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Beyond the Impostor Phenomenon: Reaching One’s Potential in Diverse and Global Contexts

Chair: Stephanie Menefee, Northcentral University
Megan Downing, Northern Kentucky University
Ada Cenkci, Northern Kentucky University
Jeffrey Zimmerman, Northern Kentucky University
Nana Arthur-Mensah, Northern Kentucky University
Melody Rawlings, Northcentral University

Abstract

The Impostor Phenomenon (IP), a psychological cycle of reoccurring self-doubt and diminished self-efficacy, can negatively affect even the most accomplished individuals. While leadership in any location is by no means easy, leadership in an unfamiliar host culture or organization can provide additional challenges to anyone used to leading in a more familiar environment. Similarly, feelings of IP can be exacerbated among leaders in an unfamiliar host culture due to a variety of factors impacting one’s self-efficacy outside of one’s home culture (i.e. culture shock, etc.). Because IP is characterized by lower levels of self-efficacy, panelists will discuss various approaches to increase self-efficacy through activities that promote self-leadership and effective followership. Panelists will also address issues such as loneliness and an increasingly virtual workplace as a means to raise self-efficacy and mitigate potential negative effects of IP in diverse and global contexts. Panelists will explore implications for leader/follower development and teaching strategies that build confidence for anyone facing IP-triggering situations in diverse environments. Contrasting perspectives and common themes will create a rich tapestry for discussion.
Applying the Integrated Capacious Model of Leadership Identities Construction: Creating and Maintaining Leadership Education Programs with Limited Time and Resources

Doug DeWitt, Chair, Salisbury University
Wallace Southerland III, Salisbury University
Christy Harper, Salisbury University
Chrys Egan, Salisbury University

Abstract

In this panel, participants will understand and apply the Integrated Capacious Model of Leadership Identities Construction to creating and maintaining leadership education programs that have proven successful even with limited time or resources. The Capacious Model encourages every person to develop their leadership identity by examining leadership contexts (from internal to cultural) and influences (purpose and calling, self-identity, social identity, and relationship). Each panelist offers different programs to illustrate what has been done and what panel attendees might do. Presenter 1 discusses serving as Chair of a Graduate Council and starting a Leadership Faculty Learning Community. Presenter 2 illustrates Student Affairs leadership programming and hosting an inaugural campus/community Leadership Summit.

Presenter 3 explains the process of creating a new Outdoor Leadership Education undergraduate major and tailoring variations of this programming to high school students. Presenter 4 outlines the Youth Innovation Academy that supports leadership development to children as young as 10 years old and aims to close COVID educational gaps. This interdisciplinary, multi-level panel examines leadership identities construction across diverse program designs to help attendees envision designing or enhancing their own programs.

Panel Details

This panel guides participants to apply the Integrated Capacious Model of Leadership Identities Construction as a design template for leadership education programs. The model’s Systems (Individual System, Microsystem, Mesosystem, Exosystem, Macrosystem, and Chronosystem) locate leader identity in time and place, while its Influences (Purpose/Calling, Self-Identity, Social Identity, and Relationships) pinpoint key factors affecting leader identities. The model connects its Systems and Influences with prominent leader identity theories (Narrative Identity, Identity Theory, Social Identity Theory, and Social Constructionism). The panel is designed for scholars, educators, and practitioners from any discipline, sector, or organization who seek to broaden their understanding of leadership identities and gain a tool for diagnosing and developing their own and others’ leadership identities construction process. The panel goals will be met by presenting an overview of the model, guiding participants through sample leadership programs from the presenters, and offering best practices for designing leader identities development programs.

In a review of the history of identity, particularly leader identity theory, Fox-Kirk, Campbell, and Egan (2017) note a wide variety of approaches to describing and understanding leader identity,
ranging from identity as psychological construct to identity as social construction. Their summative conclusion that leader identity is “ongoing, dynamic, and contextual” (p. 203) aligns with calls for leader identity theories that are multi-level and context-based (e.g., Epitropaki et al., 2016; Pratt, 2017). The Capacious Model of Leadership Identities Construction (Egan et al., 2017) responds to those challenges with an approach that considers not only context, but also the fluidity of leader identity over time, through multi-leveled Systems (Individual System, Microsystem, Mesosystem, Exosystem, Macrosystem, and Chronosystem) and examples of potential Influences on leadership identities (Purpose/Calling, Self-identity, Social Identity, and Relationships). The model addresses the what, where, and when of leader identities construction. To address the how, the updated Integrated Capacious Model (Campbell, Shollen, Egan, & Thompson, 2017) aligns each of the model’s Influences with a prominent leader identity theory (Narrative Identity, Identity Theory, Social Identity, and Social Constructionism).

As the word “capacious” suggests, the inclusive nature of the Integrated Capacious Model is particularly appropriate for use with identities who historically have been marginalized in their leadership attempts. The model’s grounding in mutually influential Systems that contextualize where and when leader identities develop is particularly apt for marginalized groups, whose leader identity may have been stifled by prevailing contextual norms. The model can help pinpoint a few among many Influences that provide challenges or opportunities for their leader identity, and be applied to discover the how of building a leader identity by drawing upon prominent leader identity theories that connect to particular Influences.

Individuals can begin their understanding of the impact of context on their own leadership identities construction by considering the Systems (modified from Bronfenbrenner, 2009): (1) their intrapersonal understanding of themselves as a leader (Individual Level), (2) how their immediate face-to-face interactions with others enable or restrict the building of a leadership identity (Microsystem), (3) how the connections between their disparate microsystems influence leadership identities (Mesosystem), (4) how their experiences are affected by indirect contact with others (Exosystem), (5) how their organizational and cultural norms influence leadership identities (Macrosystem), and (6) how their process has changed and will change over time (Chronosystem).

Attention then turns to the Influences as a starting point for diagnosing factors that impact their leader identity. Individuals may consider: (1) the reasons they choose to lead (Purpose/Calling - Narrative Identity Theory), (2) their answer to the question “Who am I?” (Self-identity - Role Identity Theory), (3) their membership in meaningful groups and the extent to which they are prototypical of the group (Social Identities - Social Identity Theory), and (4) essential interpersonal contacts (Relationships - Social Construction). Upon diagnosis of the most relevant Systems and Influences, individuals can consult the leader identity theories woven into the Integrated Capacious Model to serve as a guide for action.

The capaciousness of the model means that this panel is designed for practitioners, educators, or scholars from any discipline, sector, or organization who desire to learn more about applying the Integrated Capacious Model to their own or others’ leadership identities through assessment and programming. The panel outline includes:

ASSOCIATION OF LEADERSHIP EDUCATORS
I. Introduction: What do leadership education programs teach us about leadership identity, systems, and influences? (Panel Chair)
   b. Influences and Theories: Purpose/Calling (Narrative Identity), Self-Identity (Role Identity Theory), Social Identities (Social Identity Theory), and Relationships (Social Constructionism)

II. Graduate Leadership Education and Faculty Learning Community (Presenter 1)
   a. Graduate Council Chair: Where does leadership education belong? Graduate-level leadership education across the disciplines
   b. Leadership Faculty Learning Community: How should we train the trainers? Supporting faculty and staff leadership development to “lead the lead”
   c. Lessons learned to apply to other programs

III. Student Affairs and Leadership Summit (Presenter 2)
   a. Student Affairs: How can Student Affairs collaborate with Academic Affairs? Offering co-curricular and extra-curricular campus programs to enhance student leadership training and opportunities
   b. Leadership Summit: How should community and the university coordinate? Creating and hosting an inaugural Leadership Summit for top campus and community members to collaborate
   c. Lessons learned to apply to other programs

IV. Outdoor Leadership Education (Presenter 3)
   a. Outdoor Leadership Education: What is the connection between leadership and the outdoors? Expanding from undergraduate academic minor to major
   b. Wilderness First Aid: Are we really prepared for emergencies? Training and certification for program leaders, college students, and high school students
   c. Lessons learned to apply to other programs

V. Youth Innovation Academy (Presenter 4)
   a. Youth Innovation Academy: How young can you start leadership education? Leadership, career, and higher education preparation for middle-school students
   b. Summer Enrichment Academies: How has COVID changed youth leadership education? Closing the COVID educational gaps
   c. Lessons learned to apply to other programs

VI. Applying the Lessons – Participants are asked to discuss their existing or envisioned programs. Connections will be made from the panelists’ programs and lessons.
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When Leadership Terminology Collides: 
A Spirited Comparison of Adaption-Innovation Theory and Adaptive Leadership

Adam Cletzer, University of Missouri
Megan M. Seibel, Virginia Tech
Eric Kaufman, Virginia Tech
Curt Friedel, Virginia Tech
Moderator: Jeremy Elliott-Engel, University of Arizona

Abstract

As researchers, scholars, and practitioners, leadership educators apply an intellectual inquiry process, identifying what is known and understood, and what is not. Often, this requires seeking clarity around terms and considering how similarities might be contextualized differently between theory and practice. Exemplified through research and teaching, both Adaption-Innovation (A-I) Theory and Adaptive Leadership share similar vocabularies surrounding the concept of adaption. Both are concerned with how individuals and groups solve varying types of problems and navigate change, but one emphasizes individual differences in cognitive style while the other prescribes a series of leader/group processes. This moderated panel affords opportunity for a deep dive into the nuanced overlap of terminology with the premise that leadership educators often teach and model theoretically sound concepts in practice-based contexts. An examined comparison of A-I theory to Adaptive Leadership may illuminate this valuable example of connecting rigorous, empirically supported theory and pragmatic practice.

Introduction

Since Heifetz’s (1994) book, Leadership Without Easy Answers, Adaptive Leadership has consistently grown in popularity among practitioners and scholars. The Adaptive Leadership framework is a useful resource for leaders attempting to help organizations and communities adapt to change. However, Adaptive Leadership endures significant criticism surrounding its lack of theoretical underpinnings, empirical research, clear conceptualizations, and evidence-based support for the framework’s basic tenets (Northouse, 2021). For all its popularity, few studies have supported Adaptive Leadership’s tenets with either philosophical grounding or empirical evidence (e.g., Adams et al., 2013; DeRue, 2011; Mugisha & Berg, 2017). Both practitioners and scholars could benefit from greater understanding of Adaptive Leadership’s inner workings.

Long before Heifetz (1994) wrote Leadership Without Easy Answers, Kirton (1976) introduced Adaption-Innovation (A-I) theory, contending that all individuals are creative and must solve novel problems in their day-to-day lives. No individual leader is suited to solve a complete spectrum of problems. Kirton (2011) explains:
For a long time now we have searched for ideal leaders who can, with the help of their
team, be guaranteed to solve specific arrays of problems. But we have long known that
such leaders cannot hope to solve any such increasingly complex arrays by relying on
knowing enough personally to arrive at all the answers. It is the whole team that needs to
solve the problems… (p. 312)

Kirton’s (2011) A-I theory explains an individuals’ innate cognitive style, based on preferences
for more or less structure. More “adaptive” individuals prefer structured situations that allow
them to develop creative ideas within an accepted paradigm for the purpose of making it more
efficient (Kirton, 2013). More “innovative” individuals prefer less structured situations where
they may develop creative ideas both inside and outside of an established paradigm for the
purpose of making things different (Kirton, 2013). According to Stum (2009), “the leadership
pendulum has shifted from valuing the adaptor over the innovator in the 1970s and 1980s to
preferring the innovative leader in the 1990s and 2000s” (p. 75). In reality, a wide range of
problem solving styles helps to solve a wider range of problems (Jablokow, 2008; Kirton, 2011).

Through an in-depth, facilitated panel discussion, participants will:

- explore similar vocabularies of A-I theory and Adaptive Leadership surrounding the
  concept of adaption;
- understand how A-I theory and Adaptive Leadership focus on the manner in which
  individuals and organizations solve varying types of problems and navigate change; and
- examine the application of A-I theory to the underlying mechanisms of Adaptive
  Leadership to connect a more rigorous, empirically supported theory to a popular
  practice.

