator and consultant role, supporting and challenging the students in the process.

Participants in this study were students enrolled in the capstone course. A total of 28 students participated in the study, spanning three sections of the course taught from 2008 to 2010. The students were traditional-aged undergraduate students, and all but two of the students were juniors or seniors. Reflecting the demographic profile of the Leadership Studies minor, the participants were approximately 80% White and 70% Female. Many of the students were active student leaders on campus, serving as positional leaders within student government, fraternities and sororities, and other student organizations such as resident assistants and student employee positions. Students’ majors were varied, with the most common majors being Communication Studies, Business, and Psychology. There was a wide range of geographical diversity among the students; however, the majority was originally from the Southwest region of the United States.

Data Collection and Analysis

Participants’ final reflection papers in the course were the source of data for the study. The length of the papers ranged from four pages to approximately 15 pages, and the prompts of the papers focused on students’ learning through the course with a focus on their understanding of themselves, of the group process, and of leadership. Students were invited to participate in the study after the end of each course in order to capture the naturalistic intention of the study (Klenke, 2008); thus, the papers were written for the natural setting of the course rather than for the research study. This approach was used due to the fact that the researchers recognized that students were submitting these papers as a course assignment, and the papers would be reviewed by their respective instructors. By asking for permission to analyze the content of their papers after the completion of the course, the researchers who originally read and graded these papers as instructors were reviewing the content with a specifically different lens.
The papers were analyzed using content analysis, whereby researchers review and analyze documents to unveil their contents for discovery (Merriam, 2009). Specifically, thematic content analysis allowed for the identification of themes and patterns within the reflection papers. Both researchers reviewed all papers and used coding schemas to organize individual thoughts and ideas into collective themes (Boyatzis, 1998; Klenke, 2008). Data were organized and analyzed using the NVivo software package. To address issues of validity and reliability, identified themes were continuously compared back to the data sources. Additionally, in addressing intercoder agreement, the two researchers, examined the data first independently and then collectively during the various stages of the data analysis process to compare and finalize themes as well as to confirm the assignment of themes of the data (Klenke, 2008).

**Results**

Content analysis of participants’ reflection papers revealed a number of findings of what students learned about themselves, others, and leadership as a result of the capstone leadership course. The student-centered and inquiry-focused pedagogical design used in the course incorporated three key learning experiences identified in the research as pivotal in the learning process – reflection, group process, and feedback. Influenced by these experiences, the students’ learning fell into two main categories: having an increased self-awareness and developing a broader understanding of leadership, each of which included three sub-themes. Increased self-awareness included the sub-themes of (a) challenge and affirmation of leadership styles and roles, (b) clarity of one’s purpose and vocation, and (c) integration of learning and experiences. Broader understanding of leadership included the sub-themes of (a) openness to diverse perspectives and roles, (b) leadership as systemic and interdependent, and (c) emphasis on relationship building.

Figure 1 depicts the model of students’ learning, identifying instrumental learning experiences within the capstone course and the resulting outcomes of learning related to their increased self-awareness and broader view of leadership.

In this next section, we provide an overview of the pedagogical approaches students experienced in this capstone course and further discuss how students demonstrated growth related to the two main themes of increased self-awareness and broader view of leadership.

**Learning Experiences**

Students emphasized three key experiences instrumental in their learning process – participating in reflection, engaging in the group process, and providing and receiving feedback. Each of these experiences encompassed intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects. For example, reflection happened both individually and collectively as a class, and engaging in the group process and in feedback
involved an intrapersonal level of working with others and an intrapersonal level of making meaning of the experiences and examining oneself in the experience.

Reflection was a key activity that helped students internalize and make meaning of what they were learning and what they were experiencing in the course. While all of the students had been exposed to reflection in past courses, many noted that this was the course in which they felt that reflection was most instrumental in their learning.

Figure 1
Model of Students’ Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Experiences</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increased Self-Awareness
- Broader View of Leadership

| Challenge and affirmation of leadership styles and roles | Clarity of one’s purpose and vocation | Integration of learning and experiences | Openness to diverse perspectives and roles | Leadership as systemic and interdependent | Emphasis on relationship building |

Students examined themselves and their group process in individual reflection papers. One student wrote:

- I have developed a newfound understanding for reflection. I believe that reflection is one of the most important parts of the learning process...Reflection can help formulate meanings that change, mold, or shift my behaviors.

Collective reflection was also incorporated through reflective group discussions in class and through online forums students were able to engage with each other in a reflective manner. In discussing the utility of reflection, one student recognized how reflection helped him be more aware in how he was engaging with the learning process:

- The reflections provided an outlet for me to vent, but they also served a better purpose in how I was going to learn. With the comments provided
by the professor and [through reading my peers’ reflections on the online forum], I began to see that I was not alone in my thinking, but also that my thought process may not have been the best one.

Coupled with reflection was the overall process in which the group engaged. Group dynamics was a key aspect of the group process and encompassed authority dynamics, leadership styles and roles, and conflict. The design of the course challenged traditional notions of classroom learning, and authority dynamics were significantly altered. One student wrote:

- [N]ever before this class have I engaged in a process of group leadership, in which everyone was just as much of a primary stakeholder in the decision-making and success of the group as everyone else.”

Another student discussed that through the group process he was able to re-examine his role within the course:

- I took the opportunity during the conflict to remain quiet and listen. I wanted to hear what others had to say regarding their perspectives on the class, while in turn, hoping that I can learn from listening, not talking aimlessly.

The process caused some students frustration and anxiety, but those students were able to use the experience as an opportunity to learn. This is evident in a student’s remarks:

- Even though I hated this class at many times, I am unable to deny the fact that I gained much insight about myself and about how I work on a team.

Another key aspect of the group process was the relationships formed among the class and how these relationships enabled the group to work together in an effective manner. In discussing the relationships built among the class, one student wrote:

- Our class developed a community of care. We were all eager to learn, and realized that we could learn so much from each other. This was aided by the trust we developed in the classroom.

Further, one student emphasized the progress that the group made:

- Not only did I see myself grow as an individual but also I saw our class grow as a group.

Class check-ins, which took many forms of allowing the individual group members to share how they were doing and what things were on their mind, were significant for building trust and connections within the group. One student wrote:
• The check-ins broke down our walls towards other people and allowed all of us to grow together as a group with a new perspective of one another.

Feedback was another instrumental learning experience for students in the course. Many students expressed fear in giving and receiving feedback. For many, the feedback experiences were instrumental in students’ development of self-awareness. In describing her process of reading through the feedback provided, one student wrote:

• Tears began to stream down my face…The feedback was a bit overwhelming in that it addressed many factors about myself and how others view me that were difficult to come to terms with. I did not only get emotional because of the negative, more disapproving feedback, but also because of the positive and inspiring things people had to say.

Along with being powerful experiences for students individually, the feedback exercises also served as beneficial for the group as a whole, as one student discussed:

• What I have learned through our feedback exercises that I was not conscious of before is how feedback can act as an instrument for relationship building.

**Increased Self-Awareness**

A significant area of learning identified by students in the study was an increased understanding of self. In discussing this learning, one student wrote:

• I do not believe it is selfish to say that what I learned most this semester was me. I learned who I am, the causes behind those effects, my greater goals, my dreams, my strengths, my weaknesses.

Another student, who was more skeptical of this outcome, also shared her transformation:

• At first, when I heard the desire of a couple [classmates] to take this class as an opportunity to learn about themselves, I balked at the idea. My first thought was, “That sounds so selfish!” Little did I know, however, that the self would be the most important theme stemming from the class and how effective it can be to take that time and understand one’s self before trying to care for others.

The theme of increased self-awareness included the three prominent sub-themes of (a) challenge and affirmation of one’s leadership styles and roles, (b) clarity of one’s purpose and vocation, and (c) the integration one’s learning and
experiences. Each of these sub-themes contributed to an overall greater understanding of one’s self, which students noted as being significant, and for some even transformational.

**Challenge and Affirmation of Leadership Styles and Roles**

Through the learning experiences of reflection, group process, and feedback describe above, students had ample opportunity to examine themselves with particular attention on their leadership styles and the roles in which they took on in the group. With a deeper understanding of self, students examined their personal leadership effectiveness. One student expressed that prior to the course she felt that she knew a lot about herself, but that she hadn’t incorporated this awareness into her leadership style. She wrote:

- I know that I place the importance of others’ emotions before mine. I did not realize that suppressing my emotions for the group made me come across as less passionate and unable to speak up for myself and my ideals.

Another student recognized that his tendencies of often speaking up and providing conflicting ideas had an effect on the group and his leadership effectiveness:

- I held the group back from progress and my comments needed reworking…I can understand how I would have been seen as annoying and holding the group back.

A few of the female students, after receiving feedback from peers, recognized their natural tendency to avoid confrontation, and therefore experimented with taking on different roles in the course, ultimately pushing themselves out of their comfort zones to take on a more assertive role. While nervous about their assertiveness, the reactions they received from the group were positive. One student wrote:

- I fully expected people to give me feedback that said I was overly confident, which would have reflected my own perceptions…It gave me great insight into my leadership style…I need to understand that it is perfectly fine to be more forceful when sharing my ideas- otherwise they will not get the respect that they deserve.

Similarly, a male student expressed affirmation in his relationship-focused style within the group, noting:

- The respect peers had for my strong relationship oriented style, from both women and men, was great…I want to be someone who is approachable and trustworthy, and someone that can bring a steady presence to a group.
Some students expressed confusion and dissonance in their process of examining their behaviors and roles in a group. One student, who expressed an ongoing challenge with coming off as intimidating with peers wrote:

- It saddens me that I still come off in a [sic] intimidating way whether it is cold and uninterested or loud and opinionated…I have tried to be less intimidating and warmer but my efforts have not been responded to [sic].

A number of students translated their learning within the class to how they present themselves within groups outside of the class. In grappling with how to make meaning of his newfound understanding of self, one student began to challenge the masks and walls he had put up in his life that were holding him back:

- I learned that I do not need to always be calculated, calm, and collected. I can fail. I can make mistakes without becoming a weaker person…I faced my willingness to manipulate others so that they may see only what I want; I faced my lack of awareness to how my selfish actions affect others; I faced my arrogance and saw that it hid flaws I never wanted to accept…I learned that I have infinite flaws, infinite strengths, and infinite potential. I learned not to be scared of any of that.

Clarity of Purpose and Vocation

Many students expressed an increased sense of purpose and clarity in their vocation. During the semester, students had an opportunity to reflect on their purpose within the course and within their lives. One student, in reflecting on the assignment *Who is myself and what is my purpose?* discussed that this was the most important assignment for her. She wrote:

- I still find myself adding to [my understanding of myself and my purpose] and thinking about it. It is really about learning what makes you tick, and I truly believe my purpose is to help people reach their best.

In gaining a greater understanding of one’s purpose, some students expressed confusion. In one student’s case, this confusion was coupled with optimism and motivation to continue searching for purpose:

- This [course] has been a catapult for me to discover new things about myself, and has made me think more about my future and what I want to do after college. It may have added some confusion and complications to my life by making me re-think things, but I has opened my eyes and given me a lot to think about.

Many students discussed a transformation in how they viewed their future. One student wrote:
• I am inspired now to make transformational change and not just little change. I now think big, something that I have not felt since a child…This experience has led me to want more in life.

Another student discussed that through this course she recognized her vocational calling and decided on making a significant change in her career path:

• In the last several months, I have taken steps towards the most drastic changes that I have ever made my life. I realized that my lifelong dream of becoming a doctor was actually my lifelong dream of becoming a nurse…I am fortunate because I found the courage to walk away from medical school and to the field where I truly belong. By this decision alone I have grown more in the last six months than in the last four years.

Integration of Learning and Experiences

The theme of self-awareness also encompasses the bridging and integration of students’ learning and experiences. Students connected their learning in the classroom to their experiences and learning outside of the classroom through co-curricular experiences and in relationships with others. One student wrote about how his learning in this course helped him be more successful in his leadership role within student government:

• [The coursework] really helped my performance in my [leadership] position, [sic] I could stop and identify a certain dynamic. [The course] was like a laboratory, in the sense that we would stop and analyze what was happening in the group as it was happening. I brought this to different meetings, situations and one-on-ones with people. Taking the time to stop and look at the bigger picture or the small details helped me be more productive and effective.

Some students expressed a parallel relationship between the dynamics unfolding in the classroom and dynamics in their personal lives. One student connected communication challenges in the course to communication challenges in her relationship with her boyfriend. Through experimenting with different communication strategies in the course, she identified ways to improve her communication strategies in her relationship.

Since many students were taking the course during their senior year, they used the course as an opportunity to reflect on and make meaning of their college experience. A graduating senior discussed this in her paper:

• Each class in college allowed me to learn something independent and unique, [sic] however the sum of these classes resembles my development into an adult. I honestly believe that this class…made me aware of this
development. [It has] allowed me to integrate my experiences from college and find growth and maturity within myself.

Broader View of Leadership

The other main theme capturing students’ learning in this course is a gaining a broader view of the concept of leadership. Students had previously taken at least two and as many as six leadership courses prior to this course and had previously established understandings of leadership that tended to be fairly relational and service-oriented. Students expressed that through engaging in the group process and experiencing the concepts in action while simultaneously discussing and reflecting on the concepts, their understandings of leadership were not only solidified, but also further developed. There were three main areas in which students’ views of leadership were broadened: (a) openness to diverse perspectives and roles, (b) viewing leadership as systemic and interdependent, and (c) emphasis on relationship building.

Openness to Diverse Perspectives and Roles

By engaging in the group process the students learned to have a greater appreciation for diverse perspectives and roles within a group. In learning to value this diversity, students gained an increased understanding of others and greater openness to others. One student wrote:

- We got past the surface level of knowing each other and really got to know things about each other most would not learn from a class...The stories shared by others also gave me new perspectives and ideas that I would not normally have thought of and made me a more understanding person.

Many students learned to appreciate and value diversity of perspectives and roles through experiencing conflict. Given that the course involved a great deal of group discussions and group decision-making, conflicting ideas were often present, and the students found productive ways to engage in conflict. One student discussed how examining and seeking to understand different perspectives helped him work more effectively with others:

- When I make the effort to think about situations from a different perspective, I have an open mind to everyone’s ideas and thoughts. This ability also gives me more patience to work with others who have conflicting ideas.

A significant conflict that emerged in the course centered on the extent to which students verbally engaged within the group. A group dynamic related to the talkers and the non-talkers emerged. Through discussing this conflict as it was taking place the students learned to more critically examine their roles as well as
seek to understand others. One student, who was more introverted, shared her learning from this experience:

- The people in groups I usually struggle with are the most outspoken, opinionated leaders. I have always viewed them as pushy and having the need to always get their way. Now, I realize that this type of leader is just extremely passionate about their work and has a strong desire to create change. Knowing this increased my patience for their leadership style and helps me to understand why they are so strong about their views.

Leadership as Systemic and Interdependent

Students’ understandings of leadership were also broadened in recognizing the systemic and interdependent nature of leadership. Many students learned about the importance of the larger environment in which leadership takes place and how this influences the individuals and the group. One student shared her reflections on this:

- I finally understood that leadership is a mixture of personal characteristics and the environment. It is nearly impossible to define what characteristics are required of a leader, without understanding the environment of the challenge.

Students emphasized interdependence with a focus on the collective and the responsibility that individual members of the group had to each other and to the group as a whole. One student discussed this collective responsibility in terms of learning:

- We all became responsible for each other’s learning, and we transformed the meaning behind the ‘you’ in the purpose of the class (from what I initially read to be individual) into a collective effort.

Additionally, students expressed the importance of collaboration and working together, acknowledging the power of the whole and the important piece that each person played in that whole. One student described this through the metaphor of a puzzle:

- You have to take into account everything in your environment in order to put the pieces together. In our class we had to integrate ourselves with the rest of the class. We did this balancing our backgrounds, biases, and preconceived notions, with those who are different...balancing when to assert authority, and when to let go…finding our roles in the class and how to be most effective.

Further, students felt a greater responsibility to the larger system, viewing leadership as serving one’s community and making a positive difference to
something beyond oneself. One student discussed this in his desire to affect social change:

- Being a young adult whom considers himself a leader it is my responsibility to act out against the injustices in the world today.

**Emphasis on Building Relationships**

The final area in which students’ views on leadership were broadened through this course was an increased emphasis on building relationships within groups. The group process was a key aspect of this course, and students continuously negotiated their relationships with others, both positive and strained, within the class. Through this they learned the importance of building relationships and the impact of relationships on themselves, individually and on the group.

Building trust within the group was significant in creating meaningful and effective relationships. Many students recognized the importance of vulnerability as a basis for building this trust. Engaging the group in a check-in at the beginning of class became a common practice, which allowed the students to break down walls and become vulnerable. One student discussed the importance of this in the group’s development:

- Daily opportunities to be vulnerable and allow others to start trusting each other benefited the group as a whole. The information shared may not have been life-changing…but [it] showcased the importance of building relationships with each other through trust.

Many students expressed that the openness and trust experienced in the course was very different than the relationships built in other classroom environments. One student wrote:

- I opened up more of my heart to this class than I have to some friends in my life.

Another student shared the same sentiment:

- I could only compare this to the level of trust that take [sic] years to create in close friends or a family, and I would be shocked if I ever see this in any other class throughout my academic career.

Through developing meaningful and trusting relationships with each other students learned the importance of connecting with others on deeper levels through empathy and compassion. One student, who previously held a logical approach to engaging with others in a classroom reflected on this learning:
I disliked the concept of empathy in the classroom. I thought it was a soft part of leadership that should be reserved only for close friends and family. Now, I feel that empathy is one of the cornerstones of leadership.

Students recognized that while building relationships was pivotal to a successful group, there are other key aspects of a group that should not be neglected. A student wrote:

- Knowing your team or group on a personal level is absolutely crucial, but I have learned that I need to ensure that such a belief does not translate into placing more emphasis on relationships than effective group work and healthy conflicts.

**Summary of Results**

Findings from this study demonstrate students’ learning from the capstone leadership course in two major themes as (a) increased self-awareness and (b) broader view of leadership. Through engaging in the learning experiences of reflection, the group process, and feedback, students’ increased understanding of self consisted of three prominent subthemes: (a) challenge and affirmation of leadership styles and roles, (b) clarity of purpose and vocation, and (c) integration of learning and experiences. Further, students’ views of leadership were broadened in the three subthemes of (a) openness to diverse perspectives and roles, (b) leadership as systemic and interdependent, and (c) emphasis on relationship building.

**Discussion**

The learning from this leadership course reflects many outcomes desired in leadership education and higher education today (Astin & Astin, 2000; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2009; Huber, 2002; Keeling, 2004). Outcomes of critical thinking, interpersonal competence, intrapersonal competence, effective collaboration and teamwork, and citizenship are identified as pivotal in students’ success in college and after college (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2011; Keeling, 2004). Similar values and competencies are goals of leadership education initiatives (Huber, 2002; Komives, Dugan, Owen, Slack, & Wagner, 2011).

In this capstone course students came to view themselves and leadership more complexly. Their recognition of the importance of the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and systemic levels of leadership reflects leadership scholars’ contemporary perspectives on leadership. Heifetz and Linsky (2002) and Wheatley (2006) emphasize the interdependent levels of leadership environments and systems rather than isolated pieces or parts of a system. The Social Change Model of Leadership (Komives & Wagner, 2009) and Emotionally Intelligent Leadership Model (Shankman & Allen, 2008), two leadership frameworks developed with a
college student population in mind, similarly recognize the individual, group, and organizational levels of the leadership process. While the students’ had previously been exposed to leadership frameworks such as these that emphasize relational, process-oriented, and systemic aspects of leadership, the experiential, student-centered, and inquiry-focused nature of the capstone course helped solidify students’ learning.

The learning expressed by the students related to their self-understanding and ability to build relationships and work with others in a group environment suggests growth in their psychosocial development and cognitive development. Psychosocial development, which focuses on the formation of identity, encompasses students’ interpersonal and intrapersonal development. Chickering and Reisser’s (1993) seven vectors encompass the developmental tasks students face while in college. Many of the vectors were evident in the findings from this study including (a) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (b) interpersonal competence, (c) effectively managing and expressing emotions, (d) moving from autonomy toward interdependence, and (e) establishing identity. Further, the findings from this study suggest growth in students’ cognitive development, or students’ patterns of thought and how they make meaning (Perry, 1981). Perry’s schema of cognitive and ethical development captures the process by which students’ cognitive processes become more complex and move from dualistic thinking toward more multiplicative and relativistic thinking. The movement toward recognizing and valuing diverse perspectives within the group identified in this study along with the reframing that some students made about themselves, others’, working in groups, and leadership demonstrates a shift in cognitive capacity.

Students’ learning in the course also suggests growth in their leadership identity development (LID) – the developmental process through which college students develop a leadership identity (Komives, Owen, Longerbeam, Mainella, & Osteen, 2005). The LID model describes a six-stage process in which students’ leadership identity moves from positional and dependent toward more relational and interdependent. Encompassed in this process of moving toward a more complex leadership identity is a broadening view of leadership, more interdependent relationships with others, the ability to work effectively with others and in groups which are themes evident within the findings from this current study. The authority roles and dynamics within the classroom were identified as environmental factors instrumental in this learning, helping move students toward a more complex, relational, and interdependent leadership identity.

Implications for Practice

Findings from this study suggest the value that student-centered and inquiry-focused pedagogies have in leadership education. Particularly when seeking to help students apply their learning to practice, constructing a classroom environment that alters traditional classroom authority dynamics and decision-
making process to reflect more closely dynamics that may be more reflective of out-of-classroom leadership settings and groups can provide many opportunities for learning and development. Including students in the learning process and tasking students with guiding this process requires instructors to release authority and control, opening up many opportunities for students to learn, experiment, and challenge themselves and the group.

While such pedagogical strategies and classroom environments may not be conducive for all courses, aspects of these strategies may allow for student investment, ownership, and learning from the process. For example, students could be tasked with identifying the standards by which they should be graded on an assignment or the class could be tasked with making a decision about how to spend class time while at the same time providing opportunities for them to observe their process of making a decision as a group, applying leadership concepts to the observation. Many students described classroom discourse, group process, and even conflict as critical aspects of the course contributing to their learning. Incorporating opportunities that allow for this can help students in their self-awareness and their understanding of leadership. Finally, many students identified trust as pivotal in the group process. Opening up and exhibiting vulnerability were key in building trust. Identifying ways in which the students and instructor can be open and vulnerable can assist with the group process and thus student learning.

Areas for Future Research

As suggested by Dugan, Bohle, Gebhardt, Hofert, Wilk, and Cooney (2011), this study examined one specific leadership program in terms of student learning. Continued qualitative study of individual leadership programs will help with program quality and student learning. This study identifies teaching strategies and aspects of a classroom environment and the student learning that accompanied these strategies. While the findings span three sections, the study only focuses on one specific course at a single institution. Additional research into pedagogical approaches such as these in other leadership programs and with other student populations can contribute to a better understanding of effecting leadership education practices. Research on this topic can also be enhanced through examining students longitudinally throughout the course of a leadership minor or long-term program and post-college. Studying students’ learning about themselves and leadership as well as their psychosocial development, cognitive development, and leadership identity development can provide additional insight into leadership education and student learning and development.

Conclusion

Ernest Boyer (1997), a key influence on higher education in the United States and a former U.S. Commissioner of Education, and President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, wrote, “[G]reat teachers create a
common ground of intellectual commitment. They stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over” (p. 24). As leadership educators we are committed to creating this common ground of intellectual commitment about which Boyer wrote. This study focused on such an effort by examining student learning in a capstone course in which we incorporated action inquiry, case-in-point, and problem-based learning into a student-centered and inquiry-focused pedagogy. The findings suggest a great deal of student learning that reflects the learning goals and outcomes of leadership education and higher education today.
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Abstract

This paper examined relationships between students’ engagement in community service in different contexts through classes, student organizations, work study, and on their own as well as their development of socially responsible leadership at a large, public, research university in the Upper Midwest. Results from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership survey distributed at a single institution (n = 1,282) suggest, among other things, that students who participated in community service on their own consistently reported higher socially responsible leadership while students who participated in service both on their own and in a student organization reported higher socially responsible leadership in all areas save for consciousness of self.

Introduction

Many colleges and universities hold students’ leadership development and community engagement central to their mission, vision, and values (Dugan, 2006). The increased presence of curricular and co-curricular student leadership development programs – in addition to the increased availability of and students’
participation in community engagement endeavors – is further evidence of the increasing importance of leadership development and community engagement on college campuses (Astin & Astin, 2000; Nishishiba & Kecskes, 2012; The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Leadership development has been linked to several additional developmental outcomes among college students, including multicultural awareness, personal and societal awareness, and civic responsibility (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). In this study, we investigated the connections between undergraduate students’ community service engagement and their development of socially responsible leadership.

We grounded this paper within the overarching framework of the social change model of leadership development, which suggests that student leadership development begins with the individual self, and moves outward toward the level of the community and eventually toward greater society. This framework in conjunction with the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Tyree, 1998) has previously been used to measure students’ development of socially responsible leadership via their involvement in community service, positional roles, student organizations, and formalized leadership development programs (Dugan, 2006, 2008; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2009). It is appropriate to consider the intersections between students’ engagement in community service and their development of socially responsible leadership, as students who engaged in several types of community-based experiences may develop personal values such as (a) self-awareness and commitment to social causes, (b) group values such as collaborating with others and developing a shared sense of purpose and vision, and (c) societal and community values, such as individual responsibility to social change.

Examples abound when considering the many ways in which students’ community experiences can foster their development of socially responsible leadership: in working with community organizations, students can learn how to collaborate and work effectively on a team. Students may also become inspired to engage in promoting social justice by directly witnessing the results of social injustice. Further, students can recognize and develop their own powerful sense of agency for participation in a democracy. Engagement in community service therefore has the potential to foster the development of socially responsible leadership within students (Dugan & Komives, 2010). With those considerations in mind, this study focuses on one primary research question – Are there relationships between engagement in community service in different contexts through classes, in student organizations, on one’s own, or through work study and students’ development of socially responsible leadership when controlling for additional demographic, pre-college, and college leadership factors?
Community Service in College

Community service continues to grow on college and university campuses across the United States. Recent figures from the Campus Compact suggest that college students contributed to more than 382 million hours of service in 2009-2010. According to the National Survey of Student Engagement, in 2010, 60% of college seniors reported having completed community service or volunteer work. In addition, 65% of college freshmen reported that their respective universities offered opportunities to get involved in community service or community service-learning (Liu, Ruiz, DeAngelo, & Pryor, 2009), signaling the priority with which many colleges and universities place on providing community engagement opportunities for their college students.

Community service has been demonstrated to have positive effects on the personal development of college students by providing opportunities for students to become active, positive contributors to society. Researchers have also found that community service engagement or community service-learning is positively associated with heightened self-confidence, efficacy, and feelings of responsibility for the well-being of others (Eyler, Giles, & Grey, 1999; Markus, Howard, & King, 1993; Perry & Katula, 2001). Other researchers have found such engagement during the college years to be associated with later engagement in community service as an adult (Giles & Eyler, 1994; Oesterle, Johnson, & Mortimer, 2004).

Community service experiences provide opportunities for college students to encounter new perspectives on the world through the development of connections with others. Youniss and Yates (1996) wrote that community service experiences can “promote a heightened and broadened sense of connection to other people [and] encourage reflections on moral and political questions” (p. 87). Further, Seider and Butin (2012) have noted that the community organizations through which college students engage in service often approach service with a “particular ideological orientation that the participating college students can consider, reject, or incorporate into their own developing worldviews” (p. 1), unleashing powerful opportunities for students to critically consider alternate viewpoints as they form their own identities and worldviews.

These extended benefits of community service in its various forms can influence students’ leadership development by increasing opportunities for students to develop the values leading to positive social change in the social change model (HERI, 1996). Prior research has linked community service to students’ leadership development; for example, Astin (1993) found that participation in volunteerism had positive associations with a commitment to developing a meaningful philosophy of life, promoting racial understanding, growth in cultural awareness, and interpersonal skills. Astin and Sax (1998) discovered that when controlling for freshmen year pre-tests, community service propensity, major, race, ethnicity, gender, and structural characteristics of the institution, community
service engagement was positively associated with several life skills, including leadership abilities. In their extensive study, Dugan and Komives (2010) also found that participation in community service was a significant predictor in socially responsible leadership outcomes, save for consciousness of self and change.

Dugan (2006) also found that college students involved in community service scored higher than uninvolved peers on several leadership development values found within the social change model of development. While Dugan explored differences in the core leadership values between students who did and did not engage in community service, demographic factors and pre-college leadership experiences, antecedents, and efficacy were not considered in his models; therefore, this study attempts to expand upon Dugan’s (2006) work to determine whether the effects of community service engagement hold when controlling for the influence of demographic, pre-college involvement and experiences, and in-college diversity experiences. This study is also unique because it examines whether student participation in community engagement in different contexts – in classes, with student organizations, through work study, or on one’s own – are uniquely associated with students’ socially responsible leadership.

**Conceptual Framework**

A few of the basic premises underlying the Social Change Model are that leadership should bring about positive social change, that leadership is a process and not a position, and that all students are potential leaders (Astin, 1996). A key assumption is that leadership is about effecting change on behalf of others and society. The model also assumes that leadership is a process, leadership is collaborative, and that service is a powerful vehicle for developing leadership skills. It outlines a leadership process that incorporates the principles of equity, inclusion, and service. The two primary goals of the model are to enhance student learning and development, particularly in the areas of self-knowledge and leadership competence, and to facilitate positive social change at the institution or in the community. The model examines leadership development from the perspectives of individual, group, and community and society.

The research team that developed the model identified seven core values, referred to as the “7 Cs” of leadership development for social change. Connected to the individual perspective are:

- Consciousness of self.
- Congruence.
- Commitment.
- Collaboration.
- Common purpose
- Controversy with civility.
- Citizenship.
Change is the value hub that provides meaning and purpose to the seven core values. Interaction occurs between the individual, group and community/society levels and becomes a reciprocal process as reflection and active learning occur on a continuous cycle. It starts with the individual becoming more self-aware and then beginning to interact with others to ultimately effect change in community and society.

The model is intended to serve as a foundation for college student leadership development programs in order to “prepare a new generation of leaders who understand that they can act as leaders to effect change without necessarily being in traditional leadership positions of power and influence” (HERI, 1996, p. 12). Leadership in the context of positive social change, as the Social Change Model advocates, provides a relevant frame for examining student engagement in community service as it is associated with students’ socially responsible leadership development.

Methods

In order to address our research question, we used ordinary least squares regression to analyze whether there are relationships between community service engagement and socially responsible leadership when controlling for additional factors.

Instrument

The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, which features the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Tyree, 1998) and is based on the social change model of leadership development (HERI, 1996), was the instrument used in this study. The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership has been previously used in multiple research studies that have examined students’ development of socially responsible leadership (Dugan, 2006, 2008; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2009).

Participants

In 2009 the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) survey was distributed to 3,423 randomly selected undergraduate students at a large public university classified by the Carnegie Classification as having very high research activity. The undergraduate student population at this university was over 29,000 in 2009. The MSL survey was administered online and the response rate was 37.5% (n = 1,282). Our sample closely reflected institutional demographics, although more women completed the instrument than men (Table 1). The average age of respondents was 21.52 (SD = 4.32). Our sample included a majority of non-first-generation (i.e., defined as parents having a bachelor degree of higher), full-time, and non-transfer students.
Measures

Community service engagement. In order to capture students’ engagement in community service, students were asked – In an average academic term, do you engage in any community service? Students responded by answering in the affirmative or negative. We discovered that 45.7% (n = 585) students indicated engaging in community service in an average academic term. This question also acted as a filter variable to the question, “In an average academic term, approximately how many hours do you engage in community service?” It provided four categories in which students could select the average hours they participate in community service in each area.

Some students indicated participating in service in more than one context (e.g., engaging in service through classes and in student organizations); therefore, we wanted to acknowledge the multiple contexts in which students engage in service and also interrogate whether those contexts are uniquely associated with students’ socially responsible leadership. To achieve that goal, we dummy-coded the variables and included all of the possible combinations of service context. We discovered that very few students participated in community service through work study (e.g., .4% participated in service through both classes and in work study); therefore, we collapsed the work study-related variables into one primary category except in instances where students participated in service through classes, organizations, work, and on their own and when they participated in service through classes, organizations, and work.

This left us with nine categories representing students’ participation in community service in singular or multiple contexts. In our sample, 13.2% (n = 167) of students participated in community service as part of a class, 27.2% through a student organization (n = 167), 6.0% through work study (n = 76), and 35.2% participated in service on their own (n = 449). Those figures are not mutually exclusive, as students could select more than one context in which they had participated in community service. Therefore, when we consider students’ multiple participation through several contexts, we discovered that 3.8% (n = 48) participated in service through work study (which included work study only and combinations of work study and student organizations, classes, etc.); 12.5% (n = 160) participated only on their own; 6.3% (n = 80) participated through a student organization only; 1.3% (n = 16) participated through a class only; 2.9% (n = 37) participated both in a class on their own; 1.4% (n = 18) participated through a class and a student organization; 4.9% (n = 63) through a class, student organization, and work study; and 1.8% (n = 23) through a class, student organization, work study, and on their own.

Demographics and background characteristics. Students were also asked to self-report their gender, race/ethnicity, transfer status, parents’ educational attainment, and whether they were currently attending college full-time or part-
time. Those variables were dummy-coded accordingly (see Table 1). Finally, as Dugan, Kodama, and Gebhardt (2012) found different predictors of leadership development by racial groups, we dummy-coded separate racial groups (African-American, Asian-American, Native American, and Hispanic or Latino) with White and other or unknown students as the referent groups.

**Pre-college leadership antecedents and involvement.** Prior research has demonstrated the importance of students’ pre-college experiences in predicting students’ college experiences; for example, Astin’s (1993) Input-Environment-Outcome model considers the importance of students’ pre-college characteristics in examining college student growth or development. Along those lines, the MSL survey also asked students about their pre-college involvement in student activities and community service, confidence conducting leadership tasks, and diversity experiences. We considered these items to be important antecedents to students’ leadership development and capacity to engage in socially responsible behaviors.

Pre-college leadership antecedent items related to students’ participation in clubs, leadership positions, and volunteer work in high school. Additional antecedents referred to students’ high school leadership experience, how often they were given positive feedback or encouragement regarding their leadership ability, or how often they saw others as leaders. Pre-college leadership self-efficacy items referred to students’ confidence completing leadership tasks. Students’ engagement in socially responsible leadership before they attended college was also used in analysis.

**College leadership antecedents and involvement.** In considering factors that would influence students’ development of socially responsible leadership, we wanted to control for the influence of students’ leadership experience and training in college. We also considered whether students had been involved in college organizations or held a leadership position in a college organization. Finally, we also considered the importance of sociocultural conversations on students’ development of socially responsible leadership.
Table 1  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Coding for Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Used in Analysis</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Coding/Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic and Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0 = m; 1 = f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>0 = no; 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific American</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0 = no; 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>0 = no; 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0 = no; 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time enrollment</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>0 = no; 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer student</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>0 = no; 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0 = no; 1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1 = F to 4 = Sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Experiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed major social issues</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with students with values different than own</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with students with different religious beliefs</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed views about multiculturalism</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with students with different political views</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about different lifestyles/customs</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term leadership experiences</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-term leadership experiences</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term leadership experiences</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held a leadership position in college organizations</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1 = N to 5 = M T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-College Antecedents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in student clubs/groups</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in leadership positions</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer work</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1 = N to 4 = V O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of prior leadership experiences in student clubs, performing groups, service orgs, (etc.)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1 = No to 5 = Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often students have been given positive feedback or encouragement for their leadership ability</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1 = N to 5 = F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How students would have reacted to being chosen or appointed the leader of a group</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1 = VU to 5= VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often students saw others as effective leaders</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1 = N to 5 = F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often students thought of themselves as leaders</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1 = N to 5 = F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading others</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1 = NAC to 4 = VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing a group’s tasks to accomplish goal</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1 = NAC to 4 = VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with team on group project</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1 = NAC to 4 = V C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing differences in opinions enriched my thinking (controversy with civility)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1 = SD to 5 = SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had low self-esteem (consciousness of self)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1 = SD to 5 = SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed working with others toward common goals (collaboration)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1 = SD to 5 = SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to (commitment)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1 = SD to 5 = SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked well when I knew the collective values of a group (common purpose)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1 = SD to 5 = SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My behaviors reflected my beliefs (congruence)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1 = SD to 5 = SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value the opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community (citizenship)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1 = SD to 5 = SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Service Participation
As part of a class only .01 .07 0 = no; 1 = yes
With a student organization only .02 .15 0 = no; 1 = yes
On your own only .05 .21 0 = no; 1 = yes
Work study-related .01 .12 0 = no; 1 = yes
Through student organizations and on one’s own .04 .20 0 = no; 1 = yes
Through class and student organizations .01 .07 0 = no; 1 = yes
Through class and on one’s own .01 .10 0 = no; 1 = yes
Through class, student organizations, and work study .02 .13 0 = no; 1 = yes
Through class, student organizations, work study, and on one’s own .01 .08 0 = no; 1 = yes

**Factor analysis.** In order to derive factors from those items, we conducted a factor analysis on 28 items with oblique rotation (promax). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .90). Bartlett’s test of sphericity $\chi^2(378) = 14668.14, p < .001$, indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large. An initial analysis was run to obtain eigenvalues for each component in the data; five components had an eigenvalue over Kaiser’s criterion of one and explained 57.30% of the variance. Given the large sample size, Kaiser’s criteria components, and the convergence of a scree plot that showed inflexions that justify retaining five components, the final analysis retained the following factors: sociocultural discussions, pre-college leadership antecedents, pre-college leadership efficacy, college leadership experience, and pre-college socially responsible leadership. Table 2 shows the factor loadings after rotation in a component matrix, with factor loadings over .35 in bold. Each component had a high reliability, with Cronbach’s $\alpha > .70$. The factor scores were computed using the regression method and saved as standardized scores with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one.
Table 2
Summary of Factor Analysis Results for the MSL Questionnaire (n = 1,190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sociocultural Conversations with Peers (α = .91)</th>
<th>Pre-College Leadership Efficacy (α = .83)</th>
<th>Pre-College Leadership Antecedents (α = .84)</th>
<th>Pre-SRLS (α = .70)</th>
<th>College Leadership Experiences (α = .71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussed major social issues</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>- .025</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed views about multiculturalism</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with students with values different than own</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about different lifestyles/customs</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with students with different religious beliefs</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with students with different political views</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading others</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing a group’s tasks to accomplish goal</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to appointment as leader</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with team on group project</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking of yourself as a leader</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had low self-esteem (consciousness of self)</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-college participation in student clubs/groups</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-college volunteer work</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-college participation in leadership positions</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of prior leadership experiences in student clubs, performing groups, service organizations, jobs (etc.)</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given positive feedback or encouraged leadership ability</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing others as effective leaders</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worked well when I knew the collective values of a group (common purpose)</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to (commitment)</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>-.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My behaviors reflected my beliefs (congruence)</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed working with others toward common goals (collaboration)</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value the opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community (citizenship)</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing differences in opinions enriched my thinking (controversy with civility)</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-term leadership experiences</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term leadership experiences</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term leadership experiences</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership position in college</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Socially responsible leadership development. Outcome variables were operationalized using the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS). This instrument includes seven separate scales, each of which measures a particular socially responsible leadership value associated with the Social Change Model: consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship (Tyree, 1998). The SRLS also measures an eighth variable, change, which was not used as an outcome variable in this study, as our goal was to measure the “7 Cs.” The SRLS contains a total of 68 items for which participants self-report their agree using a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) (with negative items reversed for calculation). For example, students would rate their agreement to the following item related to consciousness of self is “I know myself pretty well.” The SRLS scale computes each factor by generating mean values, and each construct comprises between seven and 11 items. In our sample, the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) and internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for each scale is as follows: consciousness of self (M = 3.95, SD = .49, α = .79), congruence (M = 4.13, SD = .44, α = .78), commitment (M = 4.19, SD = .46, α = .80), collaboration (M = 3.94, SD = .46, α = .82), common purpose (M = 3.99, SD = .41, α = .79), controversy with civility (M = 3.84, SD = .41, α = .75), citizenship (M = 3.82, SD = .44, α = .74).

Examining Assumptions

In all of our regressions, we examined assumptions of multicollinearity, homoscedasticity, linearity, and independent/normal errors. We found that multicollinearity assumptions were not violated (tolerance statistics were between .87 and variance inflation factors ranged from 1.04 to 1.78). Additionally, the highest bivariate correlation observed was less than .57 (between pre-college leadership efficacy and leadership antecedents). In testing homoscedasticity, we found random scatter and variability in scatterplots of standardized residuals against the standardized predicted values. In producing histograms of standardized residuals and normal probability plots comparing the distribution of standardized residuals to a normal distribution, we found evidence for normality. Examinations of matrix scatterplots suggested the relationships between the predictor and outcome variables were relatively linear. We found consistently that the residual errors were independent across our models (the Durbin-Watson values ranged from 1.59 to 1.99).

Limitations
Our study has several limitations that might constrain generalizability to other populations; for example, the survey was administered at a large, public research university located in an urban region of the Upper Midwest of the United States. All data collected were self-reported from students and institutional identifiers were not collected to verify students’ demographic information. The overall variance explained in our models was around 30-40%, leaving 60-70% of the variance unexplained in our analysis. The survey was also collected at one point in time without gleaning awareness of the potential impacts of long-term or short-term involvement in community service. There are many dimensions and terms associated with community service, so it is unclear how individual students considered their engagement in community service when responding to the survey. While in some ways a limitation, this breadth of this term is also an opportunity to capture a number of different kinds of community service experiences that might otherwise be lost when considering stricter or refined definitions.

Results

We conducted ordinary least squares regressions with seven of the socially responsible leadership scales as dependent variables and students’ participation in a variety of community service contexts, including considerations of students’ participation in more than one context (e.g., through a student organization and through a class). We also controlled for demographic and personal characteristics along with the additional five factors hypothesized to impact students’ socially responsible leadership values: sociocultural discussions, college leadership experiences, pre-college leadership antecedents, pre-college leadership self-efficacy, and pre-college socially responsible leadership.

Our first model predicting the socially responsible leadership value consciousness of self was statistically significant, $F(23, 1054) = 20.15, p < .001$, and the model explains 30.5% of the variance in consciousness of self (see Table 3). In this model, only students who participated in community service on their own – without an association with a formal organization or course – reported higher consciousness of self than their referent groups. While no other forms of community service participation were significant, this model suggested that class level, sociocultural discussions, college leadership, pre-college socially responsible leadership, and pre-college leadership antecedents were positively associated with students’ consciousness of self. Asian-American and Pacific Islander students reported lower consciousness of self and pre-college leadership efficacy was negatively associated with consciousness of self. In reviewing the standardized coefficients ($\beta$), the model suggests that community service was not as strong in predicting students’ consciousness of self ($\beta = .085$) as are students’
sociocultural discussions (β = .236), college leadership (which emerged as the strongest predictor, β = .330), and pre-tests for socially responsible leadership (β = .169).

Our second model predicting congruence was statistically significant, F(23, 1056) = 15.62, p < .001, and the model accounts for 25.4% of the variance in congruence. This model suggests that students who participated in community service on their own and in two areas – on their own and with a student organization – reported higher congruence than their referent groups. As in the previous model, Asian-American and Pacific Islander students reported lower congruence while college level, sociocultural discussions, college leadership, and students’ pre-college socially responsible leadership were positively associated with students’ congruence. The standardized coefficients also suggested that participation in community service in both contexts was not as strongly predictive of students’ congruence as students’ sociocultural discussions, college leadership, and pre-tests for socially responsible leadership which was the strongest predictor in the model. The model also suggests that service on one’s own and service in both organizations and on one’s own were closely related in regards to their predictive strength of congruence (β = .071 and β = .061 respectively).

Our third model predicting commitment was statistically significant, F(23, 1056) = 17.31, p < .001, and the model explains 27.4% of the variance in commitment. This model suggests that students who participated in (a) service on their own, (b) in a student organization and on their own, and (c) with a class, a student organization, and on their own all reported higher commitment than their referent groups. Asian-American and Pacific Islander students reported lower commitment while sociocultural discussions, college leadership, pre-college socially responsible leadership, and pre-college leadership antecedents were positively associated with students’ commitment. In this model, participation in the three community service contexts was again moderately predictive of commitment, although the standardized coefficients for students who participated in service on their own and those who participated through both a student organization and on their own were higher than pre-college leadership antecedents and closer to that of sociocultural discussions and college leadership than in previous models.

Our fourth model predicting collaboration was statistically significant, F (23, 1055) = 24.93, p < .001, and the model accounts for 35.2% of the variance in collaboration. This particular model suggested that students who participated in the following community service contexts reported greater collaboration than their referent groups – (a) service on one’s own only, (b) service with a student organization only, (c) service with a class and student organization, (d) service with a student organization and on one’s own, and (e) service with a class, with a student organization, and on one’s own. Sociocultural discussions, college
leadership, pre-college socially responsible leadership, and pre-college leadership antecedents were positively associated with students’ collaboration. The standardized coefficients for all forms of community service were more predictive of college leadership yet lower than sociocultural discussions, pre-tests for socially responsible leadership, and pre-college leadership antecedents.

Our fifth model predicting common purpose was statistically significant, $F(23, 1057) = 21.76, p < .001$, and the model accounts for 32.1% of the variance in common purpose. This model suggested that students who participated in community service in the following contexts reported greater common purpose than their referent groups – (a) service on one’s own only, (b) service with a student organization only, (c) service with a student organization and on one’s own, and (d) service with a class, with a student organization, and on one’s own. Asian-American and Pacific Islander students reported lower common purpose than their referent groups while class level, sociocultural discussions, college leadership, pre-college socially responsible leadership, and pre-college leadership antecedents were positively associated with students’ common purpose. In this model, participation in the four contexts of community service were again moderately predictive of commitment and lower than the sociocultural conversations, college leadership, pre-tests for socially responsible leadership, and pre-college leadership antecedents.

Our sixth model predicting controversy with civility was statistically significant, $F(23, 1056) = 24.04, p < .001$, and the model explains 34.4% of the variance in controversy with civility. Students who participated in community service in three reported greater controversy with civility than their referent groups – (a) service on one’s own, (b) service with a student organization and on one’s own, and (c) service as a part of work study. Like the previous models college leadership, class level, sociocultural discussions, and pre-college socially responsible leadership were positively associated with controversy with civility. Within this model only service participation in a student organization and on one’s own was more predictive of college leadership while all of the other forms of service were less predictive than sociocultural discussions and pre-college socially responsible leadership.

Our seventh model predicting citizenship was statistically significant, $F(23, 1056) = 28.98, p < .001$, and the model accounts for 38.7% of the variance in citizenship. This model suggests that students who participated in community service in the following contexts reported higher citizenship – (a) service on one’s own only, (b) service with a class and student organization, (c) service with a class and on one’s own, (d) service with a student organization and on one’s own, (e) service with a class, a student organization, and on one’s own, and (f) service in work study contexts. Asian American and Pacific Islander students reported
lower citizenship compared to their referent groups while Hispanic or Latino students reported greater citizenship. Finally, sociocultural discussions, college leadership, pre-college leadership efficacy, pre-college socially responsible leadership, and pre-college leadership antecedents were positively associated with citizenship. Examinations of the standardized coefficients in this model suggest that participation in community service on one’s own is more highly predictive of citizenship than college leadership, pre-college leadership efficacy, and pre-college leadership antecedents. Participation in most of the community service contexts (save for service through a class and on one’s own and service through a class, student organization, and on one’s own) was more strongly predictive of citizenship than pre-college leadership efficacy. Sociocultural discussions and pre-college socially responsible leadership remain the greatest predictors, as was the case for all of the models.

Table 3
Regression Models Predicting Socially Responsible Leadership Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Consciousness of Self</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Common Purpose</th>
<th>Controversy with Civility</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service on one’s own only</td>
<td>.085*</td>
<td>.071*</td>
<td>.087**</td>
<td>.098***</td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>.154***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service with a student organization only</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.078**</td>
<td>.054*</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service as part of a class only</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service with a class and student organization</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.077**</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.073**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service with a class and on one’s own</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.057*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service with a student organization and on one’s own</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.067*</td>
<td>.081**</td>
<td>.112***</td>
<td>.060*</td>
<td>.078**</td>
<td>.097***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service with a class, a student organization, and on one’s own</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.058*</td>
<td>.077**</td>
<td>.061*</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.052*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service with a class, a student organization, on one’s own, and in work study</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service in work study-related contexts</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.057*</td>
<td>.085**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>-.076**</td>
<td>-.085**</td>
<td>-.098**</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.052*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.066**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level</td>
<td>.080**</td>
<td>.071*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.056*</td>
<td>.088**</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural Discussions</td>
<td>.236***</td>
<td>.226***</td>
<td>.159***</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.187***</td>
<td>.382***</td>
<td>.273***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College Leadership & .330*** & .108** & .134*** & .058*** & .094** & .073* & .114*** \\
Pre-College Leadership Efficacy & -.092** & -.040 & -.034 & .035 & .042 & -.013 & .064* \\
Pre-College Socially Responsible Leadership & .169** & .302*** & .333*** & .359*** & .348*** & .271*** & .243*** \\
Pre-College Leadership Antecedents & .050*** & .019 & .071* & .127*** & .101** & .004 & .143*** \\

$R^2$ 30.5% 25.4% 27.4% 35.2% 32.1% 34.4% 38.7% \\

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Discussion

Several themes emerge from our results that are noteworthy and relevant toward understanding the intersections between community engagement and leadership development. It appears that college students who participate in community service opportunities on their own – without the formal structure of classes, student organizations, or work study – were more likely to work for positive change on behalf of the community (citizenship); work with others in a common effort (collaboration); have the passion, intensity, and duration to drive collective efforts (commitment); work with shared aims and purposes (common purpose); think, feel, and behave with consistency (congruence); have awareness of the beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate one to take action (consciousness of self); and, hold respect for others and a willingness to hear others’ views (controversy with civility). Students who are motivated to conduct service on their own – about one-third of the students in our study – likely exhibit these traits due to their personal passion toward promoting social change. After all, they sought out community service on their own.

While participation in service through student organizations and no other contexts was only significant in the models predicting collaboration and common purpose, students who participated in service on their own and with a student organization reported greater socially responsible leadership in all areas save for consciousness of self. Those results suggest that students who have the personal motivation to engage in service and also find student organizations in which to participate in service reap greater benefits than students who participate in service through student organizations alone.

Community service participation conducted in a class was only significantly associated with students’ socially responsible leadership when in combination with either participation in student organizations or participation on one’s own. The most effective combination in this regard was participation in service in classes, student organizations, and on one’s own – students who engaged in service through these means reported higher values on four of the socially responsible leadership scales (commitment, collaboration, common purpose, and
citizenship) than those who participated in the class context alone (which was not significant in any of the models). Students’ participation in community service through a class only was not the only non-significant predictor in our models. Participation in a combination of all four contexts through work study, in a class, through a student organization, and on their own was also non-significant.

In examining each model, it is evident that community service in several contexts is most influential in predicting students’ socially responsible leadership values of collaboration, common purpose, and citizenship. This finding also emerged when examining the size of the standardized coefficients, which were largest in the collaboration, common purpose, and citizenship models and were sometimes larger than the pre-college and college controls. These appear to be potential areas in which students who engage in community service tend to benefit with regards to their socially responsible leadership.

Several of the control variables consistently and positively predicted students’ socially responsible leadership; for example, students’ sociocultural discussions, college leadership, and pretests for socially responsible leadership emerged as significant in all of our models. These areas appear to be the most powerful indicators of socially responsible leadership and were often greater predictors of socially responsible leadership compared with the community service variables in our models.

**Recommendations**

It is significant that students who participated in community service on their own reported higher social change leadership. Due to survey limitations, we were unable to fully capture whether these students had connected with a university community engagement office to seek resources related to participation in community service, locate a community organization in which to serve, or undertake training regarding community service. If students are indeed seeking community service opportunities on their own, this presents a strong case for colleges and universities to continue to provide or expand community engagement offices that can help connect students with community organizations, offer advising services to help students refine their goals and expectations, and provide structured opportunities for reflection.

While it makes sense that students who have a genuine passion for social change will seek service opportunities on their own, this also presents a potentially missed opportunity to participate in community service that may provide students the opportunity to connect with other students, make intentional connections to their academic work, and engage in reflection. Previous research has suggested
that students who participate in community service through their own have a lower sense of belonging on campus than students who participate through more formal structures such as student organizations (Soria, Troisi, & Stebleton, 2012); therefore, it is recommended that practitioners seek ways to connect these students who engage in community service on their own to other students also interested in service.

While Sessa, Matos, and Hopkins (2009) suggested that service-learning is a viable alternative for teaching leadership, our research suggested that students who participated in service in classes did not report greater socially responsible leadership. It is likely the case that students participated in community service or service learning in a wide variety of classes in many disciplines; therefore, as a consequence, they likely did not engage in service that always offered reflection, collaboration, a shared purpose, or other opportunities to connect service with students’ personal values. Hoover and Webster (2004) recommended that faculty conducting service learning activities provide students with greater opportunities to learn about other students and that allow students to move outside of their comfort zones. The authors also recommend that students participating in service learning should receive focused opportunities to reflect upon their role in service learning and that service should not be a “one time event” (Hoover & Webster, 2004, p. 61). Ultimately, institutions should seek to provide courses and opportunities where community engagement plays a strong role and express the importance of leadership development within these contexts (Ricketts & Bruce, 2008).

There are several ways in which service through organizations can be enhanced to include socially responsible leadership development; for example, students who participate in co-curricular activities can be offered complementary opportunities to participate in short-term leadership development programs, which can effectively provide students with lasting socially responsible leadership development and an integrated sense of thinking about leadership (Rosch & Caza, 2012). According to Rosch and Caza (2012), short-term programs can also be fiscally efficient and provide the means to scale up to new initiatives. Ewing, Bruce, and Ricketts (2009) also suggested that practitioners can also place less emphasis upon leadership roles in co-curricular student organizations and more emphasis on providing opportunities for individuals to gain membership to organizations that match their personal or professional goals.

Many co-curricular leadership programs and leadership courses already integrate community service as the praxis for leadership theory. Other disciplinary courses implement service learning and leadership in an effort to provide hands-on experience in applying course content to a current community issue or problem (McCarthy & Tucker, 2002). Within any disciplinary course, faculty can help
students to make strong and lasting connections between community engagement and leadership development. Leadership programs can consider collaborations with traditionally distinct offices like those coordinating volunteering and service-learning. Going even further, institutions could begin to look at community service as one vital aspect of leadership development work on campus. In addition, community service certificate programs and transcript notation are common strategies to encourage participation among undergraduates. Student organizations based on community service can provide opportunities for students to engage in a broad range of service activities.