**Background**

Adaption-Innovation theory and Adaptive Leadership are the two major topics of this panel
discussion. Below is a brief synopsis of each.

**Adaption-Innovation Theory**

Kirton (2011) posits that all individuals are creative and solve problems. Over 40 years of
research supports that problem-solving style, as it relates to A-I theory, is independent from
intelligence, process, motive, attitude, situation, culture, and learned skills. We each approach
problems with an innate problem-solving style, either more adaptive or more innovative in one’s
preference. In A-I theory, more adaptive individuals prefer well established and structured
situations, allowing them to develop creative ideas within the structure for the purpose of making
it more efficient (Kirton, 2013). Often, the more adaptive are perceived by the more innovative
as detailed, thorough, systematic, and traditional. A more innovative individual, on the other
hand, prefers less structured situations where they may develop creative ideas as a chance to set
up different structures outside of the current paradigm (Kirton, 2013). More innovative
individuals are often perceived by the more adaptive as freethinking, rule-breaking, and
unconventional. One’s preferred problem-solving style cannot be altered or developed, but rather
is constant throughout one’s life (Kirton, 2013); this is in contrast to a person’s understanding of, and approach to, leadership, which may shift as one changes his or her attitudes and beliefs on leadership (Hanks et al., 2015; Priest & Middleton, 2016). We can all operate more adaptively or more innovatively than our preferred problem-solving style, but this coping behavior (Kirton, 2011) is psychologically taxing. While preferred problem-solving style is innate and stable, individuals may learn skills to operate more adaptively or innovatively when the problem solver recognizes the need to do so, as driven by motive.

“Leaders are faced with complex challenges that call for leadership to span a broad context, create strategic alliances, share leadership responsibilities, and meet the demands of global citizenship” (Hanks et al., 2015, p. 3). Leaders are better able to face these challenges if they understand how we each differ in how we prefer to solve problems and manage structure. Additionally, it is not only individuals who can trend more adaptive or more innovative in their problem solving style. Organizations, units, or groups within organizations can also trend more adaptive or more innovative, creating a cognitive climate that privileges a particular problem solving style.

While A-I theory has not typically been considered a leadership theory, it may improve our understanding of leadership processes when used as a cognitive theory. For example, Friedel (2014) suggested that many definitions of leadership tend to be biased towards innovation, while definitions of management tend to be biased towards adaption. Friedel (2014) recognized leadership is the leveraging of cognitive diversity to solve problems, recognizing that cognitive diversity may impede work on solving the problem being tasked. In this connection of leadership and problem solving, Kirton (2013) offers that every time a group solves a problem, there are essentially two problems, Problem A and Problem B. Problem A is the main problem at hand and the initial reason why the team was formulated; whereas, Problem B is any problem that arises which does not help support the solving of Problem A (Kirton, 2013). One common Problem B that impedes solving Problem A can derive from individuals being unwilling to see fellow team members’ viewpoints with respect to their differences in problem-solving style with the belief that the other’s preference to solve the problem is not only a bad idea, but a bad idea that only benefits one or a few of the team members (Kirton, 2011). A team is therefore considered successful if it is able to work together with mutual respect and contribute to solving Problem A and proactively try to prevent Problem Bs from getting in the way.

Adaptive Leadership

Adaptive leadership is a popular prescriptive framework for leaders engaging followers in adapting their organizations to changing environments. While not a theory, the framework of adaptive leadership has evolved from situational, transformational, and complexity theories (Cojocar, 2009). It combines practical measures for the collectivist-minded positional leader with an organizational perspective informed by complex adaptive systems theory (Northouse, 2021; Uhl Bien et al., 2007). Rather than focusing on the leader and his or her characteristics, adaptive leadership stresses the activities of the leader in relation to the work of the followers in the organizational change context (Northouse, 2021). Though the conceptual foundations of
adaptive leadership have been developed by several theorists (e.g., Bennis, 2003; Yukl & Lepsinger, 2002), it was first described by, and most closely associated with, Heifetz and colleagues (e.g., Heifetz et al., 1991; Heifetz et al., 2009; Heifetz & Laurie, 1997; Heifetz & Linsky, 2017).

Heifetz’s (2009) exposition of adaptive leadership contains dozens of discrete concepts and maxims for the would-be adaptive leader. However, Northouse (2021) has synthesized adaptive leadership into a few key principles, which will be core to our panel discussion. First, “get on the balcony” refers to the practice of mentally distancing oneself from an organization to better see its patterns of interaction, and thus gain perspective. Second, “identify the adaptive challenge” refers to parsing technical challenges, which are best solved with managerial expertise, from adaptive problems, which are best addressed with adaptive leadership. Third, “regulating distress” refers to maintaining a productive level of disequilibrium in an organization, such that members feel enough disequilibrium to be compelled to address the adaptive problem, but not so much that they are unable to address the problem. Fourth, “maintain disciplined attention” refers to keeping both leaders’ and stakeholders’ attention to the adaptive problem and avoiding defaults and work avoidance habits. Fifth, “give the work back” refers to engaging those individuals with the adaptive problem in solving it, rather than seeking a heroic individual leader to provide a solution. Sixth, “protect voices from below” refers to purposefully encouraging dissenting and negative views in an organization; this is an example of fostering a feedback loop to help a system learn about itself in order to adapt (Wheatley, 1992). Additionally, Heifetz attends to the context of leadership and proposes the “holding environment,” which is the psychological and physical environment in which adaptive work is done (Heifetz, 2009). One of the primary roles of the adaptive leader is to create and maintain a holding environment.

**Description**

This moderated panel discussion will feature four leadership education scholars and A-I-certified practitioners. The moderator, a leadership program director, will pose pre-established questions and discussion prompts, while welcoming input and questions from the audience. Contextual information and question-based dialog between moderator and panelists will last about 60 minutes, with the remaining 20-30 minutes dedicated to responding to audience inquiry. The panel format with content experts will allow for rich presentation of theoretical content toward developing understanding among colleagues in attendance, with the supposition that many in leadership education and programmatic practice are teaching and modeling theoretically solid concepts in practice-based contexts. And, to this end, an opportunity for open discussion and panel Q&A is a prime exploratory exercise when terminology is similar and nuanced across subject matter.

The proposed agenda for the 60-minute panelist discussion will start with a description of A-I theory and Adaptive Leadership’s central principles, then expand on the theoretical and practical implications for leadership education and practice. We will discuss similarities and differences in terminology, addressing false and superficial parallels, and highlighting deeper underlying commonalities. Finally, we will discuss the ramifications of A-I theory on scenarios related to
Adaptive Leadership’s key concepts (e.g., getting on the balcony, holding environment, productive zone of disequilibrium).

With an assumption that the conference will utilize Zoom, this panel will engage attendees via the chat, interactive breakout spaces, and polling features in coordination with the host.

**Foreseeable Implications**

The primary implications of this panel will be a clearer understanding of the commonalities between A-I theory and Adaptive Leadership, and also a more detailed and research-based understanding of Adaptive Leadership’s own concepts by viewing them through the lens of A-I Theory. This will, of course, be beneficial to those teaching and practicing adaptive leadership. However, we also expect this panel discussion, and subsequent conversations, to spark research interests. Adaptive Leadership’s dearth of empirical evidence is due at least in part to poor conceptual clarity; this discussion of A-I Theory’s relevance to Adaptive Leadership may provide the conceptual foothold to begin empirical studies of Adaptive Leadership.

**References**


When Best is not Best for All: Rethinking Best Practices in Leadership Education

Chair: Onyedikachi Ekwerike, Kansas State University
Jessica Chung, University of Minnesota
Nyasha M. Guramatunhu Cooper, Our Lady of the Lake University
Jason Headrick, Texas Tech University
Darren Pierre, Loyola University, Chicago
Kerry Priest, Kansas State University

Abstract

The concept of “best practices” is prevalent in higher education as a means to denote a procedure or practice that is most effective or appropriate, particularly in teaching methods and assessment. The current complexities of a global pandemic, racial justice, and economic devastation ask us to pause and consider the purpose, applicability, and impact of best practices in leadership education. This panel brings together leadership educators from different institutions, social locations, and scholarly interests to discuss the use and limitations of best practices, offer a framing for “impactful practices” as an additional and alternative consideration for design and measure of assessment, and consider critical questions shaping the future of leadership education.

Introduction

The concept of “best practices” is prevalent in higher education as a means to denote a procedure or practice that is most effective or appropriate, particularly in teaching methods and assessment. Best practices exist in multi and interdisciplinary contexts, framed as means-tested methods that should be used to produce a particular and desirable outcome. The idea of best practices is appealing because it presupposes that “all things constant,” a particular way of knowing and doing (in this case: producing, disseminating, interrogating knowledge) is the best way to perhaps easily replicate desirable learning outcomes. The complexity of 2020 has challenged the notion of “all things constant.” A global pandemic, racial injustice, and economic devastation are inescapable demonstrations that “all things are not constant.” In response, we propose the concept of impactful practices.

Grounded in time, place, and context, an impactful practice is forged by the dialectic of the heart and head (Palmer, 1998). An impactful practice is guided by the premise that knowledge production is not always linear or codified because the units of analysis are individuals who are negotiating lived experiences that simultaneously affirm and contest the boundaries of a topic, subject, or discipline. The goal of an impactful practice within leadership education is to develop intellectual and emotional “products of labor” (Dugan & Humbles, 2018, p. 12) that reflect and honor epistemology, worldview, and social location as antecedents to understanding, experiencing, and enacting knowledge about leadership. What impactful practices offer is a conscious and intentional escape from the limits of best practices, acknowledging that “all things are not always constant,” and that who we are, who the students are, and the specific moment we are in matters.
This panel brings together leadership educators from different institutions, social locations, and scholarly interests to a) discuss the use and limitations of best practices, b) offer the concept of impactful practices as an additional and alternative method of assessment, and c) consider how best practices and impactful practices shape leadership education.

Background

The idea of best practices originated from management consultant Frederick Taylor, who sought the “one best way” of improving production in industrial workplace settings (Osborn et al., 2011). Framing the term “best practices” within the disability community, Osborn et al. (2011) asserted that “best practices” should come from devoted collection of work rather than a singular study. Additionally, Osborn et al. (2011) pointed out that the term “best practices” usually denotes the latest craze in a discipline and asserts a standard for everyone to follow.

While well-intended, best practices in leadership education do not always capture the complexity of how the personal experiences of learners and educators intersect, align, or clash in leadership teaching and learning. Leadership, leaders, followers, and their relationships and interactions do not occur in a vacuum. Influenced by the physical, ideological, personal, and public, leadership education responds to the seen and unseen whose nuances cannot be adequately captured by best practices. The term “best practice” is limited to the context of the person who proposed it and how it potentially worked for a limited demographic in a specific moment.

Though the current and interconnected moments of a public health crisis, continued racial injustice and racism, economic loss, and a crisis in public leadership may render us (as global citizens) weary in spirit, they offer us an opportunity to reflect on leadership education as an everyday practice of leadership (Raelin, 2011). Amid chaos and uncertainty, leadership educators are presented with opportunities to understand and reflect on their own actions, be better able to reconstruct pedagogy in light of their reflections and on behalf of mutual interests shared with learners (Raelin, 2011). Framing leadership education as an everyday leadership practice amid uncertainty “requires a willingness to interrogate what we know to be true, the foundations of our work, and our deepest values and commitments” (Dugan & Humble, 2018, p. 9).

Several scholars and frameworks provide a pathway to creating and understanding impactful practices for leadership education. Teaching and learning undergirded by impactful practices make use of frameworks that propose value in using moments of uncertainty to interrogate understanding and questioning of self, other, and context (Shankman et al., 2015), and ultimately, conceptualization and practice of leadership. Insights from human systems dynamics suggests that in times of high uncertainty and low stability, there is a need to be experimental, innovative and adaptive because the rules, policies and procedures governed by stability and predictability no longer apply (Human Systems Dynamics Institute, 2016). Operating with an adaptive and experimental mindset requires ongoing cycles of reflection and action (Eoyang & Holladay, 2013; Heifetz et al., 2019).

Heifetz et al.’s (2009) discussion on the practice of adaptive leadership exhorts leadership educators to “get on the balcony” and take a look at the work of students by examining grade distribution, quality of work, and other factors that tell the story of what is working and what is not from a pedagogical standpoint. Adaptive leadership provides a way for leadership educators to use impactful practices that draw on understanding context, personal experience, and knowledge production. Applying adaptive leadership practice as pedagogy creates the conditions for experiential learning, disrupting traditional notions and norms of reliance on formal authority,
and building capacity for students to exercise leadership in conditions of uncertainty (Green & Fabris McBride, 2015).

Part of leadership education and development is to cultivate students’ identity, efficacy, and capacity (Bertrand Jones et al., 2016). As leadership educators, we must begin with the basic assumption that students inherently have knowledge to share and are not empty vessels to be poured into (Freire, 2000). This collaboration and partnership approach seeks to make each person a subject in learning, sharing the responsibility of a learning space. That also means each learning space is different. Any practices used must meet the group’s specific needs and that of the educator. hooks (1994) builds on Freire’s (2000) ideas by emphasizing the necessity of teaching through one’s whole body, not just a separate mind. Each of us teaches from a set of social identities and experiences, and students will experience learning from their own set of identities and experiences.

Similarly, intentional emergence (Werner et al., 2016) presents an opportunity to create impactful practice by visualizing how each learning space can be shaped by defining values and the interplay between the intentional content (like assignments, readings, lesson plans) and emergence (conversations, interactions, current events, energy). Echoing hooks (1994) and Freire (2000), intentional emergence also highlights how the instructor’s social identities influence pedagogical decisions and how students’ social identities influence experience and choices made in the context. The nuances and necessary complexity of these identities may affirm or contest each other, presenting possibilities in learning that cannot be adequately captured by a best practice alone.

The referenced scholars and frameworks help us to create a context for impactful practices. We do not propose doing away with best practices. Indeed, they serve a function and purpose in surveying programs, methods, and outcomes. Our position is that in this particular moment of uncertainty and chaos, impactful practices offer us a way another way to engage and assess teaching and learning in leadership education when unstable conditions mean that no “best way” exists for all educators.

Description

The panelists represent diverse institutions, programs, perspectives, experiences. Each will offer a contextualized understanding of the concept of impactful practices and what it offers leadership education. We propose the following agenda:

- Welcome by the panel chair (2 minutes)
- The Chair will invite participants to introduce themselves and their institutions/organizations in the chat at the beginning of the session (3 minutes)
- The Chair will invite panelists to introduce themselves, their institutions/organizations, and a brief description of their work as a leadership educator (10 minutes)
- The Chair will pose questions to panelists, emphasizing specific examples that provide context for the audience. The Chair will include audience questions from the chat throughout the session as relevant (50 minutes).
- A formal Q&A period (20 minutes) will follow once panelists have responded to the Chair’s questions. Audience may submit questions via the chat or, if appropriate, unmute to pose questions to the panel.
• Closing (5 minutes)

Questions for panelists:

1. In light of changing contexts,
   a. What “best practices” have you had to “give up” or shift in your teaching?
   b. What/how are you learning in order to stay relevant?
   c. What was lost or gained?

2. Share an example of intentional impactful practice in your own leadership education space:
   a. What are the limitations or risks?
   b. How do you assess or evaluate?

3. What does the reframing of “best practices” to “impactful practices” offer leadership education?
   a. What research questions emerge?
   b. How does this impact the creation and support of professional development opportunities and experiences?
   c. How might you bring impactful practices to your particular department or organization? What challenges might be present in doing so?

Foreseeable Implications

By introducing impactful practice, our work aims to encourage the expansion of how knowledge is produced and assessed in leadership education. This creates opportunities for innovative and intentional pedagogies that are responsive to the various contexts in which leadership education occurs. We do not advocate eschewing best practices. Instead, we offer an additional way of thinking about knowing, being, and doing in leadership education. In a teaching and learning environment, impactful practices offer both the learner and educator multiple opportunities to frame learning as “a willingness to interrogate what we know to be true, the foundations of our work, and our deepest values and commitments” (Dugan & Humbles, 2018, p. 9). This type of collaboration requires spontaneous or calculated risks that attend to the possibilities of meaning-making that emerge when epistemology, worldview, and social location “interact with or are stimulated in the process” of learning (Dugan & Humbles, 2018, p. 12).

Consideration of impactful practices provides our field a chance to consider how and what professional development programs might impart upon incoming leadership educators as well as those looking to expand their skills at various stages in their leadership education careers. Specifically, those who provide professional development opportunities at any scale can use the concept of impactful practices to create programs that guide participants through re-learning, experimentation, reflection, and adaptability. By designing professional development programs
from this premise, leadership education becomes a shared intellectual space where “best” means creating and applying knowledge suited to unique contexts.

Impactful practices also offer a chance to expand scholarship of teaching and learning in leadership education. A limiting factor of best practices is that they can “set up unnecessary and competing hierarchies of thought which reinscribe the politics of domination by designating work as either inferior, superior, or more or less worthy of attention” (hooks, 1994, p. 64). Rather than framing scholarship as “what to think” (based on the premise of best practices alone), leadership educators can also consider “how to think” from multiple perspectives. This consideration makes leadership education more in tune with our students’ needs and overall leadership community while ensuring thoughtful, focused, and more inclusive pedagogy that strengthens our impact.

In parallel, as we expand our understanding of leadership education, we may also expand our own definitions of what leadership looks like, who embodies it and when, and to trouble what we have previously considered to be “best practices” in our student leaders, colleagues, or friends in the field. Perhaps what we will find is that we all have an impact, depending on our context.
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Bias and Privilege in Leadership Education

John Banter, Georgia Southern University
Jackie Bruce, North Carolina State University
Gina Matkin, University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Katherine McKee, North Carolina State University
Josh O’Connor, UCLA

Abstract
This interactive panel will provide an open and real discussion about bias and privileges in leadership education. The panelists will define terms, discuss theories, and discuss real life examples of how bias/privilege impacted their work in leadership education. Panelists will identify problems within leadership education and strategies to overcome them. Participants will be able to design and utilize strategies that attempt to address social justice/social responsibility issues through leadership engagement activities and describe how their community engagement alongside critical reflection on their own perceptions, biases, and assumptions will inform their understanding of social (in)justice issues and their awareness of power, privilege, and positionality.

Introduction
The events of 2020 promoted a national discussion of our society and the ways in which people are marginalized. From the COVID-19 lockdowns and isolation to the disparate impacts on communities of color and people with disabilities to increased participation in Black Lives Matter and increased visibility of the #MeToo movement and from the first non-English language movie to win an Oscar for Best picture, Parasite, to a presidential election with identity at its core, privilege, bias, marginalization, and oppression have been at the center of the national discourse in the U.S. As leadership educators, we are uniquely positioned to impact not only our own educational spaces, but to develop the capacity in others to change the communities in which they operate. We need to examine how we contribute to, or deconstruct, the educational structures and systems impacting or built around equity, privilege and bias. In our panel, we will explore the current system of higher education from conscious and unconscious biases and privileges in leadership education to the impact on staff and students' experiences. Further, we will identify action steps and strategies to address privilege and bias in leadership education.

Background
Multiple studies have determined that postsecondary education perpetuates the inequalities found in K-12 education and that he system as a whole is a passive agent in systematic oppression (Cabrera, 2019; Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Linder, Quaye, Lange, Roberts, Lacy, & Wilson, 2001). Such research has uncovered negative experiences and bias incidents against students of color, LGBT students, students with disabilities, and women on campus with incidents related to sexual orientation and race being the most frequently reported (Allan & Madden, 2006; Boysen & Vogel, 2009; Cress & Ikeda, 2003; D’Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Griffin, Muñiz, & Espinosa, 2012; Hurtado & Ponjuan, 2005; Kimball, Wells, Ostiguy, Manly, & Lauterbach, 2016; Rankin, Blumenfeld, Weber, & Frazer, 2010). Boysen, Vogel, Cope, and Hubbard (2009) determined that 50% of students and 25% of instructors had experienced bias in the classroom.
As students with minoritized identities experience oppression on campus and must navigate these experiences, they do not have the same access to learning and development as their peers from dominant groups do (Linder, et al., 2019). These same students are frequently tasked with the unpaid labor of engaging as activists, engagement they are often penalized for, to interrupt oppression and bias on their campuses (Bonilla & Rosa, 2015; Hope, Keels, & Durkee, 2016; Linder, et al., 2019; Rhoads, 1997). Meanwhile, the diversity activities on these same campuses is focused on teaching people with privileged identities how to engage with minoritized identities rather than disrupting systems of oppression, and administrators work to protect those systems and structures (Linder, et al., 2019; Patton, 2016).

Faculty and staff face bias against minoritized identities, as well. Repeated studies have found a bias against women (Chisadza, Nichols, & Yitbarek, 2019; Mitchell & Martin, 2018; Wagner, Reiger, & Voorvelt, 2016) and people of color (Arguete, Slater, & Mwaikinda, 2017; Chisadza, Nichols, & Yitbarek, 2019; Reid, 2010) in teaching evaluations. Further, scholars with privileged identities tend to cite their own work while the work of people of color is often unacknowledged (Budd & Magnuson, 2010; Delgado, 1984). Citation practices reinforce this privilege as the more one is cited, the more likely they are to be cited in the future (Budd & Magnuson, 2010; Delgado, 1984). This practice is furthered by journals and tenure and promotion committees which tend to show preference for “mainstream” - read cis, white, male - work (Stanley, 2007). In fact, Budd and Magnuson’s (2010) list of the twenty most cited scholars in higher education research - self-citations excluded - lists 18 white men, one man for whom racial and ethnic data was not available, and one Latinx woman. Of course, the practice of citing well-known work at the expense of the work of people with minoritized identities perpetuates the privilege of the already known authors (Budd & Magnuson, 2010).

As leadership educators, then, it is incumbent upon us to identify and address the ways in which our field perpetuates privilege and bias in order to create spaces for leadership development that are truly inclusive. Further, we must apply our expertise in leadership to dismantle the systems in education that reify and reinforce bias and privilege and create new systems that are inclusive. We must work to engage in leadership education that prepares our students to engage in this work as well.

**Description**

This panel will discuss bias and privilege in leadership education. The speakers will define terms, theories, and discuss real life examples of how bias/privilege impacted their work. Panelists will identify problems within leadership education and discuss strategies to overcome. Participants and panelists will:

- Design and apply strategies to address bias/privilege through leadership engagement activities
- Recognize bias/privilege in their own classroom/community
- Engage in critical reflection on their own perceptions, biases, and assumptions related to bias/privilege

The outline for the panel:

1. Disclaimer: why there are no people of color on the panel
2. Define Bias and Privilege, including and incorporating the following terms: Racial Discrimination, White Supremacy, Cultural differences, Gender and Sexuality, Xenophobia, Sexism

3. Theories
   a. Critical Race Theory (Delgado)
   b. White Privilege (Du Bois)
   c. Intersectionality (Crenshaw)
   d. Whiteness Theory (Cullen)
   e. Social Bias (Black)

4. What does bias and privilege look like in practice, with examples we have witnessed.
   a. Teaching and Pedagogy/Andragogy
   b. Student Affairs Leadership
   c. Graduate Leadership Education
   d. Leadership Studies Research

5. Who experiences privilege/bias in leadership education?
   a. Panel Discussion

6. Strategies to overcome bias and privilege in leadership education?
   a. Reviewing employment/hiring practices
   b. Curriculum choices: Who/What is missing
   c. Experiences/costs
   d. Social Justice Integration
   e. Seeking and applying work by marginalized folks
   f. Using privilege to amplify the voices of others
   g. Individual work

**Foreseeable Implications**
As a result of this panel, leadership educators will be aware of the ways that privilege and bias manifest in leadership education. Acknowledging and addressing bias/privilege will have a ripple effect on our education system and beyond. As educators, if we continue challenging the bias and privileges in our textbooks, training, systematic structures and leadership practices, we can create a more just learning environment for all students and scholars. By continued social justice practice, leadership educators will learn to denormalize privilege by addressing our own and address situations and emotions of bias in order for all students to feel welcomed and part of the teaching. This session is intended to be a step in the process of becoming comfortable with our own discomfort and identifying the roles we can play as we work for systemic change to make leadership education and institutions of higher education more inclusive.
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What is Interdisciplinary Leadership and How Do We Teach It (Well)?