Finally, we recommend future research be undertaken to examine connections between engagement in community service, service learning, and leadership development. Longitudinal research can provide insights into the ways in which short-term and long-term community service engagement continues to impact students’ development of socially responsible leadership. Qualitative research can also reveal the means through which some community service contexts yielded greater socially responsible leadership; specifically, we believe it would be interesting to interview those students who participate in community service on their own to learn how this seemingly unstructured form of service contributes to student outcomes. Future inquiries into the ways in which community and civic engagement enhance students’ leadership development can be leveraged to develop best practices for teaching leadership experientially on college campuses.
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Abstract

Programs in agricultural leadership are continuing to enjoy success in institutions around the country. To this point, there has been a lack of research conducted to (a) identify objectives for these programs, (b) identify courses that should be taught in these programs, (c) identify the need for and objectives of an internship requirement, or (d) determine future placements of program graduates. This study sought the opinions of 15 agricultural leadership experts from across the nation to address these questions. Although the panel came to consensus on these areas it
was apparent that the experts in agricultural leadership must continue to work toward national goals and standards for agricultural leadership programs.

Introduction

People with leadership skills are highly sought after by employers, yet in the United States, organizations are finding it difficult to fill leadership positions because of a lack of trained leaders – a leadership void (Figura, 1999; Fritz & Brown, 1998; Hemp, 2008; Kiisel, 2012; Rothkopf, 2009; U.S. Department of Labor, 1999). Compounding this is that it appears college graduates, as a whole, are ineffective leaders, suggesting that the most likely cause of the leadership void is a lack of formal leadership training (Fritz & Brown, 1998; Ricketts & Rudd, 2002). Moreover, graduates from colleges of agriculture are expected to have leadership soft skills (Crawford, Lang, Fink, Dalton, & Fielitz, 2011).

In an attempt to fill this leadership void, departments of agricultural education have begun a concerted effort to train leaders (Fritz & Brown, 1998; Fritz et al., 2003b). Yet, what curriculum should be contained in these programs is still in unclear (Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006; Fritz et al., 2003b). Indeed, Sowick (2012) states that more research is needed to determine the needs of leadership education programs. This dearth of information begs the question, “What are the elements of an agricultural leadership program?” To address this, the following questions were posited:

- What should be the objectives of a leadership program?
- What courses should be included?
- What employment options are available for students who look to agricultural leadership as a major?

The purpose of this study was to determine and prioritize the elements required for an undergraduate agricultural leadership program by soliciting input from agricultural leadership education experts. The specific objectives that guided this study were to:

- Identify the objectives of an agricultural leadership program.
- Identify courses for inclusion in an undergraduate agricultural leadership program.
- Determine the need for internships and internship requirements for an undergraduate agricultural leadership program.
- Identify the careers available for undergraduate agricultural leadership program graduates.
Theoretical Framework

Sprecker and Rudd (1997) acknowledged that it is difficult to predict curriculum needs for tomorrow, yet colleges of agricultural and life sciences must attempt to meet this difficult task to ensure the success of our future graduates. Curriculum planning and revision is often neglected by faculty and administrators for lack of an effective method to undertake this effort. Unfortunately, the need for curriculum reform is recognized only after students fail to enroll in the antiquated curriculum. To keep curriculum on target, Diamond (1989) recommended that outstanding practitioners and researchers in the field provide their input and thinking to keep curriculum viable and current.

To address this question, the curriculum model posited by Finch and Crunkilton (1999) was used for this study (see Figure 1). The model is based upon the systems approach. In this application, students are the input entering the academic program. They then enter the process by enrolling in courses based on the program curriculum and at some future point become the output by graduating from the program. Included within the academic program are faculty, resources, and curriculum, all of which are affected by the environment of the university, college, community, and industry. The feedback loop in this systems model consists of feedback from program graduates who offer suggestions for program improvement.
As seen in the model, Finch and Crunkilton (1999) placed faculty at the core of the academic program because faculty are essential in the development and delivery of the curriculum. First, faculty are experts in their discipline, possessing a deep knowledge of the subject matter, which is the basis of how they establish the knowledge, skills, and practicum required for degree attainment. Second, they control how the curriculum is delivered to the students; how material is presented, what elements are emphasized, and the type of activities used for knowledge acquisition. With this in mind, faculty members are well equipped to determine what program elements are essential.

Although there are a number of undergraduate programs in agricultural leadership currently in place, this study sought to examine the need for leadership education from a national perspective. With this perspective in mind, the researchers were attempting to frame the strategic thinking of current practitioners and researchers identified as experts in leadership education in the hopes of moving this curriculum toward strategic programming and implementation across the United States.

**Conceptual Frame**

Throughout the country 73% of agricultural education departments offer leadership courses and the offerings have been on the rise for more than a decade.
Leadership development has been a part of agricultural education for nearly a century, emerging out of a necessity to train students for advisor responsibilities in FFA and 4-H youth organizations (Fritz & Brown, 1998; Fritz et al., 2003b; Simonsen & Birkenholz, 2010).

Agricultural leadership courses attract a wide variety of students from within and outside of colleges of agricultural and life sciences (Brown & Fritz, 1994; Fritz, Hoover, Weeks, Townsend, & Carter, 2003a). In addition, most agricultural leadership programs have support from their college dean, thus helping to provide sustained growth for these programs (Brown & Fritz, 1994; Fritz et al., 2003a; Fritz et al., 2003b; Fritz & Brown, 1998). Based on the experiences of departments of agricultural education from across the country, adding a leadership component has proven to be beneficial (Fritz & Brown, 1998).

Even still, academic program curriculum can quickly become outdated and, therefore, must be constantly examined in terms of its effects and its effectiveness (Finch & Crunkilton, 1999). Unfortunately, colleges and universities have seldom applied continuous planning principles to curriculum (Briggs, Stark, & Rowland-Poplawski, 2003). Even though curriculum planning is at the heart of academic work (Middlebrooks & Allen, 2009), few studies are available to aid researchers or academic administrators in understanding the dimensions of program planning (Stark, Lowther, Sharp, & Arnold, 1997).

As the discipline of leadership has developed over the years, no national guidelines or frameworks have been established (Brungardt et al., 2006). Similarly, agricultural leadership course offerings across the country show little consistency of courses offered, content within courses, or texts used (Fritz & Brown, 1998; Simonsen & Birkenholz, 2010). Because of these inconsistencies it is essential that a consensus of curriculum essentials be established so programs of leadership may have a benchmark by which they may compare their curriculum.

**Methods**

This national study used the *Delphi* technique to determine the elements required for an undergraduate agricultural leadership program. The *Delphi* method was chosen because it is an effective technique to determine consensus from a group of people with diverse opinions (Dalkey, 1969; Stitt-Gohdes & Crews, 2004) and is useful for “formulating group judgment for subject matter where precise subject matter is lacking” (Keegan, 2000, p. 120). The *Delphi* technique has been an effective research method in prior curriculum studies (Bruening & Shao, 2005; Morgan, 2010).
The population for this study consisted of 19 agricultural leadership university faculty selected from the 2001 AAAE Directory of University Faculty in Agricultural Education (Dyer, 2001). Faculty listed in the directory self-identify their areas of expertise and the individuals selected for this study indicated expertise and experience in leadership instruction. Four individuals declined to participate in the study, thus providing 15 participants. According to Dalkey (1969), a Delphi group size in excess of 13 yields a reliability of 0.80 or greater.

The study consisted of three rounds of questions with the participants. All 15 participants completed rounds one and two, and 13 of the participants completed round three. The participants’ responses were collected using an electronic, web-based form consisting of questions or statements, text-boxes, and radio buttons. The first round questionnaire consisted of the following open-ended prompts:

- What should the objectives of an agricultural leadership program be?
- What required courses should be included in an undergraduate agricultural leadership program?
- Should an internship be required in an undergraduate agricultural leadership program? If so, what are the objectives of the internship?
- What will a graduate be able to do with a degree in agricultural leadership (i.e., jobs are available for graduates of agricultural leadership)?

Using the constant comparative method (Glazer & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), responses to these questions were sorted and grouped by common answers. These answers were written as statements for round two. In round two, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement using a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). After each statement, a text-box was provided for the participants to provide additional comments about the statement. Statements with a mean of 4.0 or greater were kept for round three.

For round three, the participants were asked to use a five-point Likert-type scale to indicate their level of agreement with the statements carried over from round two. As in round two, responses to the statements from round three were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The mean of each question was determined and the responses were sorted by level of agreement. The findings considered reliable included items where the Delphi panel reached an 80% level of agreement (4.00/5.00).
Findings

For the first research objective was to identify the objectives of an agricultural leadership program. The Delphi panel identified 26 leadership program objectives at the 80% agreement level (see Table 1). The objective reaching the highest level of agreement was “the student will develop an understanding of personal leadership strengths and weaknesses and how to accentuate their strengths” (4.79/5.00). Additional objectives included “identify and apply contemporary key leadership theories and leadership models” ($M = 4.71$), “develop a personal leadership philosophy” ($M = 4.64$), and “apply leadership theories and practice in a structured, supportive learning environment” ($M = 4.64$). Other objectives included various components of defining, developing, and demonstrating leadership related theories and skills including visioning, goal setting, and ethics.

Table 1
Mean levels of agreement for objectives for an agricultural leadership program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>$M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop understanding of personal leadership strengths/weaknesses; how to</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accentuate their strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and apply contemporary key leadership theories &amp; leadership</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a personal leadership philosophy</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply leadership theories &amp; practice in structured, supportive learning</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define leadership</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop decision making skills</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice team building skills</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop problem solving skills</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a personal vision for leadership</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively discuss ethics in the workplace</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop professional human relation skills</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively communicate via public speaking &amp; written communication</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the leadership skill of visioning</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase understanding of human interaction in all relationships and tasks</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of personality types and/or learning styles</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate leadership theory with critical issues in agriculture</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to set achievable goals</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop critical thinking skills</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to delegate effectively</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the leadership skill of recognizing others</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate effectively through presentations</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to lead change in organizations</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective time management skills</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the steps required for conflict resolution</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to empower others</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to enable others</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale anchors were 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.
The second objective was to identify the courses for inclusion in an agricultural leadership undergraduate degree program (see Table 2). The responses receiving the highest level of agreement were “Introduction to leadership theory and practice” ($M = 4.57$), followed by “Team building/working with teams and groups” ($M = 4.43$) and “Capstone course to allow students to present their leadership discoveries” ($M = 4.43$). Five other courses also met minimum level necessary to be considered reliable.

Table 2
Mean levels of agreement for courses for inclusion in an agricultural leadership program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>$M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to leadership theory and practice</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building/working with teams and groups</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone course to allow students to present their leadership discoveries</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal communication techniques for leaders</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal leadership development (intrapersonal leadership)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar related to leadership in the food, agricultural, and natural resource sciences</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational leadership theory (systems thinking)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership ethics</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale anchors were 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Undecided*, 4 = *Agree*, 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

For objective three, participants were asked to address the topic of internships in leadership education programs, and they overwhelmingly agreed that internships should be a requirement for agricultural leadership students (11 of 13 stated internships should be required). They were then asked to identify internship objectives and 14 were identified to guide leadership internships (see Table 3). The internship objective receiving the highest level of agreement was “Students will practice their personal leadership behaviors in a structured but safe real-world learning environment” ($M = 4.69$). Next was “Apply leadership and learning theories to the educational, training, and development needs of the agricultural business, organization, or governmental agency” ($M = 4.62$), followed by “Apply a variety of verbal, written, and interpersonal communication techniques” ($M = 4.62$).
Table 3
Mean levels of agreement for agricultural leadership internship student objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice personal leadership behaviors in a structured but safe real-world learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply leadership and learning theories to the educational, training, and development needs of the agricultural business, organization, or governmental agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply a variety of verbal, written, and interpersonal communication techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the outcomes identified by the intern, the intern supervisor, and the university coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile a portfolio to document accomplishments during the internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice, analyze, and assess interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice and analyze team building skills and organizational development skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice ethical decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in business meeting and project meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn and operate under office/business protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow different employees in the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the communication systems in the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend professional development sessions/programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit clients of the cooperating organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale anchors were 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Objective number 4 was to identify careers available for agricultural leadership program graduates. Table 4 lists the 22 possible career paths that achieved 80% agreement. “Commodity groups and breed associations” and “Youth leadership positions” received the greatest level of agreement ($M = 4.67$). Other suggested career paths included “Community organization leadership,” “Government agencies,” and “FFA director/secretary” ($M = 4.53$), and “Non-profit organization leadership” ($M = 4.47$).
Table 4
Mean levels of agreement with career paths identified for agricultural leadership graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career path</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commodity groups and breed associations</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth leadership positions</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organization leadership</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for government agencies responsible for leadership in agricultural issues</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFA executive director/secretary</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit organization leadership</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural policies and legislation (legislative aide)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/association representative</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business leadership</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer organization leadership</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee leadership training and education</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and marketing</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University student activities director</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event planning</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and national policy positions</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource development</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale anchors were 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Conclusions and Recommendations

A Delphi panel of 13 experts in agricultural leadership completed all three rounds of this study to arrive at consensus in four critical areas for undergraduate agricultural leadership programs. Agricultural leadership program objectives, courses offered, internship objectives, and career paths for agricultural leadership graduates were addressed in this study.

The panel reached consensus on 26 objectives of an undergraduate agricultural leadership program, with 12 objectives reaching a 90% (4.50/5.00) agreement level. Several of the key objectives relate to developing an understanding of personal leadership strengths and weaknesses. At the foundation of all quality leadership degree programs must be for each student to understand their personal leadership traits and know how to accentuate these individual skills for the success of a team or organization. Future research should be conducted to determine the best practices for achieving this outcome.
Consensus was reached on eight courses to be included in an undergraduate agricultural leadership program: “leadership theory and practice,” “team leadership,” “capstone experience,” “communication,” “intrapersonal leadership,” and “organizational theory.” Several of the courses, such as “ethics” and “organizational theory,” are relatively clear in their intended content. Conversely, some of the course titles are ambiguous and beg a clear definition of intended course content and objectives. However, the list provided in Table 2 may serve as a helpful guide as faculty decide what types of courses should be included in an ideal undergraduate agricultural leadership degree program. Future research should seek to compare course offerings of premier leadership programs and clarify objectives for the vaguer titled courses.

The vast majority of the panel (11 of 13) agreed that internship programs were an important requirement for undergraduate agricultural leadership students and identified numerous objectives to guide the internship experience. Again, as in the overall program objectives, there was a broad range of objectives ranging from the very specific (“compiling a portfolio”) to the very broad (“apply leadership and learning theories”). The wide range of objectives could prove problematic for faculty developing leadership internship programs. However, the objectives listed in Table 4 may serve as an invaluable starting point as faculty work to outline an appropriate internship program and offer opportunity to customize the objectives based upon the needs of the student and organization involved. The most agreed upon internship objective was to “practice personal leadership behaviors in a structured but safe real-world learning environment.” Combined with the overall leadership program objective of “applying leadership theories and practice in a structured, supportive learning environment” shows a need to carefully select internship sites and consider students’ past experiences, abilities, and interests when making placements.

Completion of a leadership program does not automatically qualify a student as a leader. The agreed upon objectives make it clear that real world practice and application are vital components of true leadership development. While the internship experience should provide the necessary application and practice, further study should be conducted on the mentor/mentee relationships involved in agricultural leadership internship experiences to provide insight into planning the most beneficial pairings of student and internship organization.

As with program and internship objectives, the range of potential career paths was great. The panel identified careers in 22 different areas from the very specific (e.g., “FFA executive secretary”) to the broad (e.g., “governmental agencies”). One concern among faculty with the agricultural leadership degree is the future placement of graduates. Although a lengthy list helps to alleviate some of the
Concern for graduate placement, it appears leadership graduates can fill any number of positions available at the time of graduation. The career areas reaching the highest level of agreement may be helpful to consider as students and faculty identify potential internship areas. In addition, the identified career areas could prove useful in promoting undergraduate agricultural leadership programs to attract both participants and supporters.

This study implemented the recommendation of Diamond (1989) to solicit feedback from expert practitioners for the purpose of keeping curriculum current. In order to fully realize the feedback portion of the Program System Model (Finch & Crunkilton, 1999), further steps should be taken to assess perceptions of graduates of agricultural leadership programs. Additionally, impacts from the environment portion of the Program System Model should be addressed by consulting industry stakeholders. Considering the importance indicated for the internship portion of a leadership program and the plethora of potential career paths identified by panelists, further insight could be gained from an analysis of industry expectations pertaining to graduates from agricultural leadership programs. With the need for leadership skills in new graduates established (Crawford et al., 2011; Fritz & Brown, 1998), it is important to not become focused on eliminating the leadership void to the detriment of technical skills in new graduates. The proper balance needs to be defined, with input from industry and graduates of agricultural leadership programs, applied to the foundation developed in this study and implemented by faculty experts in agricultural leadership.
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Abstract

This study seeks to understand one facet of leadership development among the newest members of a Greek Letter community at a southern university. New Members (NMs) of the Greek Community at North Carolina State University were administered the Socially Responsible Leadership Survey (SRLS Guidebook, 2005) during the Fall, 2011. Results indicate this population perceived themselves as open to and able to commit to organizations while not being as comfortable with the idea of change. However, it should be noted that none of the constructs measured in the neutral or negative range. Results of this study could be used to assist in driving the mandatory programming provided by North Carolina State University’s Administration and Greek Life staff in an effort to create more purposeful and directed programming.

Introduction

Leadership is a tenant of Greek Letter Organizations (GLOs), whether stated in mission and vision statements or implicitly directed via New Member Programs. Students in Greek Life are directed to demonstrate their leadership abilities, whether it is with their philanthropy of choice, within their chapter, or within the larger university setting. Little is known, however, about the leadership competencies of students who choose to become involved in Greek Life. Their leadership potential is the future of their GLOs and the Greek Life system on any campus.

Because leadership is exhibited in many ways, and can be viewed and valued differently by differing cultures and disciplines, it can be described as a paradigm. Paradigms are patterns and ways of looking at things in order to make sense of
them (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998). Some interpret good leaders as being
verbal, self confident, clearly in charge, and also as those who direct followers.
Some see a leader as one who delegates and is involved with group discussion.
Some see leadership within a group, and not defined as an individual. Komives et
al. describes leadership as best defined by using a personal philosophy of
leadership and how to work effectively with others toward meaningful change.

New college or university students have ideas about leadership that may strongly
influence their leadership self-perception (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). Most higher
learning institutions tout leadership opportunities within the university. However,
these institutions rarely attend to the development of their students as leaders by
offering leadership development curricula (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, &
Burkhardt, 2001). This may be because there is not a clear picture of the
leadership status and disposition of students as they begin college. Knowing the
leadership development level of NMs could provide a clearer path for leadership
development curricula.

Nationally around 10% of college students are affiliated with a GLO (Greek Life,
2011). These organizations offer opportunities for learning and development
outside the classroom. As leadership development is a needed skill and
disposition for success in today’s society, it is also a goal for most fraternal
organizations.

Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

According to Astin (1993), the single most powerful source of influence on the
undergraduate student’s development is in the peer group. This interaction
strongly effects leadership development. Affiliation with fraternities and sororities
enhances the development of positive functioning interpersonal relationships
while facilitating the development of leadership skills and teaching teamwork
which fosters the interchange of ideas, promotes values clarification, and a sense
of autonomy and personal identity (“Fraternities/Sororities,” n.d.). Created for
college students, the Social Change Model (SCM) of Leadership Development
(SRLS Guidebook, 2005) provides the theoretical framework for this study. With
this model, change for the common good was achieved with the establishment of
eight core values enhancing students’ levels of self-awareness and ability to work
with others (Dugan & Komives, 2007). These values include:

- Consciousness of Self.
- Congruence.
- Commitment.
- Common Purpose.
- Collaboration.
• Controversy with Civility.
• Citizenship.
• Change.

The use of all these values in one instrument is found in the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS). Students tend to score highest in the Commitment construct and students tend to score lower in the constructs of Controversy with Civility and Citizenship (Dugan, 2006a, 2006b; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Dugan, 2008). To avoid unnecessary repetition and promote understanding, constructs are fully defined in the discussion section.

Nature of the Problem

Approximately 2,400 students (11%) participate in one of 53 GLOs at NC State (personal communication, 2011). Previous research shows membership in fraternal organizations has an impact on the leadership development of members (Astin, 1993). To provide a more focused view, one must start at the beginning of college student development. Assessing NMs provides a baseline of leadership dispositions of individuals who have not yet experienced the full array of Greek Life and GLO opportunities. To know what these students need assists in informing research and practice in this area.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine and interpret the self-perceived leadership values of NMs of GLOs at NCSU. By profiling NMs, a description of students’ leadership values can be determined based upon the results. The objective of the study was to describe the perceived leadership values of NMs of GLOs via the eight values of the Social Change Model.

The discussion section encourages use of these results to not only inform recommendations for NCSU GLOs, but GLOs across the country if their survey results indicate similar disposition levels. Additionally the findings contribute to the amassed results from previous and future replications of SRLS-R2 results. The wide spread use of this instrument and the pooling of results opens the door to an application of implications and recommendations that one institution’s individual study cannot statistically provide. This study contributes to this collection of results; therefore, it assists in informing the practice of GLOs in their leadership development efforts and also the greater leadership development field.
Methods

Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) stated the “purpose of surveys is to describe certain characteristics of a population” (p. G-3). Descriptive studies are often intended to shed light on a problem so that recommendations can be made. This study explores the leadership values NMs of GLOs believe they possess. This group is not specifically being compared to itself at another time, or another individual group (like an experiment).

The population for this study consisted of all NMs of Greek Life at NCSU during Fall 2011. The population frame was all 629 GLO NMs. A census sample of all 629 students was used in this study. Since the entire population was used, selection was not considered to be a threat to the validity of the study.

The design of the instrument was created by Tyree (1998) as a set of valid and statistically reliable scales that evaluate the eight values of the Social Change Model of Leadership (SCM) (SRLS Guidebook, 2005). Instrument validity was established by a group of students and leadership experts at the time of development. One question was inadvertently omitted upon survey delivery. A post-hoc reliability analysis was then conducted to estimate the reliability of the instrument. Cronbach’s alpha for all sections were found to be still within the acceptable range – Consciousness of Self (.71), Congruence (.81), Commitment, (.80), Collaboration, (.74), Common Purpose (.69), Controversy with Civility, (.64), Citizenship, (.87), and Change (.76).

Data was collected mid-semester in the Fall 2011 semester using an online survey research site. Data collection followed Dillman’s (2000) Tailored Design Method. A message with the informed consent document and the link for the study was sent to all 629 students. One week later a thank-you message was sent to those who had completed the questionnaire and requesting responses again from the rest. For four consecutive weeks after the initial email a thank you note and link was sent as a reminder.

Of the 629 NMs of GLOs a response rate of 43.8% was obtained. This is higher than the typical 27% response rate achieved with email surveys (Fraze, Hardin, Brashears, Smith, & Lockaby, 2002). Because the response rate was less than the 85% suggested by Lindner, Murphy, and Briers (2001), procedures for handling non-responders (Armstrong & Overton, 1977) were followed. In comparing early respondents (first three weeks) to late respondents (last three), there were no differences. The results are generalizable because the late responses are assumed to be similar to non-responses (Lindner & Wingenbach, 2002).
Data were exported from Qualtrics.com into SPSS 20.0 for Windows. Ordinal data were collected, with a rating system ranging from 1-5. Data were summarized in each construct using means and standard deviations. These researchers followed the protocol established by the instrument developers and subsequent researchers and kept the negatively worded items of the instrument and reverse coded where appropriate (Appel-Silbaugh, 2005; Dugan, 2006a, 2006b; Gehrke, 2008; Dugan 2008). This strategy is further supported by Price and Mueller (1986) who suggest mixing of positively and negatively worded questions so as to minimize the tendency of participants to circle the points toward one end of the scale. Some have argued the use of reverse scored items reduces response set bias.

**Results**

*Change* is “making a better world and a better society for oneself and others” (SRLS Guidebook, 2005, p. 4). The item range was 2.52-4.14. Students ranked “I am open to new ideas” as the highest within the construct, (4.14). Item “Transition makes me uncomfortable” rated lowest (2.52); however, as this is negatively worded it demonstrates students indicate disagreement that they were made uncomfortable by transition. (see Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I am open to new ideas.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I can identify the difference between positive and negative change.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>There is energy in doing something a new way.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I am comfortable initiating new ways of looking at things.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Change brings new life to an organization.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I look for new ways to do something.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Change makes me uncomfortable.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>New ways of doing things frustrate me.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Transition makes me uncomfortable.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

The construct of *Citizenship* is the ability to render leadership in a community setting; it describes how an individual becomes connected to the community through activity (SRLS Guidebook, 2005). The range of
the item mean scores, 4.05-4.23, was small. Students ranked “I participate in activities that contribute to the common good” as the highest item in the construct (4.23). The lowest ranked was “I believe I have a civic responsibility to the greater public” (4.05). (see Table 2)

Table 2
Students’ Perceptions of Overall Leadership Skills - Citizenship (n=276)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I participate in activities that contribute to the common good.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I have the power to make a difference in my community.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I give time to making a difference for someone else.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>I value opportunities that allow me to contribute to my community.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I work with others to make my communities better places.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I believe I have responsibilities to my community.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I am willing to act for the rights of others.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I believe I have a civic responsibility to the greater public.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

The Collaboration construct is defined as working with others, to multiply group effectiveness, by capitalizing on the various talents and diversity of members (SRLS Guidebook, 2005). The range for this construct was 3.92- 4.24. Students ranked “I enjoy working with others toward common goals” the highest (4.24). The lowest ranked item was “I am able to trust the people with whom I work,” (3.92). (see Table 3)
Table 3
Students’ Perceptions of Overall leadership Skills - Collaboration (n=276)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I enjoy working with others toward common goals.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I am seen as someone who works well with others.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I can make a difference when I work with others on a task.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Others would describe me as a cooperative group member.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I actively listen to what others have to say.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Collaboration produces much better results.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>My contributions are recognized by others in the group I belong to.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I am able to trust the people with whom I work.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

The construct of Commitment is defined as an individual having a significant investment in an idea or person (SRLS Guidebook, 2005). The range of this construct was close, 4.20-4.55. Students ranked “I am willing to devote time and energy to things that are important to me” the highest (4.55). It should be noted that this is the highest ranked item overall. Students ranked the item “I am focused on my responsibilities” as the lowest (4.20). (see Table 4)

Table 4
Students’ Perceptions of Overall Leadership Skills - Commitment (n=276)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I am willing to devote time and energy to things that are important to me.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I stick with others through the difficult times.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I can be counted on to do my part.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I follow through on my promises.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I hold myself accountable for responsibilities I agree to.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am focused on my responsibilities.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

The construct of Common Purpose is described as an individual’s ability to work in a group with shared aims and values to envision the groups’ purpose (SRLS Guidebook, 2005). The range for this construct was 3.93-4.33. Students ranked
the item “I support what the group is trying to accomplish” as the highest (4.33). Students ranked “I think it is important to know other people’s priorities” as the lowest (3.93). (see Table 5)

Table 5
Students’ Perceptions of Overall Leadership Skills - Common Purpose (n=276)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I support what the group is trying to accomplish.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I know the purpose of the groups to which I belong.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>It is important to develop a common direction in a group in order to get anything done.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I contribute to the goals of the program.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am committed to a collective purpose in those groups to which I belong.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Common values drive an organization.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I work well when I know the collective values of a group.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I have helped to shape the mission of the group.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I think it is important to know other people’s priorities.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

The construct of Congruence illustrates ability to act in ways consistent with values and beliefs. The range for this construct was 4.01-4.44. Students ranked “Being seen as a person of integrity is important to me” highest (4.44). The lowest item was “My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs.” (4.01). (see Table 6)

Table 6
Students’ Perceptions of Overall Leadership Skills - Congruence (n=276)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Being seen as a person of integrity is important to me.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I am genuine.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>It is easy for me to be truthful.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>My behaviors reflect my beliefs.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>It is important to me to act on my beliefs.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>My actions are consistent with my values.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My behaviors are congruent with my beliefs.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree
The construct of *Consciousness of Self* is awareness of personal beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate an individual to react (SRLS Guidebook, 2005). The construct range was 1.90-4.36. Students ranked the item “The things about which I feel passionate have a priority in my life” as the highest (4.36). The lowest score (1.90) was statement “I have low self esteem.” This is negatively worded, and indicates a rating demonstrating disagreement with students having low self esteem. (see Table 7)

Table 7
Students’ Perceptions of Overall Leadership Skills - Consciousness of Self (n=276)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The things about which I feel passionate have priority in my life.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I know myself pretty well.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am able to articulate my priorities.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I could describe my personality.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I am comfortable expressing myself.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am usually self confident.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I can describe how I am similar to other people.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Self-reflection is difficult for me.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have low self esteem.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

The construct of *Controversy with Civility* describes recognizing that differences in viewpoints are inevitable, and that these differences must be acknowledged civilly (SRLS Guidebook, 2005). The range of this construct was 2.29-4.34. Students ranked “I am open to others’ ideas” as the highest (4.34). Students ranked “I struggle when group members have ideas that are different than mine” as the lowest (2.29). As this is negatively worded, this score indicates a rating demonstrating disagreement that these students struggle when group members have ideas different than theirs. (see Table 8)
Table 8
Students’ Perceptions of Overall Leadership Skills - Controversy with Civility (n=276)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am open to others’ ideas.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I respect opinions other than my own.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I value difference in others.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>I share my ideas with others.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hearing differences in opinion enriches my thinking.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Creativity can come from conflict.</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Greater harmony can come out of disagreement.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I am comfortable with conflict.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I am uncomfortable when someone disagrees with me.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>When there is a conflict …, one will win and the other will lose.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I struggle when group members have ideas that are different than mine.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

In order to facilitate comparisons to previous research and better position this research to be placed in context, mean scores were calculated for each construct. (see Table 9)

Table 9
Construct Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Purpose</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness of Self (r)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Civility (r)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (r)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (r) denotes constructs that were re-coded due to negatively worded questions.
Discussion of Conclusions & Implications

All of the constructs in this study were highly scored by the respondents; with no score lower than a ranking of neutral. This finding is similar to other studies (Dugan, 2006a, 2006b; Gehrke, 2008; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008; Dugan & Komives, 2010; Dugan, 2008). Where improvement may be desired, recommendations are provided. To compare findings of this research to other studies, and place this research in context, the single digit mean score and construct rankings will be used for comparison and discussion.