Leah Georges, Creighton University, Facilitator
Candace Bloomquist, Creighton University
Nathan Harter, Christopher Newport University
William Donaldson, Christopher Newport University
Frederick Gill, Creighton University

Abstract

Leaders from diverse disciplines must be able to effectively work together on complex problems. What many leadership educators want to know is how to teach emerging leaders—undergraduate and graduate alike—how to work together across differences in these complex spaces. One approach to navigating complex problems is interdisciplinary leadership. While origins of leadership stem from interdisciplinary roots, this does not mean that leadership is being practiced or taught in an interdisciplinary way. Together, this panel will explore the question whether there is such a thing as interdisciplinary leadership and if so, how we should teach it. We will do this by bringing together a panel of scholars, practitioners, and students of interdisciplinarity currently working in interdisciplinary leadership programs and spaces, to discuss complexity, paradoxes, systems thinking, interdisciplinarity, and working across differences as they relate to leadership. This diverse set of panelists will encourage a conversation about how we, as educators guiding leadership learners across a wide range of settings, might think more concretely about what interdisciplinarity in leadership looks like and how we might teach future leaders to harness interdisciplinarity to work across differences. Attendees will leave this panel discussion with concrete examples and philosophical ideas about how the panelists have applied and experienced specific teaching strategies that have helped prepare their students and themselves to utilize interdisciplinarity when leading teams that are addressing complex problems.

Introduction

The purpose of this panel is to provide guidance for leadership scholars and educational practitioners on how to nurture a type of leadership that is needed for the complex problems that the changing global arena demand of us today and into the future. Together, the panel will explore the question whether there is such a thing as interdisciplinary leadership and if so, how we should teach it. We will do this by bringing together a group of scholar-practitioners, currently working in interdisciplinary programs and spaces, to discuss complexity, paradoxes, systems thinking, interdisciplinarity, and working across differences as they relate to leadership. Specifically, the panel will explore the identities and practices used by diverse people who share work to create emergent outcomes when addressing complex problems. To advance our understanding of interdisciplinary leadership and in turn, identify quality pedagogical and andragogical approaches to teaching it, we must first be clear about the basic building blocks. The purpose of this panel is to explore those building blocks through three objectives. By the end of the panel, participants will be able to (1) identify at least 3 core principles of interdisciplinarity within leadership, (2) recognize the contextual signals that call for
interdisciplinary leadership, and (3) explore at least 3 techniques for preparing students to practice interdisciplinary leadership when leading teams to address complex problems.

Background

Leaders from diverse disciplines must be able to effectively work together on complex problems. However, many leaders struggle to learn how to work with, not against, diversity and complexity. Being able to work together across differences is an emergent process that takes intentional action (Bammer, 2016; National Research Council, 2015; Strijbos, 2017; Wheatley, 2006). What many leadership educators want to know is how to teach emerging leaders—undergraduate and graduate alike—how to work together across differences. It is not enough to assume that merely bringing people together from different disciplines in the same space will result in successful collaboration (Strijbos, 2017).

There are many terms used to denote efforts to effectively work together on complex problems, for example team science, collaboration, or savoir-relier (Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Gauthier, 2014; National Research Council, 2015). However, as scholars, educators and practitioners recognize that various disciplines must work together to create new ideas about how to address complex problems, one term is appearing more frequently throughout academia. That term is interdisciplinarity. Interdisciplinarity is not well defined in leadership scholarship.

In the field of leadership, we must ask, how is it possible that biology, engineering, technology, (Mwaffo et al., 2018), as well as economics, politics, and religion (Smarr et al., 2018) all use the same word, ‘leadership’? The answer is leadership seems to have interdisciplinary roots. However, the field of leadership, if it wants to accept the idea that the roots of leadership are interdisciplinary, will need leadership educators to recognize the methods and norms that come from the different background disciplines, and build leadership up as the diverse, integrated, and emergent field of its roots.

Further, even if we accept the idea that leadership is interdisciplinary it does not mean that leadership is being practiced or taught in an interdisciplinary way. In fact, the National Leadership Education Research Agenda (NLERA), published in 2013 attempted to comment on this concept specifically (Andenoro et al., 2013). The NLERA was received with mixed support from the field generally, however, it suggested a shift from an interdisciplinary approach towards a transdisciplinary approach to leadership education. The NLERA’s authors acknowledge that the NLERA was created to “enhance interdisciplinary collaborative efforts” (Andenoro, 2013, p. 6) in the pursuit of developing leadership as a discipline, but in the same document, recommended efforts to “develop transdisciplinary perspectives for leadership” (p. 2) in teaching, learning, and curriculum development. And, while these efforts may lead to the creation of leadership programs by reaching across silos in an interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary way, it does not necessarily suggest that we in turn teach leadership interdisciplinarily or teach our students to practice interdisciplinary leadership.

In short, the field of leadership education itself is unclear how to conceptualize and subsequently articulate the role of interdisciplinarity in leadership education. Further, without an agreed upon definition or model of interdisciplinarity in leadership education, what remains
unknown are the practical techniques that leadership educators can use to develop leaders who can effectively utilize interdisciplinarity.

We suggest this lack of clarity can be addressed by drawing on the knowledge and experience of scholar practitioners who borrow from multiple different fields to look at leadership through an interdisciplinary lens. We even propose that there may be a new construct, interdisciplinary leadership, that might help inform leadership educators about how to prepare leaders to work together to address complex, 21st century problems.

Description

This panel brings together people who have been writing about interdisciplinarity and leadership, each of whom has a vested interested in academically preparing future leaders. The panel includes scholars, practitioners, and students of interdisciplinarity and interdisciplinary leadership. We have purposely invited panelists that will highlight diverse perspectives.

Candace Bloomquist and Leah Georges have been exploring the idea of interdisciplinary leadership and how it can be taught for the last several years within the Ed.D. in Interdisciplinary Leadership Program at Creighton University. Their 2018 article, ‘Interdisciplinary leadership practices in graduate leadership education programs’ in The Journal of Leadership Studies sets the stage for continued exploration of how leadership educators can most effectively prepare student to practice and create interdisciplinary leadership.

To bring a management and systems thinking perspective, William Donaldson from Christopher Newport University will draw from his 35 years of experience with research, teaching, and being CEO of 8 companies. In 2017, Dr. Donaldson wrote the book Simple_Complexity: A Management Book for the Rest of Us: A Guide to Systems Thinking which provides critical context to leaders, followers, managers, owners, and board members about how a switch from top-down leadership, with the emphasis on authority, to open leadership based on a systems perspective.

To bring a humanistic perspective, Nathan Harter from Christopher Newport University, author of a 2021 book titled Leadership across boundaries: a passage to aporia tells about how leaders are charged with navigating, “…boundaries, thresholds, lines that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to cross. There are boundaries among academic disciplines, among participants in a dialogue, between the two sides in a lawsuit, between leaders and institutions, etc. The very process of differentiation creates the potential for aporias” (p. 13). Leaders in the 21st century must be prepared to navigate across aporias.

Finally, Frederick Gill, a retired U.S. Air Force Chief and current Ed.D. in Interdisciplinary Leadership Program student at Creighton University, brings a student scholar-practitioner perspective. Frederick is currently experiencing the andragogical techniques being used to encourage interdisciplinary leadership within the Ed.D. program at Creighton.
Dr. Georges will serve as panel facilitator for the 90-minute virtual discussion. As a faculty member in an online doctoral program in leadership, she is aware of the importance of actively engaging participants—panelists and attendees alike—in an online setting. Each panelist will have 5 minutes to introduce themselves (20 minutes). Then, to provide tools for participants to explore thinking about whether leadership programs are training interdisciplinarity and in turn, how to do it, three main questions will be considered. While the following questions will be directed at the panelists to initially address, Dr. Georges will invite participants to ask questions and engage in conversations with each other across our time together both via the chat feature and through moderated question and answer opportunities:

1. How has the field of leadership dealt with complexity, working across boundaries, and interdisciplinarity? (15 minutes)
2. Is there such a thing as interdisciplinary leadership? (15 minutes)
3. What andragogical/pedagogical techniques or strategies can leadership educators use to inspire and encourage students to navigate complexity and create interdisciplinary leadership? (15 minutes)

The final 25 minutes will be open for questions and conversations inspired by the learner/participants. Depending on the number of attendees, these will be accomplished as a larger group or in smaller break-out groups facilitated by each of our panelists and moderator.

Foreseeable Implications

The world is becoming more complex and we need to prepare leadership students to address complexity well by using interdisciplinarity. This panel helps us, as educators guiding leadership learners across a wide range of settings, to think more concretely about what interdisciplinarity in leadership looks like and how we might teach future leaders to harness interdisciplinarity to work across differences.

Attendees will leave this panel discussion with concrete examples and philosophical ideas about how the panelists have applied and experienced specific teaching strategies that have helped prepare their students and themselves to utilize interdisciplinarity when leading teams that are addressing complex problems. These practical techniques will provide leadership educators with a guide for thinking about interdisciplinary leadership perhaps as a tapestry - an intricate combination of identities and practices used by diverse people who share work to create alignment, commitment, and integration when addressing complex problems.

Finally, 2020 illuminated that the number and type of real-world challenges continue to increase in number and complexity across the world (e.g., COVID-19 pandemic, the murder of George Floyd, political contention). What has become clear is the need for leadership practitioners who recognize these types of challenges as complex, and apply a unique application of diversity and integration to solve them. As the number and quality of leadership programs continue to increase (curricular and co-curricular alike), leadership educators will seek opportunities for increased collaboration to meet the needs of our learners as future leaders. This panel provides an initial opportunity towards that goal. We will gather contact
information from those interested to encourage future conversations and collaborations around interdisciplinary leadership and preparing future scholars to navigate the complex, real-world problems we face today and into the future.