Changes, is an individual’s comfort with change, not necessarily change itself; and was scored in the bottom third among constructs. This is consistent with other studies where change was among the lowest scoring constructs (Dugan, 2006a; Gehrke, 2008; Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008; Dugan, 2008). The mean for this construct was within neutral ranking (3.79) demonstrating that the population ranked themselves neither highly skilled nor deficient. However, because of the lower ranking, these students may perceive themselves as less comfortable with change.

The neutral score for change could be influenced by the students’ age and ability to see themselves as change agents. College is generally a time of self-exploration, a time to begin anew. As most NMs are freshmen, they are adjusting and changing to many new situations. It may be, with all the change in their lives, they may realize they don’t have a high degree of comfort with change. To become so, students could be encouraged to join organizations outside their comfort zone. This could lead to a greater comfort with change and become a mandatory facet of Greek Life at NCSU. Since change is often ranked in the low to mid-range within constructs, recommendations to increase comfort with change are likely to be appropriate at many universities. GLOs are well-suited to providing diversification of opportunities as well as role models who have survived the tumult of the first years of college.

Citizenship is the ability to render leadership in a community setting and how an individual becomes connected to the community through activity (SRLS Guidebook, 2009); and, was in the top third of the ranked mean scores (4.14). These results are different from some studies (Dugan, 2006a, 2006b; Dugan, 2008) but similar to others (Wedel, Goodman, Chen, & Wingenbach, n.d.; Dugan & Komives, 2010). These researchers concluded that providing leadership in a community setting and becoming connected to the community are highly perceived endeavors by this population.
The students’ score in the citizenship construct could be influenced by their age and lack of formal civic engagement. Encouragement to become involved with advocacy groups about which they are passionate, in order to experience working for the rights of others, is recommended. Further, service learning projects, particularly those with a community focus, can contribute to a growing sense of citizenship. For many, college life provides a broad introduction to opportunities and responsibilities regarding civic engagement. Most GLOs require a community service component to a member’s duties. Members have a pre-established civic duty, and through GLO guidance can grow, develop, and become impassioned about their community roles.

Collaboration is working with others, to multiply group effectiveness, by capitalizing on various talents and diversity of members (SRLS Guidebook, 2009); and, ranked near the middle of the mean scores. However, students still perceived themselves as collaborative because of the high score. Dugan and Komives (2010) found that collaboration is influenced by membership in clubs, GLOs, and sports, so it follows that this group scored collaboration as it did.

Interestingly, students indicated a level of neutrality when asked about trusting the people with whom they work. College forces students to work with many different people. Much like with change, students are learning to operate in an environment where ideas, opinions, and philosophies different than their own exist. Because of unfamiliarity with people with whom they interact, students may still be developing the skills needed for forming trustful relationships. The concepts of consensus, collaboration, and compromise could be demonstrated and should be developed in the successful GLOs. More needs to be done to support collaboration between each class of members. It is recommended to give these students the opportunity to utilize their collaborative skills, experienced members need to discuss with NMs how all can work together to improve the organization. As understanding and facilitating collaboration is a core tenet of much leadership theory and practice, GLOs are in a prime position to develop this disposition and therefore the leadership development strengths of their members.

Commitment is an individual having a significant investment in an idea or person (SRLS Guidebook, 2009); and, was the highest ranked construct (4.44). This is similar to Dugan, (2006a, 2006b), Gehrke, (2008), and Dugan (2008). The highest scored item of the instrument was also in this construct; students indicated a willingness to devote time and energy to things important to them (4.55). These students perceive themselves able to commit to organizations they value.

It is not surprising that this population rated the construct of commitment high. Greek Life, at its core, is a significant commitment for students. During recruitment, GLOs discuss and emphasize the membership obligations. NMs
make a conscious decision to join. Thusly, this population may be more likely to
be comfortable with the idea of commitment. Since commitment is a large
component of Greek Life, and the results of this study imply that this population
values commitment, the recommendation would be to continue the commitment
exercises and practices that have nurtured student commitment to GLOs.

*Common Purpose* is an individual’s ability to work in a group with shared aims to
envision the groups’ purpose (SRLS Guidebook, 2009); and, ranked in the top
third of constructs (4.18). This finding is similar only to Wedel, et al. (n.d.). These
students perceive themselves as willing to have shared aims and values, and
wanting to build a group vision.

Each GLO has a unique mission and goals. NMs are informed early on and are
expected to work alongside senior members to accomplish these goals. It is not
surprising that this construct was highly scored. Additionally, NMs have less
seniority in the organization, so are more likely to follow the leaders in the group,
which may seem like working toward common purpose. To facilitate the
cooperation of leadership among a variety of individuals, it is suggested that
programs on cooperation and synergy be made available for all GLOs. Group
projects should be encouraged. For example, instead of an individualized
competition during Homecoming, where a single sorority is paired with a single
fraternity, many groups could work together and contribute to a common
philanthropic goal instead of just a spirit competition. Activities related to
philanthropy, which requires all students to work toward a common goal, should
happen regularly to give students an opportunity to further hone skills.

*Congruence* is an individual value and illustrates one’s ability to act in ways
consistent with one’s values and beliefs; and, was ranked the second highest
leadership construct (4.23). These students perceive their actions are consistent
with their values.

College tends to be a time of discovery, where students are solidifying identity,
beliefs and values. In so doing, they are determining how their values are different
and separate, or similar, from those of their friends and family. In short, as they
affirm what their values are, that influences their ability to act on a value set.
Because this group also has a set of values from their particular GLO that is
consistently reinforced, this may contribute to their ability to act in conjunction
with their values. Though the rating was high, students should all be presented
with opportunities to discover their own unique identities and values. It is
recommended that NMs be encouraged to take advantage of programs that help
individuals discover their values, talents, and persona. GLOs should facilitate
programs that help members see how group mission, vision, and values can be
congruent with members’ personal values.
At its core *congruence* may be interpreted as one of the main non-academic goals of college. The years before are often filled with group-think and the peer pressure of running with the crowd. Adulthood requires a certain independence and individuality. Successful adults, and successful leaders, are able to be who they are; to demonstrate behaviors that coincide with their beliefs. Interestingly, GLOs may provide the safe setting needed for a student to develop the internal fortitude that is *congruence* and even integrity.

*Consciousness of self* is being aware of personal beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotions that motivate an individual to react (SRLS Guidebook, 2009); and, was scored in the middle third of the constructs (4.08). However, the score still indicates that students believe they know themselves well and are passionate about their priorities. The lowest scoring item on the questionnaire was in this construct, “I have low self-esteem.” This is negatively worded, which implies they do not have low self-esteem. GLOs seem to attract a certain type of student. Confidence is highly valued. It is not surprising that these students do not have low self-esteem. Since students perceive themselves as self confident, the recommendation would be to continue current practices that encourage consciousness of self.

*Controversy with civility* is recognizing that differences in viewpoints are inevitable, and that these differences must be handled civilly (SRLS Guidebook, 2009); and, was ranked in the middle third of the constructs (3.8). These results are consistent with Dugan (2006a, 2006b, 2008) where *Controversy with civility* scored similarly. This population, while neutral with regard to conflict, perceive themselves as open to others’ ideas.

Neutral scores may be attributed to the experience level this population, likely college freshmen. As individuals mature, behavioral expectations for dealing with conflict require a higher degree of civility, with which they may be unfamiliar. Provide programs that allow students to gain experience with appropriate confrontation skills. Conflict management, dealing with difficult people, negotiation skills, and listening programs could have a positive impact on the skill set of this group of students.

**Other Recommendations**

Recommendations for practice primarily focus on creating and providing additional leadership development opportunities for students. Recommendations for research include a longitudinal study to observe this population over time. This study should be replicated using this and other research designs, for example,
including a posttest or posttest/then to determine if there has been dispositional change. A look into other variables including race, gender, age, major, etc. within this population may further shed light into the nuances of the newest members of GLOs which leads to a greater ability to provide appropriate educational and growth opportunities. Finally, a qualitative study to describe in more depth the constructs would be beneficial.
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Abstract

This study examines Texas FFA officers’ perceptions regarding the traits and characteristics that good followers possess. A content analysis of officer responses to an open-ended question found that these young leaders have a limited level of understanding of what constitutes a good follower. Furthermore, female respondents placed a greater emphasis on supporting the leader and being respectful, whereas male respondents emphasized being a team player. Males also emphasized being involved in the chapter as a desirable trait more often than females. This suggests that females are more focused on ideas that are leader-supportive and males are more action driven. Males focused more on being a team player and achievement. The study demonstrates a need to emphasize followership in leader development and education curricula. Youth organizations with similar leadership development programs can better equip their future leaders with the knowledge needed to be a follower-focused leader by teaching them how to identify good followership. As youth organizations become more follower-
focused, failure to introduce followership instruction into the leadership classroom is a disservice to students.

Introduction

The study of leaders and leadership should not focus solely on the leader. The success of great leaders depends upon their ability to cultivate and develop effective followers (Lundin & Lancaster, 1990). However, research on followership is in its infancy (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). As followers become more informed, leaders must adapt and embrace the idea of having informed followers question their leadership authority (Brown, 2003). It is important that today’s leaders look to their follower’s needs, for if a leader is not meeting the needs of followers, a new leader might be given authority (Brown, 2003; Ricketts, 2009). Overlooking this aspect of leadership development is something the National FFA Organization has done as they focus on promoting quality leadership. Finding out how one of the largest leader producing youth organizations views followership can help us understand the lack of focus on followership in leadership development programs, especially those focusing on youth.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

Although students involved in the FFA Organization are exposed to a broad range of leadership developing activities, studies have shown a lack of follower-focus. Mullins and Weeks (2006) found that chapter officers rated the statements: “Leaders involve their followers in the group’s vision” and “They are quick to act, and show progress as it happens,” as the lowest ranked practices of leaders, demonstrating the lack of a shared chapter vision. Leadership is one of the three main components the FFA Organization looks to develop in its members.

In their mission statement the FFA states that it makes a “positive difference in the lives of students by developing their potential for premier leadership, personal growth, and career success through agricultural education” (National FFA, 2012, para. 1). In addressing the FFA mission statement, Croom (2004) describes the importance of good relationships, “without a network of supportive individuals, leaders often find leading a very difficult task…leaders possess positive character traits that encourage others to seek their leadership and be comfortable with it” (p. 10). The notion of a network of supportive individuals is at the very heart of what this study seeks to address. How students involved in such a leadership organization as the FFA take into account the role of followers can only add to their development as leaders.
Review of Literature

The term follower was adopted in the 1980s and distinctions were made between leader and manager, and follower and subordinate. Kelley’s (1988) initial article on the subject, *In Praise of Followers*, moved the discussion of followership onto the media radar. Kelley cites several themes in the followership literature including (a) the idea that followers and leaders are roles, not people, (b) followers are active, (c) followers and leaders need to share a common purpose, and (d) the existence of a relationship between leaders and their followers. In contrast, Baker (2007) prefers the term subordinates referring to Graham’s separation of the term from follower by the “degree of free choice that they exercise… subordinates followed orders because they feared punishment, had been promised rewards, or wanted to fulfill a contractual obligation” (p. 55).

In *The Power of Followership*, Kelley (1992) discusses the philosophical theories on why people decide to follow certain leaders rather than others; and, in general, why people may choose to be followers rather than leaders. To understand the concept of followership, it is important to define both followership and leadership. Brown (2003) defines followership as “the willingness of people to follow” (p. 68). Yukl (2010) defines leadership as “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives” (p. 7). In any organization there exists the paradigm of leader and follower.

Due to the rapid growth in access to information, leaders are no longer the sole source of information for their followers. Technological advances and the Internet allow followers to form networks and be as informed as their leaders (Chaleff, 2003). Because of this, followers have greater knowledge and input on leadership, voicing their opinions, and choosing which leader to follow (Brown, 2003).

Densten and Gray (2001) defined followership by examining the follower as a learner. Focusing on a group that they consider neglected, they provided insight into the parallel relationship between teacher-student and leader-follower. Several researchers including Kelley (2008) have suggested that followers must possess leadership qualities to be successful (Chaleff, 2003; Kelley, 2008; Tannoff & Barlow, 2002). However, research has mainly focused on the view of leader and lists behaviors to influence followers. Little research has been conducted on the followers’ response to their leader (Densten & Gray, 2001).

Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009) state that “leadership effectiveness is just as much a product of good followers as it is of good leaders” (p. 435). Kelley
(2008) explains that because leaders do not exist in a vacuum, follower focus is needed within leaders. Being a follower has typically been viewed as a negative trait because they are thought of after the leader. In reality, followers are electing the leaders themselves (Kelley, 2008; Ricketts, 2009). The romance of leadership and how followers have been seen as more of an output of leadership rather than an input is one of concern when studying followership.

Relating to his previous work, Kelley (2008) describes five basic styles of followership – sheep, yes-people, alienated, pragmatics, and star followers. He suggests sheep are passive and allow leaders to do the thinking, whereas yes-people, although still allowing the leaders to think, are positive and ready to act while alienated followers have negative energy and are skeptical about the leader’s suggestions. Pragmatics are known as people who want to maintain the status quo and will get to work once they see where the group is headed. Star followers think for themselves, are very active, and have a positive attitude.

The works of Kelley and Chaleff (Baker, 2007) are some of the first publications on followership. They are considered the main works on which the study of followership is based. The body of research on followership is still fairly limited (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009), especially that related to youth and college students.

Active followership is rooted in sociology and psychology, specifically in social exchange, attribution, and small group theories. The Leader-Member Exchange Model highlighted the relationship between the follower and leader. Baker (2007) refers to Meindl et al.’s research on leadership conducted in 1985, stating “people’s ‘infatuation’ with the romantic, heroic, mystical view of leadership might be necessary to sustain followership and to motivate individuals to respond to the organization’s needs and goals” (p. 55).

Ward and Ellis (2008) found that the two most influential predictors of why youth may follow a leader are social support and social status. Youth generally enter into a followership relationship to fill a social need. If someone is popular – having social status and support – others were more likely to try and have a relationship with this person as a leader. Youth desire to be independent from their parents; however, because they are not mature enough to be self-supporting emotionally, they tend to be more likely to engage in a follower relationship with other youth rather than one with adults. This helps them gain a positive self-identity, specifically when they are associated with others with higher social support and social status (Ward & Ellis, 2008).

Basing their research on self-determination theory, Ward, Lundberg, Ellis, and Berrett (2010) determined that adolescents liked leaders who would support
autonomy, competency, and relatedness. This could help youth development professionals understand youth followership so they could help youth to choose better leaders to follow. When youths follow their peers, it is usually a voluntary phenomenon; therefore, understanding what attracts youth to follow is a key in their development as potential leaders and followers.

Antelo, Prilipko, and Sheridan-Pereira (2010) surveyed both followers and leaders, and found that leaders and followers disagree on perceptions of some personal attributes of the followers. This shows just how important leader-follower communication is and how the perceptions of followership are something the leadership development field needs to address. The purpose of the study is to identify traits of good followers as perceived by Texas FFA chapter officers. The research objectives of this study are as follows:

- To determine if FFA officers understand what good followership is by their descriptors of a good follower.
- To determine if demographic variables influence how students describe good followers.

**Theoretical Foundation**

Several researchers have identified traits that they believe describe good followers. Kelly (1988) notes good followers first manage themselves well. They set their own goals and decide which roles they are to take in the greater context. Next, effective followers are committed to the organization. They also build on their competencies and apply them to making the greatest impact on the organization. Lastly, effective followers exhibit courage, honesty, and credibility.

Blackshear (2004) cites eight critical characteristics of exemplary followers:

- Willing to set ego aside and function as a team player.
- Self-empowered or internal locus of control with initiative and a willingness to act.
- Persists or has staying power.
- Entrepreneurial in approach and spirit with a focus on taking risk to accomplish results and doing what’s necessary to get things done.
- More proactive as a problem fixer rather than reactive as a problem identifier.
- Adaptable, flexible and capable to manage change.
- Optimistic or is positive in approach.
- Pursues continuous improvement and engages in personal development to achieve competence. (p. 9-10)
Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2009) describe follower competencies as falling into two categories: personal management and leader support. Components of the personal management competency are:

- Communication: being informed and giving reasoning behind your actions.
- Attitude: stay positive; self-motivated; having the right attitude.
- Etiquette: show respect for leader and organization, trustworthy, encourage confidence in others.
- Full accountability: responsible for results; follow up; using perspective in job decisions; do the job right.
- Decisions: provide support to leader decisions; maximize value when carrying out decisions.

The leader support competency includes:

- Leader goals: supporting leader and organizational goals.
- Rapport: small components that make for a strong, working relationship between leader and follower (i.e., celebrate successes, remind leader of events, or follow-up without being asked).
- Culture: being an active member and participating in culture of organization.
- Style: follower adapts to leader’s style; communication style, when meetings are held, etc.

Because their characteristics are clearly defined and student comments can be more easily compared, Hurwitz and Hurwitz’s (2009) two categories of follower competencies were chosen as the theoretical framework of this study.

**Methods**

The researchers studied a convenience sample of FFA chapter officers from 11 Texas FFA chapters. These 11 chapters represented eight of the 10 FFA districts in Texas. An open-ended question was posed to the FFA chapter officers surveyed. This open-ended question was part of a larger study and was previously pilot-tested with approximately 75 current FFA members. Officers were asked, “What are the characteristics of a good follower? List all characteristics you can think of.” Fifty-one officers responded to the open-ended question.
Table 1

| Characteristics of a Good Follower as Identified by TX FFA Chapter Officers (N=51) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Female                          | Male            | Total           |
| Listens well                    | 11              | Listens well    | 8               | 19              |
| Follows directions              | 9               | Follows directions | 8               | 17              |
| Respectful                      | 11              | Respectful      | 6               | 17              |
| Support leader                  | 12              | Support leader  | 3               | 15              |
| Team player/works well with     | 5               | Team player/works well with others | 8 | 13 |
| others                          |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Possess good moral character    | 8               | Possess good moral character | 5 | 13 |
| Provides input to leader/chapter| 4               | Provides input to leader/chapter | 6 | 10 |
| Involved in chapter             | 1               | Involved in chapter | 8 | 9 |
| Holds leader accountable        | 3               | Holds leader accountable | 5 | 8 |
| Is responsible                  | 5               | Is responsible  | 3               | 8               |
| Hard working                    | 2               | Hard working    | 5               | 7               |
| Has qualities of a leader       | 3               | Has qualities of a leader | 3 | 6 |
| Continuous learner              | 4               | Continuous learner | 1 | 5 |
| Trustworthy                     | 1               | Trustworthy     | 3               | 4               |

Note: FFA officers mentioned several other traits of followers, though less frequently than those described in Table 1. Some of those qualities included: being fair-minded; being outgoing; being reliable and loyal; and having humility. Two male respondents described followers in negative terms: “not a leader” and “passive.”

Student responses to the open-ended question were first tabulated into a list of individual traits by one of the researchers using deductive analysis (Earlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993). Each trait was coded with an M or F to denote male and female responses. The list was then reduced by combining like traits. Table 1 lists the 14 most common traits identified by the FFA officers in the study. The next step was to categorize each trait into one of Hurwitz and Hurwitz’s (2009) core competencies. As discussed earlier, they describe follower competencies as falling into two categories – personal management and leader support. They clearly describe the traits within each of these two categories. These descriptors were used to categorize the followership traits described by the FFA officers. The traits and categories were then peer reviewed by an expert in the field. According to Earlandson, et al. (1993), peer debriefing helps build credibility by having an outside perspective review the hypothesis and methods. The primary researcher and peer reviewer worked together to come to consensus on each categorization.
Findings

The 14 traits listed in Table 1 were categorized into Hurwitz and Hurwitz’s (2009) competencies. Examples of the personal management competency components found include:

- Communication: Provides input to leader and chapter.
- Attitude: Possess good moral character; has qualities of a leader.
- Etiquette: Listens well; respectful.
- Full Accountability: Is responsible; hard working; continuous learner.
- Decisions: Follows directions; Support leader.

Leader support competency components found include:

- Leader Goals: Team player and works well with others; holds leader accountable.
- Rapport: Trustworthy.
- Culture: Involved in chapter.
- Style: None

Conclusions

Objective one was to determine if FFA officers understand what good followership is by their descriptors of a good follower. Comparing the FFA officers’ survey responses with how researchers (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2009; Kelley, 2008) describe a good follower, it may be concluded that the officers have some sense of what consists of a good follower. As a whole, officers surveyed did not strongly indicate certain characteristics of a good follower to be important. The most frequently mentioned characteristic, listens well, was only reported by 19 of the 51 respondents. Kelly (1988) notes that good followers first manage themselves well, set their own goals and decide which roles they are to take in the greater context, are committed to the organization, build on their competencies and apply them to making the greatest impact on the organization, exhibit courage, honesty, and credibility. Of Kelley’s good follower attributes, FFA officers only slightly touched on the commitment to the organization and exhibiting things like courage, honesty, and credibility. At least one officer noted the idea that followers should possess some leadership qualities. Several researchers have suggested that followers must possess leadership qualities to be successful (Chaleff, 2003; Kelley, 2008; Tanoff & Barlow, 2002). Blackshear (2004) also cites eight critical characteristics of exemplary followers, only one of which the officers’ provided in their responses – willing to function as a team player.

Officers did mention a number of the Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2009) follower competencies. This demonstrates that the FFA officers surveyed had a general
understanding of the competencies required of a good follower. Personal management and leader support were both touched on by the officers. All personal management competency components were mentioned, and all but one of the leader support competency components were mentioned. The leader support competency component of style was not mentioned by the respondents. The personal management component of full accountability had the most responses mentioned; however, is responsible, hard working, and continuous learner were among the least mentioned characteristics.

Objective two was to determine if demographic variables influence perceptions of followership. Female and male respondents both agreed that a good follower should listen well and follow directions. These two characteristics were in the top four described. Female respondents placed a greater emphasis on supporting the leader and being respectful, whereas male respondents emphasized being a team player and working well with others. Males also emphasized being involved in the chapter as a desirable trait more often than females. This suggests that females are more focused on the aspects of followership that are leader-supportive and males are more task oriented or action driven. Males want to focus more on being a team and achievement.

**Recommendations**

Findings from this data show a need to emphasize followership in leader development and education curricula. Followers have the power to grant leadership, so understanding the characteristics of good followers can add to the leader’s efficiency (Brown, 2003). Kelley (2008) and Ricketts (2009) note the importance of followers, and how they elect the leaders. Being able to identify the types of followers, as determined by Kelley’s (1988) followership theory and model of follower behavior, could greatly enhance the knowledge base which leaders receive in a leadership development experience.

Youth organizations with similar leadership development programs like the FFA can better equip their future leaders with the knowledge needed to be a follower-focused leader by teaching them how to identify good followership. As the importance of follower focus and followership becomes increasingly important, failure to introduce followership instruction into the leadership classroom is a disservice to students (Johnson, 2009).

All leadership educators, not just agricultural science teachers, could integrate followership into their teaching. FFA officers surveyed showed they had limited understanding of characteristics of a good follower. This lack of followership understanding could be improved by incorporating more follower-focus into
leadership development by integrating Kelley’s (1988; 1992; 2008) theory of followership and model of follower behavior. Agricultural science teachers could include followership teaching in the classroom as part of the leadership curriculum already included in the classroom. Teaching Kelley’s (1988) five basic styles of followership (i.e., sheep, yes-people, alienated, pragmatics, and star followers), could increase leaders’ knowledge of how to more effectively lead the followers within their company, organization, or other context.

As research abounds on their relationship, it is undeniable that the two concepts of leadership and followership are a co-dependent relation – one cannot exist without the other (Brown, 2003; Heller & Van Til, 1982; Hollander, 1992; Kellerman, 2007; Kelley, 1988, 1992, 2008; Pilipko, Antelo, & Henderson, 2011; Ricketts, 2009). A good leader should be able to learn what their followers want, be a good listener, and bring about results (Brown, 2003; Ricketts, 2009).

It is recommended that additional research be conducted across other youth leadership development programs to assess youth leaders’ knowledge and attitudes regarding followership as well as those of youth leadership development instructors.
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Abstract

Leadership has been deeply studied in the literature; however, little research exists studying the role of volunteer peer leaders in non-formalized leadership roles in membership-based organizations. This phenomenological study was designed to explore the experience of beef industry leaders in leadership roles. Twelve active beef industry volunteer leaders were interviewed and described their experience as leaders. Industry leadership was defined from study themes as a role fulfilled by someone who is willing to serve their industry, with the best of the industry in mind and taking on the responsibility and challenges that come along with making decisions to serve and speak for their peers with integrity. Seven themes identified the central phenomenon and seven traits of beef industry leaders were identified. This study offers significance to the field of leadership; to the beef industry; and to agricultural organizations that may guide developing future leaders.