References


WORKSHOPS

**Overcoming statistics anxiety: Understanding quantitative statistics for leadership educators (1-D)**
*Hannah M. Sunderman, University of Nebraska-Lincoln*
*Lindsay J. Hastings, University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

**Student collaboration & team effectiveness through academic & student affairs leadership programs (1-E)**
*Susan Luchey, University of Delaware*
*Josh O'Connor, UCLA*

**What If?: Teaching Transformative Leadership in a Pandemic (2-D)**
*Katherine E. McKee, NC State University*
*Jacklyn A. Bruce, NC State University*

**Improving Team Performance with KAI (2-E)**
*Jerald H. Walz, Virginia Tech*
*Curtis R. Friedel, Virginia Tech*

**Checked Out: Resistant Learning around Difficult Topics in Social Justice Leadership (3-D)**
*Jera Niewoehner-Green, The Ohio State University*
*Amy Collins-Warfield, The Ohio State University*

**Learning by Doing: Incorporating Experiential Education in a Leadership Program (3-E)**
*Susan Luchey, University of Delaware*
*Matthew Creasy, University of Delaware*
*Julie Millisky, University of Delaware*

**How Do We Know if Anything Changed? Using Degree-of-Change Methodology for Research and Evaluation (4-D)**
*Lindsay J. Hastings, University of Nebraska - Lincoln*
*Hannah M. Sunderman, University of Nebraska - Lincoln*

*Michael Linville, Indiana Wesleyan University*
*Mark Rennaker, Indiana Wesleyan University*
Overcoming statistics anxiety: understanding advanced quantitative statistics for leadership educators

Hannah M. Sunderman, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lindsay J. Hastings, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Abstract

Effective methods are critical to effective research, review of research, and, ultimately, practice. However, understanding emerging quantitative statistical techniques is no small task and can induce statistics anxiety (Onwuegbuzie & Wilson, 2003). Therefore, the purpose of this workshop is to increase knowledge of advanced quantitative methods in a comfortable environment. Specifically, we will focus on two advanced statistical techniques, structural equation modeling (SEM) and multilevel modeling (MLM), and apply them to the field of leadership education. This workshop will introduce the benefits of complex quantitative methods, provide an overview of MLM and SEM, analyze research articles, and apply advanced statistical techniques to the interest areas of participants. The target audience for this workshop is leadership educators and scholars who want to understand and, perhaps, utilize advanced quantitative techniques but do not yet have an extensive background in the field. It is our hope that all participants leave the workshop feeling more able to engage with advanced quantitative statistics, whether that be through reading, reviewing, or employing these techniques.
There is no ‘I’ in Team: Student collaboration and team effectiveness through academic and student affairs leadership education programs

Susan Luchey, University of Delaware
Josh O’Connor, UCLA

Abstract
This interactive workshop will provide an experience for participants to engage in leadership activities that will work in both virtual and traditional settings. This workshop will focus on team development and teaching students to problem solve, innovate, produce and assess in teams. Participants will understand the inclusion of providing team development activities for students in academic and co-curricular settings; how to facilitate a number of activities that engage students in effective teamwork; the value of experiential learning; and the value of student affairs and faculty collaborations in developing transferable skills.

Introduction
“I hate group projects” - every student ever! How many times have we heard this? There are many reasons why student group projects are dreaded: no-shows in group meetings, unwilling leaders, and procrastinators. This workshop will focus on how student group projects can provide a better experience for students and faculty by the inclusion of intentional team development activities. By sharing tried and true methods used in student affairs with faculty, we can create a partnership that benefits students both in and out of the classroom. We will examine theories that deepen community building among student groups that provide a more open, collaborative and participative learning environment. Further, we will provide activities, action steps and strategies to address intentional team development activities in leadership education.

Background
In the 1980s, higher education researchers began to recognize a disconnect between academic and student affairs divisions on most college campuses (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994; Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Colwell, 2006; Kellogg, 1999; Kuh, 1996; Kuh, Douglas, Lund & Ramin Gyurmek, 1994). Consequently, leaders in the higher education field began to focus on increasing collaboration between academic and student affairs divisions on campuses (Bloland et al., Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Frost, Strom, Downey, Schultz, & Holland, 2010; Kellogg, 1999; Kuh, 1996; Kuh et al., 1994). Researchers and institutional staff found that campuses were most often not providing holistic, well-integrated services to their students due to the organizational structure and relationships between their academic and student affairs divisions. This separation is impacting students' holistic experiences.

Traditional literature describes how as the U.S. higher education system developed, student affairs professionals became responsible for the students’ social and emotional development, while faculty were responsible for the intellectual and scholarly development of the student. However, it has become apparent in recent decades that the academic affairs and student affairs divisions on campus should work together (Bloland et al., 1996; Kellogg, 1999; Kuh, 1996; Kuh
et al., 1994). Research also shows academic affairs and student affairs divisions regularly engage each other despite the perceived existing disconnection (Bloland et al., 1996; Kellogg, 1999; Kuh, 1996; Kuh et al., 1994).

Prior research has shown that when academic affairs faculty collaborate with student affairs professionals, blended effects are likely to be exerted on students’ learning and development, thereby maximizing the impact and quality of the college experience (Bloland et al., 1996; Bourassa, 2001; Frost, Strom, Downey, Schultz & Holland, 2010; Kellogg, 1999; Kuh, 1996; Kuh et al., 1994). If academic affairs divisions on campuses partnered more seamlessly with student affairs divisions, and vice versa, such a partnership would capitalize on and enhance the efforts of each division by enriching the students’ academic learning with experiential learning.

Over the past decade, there has been an increased amount of research around student cooperation in the classroom, which is directly correlated to the positive effects that collaboration might have on students’ ability to learn (Lou, Abrami, Spence, Poulsen, Chambers & d’Aplonia, 1996; Gillies and Boyle, 2010, 2011). The main concern in the research area has been on how interaction and cooperation among students influence learning and problem solving in groups (Hammar, 2011a, b). Two focus areas of research emerged: cooperative learning and collaborative learning. Cooperative group work is usually considered as a comprehensive umbrella concept for several modes of student active working modes (Johnson & Johnson, 1975; Webb & Palincsar, 1996), whereas collaboration is a more of an exclusive concept and may be included in the much wider concept cooperation (Hammar, 2011a, b). Cooperative learning may describe group work without any interaction between the students (Bennet & Dunne, 1992; Galton & Williamson, 1992), while collaborative learning always includes interaction, collaboration, and utilization of the group’s competences (Bennet et al., 1992; Galton et al., 1992; Webb et al., 1996).

In addition to educational theories, there are group development models that teach students’ to work in effective teams. The Five Dysfunctions of a Team (Lencioni, 2002), Group Development Model (Tuckman and Jensen, 1977) and GRPI Model (Rubin, Plovnick, & Fry, 1977) are all models focused on student group development and used in leadership educators work.

As leadership educators it is incumbent upon us to collaborate both inside and outside of the classroom to find the best strategy for our students to work collaboratively. The authors believe that the integration of deeper community building activities among student groups will provide a more open, collaborative and participative learning environment.

**Description**

This workshop is a fun and interactive experience with participants engaging in activities that work in both virtual and traditional settings. Presenters, who are both veteran student affairs professionals and adjunct faculty at major research universities, have a combined 50 years’
experience in team development and teaching students to problem solve, innovate, produce and assess in teams. The workshop will kick off with a bang, immediately engaging participants in a quick virtual activity to build immediate connection among the group.

Learning outcomes: Participants will...
- Gain an understanding of team development models,
- Understand the value of team development activities for students in academic and co-curricular (both in-person and virtual) settings as a way to improve success of group work.
- Understand the value of experiential learning
- Learn how to facilitate a number of activities that engage students in effective team work.
- Understand the value of student affairs and faculty collaborations in developing transferable skills.

Workshop outline:
1. Introduction- (10)
   a. Virtual scavenger hunt: This activity will model a way to begin effective team development.

2. Introduction of guiding models and theories- (15)
   a. Theories supporting experiential learning
      i. Collaborative learning (Webb & Palincsar)
      ii. Cooperative Learning (Bennet & Dunne)
   b. Team development models
      i. Five Dysfunctions of a Team (Lencioni)
      ii. Group Development Model (Tukman)
      iii. GRPI Model (Rubin, Plovnik, Fry)
   c. Team research- Google’s Aristotle Project

3. Activities for Team Development- (40)
   a. Participants will engage in a variety of team development activities and discussion for application in their own classrooms or student life settings. In addition to teaching participants how to facilitate these activities, engaging in them also emphasizes the importance of any group establishing trust and psychological safety before it can begin to function as an effective team. Each presenter will facilitate 1-3 activities in a breakout room, depending on the number of participants. Participants can choose which activities they want to learn and drop into the associated breakout room. Handouts and resources for facilitating all activities will be available to all participants
      i. Team Stories: Shared personal experiences
      ii. Vision Boards- visual representation of goals, values, outcomes
      iii. True Colors & Saboteurs Test- personality assessments
         1. https://www.positiveintelligence.com/
      iv. Values Identification- Identifying a common set of values
      v. Team Charter- Accountability/expectation setting activity
360 Evaluations - Peer feedback

4. Wrap up- (10)
   a. Participants will come back to the main session to share feedback on activities and engage in a Q and A.

**Foreseeable Implications**

The authors believe that student group projects can be improved for students and faculty with the inclusion of intentional team development in the classroom. In addition, knowing how to build effective teams is an essential transferable skill for the job market for our students. The authors’ goal is to have participants leave armed with new information/activities and implement them on their home campus to enhance their leadership work. The authors hope these new tools and activities will help build stronger collaborations within student group work and enhance leadership teachings.

**Appendices**

1. True Colors Activity
2. Team Charter
3. True Colors Assessment
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What If?: Teaching Transformative Leadership in a Pandemic

Katherine E. McKee, NC State University
Jacklyn A. Bruce, NC State University

Abstract
Transformative leadership requires engagement with others, in particular, others who are marginalized. As scholars in The [ ] Scholars were in the final weeks of their transformative leadership projects, the COVID-19 crisis made face-to-face interactions impossible and poor internet infrastructure in the United States created an additional barrier for students and the communities with whom they were engaging as activists; however, activists worldwide were facing the same challenges and with the program’s emphasis on authentic practice, these activists could serve as models for the scholars to become distance activists. As the pandemic persists, it remains relevant for leadership educators to learn how to support students in engaging with communities as activists using a variety of distance practices. Participants in this workshop will learn to engage students in transformative leadership education through online project based learning and teach students to engage with activist communities and with marginalized or minoritized populations at a physical distance. Participants will work in small groups to complete an activity used in The [ ] Scholars program in 2020 and 2021 to identify effective distance activism strategies and reflect on this activity to determine its suitability for their own leadership programs.

Introduction
In mid-March 2020, many universities moved all classes and student activities online. By the end of the month, much of the country was under state-wide stay at home orders, cutting off all possibility of interacting with people outside of our own home units. The [ ] Scholars program follows a project based learning curriculum that culminates in each scholar’s engagement as an activist through March and April with a public presentation of their work in late April and early May. As faculty co-directors of the program, we had to help our scholars engage, complete their projects, and present to the public in an online format. Participants in this workshop will be able to engage students in transformative leadership education through online project based learning and teach students to engage with activist communities and with marginalized or minoritized populations at a physical distance.

Background
Shields (2016) eight tenets of transformative leadership provide a framework for action toward just, inclusive, and equitable outcomes. In responding to the mandate to effect deep and equitable change, transformative leaders deconstruct frameworks that perpetuate injustice and reconstruct them in more equitable ways (Shields, 2016; Viezzer, 2001). They must address the inequitable distribution of power while placing an emphasis on interconnectedness, interdependence, and global awareness (Shields, 2016; Quantz, Rogers, & Dantley, 1991).
Transformative leadership demands that individuals engage in the kind of work that *leads to equity, liberation, democracy and justice* (Shields, 2016; Viezzer, 201). Requiring moral *courage* to act as advocates and activists in the pursuit of justice and equity outcomes, transformative leaders must *balance critique and promise* while working *toward the collective and individual good* (Shields, 2016; Weiner, 2003).

Transformative leaders may engage as learners, allies, advocates, and activists depending on their relationships with the people experiencing injustice, their skill and confidence in that skill, and the type of action needed (Bruce, McKee, Morgan-Fleming, Warner, 2019; McKee & Bruce, in press). When working as activists, transformative leaders must continue to work toward their outcomes while they have consistent, continued engagement in trusting relationships with others who will work with them for justice and equity (Bruce et al., 2019; McKee & Bruce, 2020b; Shields, 2016). In order to build and maintain the trusting relationships necessary for this work, transformative leaders must continue to engage as allies – personally supporting individuals experiencing oppression (Bruce et al., 2019; McKee & Bruce, 2020a; Trueba, 1999; Washington & Evans, 1991). Further, transformative leaders are tasked with intentionally including those who are marginalized or dispossessed of power in developing and implementing solutions while facilitating leadership development for those same people (Shields, 2020; Wang, 2016).