Introduction

The beef industry is facing some of the most challenging times ever. Intensified competition in the meat case, ever-changing international markets, private interest groups questioning production methods, low prices, high input costs, increased regulations on land, water and food safety issues, aging producers, and policy issues that can impede current production are all providing challenges for the industry (Armbasurer, Halbrook, & Thompson, 2006; Field, 2010; Olynk, Tonsor, & Wolf, 2010; Otto & Lawrence, 2001).
Regulations and specific production practices can be costly for producers to implement, often with little return. In a volatile industry impacted by the political agenda, there is no guarantee grassroots beef producers are protected or their best interests kept in mind in the development or implementation of new legislation. In order to keep one’s business viable, the beef industry requires cooperation or minimal interference from local, state and national governments (Catchings & Wingenbach, 2006).

To represent the needs of the producers to state and national legislative bodies, a unified voice is critical and volunteer association members will be challenged to provide the necessary leadership. There are many people and organizations involved in grassroots issues (Kellogg Foundation, 1993) including agricultural and beef industry organizations.

The role of agricultural organizations is to address issues that will directly and indirectly impact the livelihood of its members. Without solid, dedicated individuals in leadership roles, reaching organizational goals may be limited. Members are the lifeblood of organizations and their leadership, typically on a voluntary basis, is called upon to assist the organization with decision making and setting future goals and vision.

A Kellogg Foundation (1993) study of grassroots leadership determined grassroots leaders are those who share identifiable characteristics to affect change and are motivated and rewarded by their commitment and service. The study concluded that when communities are truly intentional about grassroots leadership many benefits result, such as (a) more people get involved in all levels, (b) new leaders have access to support; a pipeline of new leaders is developed, (c) long-term leaders continue to grow and are renewed, (d) new talent is developed for mainstream leadership positions, and (e) more of a grassroots perspective is present in business, non-profit, and government management.

Research suggests a need for more effective beef industry leadership. Purcell (2002) studied the challenges facing the beef industry and how the industry can address these challenges to survive after an 18-year decline in demand for beef. Purcell’s (2002) prescription for a healthy beef industry includes more adequate beef industry leadership.

Beef industry leaders today are challenged to be the voice of their industry during difficult times (Field, 2008; Speer, 2008). This voice comes in the form of volunteers within the industry who serve on committees or boards of industry organizations, such as state or national cattlemen organizations. This volunteer role is vital for the support of the organization and the ability of the organization to
meet their mission and goals (Mathews & Carter, 2010). As organizations become more aware of volunteers as a resource and how to efficiently utilize volunteers, organizations have gained interest in ways to improve recruitment, training, motivation, and retention (Handy & Hustinx, 2009).

Leadership offers advantages for the individuals themselves. Individuals who take on the role of serving on boards or committees commit themselves to participate in a meaningful way and function as a catalyst for change and the result can be a highly rewarding experience. Those willing to take on leadership roles distinguish themselves among their peers and begin the process of developing as true leaders (Korngold, 2006).

Studies focused on current and emerging leaders in the beef industry (Purcell, 2002) and leadership development and education of volunteer leaders in agricultural organizations has only taken place on a limited scale (Mathews & Carter, 2010; Carter & Rudd, 2006). In conjunction with a land-grant university or other educational institutions, several states have initiated formal leadership development programs to prepare adult leaders in agriculture; however, these leadership programs focus primarily on leadership skill development (Hejny, 2010). Limited research has been conducted to study what brings a person to leadership, especially leaders in non-formal leadership roles.

**Theoretical Framework**

Burns (1978) identified two types of political leadership – transactional and transformational. Transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of something that is valued. Leaders will approach followers with a focus on the exchange. Burns (1978) believed that transformational leaders have the ability to elevate followers into leaders. Transformational leadership differs from transactional leadership as it focuses on the personal values and beliefs of the leaders rather than an exchange of items between the leader and follower (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

Bass (1985) who also studied transformational and transactional leadership described transactional leaders as those focused on achievement of personal or organizational outcomes and transformational leadership as superior leadership performance. In his further comparison of transformational and transactional leadership, Bass (1990a, 1990b) found transformational leaders (a) to be more effective, (b) have better relationships with their supervisors, and (c) make more of a contribution to the organization. In addition, followers exert more effort on behalf of transformational managers than transactional managers. Also,
transformational leaders are more likely to be viewed as effective leaders than transactional leaders.

Barker (1997) believed there was value in focusing on the abilities and characteristics of leaders because this would be effective for the development of leadership training programs. The most common component across the definitions of leadership is that leadership is an influence process assisting followers (individuals) in reaching a common goal (Northouse, 2010).

An early theory in the field of leadership focused on traits. Stogdill’s 1948 and 1974 studies (as cited in Northouse, 2010) were conducted to identify traits that set individuals in leadership roles apart from other average individuals. Northouse summarized the primary traits found in leadership research studies to be intelligence, self-confidence, integrity, determination, and sociability.

With the focus on behavior rather than traits, Kouzes and Posner (2002) developed a model of leadership stemming from their focus on transformational leadership in their attempts to describe a leader. They constructed a model with five fundamental practices of leadership – model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart.

In his essay, The Servant as a Leader, Greenleaf (1977) launched a leadership movement wherein great leaders are servants first. Servant leadership is dramatically different than the traditional perspective studied. With servant leadership the focus is (a) involving others in the decision making process, (b) demonstrating a caring, (c) ethical behavior, (d) interest in the growth of employees (followers), and (e)the success and improvement of the organization (Spears, 2010). Based on Greenleaf’s (1977) original work, Spears (2010) identified 10 characteristics of a servant leader:

- Listening
- Empathy
- Healing
- Awareness
- Persuasion
- Conceptualization
- Foresight
- Stewardship
- Commitment to growth of people
- Building community
Most of the research on leadership takes place within the field of organizational development, measuring leadership in a business setting where a manager has oversight over an employee or employees. As a result, the terminology of leader and follower is used as the basis in studying and researching leadership. Transformational, transactional, and servant leadership are all based around the common workplace setting. With limited resources on leadership in a non-formalized setting, this study will open the door for more research in this field.

**Volunteer Leaders**

Volunteers are vastly different than employees because they are not rewarded with pay or direct financial benefits for their work (Peters, 2010). About 44% of volunteers became involved with their main organization after being asked to volunteer, most often by someone in the organization, and 40.9% became involved due to their own initiative to volunteer (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). Musick and Wilson (as cited by Handy & Hustinx, 2009) noted volunteerism is a form of work because it demands skills and competencies. Education was identified as the most consistent and important predictor of volunteering, but other relevant resources were income, occupation, free time, health, gender, and race.

Additional studies focusing on motivation and roles of volunteers used as a framework for this study found the importance of volunteers:

- Understanding their roles to be a determinant in a member’s willingness to serve (Carter & Rudd, 2006; Van Til, 1988).
- Goals being in line with that of the organization (Hinkle, Fox-Cardamonde, Haseleu, Brown, & Irwin, 1996; Martinez & McMullin, 2004).
- Having the opportunity to offer their talents and had a belief they owed their service to their industry (Kajer as cited in Carter & Rudd, 2005).

While leadership has been extensively studied in the formal organizational development setting, little is known about leadership in non-formal membership-based organizational settings where individuals are volunteer industry leaders serving their peers.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to explore beef industry leaders in formal positions of industry membership organizations. The central research question was: What is
industry leadership to beef industry leaders? More specifically, the study researched the following sub-questions:

- How do industry leaders characterize industry leadership?
- How do industry leaders explain the process to become an industry leader?
- How do industry leaders describe what influenced them to become leaders within the industry?

Methods

This study utilized a qualitative approach to explore the phenomenon of beef industry leaders in order to understand industry leadership within the industry. The research relied on interviews of identified individuals using broad, general questions to explore the problem and to learn from the participants, the participants’ experience, and how they interpret the experience (Richards & Morse, 2007; Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2010). The data was later analyzed to determine themes (Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2010).

Because the purpose of the study was to understand an essence of the phenomenon (Richards & Morse, 2007; Hatch, 2002); therefore, a phenomenological qualitative study was chosen from Creswell’s (2007) five qualitative study traditions. All participants shared the common experience of the phenomenon as they were volunteer leaders serving in leadership roles for a beef industry organization. Moustakas’ (1994) two primary questions to determine the appropriate model were used as a basis to also determine the focus of the study as a phenomenological study. The study sought to gain a greater understanding of the meaning of leadership and what brings people to leadership. Thus, the phenomenological method was the best for seeking to explain and understand leadership in the beef industry.

To provide an acceptable sample size for a qualitative study (Creswell, 2007; Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2010; Richards & Morse, 2007), 12 men and women actively serving in leadership roles for beef cattle industry membership organizations were selected to participate in the study. The individuals were intentionally selected. Using homogenous sampling techniques (Creswell, 2008), they were of similar type because all participants were leaders in a beef industry membership organization at the national level. Organizations included either the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association or a seed stock beef cattle membership organization such as the American Angus Association. The number of leadership roles was not a determining factor in selecting interview participants; however, they had to be active on at least one committee or board to create similarity across all participants.
Criteria to differentiate the participants followed maximal variation sampling (Creswell, 2007). Leaders who varied in age, gender, geographical location, and sector of the industry (e.g., seed stock; commercial cow/calf; backgrounder/stocker or feedlot) were identified. The study aimed for a balance of genders, although had to take into consideration the dominance of men in the agricultural field. Of the 12 participants, nine were male and three were female. They represented 11 different states. There were two seed stock industry representatives, four from the cow/calf segment of the industry, two representing the backgrounder/stocker industry, and four feedlot segment representatives. Strong emphasis was placed on selecting leaders who made their livelihood primarily from the beef cattle industry and were actively involved in production agriculture. Eleven of the participants matched the selection criteria. One participant indicated that in addition to the family’s ranching business, the individual was employed in a full-time position in agriculture/livestock production.

A set of broad questions was developed for data collection to elicit broad responses from the participants (Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2010; Richards & Morse, 2007). Geographical limitations presented in this study necessitated interviews being conducted via telephone. The interviews averaged 60 minutes in length, ranging from 40 to 90 minutes. All participants were asked the same six questions from the interview protocol form and asked predetermined probing questions (Creswell, 2007). Additional questions were only asked to clarify a point. The interviews were transcribed for coding. Additional notes taken during the interviews were also documented. Collection of data occurred between February 27 and March 10, 2011.

Participants were invited to take part in the research study via an initial email letter explaining the project and then a follow up phone call or email to determine their acceptance to be a participant. The participants were asked to sign the consent form and fax it back to the researcher. The researcher verbally reviewed the consent form with the participant prior to conducting the interview to make sure the participant did not have any final questions about the project. All participants returned the consent form.

The study was pre-approved by the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of the researchers’ universities in order to assure ethical management of the study. All aspects of the study were reported and approved by the appropriate IRB prior to the start of data collection.
Identifying Themes

Significant statements and meanings about the phenomenon were analyzed and reported as the themes and what was experienced (Plano-Clark & Creswell, 2010). To identify themes, the researcher read the 12 verbatim transcripts several times to obtain an overall feeling for the data. Significant phrases and sentences were identified and coded to formulate meanings and were clustered together by common themes (Moustakas, 1994). A rigorous examination of the data was conducted to gain a greater understanding of the central phenomenon. All the themes were in vivo – directly from the interviews of the participants. The transcripts were analyzed using the software program MAXqda. MAXqda allowed the researcher to conduct initial coding, highlight quotes, and provide a rich, thick description of the research study participant responses (Creswell, 2007). From the hand-coding for themes and the integration of the software analysis, the results were incorporated into an in-depth description of the phenomenon.

Validating Results

Because the study was conducted as qualitative research, the focus was on understanding the information expressed by the participants, rather than validations of a quantitative nature. Referencing Creswell’s (2007) eight strategies of validation used in qualitative studies, the researcher conducted clarifying researcher bias, member-checking, using rich, thick descriptions, and peer review.

The researcher conducted member checking of the data to validate the results. All participants were provided the opportunity to review the transcripts for validity and credibility and they were asked to make changes or add information. Two of the participants requested to see their interview transcripts, the remaining 10 participants chose not to review the transcripts. Of the two who reviewed the transcripts, one participant contacted the researcher with corrections in spellings and acronyms, the second participant did not indicate any needed changes. Participant names were changed to pseudonyms and any information that could identify the participant was removed or altered so as to be unidentifiable. The format of this study did not allow for the participants to review the other existing data and analysis without breaching confidentiality of the data.

Rich, thick descriptions were used as an additional data validation method. Detailed participant responses to the questions, including direct quotes, were provided in the findings. In the final step of the data analysis, an essence was written to explain the central phenomenon – what the participants experienced and
how they experienced it. Peer review was conducted by a seasoned academic researcher to further validate the interpretations of the themes and conclusions drawn from the qualitative data by the primary researcher.

Findings

Using the central question – “What is industry leadership to beef industry leaders?” – for analysis of transcripts and the researcher’s notes, the data revealed seven primary themes:

- The world is run by those who show up.
- Represent what is best for the industry.
- Be willing to carry the bucket.
- Gained while giving.
- Have innate leadership abilities.
- A natural progression.
- Selected by your peers.

Theme One: The world is run by those who show up. This was a popular statement heard among the participants. This statement summarized to them that! you cannot be a leader if you do not show up or you cannot have a say in the future of the beef industry if your voice is not heard. Those who show up are willing to serve, volunteer, get active, and be dedicated to the future of the industry. If they want to be part of the decisions made impacting the future of the beef industry then they needed to be present for the discussions. For some of the other participants, they did not reference this statement specifically, but they identified the importance of showing up at meetings, taking part, and giving of their time.

Theme Two: Represent what is best for the industry. The participants clearly identified their pride for their role in the beef industry and how seriously they take their role of working with other producers to enhance and impact the future of the industry. They have high expectations of leaders in the beef industry to represent the industry to the best of their ability and for someone who is willing to put the goals of the organization/industry first. The participants also expected this of themselves as they served in a leadership role. The participants believed in order to have confidence in a leader they must feel self-assured that the chosen leader has the best interest of the beef industry at heart.

Theme Three: Be willing to carry the bucket. This statement was made in reference to a leader who is willing to carry the bucket (of water) – regardless of how heavy the bucket may be. The participants emphasized the role of a leader as being a decision-maker. The responsibility of being the decision-maker is a huge
one as described by the participants. The participants discussed the importance of a leader who can make decisions, even in cases when there are tough or unpopular decisions to be made. In efforts to make these decisions, leaders were described as those who must be able to see the big picture and steer the organization forward. In essence, the leader is challenged to be pushing the envelope and doing this requires taking a stand and making tough decisions.

Theme Four: Gained while giving. The beef industry has been described as an industry that often sees ranches and businesses passed down from generation to generation within families; however, three of the participants indicated they did not grow up in the business they were actively pursuing as their livelihood. Taking this into consideration, all of the participants expressed the importance of giving back to the industry. Taking the time to volunteer and give back to the industry allowed these participants to gain more and new knowledge, build relationships with fellow beef producers, and have opportunities they would not have experienced otherwise.

Theme Five: Have innate leadership abilities. The leaders described by the study participants had characteristics or traits that were reflective of many strong abilities and characteristics that allowed them to succeed as leaders. Traits recognized were trustworthy, respectful, integrity, responsible, knowledgeable, great listener, and dedicated. They were describing a leader with character and one who displayed effortless and innate abilities that provided that substance of the leader. They were leaders the participants looked up to, but they were also ordinary people who mixed together abilities resulting in personal charisma and that made those in the industry believe and trust in the leader.

Theme Six: A natural progression. It was obvious that being a leader was not on the To Do list of these participants. They did not have a set plan or timeline where they said their goal was to be the president of the state cattlemen’s group. Rather, their rise to leadership occurred through a process of natural progression. In all cases, the leaders started to get active in their organizations whether they were recruited or started to volunteer for roles. As their dedication and time commitment grew within the organizations, they found their role snowballing into more and more leadership roles. This theme also related to the second sub-question to identify how the process to leadership occurred.

Theme Seven: Selected by their peers. Several participants mentioned how unique the leadership process is in the beef industry because the leaders are selected by their peers. In typical traditional leadership positions, management selects the leader and the leader then becomes responsible for one or more followers. That is not the case in volunteer membership organizations like state cattlemen or national cattlemen organizations. Rather, leaders are selected by their
peers to move into leadership roles or in some cases recruited by their fellow association members and asked to serve in a committee or board role. Once in leadership roles, leaders worked with their peers to make industry decisions, and although the responsibility of leading rested on the shoulders of the selected leader, the significant difference in levels of authority as seen in the traditional leader-follower setting does occur with peer leaders.

Traits of a Beef Industry Leader

The second objective of the study was to determine how industry leaders characterized industry leadership. The first sub-question focused on hearing how participants characterize industry leadership. The participants were asked to define or describe a leader. Responses included terms or phrases like (a) forward thinker, (b) know the facts, (c) accountability, (d) accept the consequences of the decisions, (e) true to their convictions, (f) great listeners, (g) constant communicator, and, (h) be able to work with others. Participants’ descriptions of the perfect leader revealed a person with character and integrity; one who they would be proud to say represents their industry. The participants emulated leaders who were respectful and had their heart in the right place (i.e., to represent the industry the best they could). These characteristics allowed participants to trust the leaders, follow them, and have confidence in their ability to make the right decisions and stand by their decisions.

The traits acknowledged in the study led to the identification of seven characteristics of an agricultural leader. Listed in order of emphasis placed by the participants those traits are:

- Willingness to serve
- Decision maker
- Believe in Industry
- Knowledgeable
- Ability to listen/communicator
- Team player/motivator
- Integrity/character

Identifying these traits also provided insight into the fifth theme of the overall study – Have innate leadership abilities.

Sources of Motivation

The third objective of the study focused on the source of motivation to become a leader. The third sub-question asked, “How do industry leaders describe what influenced them to become leaders within the industry in order to determine their
motivation to being a leader?” The most common answers were “to give back to
the industry that supports their livelihood” and because “they are proud of the
industry.” Participants were influenced to be leaders because “I care about the
industry,” “my life depends on it (the industry),” “to get involved and speak up on
the issues and out of concern for the future of the industry,” and “if it’s an
industry you are passionate about you want to make it better.”

The participants were motivated by a purpose – the purpose to speak up for their
industry, to guarantee a future for the next generation, to stand up against outside
influences that may be trying to bring the industry down or because their feedlot
or ranch has been in the family for generations, and pride has been instilled in
them to produce safe, wholesome food. Pride created a purpose as well as
concern. If these leaders did not stand up for the industry then who would? Some
of the leaders were influenced and encouraged by mentors, some had leadership
skills and abilities instilled in them during their tenure in the military, and some
had observed leaders who they greatly respected.

Conclusions

This qualitative study sought to explore leadership traits prevalent in beef
industry leaders, identify influences and motivators of the individuals serving in
leadership roles for their organizations, and further analyze the structure of the
industry and how leaders become leaders in such a setting. A common definition
of industry leadership was developed by the researcher. That is, “A role fulfilled
by someone who is willing to serve their industry, with the best of the industry in
mind and taking on the responsibility, and challenges that come along with
making decisions to serve and speak for their peers with integrity.”

This study identified qualities and characteristics similar to those found in trait
approach research (Stogdill as cited in Northouse, 2010) and were closely aligned
to the five central traits identified by Northouse (2010). The participants spoke
often about respect, garnering respect, and being respectful. Northouse indicates
integrity leads to respect and study data suggest the beef industry leaders have this
same interpretation.

Study participants described beef industry leaders as ones who start at the ground
level, a trait consistent with servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977; 1991).
Participants started their involvement in leadership by volunteering and getting
active at the local level with beef membership organizations, becoming better
equipped to be leaders from the experiences and skills they learned. As the
participants discussed their views of leadership, they related very similar thoughts
to Spear’s (2010) description of servant leaders, which include focusing on others
in the decision making process, demonstrating a caring and ethical behavior, and interest in the success and improvement of the organization.

Barbuto and Wheeler’s (2006) altruistic dimension of servant leadership was identified as one’s desire and willingness to serve others and is directly aligned to the first theme identified in the study, “The world is run by those who show up.” Beef industry leaders are willing to serve their industry and do so because of the pride and belief they have for their industry and this demonstrates a dimension of servant leadership. The participants’ interest in serving because of their altruistic calling was also congruent with what researchers found as to why individuals volunteer. Empowered volunteers have a desire to make a difference (Peters, 2010), which is supported by the findings from this study where beef industry leaders were empowered to step forward and represent the industry to the best of their ability, remembering that their ability to lead impacted not only the industry but the viability of their peers’ businesses.

Implications

Agricultural industry organizations, which are primarily membership-based, are structured to provide members with a legislative voice at the local, state and national level and influence governmental policy (National Grange, 2010). Volunteer leaders fill the roles of committee and board members to represent these organizations. This study offers significance to the field of leadership, to the beef industry, and to agricultural organizations. The beef industry is a viable economic driver for the United States (NASS, 2010). Beef producers rely on beef production for their livelihood and consumers rely on beef for consumption. A greater understanding of industry leadership will provide direction and support to organizations who rely on volunteer leaders to be the decision-makers, facilitators, and representatives of their industry on legislative, economic, social, and production issues.

The results of this study can direct practical implications in the area of leadership and beef industry leader development such as transitioning leadership from one generation to the next, educational leadership training, recruitment and development, clarification of roles for volunteer leaders, the process for volunteers to serve as industry leaders, a greater understanding of leaders in a non-formalized system, and the role of leaders in membership-based organizations.

Insights gained from this study will be most helpful to organizations led by volunteer leaders selected by their peers. This study offers a valuable contribution to the field of research on volunteer peer leaders. Peer leadership is unique to the
more commonly studied leadership in formalized settings such as in the corporate business world, and this study helps explain why individuals are willing to assume peer leadership roles (i.e., leading their peers) and the expectations of being in a peer leadership role.

This study provides a research basis for beef industry leaders in regards to the trait approach, the styles of leadership (e.g., servant, transformational), sources of motivations, and overall outline of what is industry leadership. Agricultural industry organizations could incorporate some of these foundations discussed and discovered in this study into their organizational structure to aid them in developing and educating leaders, selecting leaders and retaining leaders.
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Abstract
One of the major foci of universities in relation to the educational missions is to promote the growth and development of students as leaders. This article discusses the role of academic advising as a strategic partner with classroom and extra-curricular leadership development programs. To that end, this article reviews the roles of academic advising in higher education and discusses the viability of expanding these roles to include the role of advisor as leadership educator. In so doing, I provide a review of the literature related to student leadership development, discuss the similarity in advising outcomes and leadership development outcomes, and examine how the roles of academic advisors in higher education relate to leadership development as well as how advisors can become intentional leadership educators.

Introduction
Across the United States, universities and colleges have taken up the agenda of promoting the development of future leaders (Komives et al., 2011). Some are doing so through the development of curricular programs in leadership. Others focus on co-curricular efforts. Some combine these efforts intentionally, others haphazardly. Regardless, the importance of leadership development on campuses has reached what is likely an all-time high and this trend does not appear to be ending soon. Leadership is important. In our current society, which has been identified by some as experiencing a leadership crisis (Greenleaf, 1996; Russell, 2000), it is likely the key to our future. Thus it makes sense that universities increasingly strive to promote its development. However, if they wish to do so, and do so successfully, they will need to tap into all of the resources of the university, especially those with potential for making significant contributions to this effort (Guthrie & Thompson, 2010; Komives et al., 2011). The purpose of this paper is to examine the potential contribution of one of the frequently overlooked strategic partners in the leadership development equation. This paper
examines the connection between student leadership development and academic advising.

**Academic Advising**

Academic advising is a conceptual chameleon. It changes colors to match its environment. Thus, while there are many aspects of academic advising that remain constant across a variety of academic contexts, the significant differences that emerge make it difficult to develop a firm definition of advising. Consequently, numerous definitions of advising have been developed that prove relevant for some advising contexts, but not for others (NACADA, 2003). Therefore, none of these have received universal acceptance. In response to this challenge, the National Academic Advising Association (2006) commissioned a task force to develop a universally acceptable definition. The result was a statement regarding academic advising which suggests:

> Academic advising is integral to fulfilling the teaching and learning mission of higher education. Through academic advising, students learn to become members of their higher education community, to think critically about their roles and responsibilities as students, and to prepare to be educated citizens of a democratic society and a global community. Academic advising engages students beyond their own world views, while acknowledging their individual characteristics, values, and motivations as they enter, move through, and exit the institution. Regardless of the diversity of our institutions, our students, our advisors, and our organizational structures, academic advising has three components: curriculum (what advising deals with), pedagogy (how advising does what it does), and student learning outcomes (the result of academic advising).

(p. 7)

While this statement and the document in which it is embedded do not formally define advising, because the diverse functional nature of advising makes it difficult to universally define, there is general agreement that like teaching, academic advising possesses a pedagogy, curriculum, and specific desired outcomes.

Within each of the components of advising there exist multiple perspectives. Regarding pedagogy, advising can be viewed as largely prescriptive or entirely developmental or a combination of both (Crookston, 1972). In some cases it has been categorized based on how developmental it is (Shane, 1981). The curriculum and desired outcomes are debated as well, should advising deal with just academic development and related outcomes, such as critical thinking, or should
it focus more broadly on career and personal development (Dickson & McMahon, 1991; Hemwell & Trachte, 1999; Lowenstein, 1999). Within the broad spectrum of possibilities, and with particular emphasis on the nature of this article, the following roles of advisors seem appropriate and valid for consideration:

- The advisor as developmental professional.
- The advisor as teacher.
- The advisor as career counselor.
- The advisor as coach.
- The advisor as guidance counselor.
- The advisor as advocate.
- The advisor as mentor.

Obviously not all advisors will fulfill all of these roles; nonetheless, it is likely that most will fill some if not a majority of these. Furthermore, each of these roles, as will be discussed later, provides a perspective on how academic advising can contribute to the encouragement, education, and development of students as leaders. Consequently, these roles will be examined briefly in more depth.

**The Advisor as Developmental Professional**

One of the most discussed and debated roles of academic advisors is that of developmental professional (Chickering, 1994; Creamer, 2000; Hagen & Jordan, 2008; Purdee, 1994; Ramos, 1994; Winston Jr., 1994). According to this perspective, the role of an advisor is to facilitate the broader holistic growth of students in up to nine-dimensions of development: intellectual, life planning, social, physical, emotional, sexual, cultural, spiritual, and political (Dickson & McMahon, 1991). This is accomplished through holistic counseling practices.

**The Advisor as Teacher**

Based on the extent of concerns levied against the developmental perspective regarding the role of advising, a number of scholars and practitioners argued for the need to weave the advising function more closely with the instructional role of the university (Hagen & Jordan, 2008; Hemwell & Trachte, 1999; Laff, 1994). Consequently, they re-conceptualized the advising role as that of teacher (Hemwell & Trachte, 1999, 2005; Lowenstein, 1999, 2005). This role involves instructing students regarding how gain a maximum benefit from their academic programs and curricula. This includes teaching students how to think critically, understand the mission of the university, realize the cohesive logic of their education and of the curriculum, transfer knowledge across disciplines, integrate knowledge and practice, engage in integrative decision-making, and recognize the
relationship between personal and institutional goals (Hemwell & Trachte, 2005; Lowenstein, 2005).

**The Advisor as Career Counselor**

A less controversial role for advisors, but one that definitely varies in relation to the advising position and context is that of career counselor. This role involves providing differing levels of support in relation to increasing one’s self-awareness in relation to career interests, personality, work values, etc, expanding one’s knowledge of the career marketing, engaging in career and major decision-making, and supporting career finding efforts (Gordon, 2006; Gore Jr. & Metz, 2008; McClellan & Moser, 2010; McCollum, 1998).

**The Advisor as Coach**

A role that is more related to the process than the content of the advising session is that of coach. Coaching as a role suggests that advisors act more as facilitators of student decision making than advice givers or counselors. Coaching uses specific facilitative techniques and procedures focused on developing a trusting relationship that allows the advisor to help students think through the decisions they need to make, resolve the challenges they face, and achieve their dreams (McClellan & Moser, 2011). In this role advisors also assist students in the development of critical skills. The practice of appreciative advising is one of the more popular forms of advising as coaching (Bloom, Hutson, & He, 2008). Advising for self-authorship is also closely related (Magolda & King, Winter 2008; Meszaros, 2007; Pizzolato, 2006).

**The Advisor as Guidance Counselor**

From the perspective of many students, the role of an academic advisor is similar to that of a guidance counselor in high school. This role involves three primary behaviors – providing essential information, offering guidance in relation to course scheduling and degree completion, and giving referrals. This role is referred to in the literature as that of prescriptive advisor or as a scheduler (Daller, Creamer, & Creamer, 1997). It has also been conceptualized as informational advising (Shane, 1981). In spite of its often being vilified as an impersonal, narrow, and outdated approach to advising, research has validated the desirable and important, even essential, nature of this advising role (Brown & Rivas, 1994).

**The Advisor as Advocate**
NACADA (2005) developed a statement of core values for academic advisors. This statement suggests advisors are responsible to multiple stakeholders. Given the often contradictory nature of these responsibilities, advisors are often placed in a role of having to advocate for one or another of these groups. One of the more common forms of advocacy that advisors engage in is bringing the voice of the student to bear on organizational decision making.

**The Advisor as Mentor**

A final role of advisors is that of mentors. Mentoring is similar to coaching in that it focuses on skill development and decision-making. However, it is different from coaching, in that the emphasis is placed on the skills and experience of the advisor as opposed to the student. Mentors are typically experts in a specific field of practice who apprentice followers within their field. They do so by giving advice, providing an example, and granting access to the mentors social network and resources (Friday & Friday, 2002; Viney & McKimm, 2010).

Regardless of the roles that a particular advisor incorporates into his or her work, the strength of advising in universities and colleges is attached to its ability to act as a strategic partner in the educational mission of the institution. As universities craft their missions and develop specific outcomes, advising administrators should follow up by aligning their strategic plans and advising outcomes with those of the broader institution. In so doing, a particular emphasis should be placed on student learning outcomes.

While a wide range of student learning outcomes have been developed by a variety of institutions, once again no general list of widely accepted outcomes is available. Nonetheless, the most comprehensive list of possible outcomes is that provided for within the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) standards of advising (2005). These include:

- Intellectual growth.
- Personal and educational goals.
- Enhanced self-esteem.
- Realistic self-appraisal.
- Clarification of personal values.
- Career selection.
- Increased independence.
- Effective communication.
- Leadership development.
- Healthy behavior.
- Meaningful interpersonal relationships.
- Collaboration.
• Social responsibility.
• Satisfying and productive lifestyles.
• Appreciating diversity
• Spiritual awareness.

This list provides some obvious connections to the role of advising in leadership development; in fact it names leadership development specifically as an outcome of advising. Unfortunately, while some scholars have begun to examine the role of advisors as leaders and to mine the potential value that leadership theory may contribute to the process of advising (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2009; Lerstrom, 2008; McClellan, 2007), there is little to no evidence of a concerted effort to explore the role of advisors as leadership educators.

Advisors as Leadership Educators

For advisors to become maximally effective as leadership educators, they would likely need to begin by developing a basic understanding of leadership development models in higher education and the process of leadership development. Based upon this foundation, and consistent with the principles of effective program development, assessment, and backward design (Popa, 2009; Robbins & Zarges, 2011), they would then need to articulate a clear set of leadership learning outcomes. Having done so, advisors can then intentionally embed leadership development efforts into their work as advisors consistent with their roles within the institution.

This may be accomplished as advisors engage in the role of leadership development facilitators (Huber, 2002). According to Huber, this role involves first helping students to identify the purpose for leadership by helping them answer the question of why they would want to lead others. Second, advisors can help students understand the process of leadership, again this requires both knowledge of leadership theory and practice. It also requires that advisors help students to reflect on ways in which they can become engaged in leadership, connect with the issues and systems in such a way that they can identify where to begin their efforts to lead, decide how to lead, and engage in leadership practices which they can then reflect on in order to deepen their learning and development. These practices are not in any way foreign to the advising process. Thus, it is more a matter of the focus and framing of the developmental process within advising, than it is changing the processes that are used to advise.

Consequently, it is worth noting that even without such the intentional efforts described here, advising may already be contributing to the development of leadership among college students as the nature of the process is conducive to
the promotion and development of many leadership competencies. Furthermore, while the term educator is being used to describe the role of advisors in relation to leadership development, it is important to note that the emphasis for advisors is more on the development work of helping students to become leaders than the education work of teaching students about leadership. Nonetheless, both roles are enveloped in the discussion within this article.

**Models of Leadership Development in Higher Education**

Within the realm of higher education, a number of models of leadership and leadership development have been espoused and utilized in developing leadership curricular/co-curricular programs. Some of these more frequently cited models include servant leadership, the leadership challenge, transformational leadership, adaptive leadership, and the social change model of leadership development (Harris, Bruce, & Jones, 2011). Just as these models can be used as a framework for creating leadership development programs, they can also be used for guiding the creation of advising programs that promote leadership development.

**Servant Leadership**

The modern concept of servant leadership was articulated by Robert K. Greenleaf (2002). Greenleaf’s central argument was that when leaders are motivated out of a preeminent desire to serve, as opposed to a primary desire for power or even success, it fundamentally alters and enhances the nature of leadership. Lad and Luechauer (1998) wrote:

Servant-leaders typically have a passionate zeal for creating a preferred future . . . What differentiates servant-leaders from maniacal dictators is their deep desire to pursue this vision from the basis of humility, empathy, compassion, and commitment to ethical behavior. (p. 64)

This difference in motivation and the means of pursuing one’s vision, causes servant-leaders to incorporate what Spears (1998) refers to as the 10 characteristics of servant leadership into their leadership practice. These ten characteristic include:

- Listening.
- Empathy.
- Healing.
- Awareness.
- Persuasion.
- Conceptualization.
- Foresight.
• Stewardship.
• Commitment to the growth of people.
• Building community.

Greenleaf (1998, 2002) suggested that students need to be taught to view and be assisted in perceiving the university not as a place apart from the world, but rather as a part of the real world wherein they can begin to exercise caring leadership. He advocated for a model of encouraging, educating, and mentoring students in actively leading positive, constructive change within all aspects of their lives as a means of promoting their growth and development as the builders of a better society.

The Leadership Challenge

Kouzes and Posner’s (1995) model of leadership has been used extensively in leadership development programs at the graduate and undergraduate level (Harris et al., 2011; Kass & Gandzol, 2011). Their book was also one of the most frequently cited texts in the Journal of Leadership Education from 2002 through 2006 (Edgar & Cox, 2010). Since the 1980s, these scholars have conducted multiple quantitative and qualitative studies in which they have sought to identify and understand peak leadership experiences.

Kouzes and Posner’s (1995) research revealed five core practices of leaders. These practices include (a) challenging the process by engaging in significant, meaningful, and challenging projects, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) enabling others to act, (d) modeling the way “through personal example and dedicated execution” (p. 13), and (e) encouraging the heart of those they lead by fostering a passion for “their products, their services, their constituents, their clients and customers, and their work” (p. 14). Kouzes and Posner advocated for developing leaders overtime and experientially through seeking opportunities to engage in leadership using the five practices. Doing so promotes increased self-awareness and leadership capacity.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is one of the most extensively researched models of leadership (Northouse, 2012). This model of leadership originated in the work of Burns (2003). He compared and contrasted transactional – reciprocity based influence – with transformational leadership – helping people participate in the processes of change, creating collective identity as well as efficacy to bring about stronger feelings of self-worth and self-efficacy and personal transformation.
According to Bass and Riggio (2006), this model of leadership is characterized by four components. The first component is idealized influence, which refers to the leader’s ability to serve as a role model for followers. The second component, inspirational motivation, involves motivating followers through meaningful and challenging inclusion and charismatic discourse. Intellectual stimulation, the third component, refers to a leader’s ability to encourage followers “to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways” (p. 7). The fourth component is individualized consideration. This final aspect involves the willingness of leaders to take each individual’s needs, interests, and growth into consideration by engaging in coaching, mentoring, and other forms of mutual interaction. Various universities and colleges have incorporated this model of leadership into both curricular and extracurricular components of their leadership programs.

Adaptive Leadership

Heifetz’ (1994) model of adaptive leadership is frequently used in curricular leadership development efforts. He argues that leadership is derived from the informal influence capacity that one possesses and is necessary for addressing adaptive challenges. In contrast, authority which is derived from a person’s position is more relevant to traditional challenges. Adaptive challenges are those which require that leaders go beyond the use of entrenched knowledge, skills, and processes to make progress on significant issues. Thus, according to Heifetz, “Adaptive work consists of the learning required to address conflicts in the values people hold, or to diminish the gap between the values people stand for and the reality they face. Adaptive work requires a change in values, beliefs, or behavior” (p. 22).

Consequently, leaders are forced to raise challenging issues through the surfacing and questioning of values and current practices. Such an approach can be risky for leaders if they do not navigate such leadership initiatives very carefully. Heifetz and others (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Parks, 2005) advocate for an iterative balancing of big picture thinking and systemic awareness with intensive engagement or presencing. In addition, leaders are encouraged to manage relationships with allies and opponents, carefully regulate emotional intensity, shift responsibility for making change to those involved, and hold steady throughout the process.

Heifetz (1994), and those who use his model, approach leadership development largely through what Heifetz calls the case-in-point method. This approach to leadership development uses the classroom as a learning laboratory in which the issues of leading adaptive change are taught through both traditional instructional
methods and experiential reflection on classroom behaviors and past experiences that reflect the concepts discussed (Parks, 2005).

The Social Change Model

The social change model of leadership development was created by a team of leadership scholars to “enhance the student learning and development of leadership competence, and . . .to facilitate positive social change” (Komives, Wagner, & Associates, 2009, p. 48). As in Heifetz’ (1994) model, the kind of change sought after is fundamental and values oriented. Consequently, the model is focused around seven core values, as opposed to competencies, including (a) three individuals values – consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment, (b) three group values – collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility, and (c) one social/community value – citizenship. These values are all interrelated and represent ongoing realms of leadership development.

According to Komives et al (2009), growth as a leader occurs in three realms as one “acquires knowledge (knowing), integrates that knowledge into beliefs and attitudes (being), and applies knowledge and beliefs in daily life (doing)” (pp. 66-67). As is evident, this model promotes leadership through civic engagement and intentional reflective activity in relation to the values components.

As advisors contemplate how to engage in intentional leadership development efforts, these models provide guidance regarding the outcomes and objectives of leadership development. Advisors should select a model or a combination of components from various models that suits their philosophy and style of advising. Having done so, they can then consider how to integrate the process of leadership development with that of advising.

The Process of Leadership Development

Komives et al. (2009) suggest, “Leadership is a process that is learned . . .from reflections on experience, from observation, and from applying new concepts” (p. 79). The traditional leadership development process begins as leaders learn about leadership and develop awareness of which they are as a leader and what they would like to become. They then engage in intentional efforts to improve on their leadership and assess progress overtime (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Lawson, 2008). This process simply requires a context in which one can learn, experiment with, and reflect upon one’s own efforts to influence others through leadership. Much of this work of leadership development in universities takes place in the classroom and in the arenas of practice provided within the extra-curricular programming of institutions. In fact, the research on college student
leadership development suggests that some of the most significant predictors of student leadership development include interaction “with peers outside the classroom across differences” (Dugan, 2011, p. 72), faculty mentoring, participation in community service, engagement in campus based clubs and organizations, and participation in moderate length formal learning experiences such as classes or a series of workshops as opposed to short-term or longer term experiences.

Additional application based learning likely takes place beyond the realm of the university in work and family settings. However, as mentioned, a unique and important realm for promoting such growth, which has not been adequately explored, can be found in the office of academic advisors who use their uniquely important roles to promote intentional leadership development. One thing that makes advising particularly relevant to leadership development is that it is an ongoing relational process in which advisor and advisees meet regularly to discuss goals, plans, and developmental outcomes (Light, 2001; NACADA, 2003). Consequently, advisors are uniquely suited to assess student leadership development, develop plans for development as leaders, and discuss outcomes.

To integrate leadership development into the advising process, advisors should consider how they will introduce the concept of leadership and help students to assess their current and ideal leadership capacities. Having done so, they can then assist students to identify developmental opportunities for learning about and engaging in leadership that are consistent with student goals. It would be wise to not overlook the day to day leadership opportunities that students experience such as working in study groups, interacting with faculty, solving problems, resolving conflicts with roommates, and other situations. Finally, advisors should continually help students to assess their growth and development as leaders and help them to revise their goals and plans as necessary.

To some extent, the ability to implement leadership development depends on the specific roles the advisor plays within the institution. However, before determining, more specifically, how advisors can apply leadership development models and processes within their roles, they should clearly articulate the outcomes they wish to achieve and how these relate to leadership development. In so doing, it is worth noting that a tremendous amount of commonality already exists between the outcomes of leadership development and those of academic advising.
While diverse models of leadership exist, there are some significant areas of overlap relative to leadership development outcomes. Most models include some or all the following skills or competencies (Brungardt, 2011; Dhar & Mishra, 2001; Goleman et al., 2002; Harris et al., 2011; Lussier & Achua, 2007; Owens, 2011; Yukl, 1998; Zenger & Folkman, 2002):

- Ethical and moral reasoning.
- Effective decision-making.
- Oral and written communication.
- Critical thinking and problem solving.
- Strategic planning.
- Visioning.
- Goal setting.
- Self and other motivation.
- Creativity and innovation.
- Willingness to take risks.
- Team building.
- Developing trust.
- Leading groups and teams.
- Coaching.
- Conflict management and negotiation.
- Self-awareness.
- Social awareness.
- Relationship management.
- Conducting meetings.
- Leading amidst diversity and in multicultural settings.
- Time management.

Interestingly, many of these outcomes are either directly or are at least conceptually related to student learning outcomes already included in models of advising outcomes including the CAS (2005) standards for advising and the desired outcomes of the advising roles discussed previously. See Table 1 for a comparison of leadership outcomes/competencies and student learning outcomes of advising. Please note, however, that this is not intended to be a comprehensive summary of either leadership competencies or advising outcomes. Instead, it is intended to suggest the extent to which overlap exists across both frameworks.
Table 1
Comparison of leadership outcomes/competencies and student learning outcomes of advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competencies</th>
<th>Advisor Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical/moral reasoning</td>
<td>Spiritual awareness, social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective decision-making</td>
<td>Career selection, career and major decision-making, integrative decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and written communication</td>
<td>Effective communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking and problem solving</td>
<td>Intellectual growth, critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning, visioning, goal setting</td>
<td>Development of academic/career plans, personal and educational goals, life planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and other motivation</td>
<td>Increased independence, enhanced self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading groups and teams</td>
<td>Leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management and negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>Realistic self-appraisal, clarification of personal values, self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social awareness</td>
<td>Collaboration, appreciating diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship management &amp; developing trust</td>
<td>Meaningful interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading amidst diversity and in multicultural settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>Satisfying and productive lifestyles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While not directly included in the CAS standards or the theoretical model previously discussed, advisors frequently engage in and assist students to deal with conflict (McClellan, 2005; Punyanunt-Carter & Wrench, 2008), promote risk taking as part of motivating students (McClellan, 2006), practice coaching (McClellan & Moser, 2011; Pizzolato, 2008), encourage diversity awareness and multicultural intelligence (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008; Priest & McPhee, 2000), and encouraging creativity and innovation (Bloom et al., 2008).

Clearly there exists a significant overlap between the desired outcomes of both leadership development efforts and academic advising. Consequently, it is likely
that any intentional effort to engage in effective, outcomes oriented advising will unintentionally contribute to leadership development. However, to the extent that advisors intentionally identify desired outcomes for both leadership development and student learning, and pursue these outcomes, they can both more intentionally and more effectively contribute to leadership development.

Applying Leadership Development Theory to Advising Roles

Having identified specific outcomes for advising that promote leadership development, advisors can then alter their role based efforts to better contribute to leadership development. In the following section, some suggestions will be offered regarding what models of leadership development are most relevant in relation to each role. It is worth noting, however, that any of the leadership development models could be used in relation to any of these roles.

Developmental Professional

Perhaps it is through the role of developmental professional that academic advisors can most contribute to the development of students as leaders. Leadership is truly a developmental process (Komives et al., 2011). As discussed earlier, advisors contribute to student development through an intentional emphasis on structuring the advising process to focus on developmental issues and stages associated with growth in the following areas – (a) intellectual, (b) life planning, (c) social, (d) physical, (e) emotional, (f) sexual, (g) cultural, (h) spiritual, and (i) political (Dickson & McMahon, 1991). Many leadership scholars and theorists advocate for similarly broad holistic approaches to leadership development (Covey, 1989, 2004; Goleman et al., 2002; Komives et al., 2011; McClellan, 2009). Furthermore, since the connection between effective leadership and developmental maturation is strong, it is likely that any efforts to promote holistic development will increase student leadership potential and ability. Servant leadership is a particularly relevant model of leadership development for advising programs focused on student development.

Advisors wishing to use servant leadership as a model for promoting student leader development may choose to begin by identifying the leadership development outcomes that they wish to achieve in relation to five aspects of holistic development: spiritual, which involves establishing meaning and a sense of purpose; physical, which focuses on personal health and wellness as well as physical skill; mental, which involves developing the cognitive capacity to lead and skills to lead effectively; emotional, which focuses on the development of emotional intelligence; and extra-personal, which encompasses the tangible elements of one’s identity as an individual and a leader, including positions of
leadership (McClellan, 2009). An alternative to this more qualitative approach would be to use formal assessment instruments to measure a student’s servant leadership character, competencies, and skills. Multiple instruments exist for doing so (Barbuto, JR. & Wheeler, 2006; Dennis & Borcarnea, 2005; Liden, 2008; Page & Wong, 2004; Sendjaya, 2003).

Having identified areas for development as servant-leaders, advisors can then identify the principles and practices of servant-leadership that are most relevant to their practice of advising and the students areas for growth (McClellan, 2007; Sipe & Frick, 2009; Spears, 2002). They may then identify when and how to encourage students to apply these same principles and practices to their academic and social efforts.

Teacher

The focus on the advisor as teacher likewise offers great promise in relation to promoting leadership development. However, the focus of this advising role is more directly associated with the promotion of the cognitive capacity of the student and the student’s ability to engage in integrative thinking and decision-making, as well as praxis in relation to leadership (Lowenstein, 2005). Leadership provides an excellent framework for facilitating the integration of knowledge across disciplines. Advisors can achieve this without developing a significant knowledge of either leadership theory or practice as the concepts of leadership and social influence are widely understood phenomenon about which most students and faculty are capable of discussion regardless of their academic background. Nonetheless, a working knowledge of leadership theory can further contribute to the intentional and coherent leadership development of students. Whether or not such intentional conversations occur, however, the very processes of promoting the outcomes associated with this advising role will contribute to the development of the many of the related leadership competencies.

Heifetz (1994) model and case in point approach to teaching do offer some valid insights into developing programs associated with advising as teaching. His model and methods suggests that students contemplate all of their interactions and reflect upon their approach to leadership, capacity in practicing leadership, and development as leaders (Parks, 2005). Thus, advisors who wish to engage in intentional leadership development could invite students to reflect upon whether or not the challenges they face are adaptive or technical in nature, thus using their entire collegiate experience as a learning laboratory. They could then challenge them to examine their own values and assumptions, promote big picture thinking and being present, assist them to reflect on how they use power and influence in their efforts as students, and encourage them to think about how to use leadership to address these challenges and overcome them. It is worth noting, however, that
use of Heifetz’s model requires a more in-depth understanding of the theory and language that he uses so as to be able to apply it spontaneously in specific situations.

**Career Counselor**

The role of a career counselor is hugely significant in the promotion of leadership development for students. The career decision making process naturally promotes leadership development as a result of the emphasis on helping students to learn about their strengths, limitations, personalities, interests, values, and other aspects of who they are as a person. This facilitates increased self-awareness.

Additionally, the process assists students to define the realms in which they wish to contribute through the work they will do when they graduate. Finally, it involves decision-making, planning, and goal setting. Advisors who use the process to assist students in developing these skills naturally contribute to the development of leadership competencies (Gordon, 2006; Gore, Jr. & Metz, 2008; McCollum, 1998; Zunker, 1998). Any of the leadership models with components associated with planning and decision-making could prove useful within the role of advisor as career counselor.

In transformational leadership, this would involve advisors modeling and teaching the practices of idealized influence by establishing trust based relationships with students and encouraging them to do so with teachers, peers, and others. In addition, they would provide inspirational motivation by helping students to clearly articulate inspirational goals for their educational efforts. Further, they could aid individualized consideration by listening, supporting, mentoring, and coaching students with regards to how to achieve their goals. Finally, they ought to encourage them to recruit peers, parents, and others to support them through the same methods as well as provide intellectual stimulation by helping them to think through and overcome challenges as they strive to accomplish their goals and plans. (Bass & Riggio, 2006)

**Coach**

As mentioned earlier, coaching is a process that allows an advisor to help a student to think through the processes needed to complete in order to make decisions, resolve challenges that arise, and achieve their dreams (McClellan & Moser, 2011). Through a process of inquiry, advisors as coaches guide students to think through and develop plans of action to address these items. Furthermore, they help students demonstrate follow-through and accountability and promote student motivation.
The process of coaching thus facilitates the cognitive thinking, problem solving, decision-making, planning and goal setting skills of students while increasing their self-awareness and motivation. Additionally, as coaching topics can address any number of challenges students face from conflict with a faculty member to challenges in organizing a study group, the potential for both direct and indirect conversations about and skill building in relation to leadership is strong.

Furthermore, by modeling the behaviors associated with effective coaching, advisors assist students to develop skills in self-awareness, problem solving, planning, and critical thinking. As a result, the use of coaching as an advising practice offers tremendous benefits in relation to the promotion of leadership development. Once again, an advisor coaching process for leadership development could be built upon any one of the leadership models.

In relation to this approach, however, the social change model of leadership provides a particularly relevant conceptual framework for advising as coaching. The components of the model – consciousness of self, congruence, commitment, collaboration, common purpose, controversy with civility, citizenship – provide a framework for coaching that advisor can use to promote leadership development. Advisors can thus teach students about each component, encourage them to engage in projects or specific activities to develop skill in each area, and follow up with them as they strive to develop in relation to each aspect of the model.

**Guidance Counselor**

As outlined earlier, the role of an advisor as guidance counselor involves three primary behaviors: providing essential information, offering guidance in relation to course scheduling and degree completion, and giving referrals. All three of these efforts can significantly promote leadership development. Advisors can begin by becoming aware of the programs and resources available on their campuses for leadership development. With this knowledge they can provide students with information about these leadership development opportunities on their campus. They can then offer guidance regarding courses and how these might relate to the students growth as a leader, finally, they can refer students to leadership related programs and resources. Regardless of whether or not they do anything more than this, they will likely assist many students to consider and become involved in leadership development activities.

This advising role would not need to draw on any models for leadership development except, perhaps those espoused by the programs of the institution. Nonetheless, any model could be used as a framework for structuring the provision of guidance.
Advocate

One of the significant roles of advisors on university campuses is that of an advocate for student interests, concerns, and success (NACADA, 2005; Nutt, 2010). As such advisors can contribute significantly to the development of and feedback regarding the quality of leadership programs and resources.

Furthermore, they can openly advocate for the inclusion of students in discussion related to these. Leadership program coordinators should be aware of the reality that students will often share insights and opinions about the quality of academic and extracurricular programs that they will not always convey to the programs directly via formal assessment efforts. Additionally, advisors are a major resource for advocating for student involvement in these programs. Consequently, two-way feedback loops should be carefully established to ensure that information is being conveyed in such a way that this role can benefit students and leadership efforts.

Curricular leadership programs, even if they are minors, should be very intentional about the design and conduct of their advising efforts to promote this and the other benefits of advising in relation to leadership development. Adaptive leadership and the social change model are particularly relevant for this role as it tends to be more political in nature.

Mentor

Finally, advising, like leadership, is a social influence process designed to accomplish outcomes (Creamer & Creamer, 1994; Zenger & Folkman, 2002). Advisors are leaders (Barbuto et al., 2009; Lerstrom, 2008; McClellan, 2007). They have successfully navigated the contexts in which students find themselves. Thus, advisors are ideal mentors for students who are trying to develop skills associated with both leadership development and academic success.

By both modeling and tutoring students in relation to effective communication, time management, the conducting of effective meetings, self and other motivation, coaching, decision-making, planning, and the other leadership competencies, they can both directly and indirectly assist students to develop leadership skills. In addition, they can work to develop networks with other professionals whom they can draw upon as necessary to further assist the students they advise through referrals, information and knowledge acquisition and sharing, and problem solving. Kouzes and Posner’s (1995) model is particularly appropriate for guiding advisors who operate as mentors as it is built on the foundation of modeling the way as a leader. Once again, however, any of the models could be used.
In accordance with their model, Kouzes and Posner (1995) suggest that leaders begin by clarifying their own values and guiding principles and then helping their advisees to do the same. They then work to develop a shared vision of what they wish to accomplish with each student. Having done so, they can then embrace the challenge of helping the student to embrace his or her own journey to growth and development in college. In doing so, the advisor can do his or her best to support or enable the student to achieve his or her goals by providing advice, support, resources, or contacts as appropriate. Finally, the advisor can encourage the heart of the student by keeping commitments to help, showing appreciation, offering encouragement, and recognizing and celebrating the students’ successes. As advisors model effective leadership in this way and teach and encourage students to apply these principles, they mentor them to become better leaders themselves.

**Conclusion**

Leadership development is important. In a discourse to college students, Robert Greenleaf (1998) declared, “I hope you will manage your lives the next three years so that you leave the university with a well set lifestyle of greatness, with attitudes and values and ways of initiating and responding that assure service in the public interest with distinction” (pp. 95-96). In order to achieve this capacity to lead, Greenleaf encouraged students to view the university as a real environment in which they could act intentionally to promote change and improvement. Through such efforts, he believed students could grow and develop as leaders and be able to begin to influence the world.

Greenleaf’s (1998) vision is becoming more and more real as we see a greater number of students becoming actively involved in community service, civic engagement, internships, and other forms of engaged learning. However, there remains a gap to fill in the intentional promotion of student’s growth as leaders.

Not all of the resources of the university are dedicated to the achievement of the multitude of university missions that both overtly and indirectly espouse leadership development. One of these resources is academic advising. In this article, an argument has been made for both the innate role of advising as a leadership development tool as well as the need for more intentional efforts to promote leadership development. This can be accomplished by raising awareness of advising as leadership development, educating advisors in relation to leadership theory, intentionally designing advising to promote leadership development outcomes, and altering the roles of advisors to incorporate leadership development activities. To the extent that this occurs, university educators may collaboratively develop a generation of leaders that help us escape the current leadership crisis.
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Abstract

The value of reflective writing assignments as learning tools for business students has been well-established. While the management education literature includes numerous examples of such assignments that are based on Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning model, many of them engage only the first two phases of the model. When students do not move through the complete model, they are less likely to take what they learn from the classroom to the workplace. This article describes a graduate learning journal assignment that incorporates all phases of Kolb’s model. The assignment’s success in creating a bridge between simply learning about leadership and actually putting leadership knowledge into practice is grounded in three learning theories.