Undergraduate students in a year-long leadership scholars program – The Scholars – were faced with an enormous challenge in the final few weeks of their project based learning curriculum: how do we engage as activists during a pandemic? To engage as activists, these scholars had been tasked with working toward equitable outcomes while developing other leaders to do the same (Shields, 2020) and organizing and mobilizing others in support of a call to action (Ganz, 2009; Trueba, 1999). The Scholars are required to focus their transformative leadership work on issues of injustice and inequity related to agriculture. All of this was complicated by the sudden need to physically isolate from other people as [State] attempted to respond to the COVID-19 Crisis.

Much of the Scholars’ work is done with people from rural communities where internet access is non-existent or severely limited (Perrin, 2019). In fact, approximately half (51.6%) of rural homes have sufficient internet access for moderate use (FCC, 2020). Further complicating reaching marginalized rural Americans through virtual platforms is the cost as many rural areas have only one provider available and people need to pay for mobile hot-spots in addition to home internet (Lai, Widmar, & Bir, 2020). And even if they can afford the high cost, some rural residents have no options for reliable home internet (Associated Press, 2019). This presented an additional challenge for our students as many were returning to homes with poor internet service they would have to share with parents and siblings while trying to work with communities that also lacked strong internet. Thus, it became essential that scholars find a variety of ways of engaging as distance activists.

The Scholars program follows a project based learning curriculum (Bruce et al., 2019; McKee & Bruce, 2020a). As engagement in authentic practice is a crucial tenet of project based learning (Adderley, Ashwin, Bradbury, Freeman, Goodlad, Greene, Jenkins, & Uren, 1975), scholars
were positioned to take on this challenge by modeling what expert activists were doing to continue their work during a pandemic. This workshop will engage participants in activities used to guide students through making the change to meaningful distance activism and through reflection on how these activities may be used in other transformative leadership education programs.

**Description**

1) **Brief review of transformative leadership and project based learning:**
   a. Participants will use the slide annotation feature to share what they know about transformative leadership and project based learning.
   b. As a group, we will build a definition of each with any necessary supplements from the literature. This will include intentional articulation of Shields (2016) eight tenets of transformative leadership.

2) **Activism web search:**
   a. Participants will be put into small groups of 3-5 in breakout rooms
   b. The participants in each room will be given a description of a project that one of The Scholars worked on in 2020. The description will include details about the issue of justice the scholar is addressing, the people impacted by the project, and other organizations involved in the project.
   c. The participants will investigate to find at least three activists whose work addresses the same - or similar - issue and how they continued their work (distance activism) during the COVID-19 pandemic.
   d. Each small group will report back to the whole workshop on specific actions or techniques they found.

3) **Distance activism reflection:** Groups will return to breakout rooms to develop answers to the following questions:
   a. Which of these actions would work given typical internet access where you live?
   b. Which of the actions you found could work with the people involved in your project topic? How?
   c. Which of the actions that could work for the people involved in your project are possible under current pandemic-related safety measures?
   d. Which would you continue to use even after we can resume face-to-face interactions without restriction?
   e. Which of the eight tenets of transformative leadership is exemplified by this action?

4) **Report back and group debrief:**
a. Which actions did your group identify as useful when activism must be done at a distance? (Remember to consider populations with limited internet access).

b. Which would you continue when face-to-face interactions can resume?

c. Which of the eight tenets of transformative leadership is exemplified by this action?

d. How could you use this lesson with your students?

5) Example of one scholar’s project: The Bandana Project art by mail and virtual exhibition.

Foreseeable Implications

Transformative leadership is essential in order to move our communities forward more equitably. A global pandemic is a daunting obstacle; however, the work of justice and equity cannot stop. After participating in this workshop, learners will be able to:

1. Identify the tenets of transformative leadership
2. Formulate transformative leadership plans to engage in advocacy and activism in an online format and while at a physical distance

Participants will receive pieces of a transformative leadership curriculum. Additionally, participants will be able to create connections with other individuals working in transformative leadership for future collaborations in teaching and research.
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Improving Team Performance with KAI

Jerald H. Walz, Virginia Tech  
Curtis R. Friedel, Virginia Tech

Abstract

In this interactive workshop participants will discover the key tenets of Kirton’s Adaption-Innovation theory, its related assessment, Kirton’s Adaption-Innovation Inventory or the KAI, and how this theory can be applied for individuals working alone and in groups to improve inter-personal dynamics and increase group success. The late psychologist Michael Kirton (1976) developed Adaption-Innovation theory and its personality assessment to explain why some initiatives are successful and others fail (Kirton, 2011). He suggested that success or failure of a new initiative is related to group inter-dynamics that are in turn caused by deep-seated personality differences in cognitive style, which he characterized as lying on a continuum between more adaptive and more innovative (Kirton, 2011).

At the conclusion of this workshop, participants will be able to:
- Explain differences in cognitive styles for problem solving as defined by the Kirton’s Adaption-Innovation Theory and associated inventory,
- Understand their own KAI score and what it means for them personally and when working in a group, and
- Implement strategies for managing cognitive style diversity among team members in order to increase productivity when leading change.

The presenters will accomplish this through providing an awareness of KAI theory and its basic tenets, comparing and contrasting different cognitive styles, helping participants understand their own cognitive style, offering the characteristics and dynamics of team problem solving, and examining strategies for managing cognitive diversity within project teams.

Introduction

As the problems leaders face become greater in number and more complex—if not wicked (Rittell & Webber, 1973)—there is increased need to understand the dynamics of diverse project teams in business, higher education, the military, and schools, among other locations and professions. Often times these teams are composed of highly intelligent experts in their fields, and have the greatest of intentions to collaborate across diverse contexts. Yet, these teams sometimes are difficult to maintain collaborative efforts to the point where the interdisciplinary team dissolves before completing the project. Said differently, why is it that some interdisciplinary teams are successful, and others are not?

Background
Adaption-innovation (A-I) theory (Kirton, 2011), a theory based on the cognition of problem solving, may be most appropriate in seeking to explain why some interdisciplinary teams are successful, and others are not. A-I theory posits that we each have a stable personality characteristic indicating our preference for solving problems, either more adaptively or more innovatively (Kirton, 2011). This problem-solving style is measured on an interval scale, and has been found to be unrelated to intelligence, motivation, learned skillsets, culture, ethnicity, nationality, and age (Friedel, 2014). The isolation of problem-solving style as a variable of interest among other variables of a team’s diversity has been useful for practitioners and researchers to determine if differences of problem-solving style among team members may be reason for a team not working well together. Further, A-I theory is the only known theory connecting a personality characteristic to the management of solving problems. While many personality assessments help one to better understand oneself, A-I theory is the only theory able to predict how two individuals (or two groups) may interact with each other given their problem-solving style.

The KAI is the measure of problem-solving style corresponding to A-I theory (Kirton, 2015), and indicates if someone may be more adaptive or more innovative on an interval scale ranging between 32 and 160 points. The general population mean is at 95 points, with individuals with less than 95 points being more adaptive, and individuals with greater than 95 points being more innovative (Kirton, 2015). However, Kirton (2011) is quick to point out that one’s score has more meaning when compared to the team one is with, rather than a worldwide population. For example, a person who may score an 83 on the KAI continuum is typically more adaptive when compared to the general population; however, a score of 83 is more innovative than an individual scoring 57 on the KAI. The same is true on the innovative side of the continuum, with a KAI score of 117 being more adaptive than the more innovative score of 142. See Figure 1.

![Figure 1](image-url)

*Figure 1.* General population of KAI scores along the continuum of problem solving more adaptively or more innovatively.

Someone who is more adaptive may prefer well established structure and situations which allow them to be creative within the structure for the purpose of focusing on efficiency. Often, more adaptive individuals are perceived by the more innovative as detailed, thorough, and systematic for the purpose of developing a paradigm-consistent solution (Kuhn, 1970; Kirton,
On the other hand, more innovative individuals are perceived by the more adaptive as freethinking, rule-breaking, and unconventional in solving problems for the purpose of developing a paradigm-breaking solution (Kuhn, 1970; Kirton, 2011). A 20-point gap, or more, between someone who is more adaptive and someone who is more innovative will lead to disagreements about solving the problem and the possibility of failing to solve the problem altogether. Because problem-solving style is not as apparent as other more visible aspects of diversity, disagreements between individuals are often misattributed to what may be more visible. For example, in Mitra’s (2017) examination of disagreements between American professors and their international graduate student advisees, many of the prominent issues faced by advisor and advisee were aspects of A-I theory, not differences of culture.

Further going into the science of teams, Kirton (2011) suggests that a KAI mean score of the team may be calculated to better explain team dynamics. According to A-I theory, because we are all problem solvers, we are all agents of change; or an AC1 (Kirton, 2011). A person may be denoted as an AC2 if the individual is within 10 KAI points on either side of the group mean. Individuals in a particular team who are categorized as an AC2, form the consensus group which holds power due to a typically larger number of individuals (often approximately 40%) and have a shared belief on how problems should be solved (Kirton, 2011). Individuals who are denoted AC3s are located beyond 10 KAI points of the group mean, and may be more adaptive or more innovative to the consensus group. Individuals who are AC3s offer the most cognitive diversity to a team, but are also not valued by the team due to their differences in preference to solving the problem differently than the consensus group (Kirton, 2011). Many KAI practitioners around the world have provided anecdotal evidence of the group dynamics associated with AC2s and AC3s, but little empirical evidence exists examining this interaction among team members. The only known study to date examining the differences between AC2s and AC3s found that in youth research projects, homogeneous teams (groups with no AC3 team members) rated fellow team members higher in preparation, communication, and participation than heterogeneous teams (groups with AC3 team members) rated fellow team members (Bush, Friedel, Hoerbert, & Broyles, 2017). If heterogeneous teams are needed to successfully address complex problems, more research is needed to determine how AC2 and AC3 individuals may best work together.

Kirton (2011) indicates that one may operate outside one’s preferred problem-solving style, which is termed coping behavior. Coping behavior is a learned skill and used when a person is motivated to operate more adaptively or more innovatively than what they prefer (Friedel, 2014). However, according to Kirton, exerting coping behavior is stressful and may only be done for a certain amount of time (duration) and at a certain intensity (degree of adaptiveness or innovativeness). So, it appears that success of interdisciplinary project teams may hinge on each team member’s motivation to exert coping behavior.

**Description**

This presentation will be an interactive workshop within an online environment. The presenters will use breakout rooms throughout a PowerPoint presentation to allow participants to discuss and answer key leading questions. The presentation will incorporate brief video clips designed to illustrate or elaborate key components of KAI theory. Participants will also have the opportunity to take the KAI assessment and receive their results. Finally, suggestions for how KAI applies to teams and what an understanding of KAI can do to increase team effectiveness
will be examined and discussed. During or immediately after the workshop, participants will receive an 8-page KAI feedback booklet, a one-page supplemental feedback report, and two articles on KAI theory. These materials have been carefully curated to provide participant engagement with the KAI theory-related literature.

**Foreseeable Implications**

There are several foreseeable implications that are likely to occur as a result of this workshop. By completing this workshop leadership educators will have a greater understanding of how individuals problem solve alone and in groups in three ways. First, participants will receive their KAI score and thus gain an understanding of how KAI theory applies to one’s own self. Second, participants will understand how KAI theory applies to individuals working in groups. Third, participants will learn how KAI theory explains how groups with interact with other groups. These apply to leadership education since leadership educators often work with others in teaching, research, and service. For teaching, an educator interacts with students singly or in groups, and those who complete this workshop will have another set of powerful tools to aid them in interpersonal interaction. It also has implications for research, specifically how experts collaborate with one another in different research-related projects. Finally, it has implications for service, because this is the arena where leadership educators frequently encounter and solve problems with others. Thus, understanding KAI theory will better position participants to collaborate successfully with others.
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Checked Out: Resistant Learning around Difficult Topics in Social Justice Leadership
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Introduction

It is time for the discussion activity in the leadership studies class. Glancing around the room, the instructor knows who will participate in class discussion today and who will not. It is clear to the instructor which students are motivated, care about the course content, and enjoy being in class. The instructor thinks, “if some students just don’t want to be here, I can’t make them learn.” Does this sound familiar? Perhaps we have all fallen into this trap of attributing students’ lack of engagement or poor performance to their inherent traits. However, scholars studying resistant learning contend this is a motivational state influenced by the interaction of multiple factors. Examples of these factors include negative classroom experiences, institutional culture, and environmental forces particular to the student such as race, gender, or family (Tolman et al., 2016). Another school of thought around resistant learning addresses an individual’s failure to integrate new information due to their previously held beliefs (Alcorn, 2013). Even if a student can study and do well on an assessment, their actual beliefs and cognition will not change, despite exposure to credible information or through application of a concept.