Introduction

Reflective writing assignments in business education take many different forms with varying degrees of depth and structure, but their common purpose is to enhance learning. By requiring students to question their assumptions, surface tacit knowing, and reflect on how to integrate course content with personal experience, learning journals actively involve students in their own learning. This highly participative process can expand a student’s capacity to acquire leadership knowledge (Castelli, 2011; Daudelin & Hall, 1997; Moon, 2006; Moore, Boyd, & Dooley, 2010; Roberts, 2008; Varner & Peck, 2003).

Learning journal assignments also are intended to guide students in using the insights gained through reflection as the basis for assessing their current skills and expanding the focus of their practice to be more effective leaders (Jarvis, 2001; Moon, 2006; Moore, et al., 2010). In light of this, Kolb’s (1984) experiential
learning model provides a logical framework for learning journal assignments. It is a learning cycle that combines the way students acquire new knowledge and the process by which they make it meaningful. It entails the following four phases:

- **Concrete Experience** – being involved with what is occurring in the here and now.
- **Reflective Observation** – understanding the meaning of experience through careful observation and impartial description of different perspectives.
- **Abstract Conceptualization** – using logic, ideas, and concepts to build general theories about experiences and new perspectives.
- **Active Experimentation** – making changes by applying new general theories to personal situations.

This learning sequence is continually repeated. As one cycle ends, the last phase (i.e., active experimentation) then becomes the first phase (i.e., concrete experience) for the next cycle. Despite the comprehensive nature of the model, many learning journal assignments focus only on the first two phases while neglecting the last two (Smith & Roebuck, 2010). Daudelin and Hall (1997) suggest that to capitalize on the insights gained from reflective assignments, students should be required to determine how they will use new ideas at work and describe the potential implications of applying the new ideas. In other words, to maximize learning, students should complete the entire learning cycle.

The learning journal assignment I use in my graduate leadership courses takes students through all four phases of Kolb’s (1984) model. This aspect of the assignment is significant because it treats learning “as a holistic adaptive process” and “it provides conceptual bridges across life situations such as school and work” (p. 33).

### The Learning Journal Assignment

My assignment is structured, consisting of three specific parts: (a) insight gained from class materials and/or activities, (b) application of insights on the job, and (c) implications for effectively leading organizations. The purpose of the assignment is to focus students’ attention on what they learn about leadership concepts and how they plan to use their learning. The assignment also asks students to recognize the positive impact their improved leadership practices can have on the overall effectiveness of their organizations.

Students submit six journals throughout a 12-week term. They write in the first person from the perspective of a leader rather than a subordinate employee. Students who do not hold leadership positions write in the future tense to describe
what they will do when they become leaders. Students with limited work experience are not at a disadvantage in this regard. Learning journal quality is differentiated more by students’ reflection and conceptualization skills than by work experience.

In the following sections I describe each part of my learning journal assignment in greater detail. I also address questions of grading, feedback, and the assignment’s theoretical underpinnings.

**Part One: Insight**

In this part of the journal students share an insight they gained in class, which may come from readings, lectures, discussions, assessments, team activities, or experiential exercises that comprise their concrete experiences (Kolb’s, 1984, phase one). An insight is more than a simple recapping of basic elements, terminology, categories, and techniques associated with a topic. I expect students to move beyond merely reciting factual, conceptual, or procedural knowledge in order to demonstrate a more complex level of understanding (Krathwohl, 2002; Reynolds, 1998). Articulating insights requires students to determine the meaning of instructional messages through interpretation or inference (Krathwohl, 2002). I ask students to consider the concrete experience from various perspectives (English, 2001). In so doing, students are engaging in reflective observation (Kolb’s, 1984, phase two).

The following example is an excerpt from a student’s learning journal insight section:

- The new learning I took away from our class activities this week came from the Emotional Intelligence Leadership Competency exercise. Although I appear to have a good platform of emotional intelligence to develop my leadership capability, I have low self-management and mid to low self-awareness. When reviewing the specific questions associated with these dimensions, I realized that, although I tend to know when I am getting angry, I have difficulty knowing when I am becoming defensive.

**Part Two: Application**

In this part of the assignment students explain how they will use the insight described in part one. Students must move to abstract conceptualization (Kolb’s, 1984, phase three) to think about how they will use their new knowledge to improve their leadership practices. I want students to be very specific here. I instruct them to use action verbs rather than saying they will be more aware of
something or will try to do something better. This requires students to progress to active experimentation (Kolb’s, 1984, phase four) as they envision themselves applying new behaviors.

The following is an excerpt from part two of a learning journal that describes the student’s plan to apply their learning:

- After intense interactions with my peers, I will take a step back and look at the big picture, especially in the complex situations. I will make a chart where I will list the individual I was speaking with, the situation we were involved in, the outcome, and the emotions felt both during the situation and after the outcome. I will have my chart available during future telephone interactions as a reminder to monitor myself. I will also review the chart at the end of each week to look for any situational trends where I feel negative emotions and become defensive so I can make further plans to improve in this area.

**Part Three: Implications**

This part of the assignment is one that is typically not seen in all learning journal assignments. Here students identify how the application of what they learned will contribute to the overall success of their organizations. A student’s ability to look outside oneself in order to understand how to connect to the whole is essential to the application of learning (Roberts, 2008). By doing this, students can recognize the potential benefit of their new behavior which will make them more likely to actually carry out their application plans (Merriam, 2001).

Following is an example of a student’s learning journal implication section:

- By understanding and verbalizing my strengths and weaknesses, my team will see I am open to learning and actively seeking self-improvement. This could help cultivate a more trusting relationship between us. Our text states quality employees are one of the best predictors of a firm’s financial potential. Being more aware of my emotions can help generate better relationships that will lead to a more positive work atmosphere. This would ultimately result in more productive employees for [the company], thus increasing our bottom line.

**Grading and Feedback**

Much debate surrounds the question of whether learning journals should be graded (Varner & Peck, 2003). Some critics of grading have voiced concern that
it will stifle the students’ candor and hinder the depth of learning. Others are concerned that ethical issues may arise if journals include inappropriate levels of self-disclosure (English, 2001).

Student candor has not been an issue with this assignment because of the structured format and specific content I require. While I do ask students to consider their personal thoughts and feelings, I instruct them to focus on business rather than personal applications of the material. I grade journals using a rubric similar to the one in Table 1, which I also ask students to use to inform their writing. I focus more on content than style; however, I do expect journals to be written professionally and to flow logically.

Table 1
Sample Learning Journal Grading Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Deductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple reiteration of concepts or activities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect interpretation of concept/theory/model</td>
<td>5 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of depth of insight</td>
<td>5 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight not clearly articulated</td>
<td>5 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application not related to insight</td>
<td>5 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper application of concept/theory/model</td>
<td>5 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of specificity or incomplete application plans</td>
<td>5 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implication not related to application</td>
<td>3 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or incomplete implication</td>
<td>5 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear link between application &amp; implication</td>
<td>3 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not written from management perspective</td>
<td>3 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in second or third person</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar, spelling</td>
<td>2 - 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I provide descriptive feedback in addition to numerical grades. Although this can be time-consuming, the feedback students receive from me is an important element of the learning process. Feedback that is non-judgmental and positive is more readily accepted by students (Brookheart, 2008); therefore, I include positive comments where sections of the journal are particularly discerning or applicable. I also make it a point to use non-evaluative words so students will be motivated to improve rather than react defensively to my feedback. Unless students have not grasped the essence of a concept or they plan to apply the concept incorrectly I do not indicate that anything is necessarily wrong. Instead, I pose questions intended to make students rethink aspects of their journals that may be incomplete or off target.
Discussion

The effectiveness of my learning journal assignment is supported by three key learning theories – Bloom’s taxonomy, learning transfer, and principles of andragogy (adult learning).

Bloom’s taxonomy is a hierarchy of learning levels: (a) remembering, (b) understanding, (c) applying, (d) analyzing, (e) evaluating, and (f) creating (cited in Krathwohl, 2002). Learning journal assignments that do not include all phases of Kolb’s (1984) model typically do not move students beyond Bloom’s lower learning levels. My assignment incorporates all four phases of Kolb’s model and thus brings students to Bloom’s higher levels of learning as follows:

- The insight part of the journal assignment requires students to participate in class activities (i.e., concrete experience) and then think back upon those activities (i.e., reflective observation) to infer meaning from them. At this point students must remember and understand, which indicates they are learning at Bloom’s (cited in Krathwohl, 2002) first and second levels.

- As they plan how to use their new knowledge (i.e., abstract conceptualization and active experimentation) in part two of the assignment, they are learning at Bloom’s third and fourth levels. That is, in the process of articulating how they will implement new behaviors in given situations, students analyze their insights and think about how to apply their knowledge (cited in Krathwohl, 2002).

- For part three of the learning journal, students consider how the application of their new learning will contribute to organizational success. In doing so, students evaluate the potential effectiveness of their newly learned behaviors, which puts them at Bloom’s (cited in Krathwohl, 2002) fifth learning level.

- Active experimentation becomes concrete experience as students begin Kolb’s (1984) four phases anew. By revising their behaviors for the next pass through the model, they must create new application plans. They have now arrived at Bloom’s highest learning level (Krathwohl, 2002).

Table 2 shows how my assignment integrates Kolb’s (1984) model and Bloom’s (cited in Krathwohl, 2002) learning levels.
### Table 2

**Assignment/Theory Integration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kolb’s Experiential Learning Model Phase</th>
<th>Learning Journal Assignment</th>
<th>Bloom’s Taxonomy Learning Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Experience</td>
<td>Part 1: Insight</td>
<td>1 – Remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Observation</td>
<td>Part 1: Insight</td>
<td>2 – Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Conceptualization</td>
<td>Part 2: Application</td>
<td>3 – Analyzing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Experimentation</td>
<td>Part 3: Implication</td>
<td>4 – Applying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Experimentation = Concrete Experience for the next cycle through the model. It is evaluated to create new behavior plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Creating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning transfer theory addresses the use of learned knowledge or skill back on the job (Burke & Hutchins, 2007). It offers further insight as to why my journal assignment facilitates the transfer of student learning from concept to practice. By anticipating and articulating exactly how they will apply their learning for part two, students are creating retrieval cues. These cues allow them to pull their learning from the classroom into working memory at the same time they encounter similar situations in the workplace (Omrod, 2004):

> The presence or absence of retrieval cues in the transfer situation determines what relevant knowledge, if any, is retrieved to working memory. A new event is more likely to call to mind previously learned information...if the learner anticipated the situation when storing the new information, so that the situation and information relevant to it were stored in a connected fashion. (p. 366)

The andragogical principles of self-directed learning and problem-centered learning further support the argument for guiding students through Kolb’s (1984) entire learning cycle. Adults learn best when they take responsibility for their own learning and when they can determine what is important to them. Additionally, they are most interested in acquiring knowledge they can use immediately (Knowles, 1990; Merriam, 2001; Moore et al., 2010).

The learning that occurs with part one of the assignments is self-directed because it allows students to choose an insight from the class activity that resonated most with them. Learning is enhanced by allowing students to write about classroom concept(s) that are important to them at the time (Knowles, 1990; Merriam, 2001). For part two of the journal, students must reflect upon and specifically articulate how their learning will be used; in other words, they have to visualize taking those actions (Moore et al., 2010). The self-directed nature of allowing
students to select a concept that is most relevant to them (i.e., one that will help them solve an immediate problem) makes this visualization process more realistic. This subsequently increases students’ self-confidence and sense of responsibility, which can encourage them to actually take the actions they plan (Brown, McCracken & O’Kane, 2011) and, thus move from concrete experience to active experimentation.

Conclusion

It is incumbent upon management educators to help students integrate their knowledge of leadership concepts with practical ways of applying that knowledge (Cunliffe, 2004; Hiemstra, 2001). The learning journal assignment I have described here accomplishes that objective. It moves students through all phases of Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning cycle, which also helps them progress to the upper levels of Bloom’s (cited in Krathwohl, 2002) learning taxonomy. It is here that students can use what they learned to apply, analyze, evaluate, and create effective leadership practices. They are relying on the transfer cues they create in class to move pertinent and practical knowledge to the workplace. The combination of these factors intentionally matches learning from the classroom as closely as possible to the organizational contexts in which students will be required to apply their learning (Armstrong & Mahmud, 2008). In essence, this is the bridge between school and work that Kolb (1984) envisioned. Anecdotal evidence from my students indicates that many of them have effectively implemented their learning journal application plans to yield successful outcomes. As such, the learning journal assignment served as the blueprint students needed to construct the bridge from classroom concepts to leadership practices.
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Abstract

The development and socialization of morals is a complex concept for students studying ethics. To help students understand the role social learning theory plays in the development of morality, an activity was created focusing on cultural artifacts and their introduction, perpetuation, and/or reinforcement of morality. The aim of this assignment is for students to see “the dialogue between cognitive structure and the complexity presented by the environment” (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977, p. 57). Results for this assignment not only showed improved conceptualization of moral development by students, but also engaged their higher-order thinking skills.

Introduction

When discussing how our moral compasses form as well as moral development, students are quick to identify parents and peers as influential factors. They tend not to realize the complexities that social learning theory plays on moral development. While some moral theorists would argue of our innate capabilities to discern right from wrong and good from bad, the majority of moral development theorists would argue we are socialized into our dominate moral philosophy (Pojman & Fiser, 2009).

To aid students in their self-discovery of moral development, an activity was developed which asks them to look for an example of how morals are introduced, perpetuated, or reinforced within a culture (broadly defined). The objectives for the activity are:
1. identify an artifact which introduces, perpetuates, or reinforces moral ideals
2. research the origin of the artifact
3. analyze the application of the artifact in terms of socialized moral development
4. correlate the artifact to Kohlberg’s stages of moral development
The aim of this assignment is for students to see “the dialogue between cognitive structure and the complexity presented by the environment” (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977, p. 57). Students are asked to reflect on their experiences as well as look to other cultures to find their examples. In this regard, they are using their existing cognitive structures in regards to morality and seeing how the artifact interacts with the culture (environment). By utilizing diverse artifacts, and then presenting said artifacts to the rest of the class, students begin to acknowledge the complexities of moral development (or acknowledging how complex it is to build a moral compass).

Background

In the current neo-charismatic leadership paradigm, morality is a central issue in leader development. The link between morality and leadership goes beyond authenticity and values based leadership. Studies link moral development with leadership traits and show how personality dichotomies can be used in diagnosing moral developmental levels (Narvaez, Lapsley, Hagele, & Lasky, 2006). Studies of the associations between morality and motivation as well as leader behavior and morality have shown correlations (Narvaez & Lapsley, 2009). Because of this, morality and leadership are exceedingly intertwined. It is imperative for students to understand not only how the two concepts coincide but also how each are developed.

Moral development as defined by Piaget and enhanced by the research of Kohlberg, “represents the transformations [morality] that occur in a person’s form or structure of thought” (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977, p. 54). Kohlberg’s three stages of moral development; preconventional, conventional, and postconventional, occur invariant sequence with movement forward through the stages. Kohlberg and other theorists have proven a correlation between moral development and Piaget’s model of child development. Other theorists have drawn from social identity theory to describe moral development. This idea of moral identity “can be organized around traits associated with moral behavior” (Reynolds & Ceramic, 2007, p. 1611). Thus, ethical relativism has a direct impact on moral development. “Frequent and consistent experiences with a specific domain of social behavior” (p. 968) has a direct correlation with subscribed moral actions (Narvaez, Lapsley, Hagele, & Lasky, 2006). For this reason, it is essential for students to understand the role of context and culture in morality. Looking at artifacts is one way to understand this level of culture.

Using an activity which asks students to use their higher-order thinking skills to examine moral development will not only increase their knowledge of moral
development but will also enhance their moral development and allow them to utilize Kohlberg while leading. Synthesis, application, and active participation are important in using higher-order thinking skills in exercises in leadership and morality (Williams & Coers, 2009). Mayhew, Seifert, Pascarella, Laird, and Blaich (2012) found the use of this type of pedagogical methodology increases moral reasoning among college students.

**The Assignment**

The origins of this assignment can be traced back to a children’s book. While reading *The Berenstain Bears and the Golden Rule*, (name) realized how many of her child’s books truly have “a moral” to the story. (name) then began to look at how other non-traditional teaching methods are utilized to socialize moral development. After finding connection after connection between moral development socialization, and cultural relativism, (name) thought her students would benefit from such an analysis. Thus, an activity for moral development was developed.

This assignment asks students to identify an artifact that introduces, perpetuates, or reinforces moral ideals of a culture. They are challenged to look reflexively at their own upbringing as well as to diverse cultures to find examples. This allows students to combine previous leadership training and education to enhance their leadership and moral development (Brungardt, 1996).

Because of the impact of relativism in the development of moral identity, it is important for students look at moral development through the lens of organizational culture. Schein (2004) notes when looking at organizations, the first level of analysis includes artifacts. After artifacts are identified, students can then begin discussing the underlying values and beliefs of the culture. Artifacts are the phenomena one sees, hears, and feels” (p. 25) when diagnosing culture. Artifacts can also include “physical environment, language, technology, artistic creations, style as embodied in clothing, manners of address, emotional displays, and myths and stories told” (pp. 25-26). This was also the inspiration of the assignment.

The activity is introduced by reading *The Berenstain Bears and the Golden Rule* to the students. At first, they laugh and then they begin to remember those books they read as children and young adults, which had an impact on their development. A facilitated discussion follows giving other examples (commercials for after school specials are shown along with a cartoon version of Aesop’s Fables) in which students can begin a dialog about how moral compasses develop.
In groups, students are given time in class to brainstorm artifacts. There are a couple we have told them were “too obvious” and not let them use for their final paper and presentation. Those include the (university) code of honor statement, religious texts, and any item we have discussed during class. They are then assigned their project. Groups are given a week to find their artifact and complete the assignment.

The assignment manifests into a presentation that asks the groups to:

- Introduce their artifact
- Explain how their artifact either introduces, perpetuates, or reinforces either morality or ethics
- Research the underlying theory (ex: who came up with the golden rule for Sister Bear)
- Explain the social ramifications of their artifact
- Correlate the artifact to Kohlberg’s stages of moral development. Which does it target and how does it help one move to the next level.

The presentations are five to ten minutes with time for questions upon completion. Students are encouraged to bring in examples of their artifact (if applicable) or present in an “edutainment” manner (enhanced creativity and active learning by the participants). Students also submit an outline of their information with proper references.

**Results**

By asking the students to identify, analyze, and apply their artifact to the socialized moral development of a culture, they are engaging in higher-order thinking which, as Mayhew et. al (2012) found increases the moral identity development of the student. Students also are quick to identify the cultural relativism, which exists within each artifact and how it is used to introduce, perpetuate, or reinforce morality.

This activity has been used in five semesters of “Leadership and Ethics.” Each semester has given diverse but always interesting artifacts. One group identified fortune cookies as an ethical artifact. They researched and found the original fortune cookies relied on Confusion ethical statements as their fortunes. They brought cookies for the class and had them open and read the fortune inside and then compare it to moral philosophy. Another group showed clips from TV show from the 50s-present day displaying the relationships between women and men. They showed how we have gone from a married couple not being able to share a bed, on television, to 16 year olds having children and their own reality show.
They related it back to not only leadership movements but also political movements. The Foundation for a Better Life has been used two semesters as an artifact. The students researched and found the foundation’s commercials, displaying values and moral behavior, are specifically run during certain times of the day as well as during specific shows to target behavior.

Recommendations

While this activity is used in an undergraduate course focusing on moral/ethical theories and their application to leadership, it could be incorporated into a course where there is a component of ethics.

If the activity is used in an ethics course where theory is learned, it is recommended to complete this activity toward the beginning of the course. Beginning the course discussion how we develop moral philosophies serves as an effective starting point. Students discussing how they view morality and where they learned right from wrong and good from bad lets them discuss their similarities and differences in cognitive structure. Having students discuss artifacts before the constraints of learning moral theory will allow them to think creatively.

It is also recommended to refer back to the artifacts as the semester progresses. For every moral theory discussed, there is usually at least one artifact, which displays that moral theory. For example, corporal punishment is a good example of social contract theory. At the end of the semester, students can look back on their artifacts and reflect on the impact each holds in introducing, perpetuating, or reinforcing moral ideals.

The activity has been completed with and without discussion of Kohlberg’s developmental stages. If Kohlberg has been discussed, students can categorize their artifact as preconventional, conventional, or postconventional. By having the students categorize, they use higher-order thinking skills.
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Abstract

This article is based on experiences and convictions from teaching leadership to students on the university and college levels. Teaching through leadership rather than about leadership is advocated. Student learning and facilitator teaching are contrasted. Leadership is viewed more as a mutual relationship rather than certain personality traits of the leader. The importance of understanding group processes is stressed.

Background

During the last 20 years we have been teaching leadership at a University College for undergraduate students, becoming physical education teachers as well as professional coaches, health promotion professionals and sport managers.

Firstly, it is not only semantics when we argue that the challenge for the teacher is not to teach leadership, but rather to create possibilities for learning, capturing, and building leadership, a process resembling Kolb’s (1984) learning cycle. His work entitled, Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development, as well as other researchers work has examined this concept (i.e., Ng et al., 2009). Working experientially and critically means challenging students’ ways of thinking about leadership (Sinclair, 2007).

Furthermore, conventional teaching has been criticized at times. For example, Beard and Wilson (2006) have suggested:

Traditional learning, with the teacher or trainer spouting facts and figures and with pupils or participants regurgitating the
information without deeper involvement is a very ineffective form of learning. A much more effective and long-lasting form of learning is to involve the learner by creating a meaningful learning experience (p. 1).

One important prerequisite is that students are viewed as initially being reasonably knowledgeable concerning leadership in the common sense and that, to a certain extent, they recognize leadership behavior and actions. In other words, all students have experienced leadership and group processes during earlier school years, training sessions, jobs, and other life situations, but without having had the opportunity to analyze and reflect.

Leadership development is offered to students during the second half of their teacher education. Studies in leadership demand a certain level of maturity in order to gain the personal growth that is one desirable outcome from leadership training.

We work in The Leadership Center which is located in a separate section of the college campus. This relative seclusion can support and strengthen the experiences from the leadership classes. The Center can be viewed more as a laboratory than just general seminar rooms. Our courses usually cover five or ten weeks of studies wherein the students in groups of 20-30 can concentrate entirely on the study of leadership and group processes. Usually two teachers work together in the room, making interactions with the students more intense and also making the assessments and evaluations from the courses more reliable and valid.

Co-leadership or shared leadership offers a number of advantages (Heenan & Bennis, 1999; O'Toole, Galbraith & Lawler, 2002). During leadership classes, students generally meet twice a week, always in the same room, working full days, and in the in-between-time they are expected to read, reflect, and document.

To Teach Through or About?

Usually leadership education is directed towards teaching about leadership in a cognitive manner. Typical programs promote leadership literacy, but not leadership competence (Allio, 2005). Our conviction is that leadership skills are best learned by teaching through leadership, not about leadership, meaning that it is important to create opportunities for students to learn, choose, and form their leadership. Briefly students are introduced to different practice situations, a form of experiential learning, wherein leadership and group processes are illustrated and experienced. The processes here and now create a foundation for a theoretical elaboration. Our aim is to involve the cognition, the emotion, and the drive of leadership. Teachers act as role models. This also means that exclusively
theoretical lectures on leadership skills are avoided, and instead short introductions on different theories and subjects after a learning session are offered. Students are then encouraged to read more about the specific topics (Beard & Wilson, 2006).

Teachers, or rather facilitators, at the Center are working both as management consultants in private and public organizations, and meeting students on campus. Every now and then students take part in authentic projects in companies and public agencies, thus getting opportunities to bring theory closer to practice. Hence, the concept of education through leadership infers that students are offered learning situations in order to capture, develop, and deepen their own leadership skills.

**Leadership as a Relation**

In the following paragraphs some examples are presented concerning the way we work during the leadership studies and also some additional ideas about leadership and teaching.

The main focus of leadership research since the 1930s has been upon the leader as a person. There is an abundance of research where successful leadership is described as a set of personality traits (Bono & Judge, 2004; Yukl, 2009). Skills and certain characteristics and personality traits were relevant predictors for successful leader behavior.

A conceivable consequence of this research orientation is that certain individuals were born to be leaders rather than having developed skills through practice, training, and learning. However, hundreds of studies about successful leadership have been carried out without showing any clear correlation between personality traits and efficient leadership performance (Bryman, 1992; Grint, 1997; Hagström, 2003; Yukl, 2009).

Our need for leaders has been investigated and described by many researchers (Bion, 1961; Tubbs & Carter, 1978; Moxnes, 1998). It seems like we, as group members, constantly want someone to glorify or to blame. This focus on the leader reflects dependence and an escape from responsibility as a group member.

We prefer to regard leadership as a relationship, where the ability to comprehend the needs of the co-workers and to show empathy, will create a perspective and motivation for the personal development for the leader. As an example, our ambition is to live the concept of leadership as a relationship by using feedback extensively. Feedback has been proposed as a powerful factor in adult learning.
(Halpern, 2004; DeRue & Wellman, 2009). The students are encouraged to reflect on their own behavior as well as give feedback to each other and to the teachers. Individual feedback is given frequently, first and foremost in connection to seminars and lectures managed by the students. In order to illustrate the concept of handling conflicts and to give students an opportunity to practice, role plays with subsequent discussions are offered.

**Managing Boundaries**

One of the areas we strongly focus upon, besides the ability to give and receive feedback, is the importance and the awareness of handling boundaries. Boundaries are often considered to be negative and repressive. They can be associated with being authoritarian and unfriendly. The consequence can be that the leader avoids setting boundaries. Instead, statements from the leader like – "my door is always open," "we are one big, happy family," and "I am part of the group, with very little power" can characterize the working place.

To us this means that the leader abdicates, making his mandate indistinct and unclear. Therefore, handling boundaries is an important leadership skill, being clear and visible; in fact being professional.

Some leaders want to bring about a popular image by trying to be one in the group, fulfilling personal needs of confirmation and social contact. We maintain the view that every leader should understand the importance of upholding this boundary. Without integrity it will be hard for the leader to give valuable and credible feedback and to stay detached. Upholding the boundary will gain respect, motivation, and liberate energy.

**“The Reflecting Team”**

The pedagogical setting of the reflecting team is used to increase the participation of the students and to encourage them to express their views as well as feelings and interact with each other (Andersen, 1991). The concept means that one group of 4-6 students sit in a circle discussing a matter of importance, and the rest of the students listen, sitting in an outer circle. Only the students in the middle have the mandate to participate in the conversation. The other students are encouraged to listen actively and to reflect, and after a set time a new group of students is invited to pick up on the discussion. For every new group the discussion becomes deeper and more focused. The teachers do not lead the conversation and no summary at the end is necessary because everyone has listened and participated during the discussion. This approach enhances the learning process and encourages a continued reflection. There are some educational qualities working in reflecting
teams. Time is the boundary, not the achievement. You practice your skills by both listening to your inner conversation and to the outer conversation everyone can hear. The members in the team feel more equal, since there is no chairperson. The conversation in the inner circle is usually more serious and open with a silent outer circle listening, and, moreover, everybody has heard all discussions in the room.