Both perspectives on resistant learning are relevant to leadership education. Our courses are situated within the larger institutional culture. Students from diverse backgrounds are part of the classroom community and we may address challenging topics related to beliefs, values, and culture. When teaching a social justice approach to leadership, students’ identities, cultural norms, and political beliefs can be challenged, increasing resistance to both class engagement and openness to different perspectives. Through this Educator Workshop we will provide the content and pedagogy for how to effectively identify and engage resistant learners in the classroom. Upon completion of this Educator Workshop, participants will:

1. Define resistant learning and summarize reasons why it occurs;
2. Identify resistant learning behaviors in the classroom and explain a potential method for engaging resistant learners;
3. Reflect on how their own experiences can inform their future work; and
4. Devise one or more strategies to implement in the future

Background

Resistant learning is multidimensional and requires the consideration of several factors of the student experience and human cognition. Tolman and Kremling (2016) define student resistance as an outcome and motivational state due to systemic factors that include environmental and cultural factors, classroom experiences, and the broader campus climate. Student resistance can manifest in a variety of ways including disruptions, disagreement
with the professor, minimal participation, surface approaches to learning, and expressing concerns about working with others (Tolman & Kremling, 2016). Whether passive or active, resistant behaviors indicate there may be an underlying motivation such as asserting autonomy or preserving self. Instructors must acknowledge this and adapt their own behaviors and/or structural elements of the course.

For example, hidden curriculum in courses can reinforce social roles, rules and norms that may conflict with those held by students in non-dominant groups (Giroux, 2001; Tolman & Kremling, 2016). Who is represented in course content based on social identity, gender bias related to how instructors respond to students, and focus on meritocracy as the means for success can teach lessons about belonging, self-worth, and ability (Dugan, 2017; Pratt, 2020). By problematizing the hidden curriculum and the nature of power, learning and identity, instructors can reveal it to students and work through this conflict (Tolman & Kremling, 2016). Addressing the hidden curriculum dovetails with social justice leadership as these types of educational experiences challenge dominant social discourses (Fine, 2019).

Race, class, gender, and sexual orientation can play a role in student resistance as well as situational factors related to work and family. These factors can influence student engagement across disciplines, but the challenging nature of social justice issues can also exacerbate resistance. Most people will have strong feelings around the topics in such courses but may lack the language to discuss it in an academic context (DiAngelo & Sensoy, 2013). Further, students in positions of privilege may tend to float around the edges of issues like social justice or inclusion, or only approach a discussion in general terms (Beatty & Manning-Ouellette, 2018; Fine, 2019). Scholars have offered a few ways in which instructors can maximize learning and engagement around these topics including extensive self-reflection with self and peers, embracing vulnerability and mistakes, “calling in” all students, purposefully establishing classroom community, and increasing social connections with students (Beatty & Manning-Ouellete, 2018; Burroughs, 2007).

Additionally, we may assume that evidence and the use of logic will be sufficient for teaching around social issues. However, there are those who hold on to unsupported beliefs and deny facts if it creates cognitive dissonance. Alcorn (2013) presents a continuum of behaviors that represent forms of resistance to new and uncomfortable information. “Symptomatic fixation” refers to a condition wherein an aspect of belief operates on a kernel of ideation (Alcorn, 2013). This type of processing is inflexible and immune from the influence of external reality, thus considered non-dialectical. With the second condition, “emotional resistance,” thought is possible but not through logic. Alcorn (2013) contends this must be through emotional recontextualization facilitated by new social connections. A better understanding of the emotional attachments we have to resistances offers a means to establish learning environments that are safe and offer space to engage in conflicting emotions (Alcorn, 2013).

We can observe examples of emotional attachments related to racism in social justice courses for White students in which new information is rejected despite the presentation of evidence. Some scholars contend that White students resist learning about racism and social
justice issues because they hold existing understandings of social inequality that makes it difficult to change their beliefs around racism and white privilege (Sleeter, 1992). Worldviews that focus on individual harm and action as racism rather than societal structures are maintained as it can implicate them as part of the problem (Sleeter, 1992; Kleinman and Copp, 2009). Resistance to learning is one coping mechanism that can be used to avoid anxiety, guilt, and other negative emotions associated with new information about racism. This can manifest as normalizing inequality, silence, and poor teacher evaluations (St. Denis & Schick, 2003; Evans-Winters & Hoff, 2011). However, faculty, staff, and student affairs professionals can call students into the conversation by building inclusive spaces (Sylvester, 2018). Discomfort may be inevitable in discussions of privilege and social inequality due to the emotional connections that exist, but they also provide opportunities for individual and social transformation (Zembylas, 2017).

Description

Introductions (5 minutes)

We will begin the workshop by introducing ourselves, outlining the agenda, and sharing the learning objectives. We will conduct a brief round of introductions by asking participants to share on mic or in the chat: name, affiliation, and why they selected our session. We will also conduct a brief icebreaker to help facilitate connections in the online setting.

Google Jamboard Warmup Activity (15 minutes)

We want to prepare conference participants for the workshop content and discussion by engaging them in an activity. Participants will be given the prompt: “Describe a resistant learner.” Google Jamboard will allow for flexibility, creativity, and anonymity as participants engage in this brainstorm. Participants can write, draw, or even copy-and-paste images into the Jamboard. After 5 to 7 minutes, we will debrief the activity by asking participants to look for common themes or standout responses. We will also discuss the possibility of stereotyping of learners or instructor bias towards resistant learners and implications.

What: Presentation of Resistant Learning Models (15 minutes)

We will present the theoretical background and models of resistant learning. We will formally define resistant learning and provide examples. Participants will gain an understanding of how resistant learning manifests in the classroom. The potential impacts of resistant learning on classroom culture and student learning will also be explored.

So What: Padlet Discussion of Influences on Resistant Learning (15 minutes)

Participants will utilize Padlet to participate in a discussion around the different elements that influence resistant learning. We will start by listing typical influential elements, such as environmental forces, institutional culture, previous negative classroom experiences, and inflexible thinking. The participants will expand on these by offering their insights: why would this lead to resistant learning? How might this manifest? What are the potential consequences? Participants will also have space to share their own ideas about potential influences. After 5 to
7 minutes of brainstorming, we will review the participants’ contributions with them and facilitate a discussion.

**Now What: Presentation of Frameworks for Engagement (15 minutes)**

Following the Padlet discussion, we will present frameworks for engagement, with specific focus on the concept of heads, hands, and conscience. The presentation will also include tools and strategies, such as designing the learning “space” with students, engaging students in setting class rules, asking students to explore their reactions through concept mapping or creative outlets, and more. We will discuss how we approach teaching and give examples from our own experiences. An emphasis will be placed on leaning into the conversation, even if it is not directly connected to class content.

**Reflective Wrap-Up Activity (25 minutes)**

Participants will be asked to take a few minutes to reflect and recall a recent instance when they encountered a student who was resistant to engaging in discussion on a hot-button topic. We will provide them with a handout to work through this on their own for about 5 to 7 minutes. We will ask them to remember the emotions that arose in that moment. What assumptions, if any, did they make about the participants in the conversation? What would have led students to engage or re-engage? How might the conversation have gone if engagement strategies were used? Participants will also be asked to draw connections as to how these reflections inform their work as practitioners. Once participants have completed the worksheet on their own, we will place them in breakout groups of 3 to 4 participants for space to discuss what they have learned in the workshop and identify one or more strategies to try in the future (7 to 10 minutes). We will also leave the Jamboard open as a space for participants to document best practices based on their conversations. After completing this activity, we will wrap up the workshop by asking participants to share the key takeaway points. This wrap-up will conclude with thoughts and time for questions.

**Foreseeable Implications**

Resistant learning can occur across different disciplines, including leadership education. Although leadership education can play a role in addressing social justice issues, not all students will want to engage in this content. Furthermore, environmental, cultural, and cognitive factors can influence student resistance in the classroom. Given the current sociopolitical climate, conversations around social justice issues are even more challenging due to deep divides and the urge to avoid conflict. However, learning to engage in difficult topics wherein assumptions are challenged can develop students’ critical thinking and perspective taking. It is essential for enacting a socially just leadership curriculum. By expanding an instructor’s understanding of the potential causes of student resistance, they can reflect on their current practices and develop strategies for increased engagement and inclusion.
We hope that through this workshop, leadership educators can reflect on and share what they have learned in their experiences as well as walk away with additional instructional strategies to employ. As Sylvester (2018) asserts, regardless of where students are at in their development, knowledge, and understanding, it is our responsibility to develop inclusive programming. By implementing proactive strategies, educators can resolve these moments when they occur and assist students with moving forward with their learning.
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Learning by Doing: Incorporating Experiential Education in a Leadership Program Through Role Plays, Design Thinking and Reflective E-Portfolios
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Abstract

How do you make your classes or workshops engaging in a virtual or in person setting? Do you provide your students with transferable experiences that will not only develop them as leaders, but will earn them success in the workplace? This workshop will engage participants in understanding the value of experiential education in developing our students as leaders by engaging them in activities that reinforce the outcomes and theoretical underpinnings of a nationally recognized, four-tiered, co-curricular leadership development program at a large research university.

Introduction

Leadership education and higher education in general utilizes experiential learning to prepare students for complex challenges inside the classroom and outside of the university (Cantor, 1997). Often these experiential learning activities are thought of as in-person learning using the community, ropes course, or internship placement as a learning lab. However, the program discussed in this submission will demonstrate through this session that impactful experiential learning is possible at distanced and virtual settings.

The purpose of this educator workshop is to present how an established, tiered leadership development program implements experiential learning activities at each tier while providing time and space for participants to develop a plan to implement these activities on their own campuses. The following few paragraphs will explain the structure of the program, and the description section will detail the practices workshop participants will learn as a result of attending this workshop.

Background

The four-tiered co-curricular program is framed by the Social Change Model of Leadership (HERI, 1996), with each of the first three tiers corresponding to the three values in this model: self, group, and community. The first tier of this program introduces students to basic leadership skills, thoughts, and behaviors with a focus on increasing self-awareness and leader identity. There are four main workshop requirements that all students in Tier 1 must complete, which introduce The Leadership Challenge model (Kouzes & Posner, 2017), True Colors personality inventory (Miscisin, Haines, & Lowry, 2010), an introduction to identity and leadership, and a workshop that meets a diversity and inclusion requirement. Beyond these four required workshops, students are also expected to attend at least four additional workshops of their choosing which can range from skills based, to concept based learning - all of which are
connected explicitly or implicitly to The Leadership Challenge’s five exemplary practices of leadership.

Participants in Tier 2 of the program learn project management and teamwork skills, aligning with the three C’s of the group lens of the Social Change Model: common purpose, collaboration, and controversy with civility (HERI, 1996). Throughout the academic year, students learn integral project management skills such as accountability, conflict resolution, communication, and assessment. In meetings, students are provided with educational background information, then given time to put those skills into practice. Smith et al. (2008) state: “Industry has indicated the desire for academic programs to produce graduates that are well-versed in collaborative problem solving and general project management concepts in addition to technical skills.” Though academic programs may teach project management skills, students are often not taught the accompanying “soft” skills needed to succeed, such as being comfortable with team conflict and holding each other accountable to tasks.