**Retrospect**

One aspect of reflections is that every morning in class, the period starts with a review from previous seminars. The students try to remember and answer questions such as “What did we do?” “How did the learning exercise and discussion affect me?” “My thoughts and feelings are?” “Have I met the phenomena before?” “How can I apply this new knowledge and experience for further development?” The subsequent discussions help students to confirm their experiences, to internalize their learning, to open up for colleagues’ reactions and to prepare for future leadership behavior. This procedure emphasizes process learning in contrast to pure cognitive learning.

**The Mutual Dependence of the Leader and the Group**

The prevailing view among students at our university college is that leaders take the lead, they are visible, they are heard and they push and control. In addition, conscious leadership implies that the group behaves in a predicted, desirable way, in a kind of stimuli-response reaction. As a consequence of this mental image, many participants attending leadership seminars, express an expectation to get “ready-made tools and instruments”, to handle situations in a predetermined way.

During classes at the Center we present an alternative view regarding the interaction between leaders and the group. With a metaphor, professional leadership sometimes means to walk first in the line, at other occasions to walk beside, and in a mature group maybe you, as a leader, should walk behind the group. The group is constantly occupied in influencing the leader to behave and act in ways that the group desires. Within the dynamic oriented research concerning group behavior, leadership is defined as a dynamic process where the leader and the group interact in such a way that it is not necessarily the leader who leads and the followers who follow (Granström, 1986). The impact from the group upon the leader is generally not conscious. These processes are not easy for the untrained to see, perceive, and understand (Bion, 1961; Moxnes, 1998). In role plays and observations students are made aware of these interactional processes.
Methodological Perspectives on Developing Leadership

As a principle for our teaching, the managers and the students are invited to educational methods focusing on understanding processes and opportunities for reflection. Since students do not attend any other classes while participating in leadership classes, it is easier for them to focus and concentrate.

Knowledge and skills not only deal with experiencing learning exercises, role-plays and mini-lectures, but also the ability to assimilate, to reflect, to analyze, to evaluate, and to synthesize. In this article the reflecting team has been described, where concepts are created and understood by a form of dialogues, and dialogues about dialogues, integrated with reflective listening (Andersen, 1991).

The learning processes by listening to experiences, reflections and view points from other colleagues are emphasized. Students are taught to focus not only upon the vertical learning processes (i.e., those between the student and the teacher). Learning is also taking place when interacting with a fellow colleague – horizontal learning.

One example of horizontal learning is peer-feedback. Reflexive journal assessment is also used extensively.

As a complement to regular leadership literature the students and the managers are required to read fiction written by authors on an acknowledged level. Fiction literature, quality films, and theater plays are ways to learn how to listen and to practice consciousness and sensitivity for interpersonal processes. In contrast to traditional, quantitative, external assessment, our evaluations usually take place continually during classes and focus on inner learning processes within the student. Aulls (2004) found that student perceptions of good and poor university education emphasized emotions more frequently than academic learning outcomes.

Students participate in leadership classes during their last years of their studies, since you need maturity to internalize your learning, allow personal growth and apply a relativistic way of thinking (Perry, 1999). Our way of thinking includes the fact, that training in leadership skills and behavior should strive for a change and development of the students’ understanding of themselves, and their surrounding world.

Argyris and Schön (1978) have postulated that learning in organizations can be of first order and of second order learning. The former, also called the single loop learning, implies that you directly from casual relationships take necessary steps,
to do more or less of that specific behavior. Second order learning or double loop learning refers more to an understanding of the problem, the connections and the consequences. Here the focus is on reflecting, acting to understand and changing the conditions, rather than establishing new rules and regulations.

A challenge for us, as academics, is to handle the interaction between theory and practice. Often in leadership training, the everyday solutions, the tools, have a tendency to dominate. The theoretical anchoring is necessary in order to reach another level, to understand the situation, not just to fix it (i.e., striving for double loop learning). Another aspect of academic studies is critical thinking (Burbach et al., 2004). If you have the competence to see connections and consequences, you have the ability to link your learning and conclusions to societal aspects and processes. At this level you probably have the capability to be critical towards certain tendencies and trends within the field of leadership training and their consequences for working life in society.

Conclusion

Our leadership classes have been evaluated in retrospect through questionnaires, with former students having worked for some years in different positions as leaders and teachers. Leadership training was mentioned as the subject area affecting students the most. The answers also indicated that leadership education had influenced them personally as well as professionally. For us, experiential learning is one important key element in our way of regarding and developing leadership. Beard and Wilson (2006) offer a definition: “Experiential learning is the sense-making process of active engagement between the inner world of the person and the outer world of the environment” (p. 2). Furthermore, after taking part in our leadership classes, each participant has developed an individual leadership style, based on needs, background and preferences. Finally, we believe that the best way to learn leadership is when leadership and connected processes appear in the room.
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Abstract

This paper provides leadership educators with a resource for teaching followership. It presents a lesson for teaching students about followership in contemporary society by including key concepts and follower characteristics followed by class activities and assignments designed to engage students in active learning and self-reflective processes. A dose of whimsy enhances this lesson with the use of a YouTube video that eloquently and humorously illustrates the crucial role followers play in organizational life.

Introduction

This paper provides leadership educators with a resource for teaching followership that includes key concepts and class activities. This lesson is enhanced with a humorous YouTube video that describes the role of today’s follower as being crucial. While the term followership started being used in conjunction with the term leadership to recognize the important role of the follower (Kelley, 1992), only mere mention is made of followership in leadership textbooks. While followership is gaining momentum in the leadership literature (Baker, 2007), it is still mistakenly undervalued by society as a whole (Kellerman, 2008).

Followership is a concept that is often undervalued, thought to be inconsequential or just common sense as it lingers in the shadow of leadership (Kellerman, 2008). Historically, leadership studies have neglected or limited their focus on follower styles, competencies, and attributes (Collinson, 2006) where theorists and researchers have focused on leadership almost to the exclusion of examining followership, even though most people are followers most of the time. The leadership literature is vast, yet some scholars have argued that we cannot fully understand leadership without also understanding the significance, characteristics,
and complexities of followership (Bass, 2008; Popper, 2011; Van Vugt, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2008).

Since most of us are more often followers than leaders and even engage in multiple follower roles at any given time, followership should be more prevalent in our research (Chaleff, 2009; Kelley, 1988). I argue it should be in our teaching. As Kelley (1998) stated concerning the pressures of today’s organizational life: [N]ow demands that we all learn how and when we most effectively advance our self-interest by following…which starts with abandoning a positional reference to the issue of who are followers, who leads…. (since) performance challenges – not position – should determine when you should follow and when you should lead (p. 204).

However, following provides a complex dilemma because our society incorrectly stereotypes followers in a condescending manner as docile, passive, obedient, conformists, indifferent, weak, dependent, unthinking, failures, and helpless (Baker, 2007; Chaleff, 2009; Collinson, 2006; Kellerman, 2008; Rost, 1993).

In the United States following is often even considered an insult because we have such an aversion to these characteristics which are actually incorrect perceptions about what effective followership is all about (Kellerman, 2008). Our students bring these misconceptions with them to the classroom. Nevertheless, we can argue that by fully understanding the principles of followership, students can better understand leadership (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). After all, as Kellerman (2008) wrote “better followers beget better leaders” (p. xxii).

Harris, Bruce, and Jones (2011) examined the leading academic and popular texts used by leadership educators. In their survey of 33 leadership educators, they identified 12 academic and 21 popular texts. Only one of those texts included a chapter on followership (Leadership Theory, Application & Skill Development by Lussier and Achua), but it was used by only 2.3% of the respondents. Only one popular press book was identified (by one survey respondent) that had a follower focus (Courageous Follower by Chaleff).

Since leadership textbooks pay so little attention to followership, this paper strives to remedy the current state of affairs by providing leadership educators with a resource for teaching followership in contemporary society. It includes a theoretical base of followership and summary of key concepts and follower characteristics as influenced by followership theory. It is followed by class activities and assignments designed to engage students in active learning and self-reflective processes. A dose of whimsy is included by enhancing this lesson with a YouTube video that eloquently and humorously illustrates the crucial role followers play in organizational life.
Lesson Overview & Lesson Plan

The following lesson plan is designed to facilitate learning with the primary intent to introduce students to followership in contemporary society. It includes key concepts and characteristics as well as discussion questions, class activities, and self-reflective assignments and can serve as a stand-alone lesson. The primary learning objective for this lesson is that the students will identify and explain followership concepts and characteristics in contemporary society.

The assignments are certainly not exhaustive, but are intended to offer a variety of methods, exercises, and assignments to facilitate student learning. The works from Chaleff, Kellerman, and Kelley were paramount in preparing this lesson.

Before the lecture portion of the class where the theoretical construct and key concepts are taught, I have found it helpful to pose the following discussion questions to the class or small groups first. These questions typically get responses that adhere to conventional wisdom about followers including that they are passive and dependent, or at the very least they are less important than leaders.

- What comes to mind when you think of followers (or followership)?
- Are these terms generally used in a positive or negative sense?
- What characteristics are traditionally associated with followers?

I have found this discussion provides a helpful segue into then sharing major followership themes and debunking the myths about followers to then foster a paradigm shift to the post-industrial paradigm perspective of followership.

Theoretical Base and Key Concepts

The lesson continues with the theoretical construct of followership with the major themes, key points, and follower characteristics. The following points from the literature (Baker, 2007; Chaleff, 2009; Hackman & Johnson, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988; Rost, 1993; Smith, 1997) provide an explanation of the major followership themes and follower characteristics that can help students to understand followership from post-industrial paradigm perspective with a focus (see Table 1):

- The term followership honors and recognizes the importance of the role of the follower.
- Followers and leaders are roles that can be exchanged. Most people play the roles of both follower and leader within an organization and the reality is that most of us are more often followers than leaders.
• Followers are active rather than passive. They can and should initiate change and engage in problem-solving and ethical behavior.

• Leaders and followers share a common purpose. They may have different functions or roles, but they are both equally committed to the organization, share responsibility for meeting organizational goals, and should both strive for organizational excellence.

• There is an interconnection between follower and leader. They are interdependent, a two-way influence process, in a partnership, and reciprocal. Much of a leader’s success depends on effective followers and both roles deserve equal weight.

• Leaders are no longer equated with supervisors; therefore, followers should no longer be equated with subordinates.

• Effective followership prepares one to be an effective leader.

• Leaders and followers are “two sides of one process, two parts of a whole” (Chaleff, 2009, p. 2).

• According to Kelley (1998), follower roles are determined by levels of activity and critical thinking. There are 5 roles – sheep, yes people, alienated followers, survivors, and effective followers.

• Follower characteristics have traditionally been seen as dependent, indifferent, detached, passive, unthinking, and amoral. These characteristics represent the industrial paradigm.

• In contrast, from the post-industrial paradigm, follower characteristics include self-management, team spirit, positive attitude, contributor, competent, and ethical.

Table 1 summarizes the key characteristics that contrast the industrial versus post-industrial paradigms from a variety of sources (Baker, 2007; Chaleff, 2009; Hackman & Johnson, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988; Rost, 1993; Smith, 1997). Faculty may use this as a reference for lecture notes, PowerPoint slides, and student handouts.
Table 1. Follower Characteristics from the Industrial and Post-industrial Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Paradigm Characteristics</th>
<th>Post-industrial Paradigm Characteristics</th>
<th>Post-industrial Paradigm Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Self-management</td>
<td>self-reliant, thinks for self, can work well without close supervision, responsible, self-starter, well-balanced, takes initiative, self-control, self-reflective, clarifies role and expectations, seeks honest feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Team Spirit</td>
<td>appreciates goals and needs of the team, loyal, loyal, sees coworkers as colleagues rather than competitors, contributing “sweat equity” to the performance of others, offers support to the leader, works as partners with the leader, builds bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>Positive Attitude</td>
<td>enthusiastic, appreciative, gracious, optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>functions well in change environment, believes he/she can offer as much value to the organization as the leaders do, committed to a cause/idea/organization, search for overlooked problems, raises issues or concerns when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unthinking</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>master skills useful to the organization, high performance standards, committed to professional development, good judge of personal strengths and weaknesses, thinks independently and critically, problem solver, insightful, talented, skilled, curious, innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoral</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>honest, courageous, credible, considers integrity of paramount importance, good judgment, admits mistakes, stands up for beliefs, knows oneself, resists inappropriate influence of the leader, makes right ethical decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Baker, 2007; Chaleff, 2009; Hackman & Johnson, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988; Rost, 1993; Smith, 1997

Once the key concepts are presented, I show a YouTube video entitled Leadership Lessons and the Dancing Guy (Sivers, 2010). The video is of a lone dancer who
then gets the crowd to join him. The scene and narration provides a humorous learning tool to further stimulate students’ thinking about followership from the post-industrial paradigm.

Using video in various formats, including YouTube, allows us to illustrate a concept or principle while making class content more relatable to students. Berk (2009) cites more than a dozen studies that support using video or film to support student learning. By the same token, multimedia allows leadership educators to teach leadership theory in new and inventive ways that captures students’ attention, provides a catalyst for thoughtful discussion (Graham, Sincoff, Baker, & Ackerman, 2003), and generates dialogue to drive home difficult or complex points (Williams, 2006).

Likewise, there are also benefits to using humor in teaching. It helps students engage in the learning process by creating a positive environment to allow students to better focus on the information being presented. Research shows that students who have teachers who use humor in the classroom tend to learn more since it aids recall (Garner, 2009). As such, the Leadership Lessons and the Dancing Guy video, using multimedia and humor, enhances the lesson to assist students with making the paradigm shift to understand the importance of followership.

After the lecture and showing the video, students should have a firm foundation to then commence with further class discussion, small group discussions, activities, and guided reflections and suggestions are provided as follows.

Class Discussion Questions, Activities, and Self-Reflective Assignments

Class Discussion Questions (or Online Discussion Questions)
- In the video, what is some of the terminology the narrator uses that shows that he recognizes the importance of the “followership?”
- In the video, the narrator says that the leader embraces the first follower as an equal. Remember a time when you embraced as an equal or felt empowered as a follower. What caused you to feel this way? What role does the leader play in empowering followers?
- In the video, the narrator says that new followers emulate followers – not the leaders? Do you agree or disagree?
- In the video, the narrator says that leadership is over-glorified. Do you agree or disagree?
• What’s it like to be a follower in a situation/organization/context with traditional (industrial) mindset of followership? How is it the same or different from a context with a post-industrial mindset of followership?
• Have your thoughts on followers changed from today’s lesson? How? Are there ideas about followership that warrant more thought?

Class Activities
• Joseph Rost (1993), author of Leadership for the Twenty-first Century, says that we shouldn’t use the term “followership” because followers engage in the “leadership” process, not the followership process. On the other hand, some say that the term “followership” best describes what followers do and how they differ from leaders. Debate the term “followership.” Do followers participate in leadership as Rost advocates or do they engage in followership?
• The video narrator says that being a first follower is an under-appreciated form of leadership. Debate this notion. Is the “first follower” a form of leadership or is it followership?
• The video narrator, as well as Chaleff (2009), says that being a follower takes courage. In small groups, come up with real-life situations either personal or public where this is the case and share with the class.

Self-Reflective Assignments (Journaling or Self-Reflective Paper)
• What type of follower are you according to Kelley’s (1998) follower types? How do you assess yourself as a follower? Do you tend to fit the characteristics of an industrial paradigm follower or a post-industrial paradigm follower? What are your followership strengths and shortcomings?
• Develop a personal action plan which describes actions you can take to be a more effective follower. Explain how this can also translate to effective leadership.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the term followers has been attributed with negative qualities, such as passivity, dependence, and detachment (Chaleff, 2009; Kellerman, 2008). As products of our society, I believe our students will largely continue to ascribe many of these characteristics to followers rather than viewing following as a positive and necessary part of the leadership process unless we teach them otherwise.

I teach this lesson about two-thirds of the way through the class once students have an understanding of leadership theories such as leadership traits, skills, styles. My student responses to including followership as a topic in a leadership
class have been positive overall. Some of the typical types of comments that illustrate their learning are as follows:

• My thoughts on followers have changed. They have changed because now I clearly understand that it takes just as much work to be an effective follower as it does with an effective leader.

• Prior to studying the term “followership” my definition of a follower was a person who mimicked the actions of the leader, who did not have a mind of their own and had no leadership type traits. I was shocked when I found out my thoughts were totally wrong.

• Before studying this unit I never thought of followers as an important part of leadership but now I see that you cannot have effective leaders without effective followers and how much responsibility falls on followers as well.

• I really liked the second video about the young man dancing, not only was it entertaining but the video did an excellent job of explaining that leadership is the product of successful followership.

• The video clip of “leadership (and followers) lessons” shows how important that the first follower is to the leader. The first follower needs acceptance and praise from the leader. It’s not just the leader that attracts other followers, followers need to see that the followers before them are cared for and are needed.

• This writing got me to think about the fact that we do spend so much time studying leadership, but not followership. It’s like growing up learning how to be an effective speaker, but never an effective listener.

I believe we have an obligation to help our students get past an elitist view of leadership that coincides with a conformist view of followership. Once again, Rost (1991) challenges our thinking by saying that only people who are active in the leadership process should be considered followers because passive people are not in a relationship, or contributing to this process since they have chosen to not be involved. In other words, passive people are not followers. He goes so far as to say that “followers do not do followership, they do leadership” (p. 109). They are two sides of the same coin – leaders and followers are engaged in leadership together.

Just as Huber (2002) wrote that as leadership educators we must develop the capacity of individuals and organizations to lead, I believe an important part of
that educational process is to also teach them how to effectively follow and to view followership in a positive light. As leadership educators, we can help our students reconceptualize how they view followers and nudge them past the preconceived notion that followers are unimportant and inconsequential to organizational success (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007). Hence, we can facilitate an understanding of the conceptual framework of followership and the value of followers, and foster an appreciation of the critical contributions followers make to organizational life.
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Abstract

What style of leadership is most effective in a particular situation with a specific group of followers? How do leaders best motivate followers in achieving goals? Although important questions, before we may come to fully understand the how and what of leadership, in this brief I suggest that we reflect upon a more basic leadership question. In the context of a paradigm from the work of the late educator and social critic, Neil Postman (1931-2003), I explore the question, “Why does leadership exist?” For when we reflect upon the answer to that question, we may gain further insight into ourselves as leaders, which may enhance our understanding of what good leadership looks like and how we might best achieve it.

Introduction

I have always valued the wisdom of the late educator and social critic, Neil Postman (1931-2003), whose critique of education is quite thought provoking, remaining relevant to this day. It is his work that in part influences my vision of leadership. Postman (1996) believed that before we address questions such as “What should be taught in school?” and “What should be expected of teachers?” we first need to discern the purpose of school, which he proposed was to create morally healthy and sustainable communities. To accomplish this goal of creating community, Postman advocated that teachers must engage students in the exploration of true narratives. In the context of his writing, a true narrative is a complex concept of such significance to our existence as a society that we arrange our lives around it. In the case of true narratives such as democracy and freedom, we risk our lives to attain and preserve them. Other examples of true narratives include love, peace, spirituality, integrity, and learning. Postman believed that
these true narratives teach us “how to make a life, which is quite different than how to make a living” (p. x). He further suggests that these narratives provide us with a sense of identity, community, and moral conduct. It is through learning about true narratives that we create the capacity for community building.

**Postman’s Paradigm in the Context of Leadership Education**

Reflecting on Postman’s work in the context of leadership education, it seems that as leaders, researchers, and educators we need to ask a similar question, specifically, “Why does leadership exist?” before we may come to fully understand the how and what questions, which have been the primary focus of the current body of leadership theory and research to date. Some examples of these questions include, “How do leaders persuade others to follow them?” “How do leaders and followers best achieve goals?” “How do leaders best motivate followers in achieving a vision?” “What style of leadership is most effective in a particular situation with a specific group of followers?” I am not suggesting that these questions are not important to the study of leadership. What I am suggesting is that history teaches us that those who we identify as society’s greatest leaders had very clear insights on why leadership exists and that is the focus of this writing.

For example, when acting as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, past President George Washington, was driven in pursuing the true narrative of independence as illustrated by his words, “It is my full intention to devote my life and fortune in the cause [independence from British rule] we are engaged in, if need be” (Phillips, 1997, p. 45).

Another example, Martin Luther King gave his life in the pursuit of freedom; his passion is evident in his words, “We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed” (http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=100).

These examples and many others suggest that a good part of the answer to, “Why does leadership exist?” has much in common with how Postman poses and answers the question, “Why does school exist?” It could be that the purpose of leadership is to achieve and sustain true narratives that teach us how to make a life while the purpose of schools is to teach students to explore why those narratives are valuable in the first place. Therefore, just as teachers need to engage students in identifying and understanding the relevance of true narratives, leaders need to engage society in pursuing them.
Those of us in education serve as both teachers and leaders. I would further suggest that global commonality exists in identifying true narratives; how to best achieve and sustain them is where the conflict is likely to arise. For it is the how and what questions that are influenced by cultural norms and divergent life experiences, but the why questions are far more universal and profound, as they are likely to encompass true narratives that are for the most part valued by the majority.

To further illustrate, Washington spent a major portion of his life pursuing independence; yet how Washington practiced leadership in pursuit of independence may have been quite different than how leaders might pursue it today. Culture and context influence leadership, making leadership behavior dynamic over time and circumstance. As Gandhi points out, “I suppose leadership at one time meant muscles; but today it means getting along with people” (as cited in Chew, 2011, p.130.)

However, true narratives that help to identify and explain why leadership exists are timeless. Wise leaders artfully avoid the pitfall of discussing how without first establishing why by linking shared vision to true narratives. For if we agree on why leadership exists, we may then better understand what good leaders need to do to enact it, which, when incorporated into our teaching of leadership, is likely to enhance leadership performance. Many true narratives exist among us. Good leadership recognizes the need to define and redefine those narratives in the context of today’s global world, expressing tradition while at the same time vividly painting the narrative in a way that instills passion, creates clarity and engages global minds in contemporary times.

**Leadership as True Narrative: Connection, Authenticity, and Vulnerability**

Well-orchestrated leadership is a powerful narrative in itself that profoundly connects us communally in the pursuit of other true narratives, creating in us the heightened sense of identity, community and moral conduct necessary in what Postman describes as making a life. Our heightened sense of identity is the evolving self-discovery achieved through frequent reflection and discernment; it is the sum of who we have become from birth until the present moment. Thus, it becomes vitally important for us to thoughtfully identify those true narratives that are so compelling that they define us and connect us with one another, making us willing to change our life and our work in pursuit of them. For if we let another person or entity define our identity for us, we cheat ourselves out of that true self-discovery; and with that, we extinguish the ability to think uniquely and creatively, traits in which most great leaders excel. In other words, we cheat
ourselves and others out of our best leadership potential. The sacrifices we are willing to make in pursuit of true narratives give us the foundation for making a life and in so doing make our existence more meaningful and worthy in our own eyes as well as in the eyes of those around us.

To better illustrate the importance of connection, the well-known sociologist and researcher Brené Brown (2011), learned from over a decade of research that those of us who feel worthy of belonging (she describes this as whole-heartedness) are those of us who have the courage to be imperfect, the compassion to treat ourselves and others kindly and the ability to feel connected; and that this whole-heartedness is what others describe in us as being authentic. I would argue that successful leadership becomes most apparent at those points in our lives when we are most authentic, when we take the risk to let ourselves be seen, really seen. Brown refers to this depth of authenticity as excruciating vulnerability, which she describes as strength versus weakness; strength that we, as educators, need to demonstrate consistently in our interactions with students and in the work that we do outside of the classroom. It is this degree of authenticity that connects us to one another, and it is those connections that lead to what Postman (1996) describes as making a life by building morally healthy and sustainable communities.

As for authenticity, it is values-based. It is the moral conduct that Postman (1995) describes as necessary when building community. Those of us who consistently though not perfectly emulate espoused values will likely be viewed as worthy leaders. To achieve that depth of authenticity, however, we first need to know ourselves well and be comfortable with that knowledge. In so doing, we are more able to recognize and avoid the pursuit of false narratives, such as excessive consumerism, greed, and illegitimate power over instead of legitimate power with. We learn to realize that serving self above others results in feelings of cynicism, anger, disillusionment, and isolation for us and for those we interact with regularly, including our students. Senge (2002) highlights the importance of authenticity and connection as he writes, “genuine leadership is deeply personal and inherently collective” (p. 359).

Putting Ourselves in the Place of Most Potential

We might also ask ourselves how we may be most impactful in pursuing true narratives, and in encouraging this pursuit in students as well. Dewitt Jones (2005), a professional photographer, tells us that to best achieve our personal vision in life we need to be in places with the most potential. What I believe Jones means is that we need to develop a keen sense of where our talents and interests are most likely to make a positive difference and that is where we need to place
ourselves. To illustrate, throughout my career I have seen formal leaders become comfortable in their organizational roles. They have become so comfortable that they begin to use their position power to achieve a personal vision that is unaligned to the organization’s vision, sometimes actually convincing themselves that their personal vision is the organization’s vision. No matter how honorable that personal vision might be, when it is unaligned with the vision of the organization, it becomes an organizationally ineffective use of talent and resources. Nanus (1992) reminds us of this when he writes, “Human behavior in organizations is very much shaped by a shared vision of a better tomorrow. Developing and promulgating such a vision is the highest calling and truest purpose of leadership” (p. 19).

A classic example of personal vision in conflict with organizational vision can be seen in the behavior of the late Steve Jobs when he parted ways with Apple in the early 1990s. Imagine the passion he felt for the organization he had created from ground up just seven years earlier. And yet he left Apple because his personal vision at his time of departure was unaligned with the company he had founded. That misalignment created barriers instead of bridges and he was smart enough to recognize that what he had created outside of Apple’s vision took on a life of its own.

To emphasize, impactful leaders recognize the need to put themselves in the place of most potential by working with those who share the passion of achieving those true narratives most valued by them. Cultural anthropologist Margaret Mead once said, “A small group of thoughtful people could change the world. Indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has” (http://www.biography.com/people/margaret-mead-9404056). When we align ourselves with those who pursue narratives that we, too, are most passionate about, our chances of achieving success in what we do together is far greater than what we may accomplish alone. We see the truth in this throughout history with examples such as the civil rights movement in the United States, the restorative justice movement in South Africa, the peace treaty attained in El Salvador, and the present sustainability movement across the globe. These historical events clearly demonstrate why leadership exists. In each of these instances, a small group of thoughtful people built their lives around true narratives of equality, peace, preservation, justice, and forgiveness. The impact of their leadership has made the world a better place for all of us.

On a more personal and professional level, we see the power of passion in our teaching and learning, in serving on committees, and in conducting research. When we align ourselves with those in our profession who lead with impact and we do so as well, we put ourselves in the place of most potential for making positive change happen. Challenges begin to present themselves as opportunities for positive change.
Why does leadership exist? It exists to profoundly connect us to each other in achieving those true narratives that promote the common good by building morally healthy and sustainable local and global communities for the benefit of humanity. Sorenson, Goethals, and Haber (2011) paint this picture as they write, “The human condition, and thus leadership, fundamentally involves making meaning…and that real change…involves influencing the meanings that different groups make in the context of competing and conflicting definitions of reality and of value” (p. 33). In a similar vein, Laudeman (2012) tells us, “In the postmodern world, leading is about contributing to collective cognition and enabling shared sensemaking” (p. 42). When we lead in this way, we continue to discover ourselves and the richness of our relationships with students while role modeling behavior that better illustrates to them why leadership exists. At the same time, we garner better understanding of the purpose of our existence, fulfilling a moral impetus that helps us make a life by pursuing those true narratives that lead to holistically healthy living for us and for those we serve.
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