In Tier 2 of the program, participants are divided into small groups and paired with a community partner that aligns with their interests. These community partners are non-profit organizations or small businesses that have a specific project in mind but lack the resources to accomplish it. Teams of 3-5 students are paired with each community partner for an eight-month internship-like experience to learn group leadership and project management skills. The program uses a two-pronged approach to educate students about group leadership skills: through a “real world” partnership with a working professional, and a curriculum facilitated by program staff and university faculty. Throughout the year students meet weekly for leadership workshops pertinent to their projects. At its core, Tier 2 of the program is about community collaboration: with peers, with campus experts, and with organization partners. Upon successful completion of Tier 2, students may choose to proceed to Tier 3 which is taught for academic credit.

One of the primary learning outcomes for Tier 3, is to have students develop habits and techniques around creative problem solving and design thinking. Providing a variety of activities to encourage divergent and entrepreneurial thinking will teach students to be open to risks, to not fear failure, to embrace change as opportunity, and to become skillful at idea generation. Traditional entrepreneurial thinking teaches a balance between knowing, doing and being (Puccio, Cabra & Schwagler, p. xvi), and the curriculum in Tier 3 follows this pattern in its pedagogy. The start of the year is focused on Knowing, the transmitting of information needed to understand and progress. Students are taught the structure, purposes and challenges of the social sector through lecture, guest speakers, and hands on research. Doing, or engaging in practices that develop skills and capabilities, begins with the completion of a detailed SWOT analysis of each team’s nonprofit partner, and then continues with problem solving through a project design and implementation to address an identified need. Being, or the ongoing personal development and integration of beliefs and values, is the sustained goal of developing leaders through BHLP. Being is also tied to the first of Kouzes and Posner’s Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership, Model the Way, that our students learn in Tier 1.

The Tier 4 capstone experience includes attendance at a “Life after College” series, continued involvement in program events, and comprehensive reflection into an e-portfolio. This portfolio
is a long term, self paced project guided by staff and prompted by a reflective matrix of questions for the students to answer and synthesize into their portfolio. This tier of the program returns from a cohort-based program to a more individualized tier as students focus on their development as a leader in the past four years. The cornerstone of a reflective e-portfolio capstone within the Tier 4 program is that students will further their self-awareness of their leadership growth and development over four years of learning. This is consistent with research which asserts that self-awareness is a key to leadership development and that “the most significant value of portfolios is as an aid in the self-reflection process” (Olsen 2008, Giuliano, 1997).

**Description**

Participants in the workshop will:

- Learn to apply 3-4 experiential learning activities to their work in teaching leadership, in person or in virtual settings.
- Understand the connections between activities and theoretical underpinnings
- Learn about a 4-tiered, co-curricular and experiential leadership program model at a large research university.

This interactive workshop will begin with an overview of the leadership program’s mission, theoretical framework and pedagogical approach. (15 minutes)

The next hour will be divided into two, 30-minute blocks when participants will be able to go into 2 different breakout rooms to learn about and engage in activities used in Tiers 2, 3 and 4 of this leadership program. Within these breakout rooms, presenters will facilitate activities, discussion, and application, sharing a combined 50 years of Student Affairs experience in experiential learning and leadership development. At the end of the first 30-minute block, participants will be able to enter a second breakout room.

**Breakout Room A:** Participants will engage in an activity to identify unskillful behaviors that may lead to group conflict. In the fall of Tier 2, students explore their saboteurs: self-sabotage behaviors that may impact their ability to be skillful within team conflicts. To help students become comfortable with conflict, workshop facilitators create roleplay scenarios exemplifying each of the shadows that may be triggered. Students respond to these scenarios in real time, and learn how to diffuse conflict and move towards solutions. In this train-the-trainer style section of the workshop, participants will take an assessment to explore their own triggers and will move through role play scenarios as if they were student participants (positiveintelligence.com). Participants will be provided with materials necessary to conduct this within their own classrooms or programs.

**Breakout Room B:** Participants will engage in two activities that can increase a team’s ability to think creatively and embrace an iterative process. Students in Tier 3 must design and implement a project that adds value to their community partner organization by addressing a need or
opportunity identified in the SWOT analysis. While students can embrace the Design Thinking stages of Empathy, Ideate, Design, Prototype and Test, (Shanks,M.) they are often resistant to the process of reiteration- going back and brainstorming, re-designing, and challenging themselves to make their projects better. The activities in this Breakout Room, How To Make Toast-and YES and The Failure Resume, will provide participants with an opportunity to learn two methods to help students willingly and more effectively engage in the iterative process of innovative problem solving.

**Breakout Room C**: In this breakout session, participants will be given the opportunity to brainstorm and develop their metrics for a reflective matrix. The matrix is designed as a series of reflection prompts to guide students in the development of their portfolio and the synthesis of their experiences. Participants will work upon the reflection prompts for each cell of their matrix that may be implemented within their programs. This sample matrix (see Appendix C) is designed along key outcomes of the presenters’ program (Self-development, interpersonal development, organizational & group development, service, and community engagement) as students self-evaluate their growth in each area according to their knowledge, skills & experiences, and disposition. The Tier 4 curriculum utilizes other resources in addition to the reflective matrix to encourage students in their development of a holistic portfolio, but the reflective matrix is the hallmark of portfolio development.

**Foreseeable Implications**

Participants in this workshop will leave with an increased understanding of experiential learning in leadership development programs and leave with 1-3 specific examples that they can immediately implement in their campus programs. Both Student Affairs practitioners and faculty can incorporate these activities into curriculum focused on leader identity, innovative problem solving, project design, team effectiveness and personal reflection.
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Appendices

Tier 2: Conflict Resolution Role Play

**Instructions:** During role play scenarios, a few students will be “actors” and the other participants in the session will help the actors navigate the scenario, identify the issue, and explore what could be done differently in the future. Each role play is meant to highlight a particular saboteur (Positive Intelligence, n.d.).

**Role Play 1: Avoider (Unskillful)**

The saboteur of “Avoider”, is described on the Positive Intelligence website (n.d.) as a person who focuses on the positive and pleasant in an extreme way. They avoid difficult and unpleasant situations and conflict. They would rather suppress their anger and resentment than “create a scene”.

**Setting:** The team is ending their weekly meeting with a lot of tasks to complete before they leave school for spring break. One team member has been doing all the work because they don’t want anyone to get mad at them for saying they can’t do it.

Person 1: *Okay so we’ve got a lot to do next week before spring break. I already know I can’t do much because I’m leaving early for Florida. [Avoider] - You were awesome at writing the emails last time. Can you do that?*

Person 2 [Avoider]: *Sure I can do that!*

Person 3: *Wait [Avoider] - you were the best at organizing the spreadsheet too. I suck at that! Would you mind doing it?*

Person 2 [Avoider]: *Um, yeah I can do that, no problem.*

Person 4: *Okay then I’ll hold everyone accountable and check in with you in 2 days.*

Person 1: *Thanks for taking care of that, [Avoider]!*

The team leave the meeting with only one person doing all of the tasks.

**Role Play 1: Avoider (Skillful)**
Person 1: Okay so we’ve got a lot to do next week before spring break. I already know I can’t do much because I’m leaving early for Florida. [Previous Avoider] - You were awesome at writing the emails last time. Can you do that?

Person 2 [Previous Avoider]: Sure I can do that! What task are you going to take on?

Person 1: Um...I guess I can communicate with our project partner and set up a time to meet.

Person 3: Wait [Previous Avoider] - you were the best at organizing the spreadsheet too. I suck at that! Would you mind doing it?

[Person 2/Previous Avoider]: Sure, if you would rather write the emails, I can organize the spreadsheet. What works best for everyone?

Person 4: [Person 3], I can help you out with the spreadsheet so [Person 2/Previous Avoider] can handle the emails. Let’s try to get it done by Friday.

**Debrief Discussion Questions:**

What Saboteur(s) did you see in this scenario?

Why do we sometimes “bite our tongues?” What are we afraid of?

Who is helped when we see a more skillful interaction?
How Do We Know if Anything Changed? Using Degree-of-Change Methodology to Improve Leadership Research and Program Evaluation
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ABSTRACT

Effective leadership development tends to require intrapersonal, interpersonal, and longitudinal elements; thus, careful attention should be applied toward evaluating and researching change beyond the default pre-post mentality. Degree-of-change methodology has considerable utility for leadership educators in program evaluation and research as it addresses several forms of bias, primarily response shift bias. The purpose of this Methods Workshop is to sharpen ALE member acuity in degree-of-change methodology to improve their program evaluation and research efforts. By the end of this workshop, participants will be able to (a) describe and distinguish degree-of-change methodology from other forms of assessment methodologies, (b) recognize and distinguish applications of degree-of-change methodology in program evaluation and research, and (c) formulate a defensible plan for using degree-of-change methodology in their program evaluation and/or research efforts.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership development (LD) is multilevel (i.e., includes both intrapersonal and interpersonal development) and longitudinal (Day et al., 2014; Patterson et al., 2017); thus, important consideration should be taken for evaluating and researching change beyond the default pre-post mentality. Degree-of-change is an alternative method for measuring change whereby raters indicate the degree to which they think they or someone else has changed by virtue of participation in an LD intervention. Degree-of-change methodology has considerable utility for leadership educators in program evaluation and research as it addresses several forms of bias and demonstrates the strongest consistency across raters (Black & Earnest, 2009; Patterson et al., 2017; Rosch & Schwartz, 2009). The purpose of this Methods Workshop is to sharpen ALE member acuity in the use and utility of degree-of-change methodology to improve their program evaluation and research efforts.

By the end of this workshop, participants will be able to:

- Describe and distinguish degree-of-change methodology from other forms of assessment methodologies
- Recognize and distinguish applications of degree-of-change methodology in program evaluation and research
- Formulate a defensible plan for using degree-of-change methodology in their program evaluation and/or research efforts

BACKGROUND
One of the major issues in leadership research and outcomes assessment is response shift bias (i.e., *Horizon Effect*, Rosch & Schwartz, 2009), whereby the LD participant’s pre-test scores on any leadership scale or assessment tool become less and less valid as the participant changes throughout the course of an LD intervention. In other words, a student or participant will likely change over the course of a leadership class, workshop, or program with regard to their implicit views of leadership, their leadership identity, as well as their leadership knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors. Thus, their interpretation of scale and/or assessment items will likely change pre-intervention to post-intervention as well. For example, a participant may believe they possess strong empathetic behavior, thus scoring themselves highly on a pre-test. However, after learning more about empathy in an LD intervention, may realize their initial beliefs about their empathetic behavior were inflated.

To address response shift bias, the most heralded best practices include retrospective assessment (then-now methodology) and triangulation (Black & Earnest, 2009; Hoole & Martineau, 2014; Rosch & Schwartz, 2009). Retrospective assessment typically involves post-then-pre and/or degree-of-change ratings. The focus of this Methods Workshop will be on degree-of-change ratings as this method creates stronger opportunities for consistency across raters (i.e., self and other), thus also addressing the *Hollywood Effect* (Rosch & Schwartz, 2009) assessment issue whereby participants often rate themselves higher on leadership scales or assessment tools when socially desirable (Black & Earnest, 2009; Patterson et al., 2017). Degree-of-change ratings have applications in both leadership research as well as program evaluation. In program evaluation, degree-of-change ratings can be used to indicate the accomplishment (or lack thereof) of learning objectives and the associated value of that assessment data in determining program effectiveness. In research, degree-of-change methodology allows leadership researchers to utilize LD program participants for answering broader questions in the leadership field.

Degree-of-change measures change by having raters indicate the degree to which they think they or someone else has changed by virtue of participation in a leadership development effort. Surveys that involve degree-of-change ratings typically outline the major changes (e.g., outcomes, competencies, behaviors, etc.) expected from a leadership development effort with response anchors requiring one or more ratings of change for each intended area. Below are some example degree-of-change survey prompts and response anchors (see Patterson et al., 2017).

**Example 1**

*Survey prompt:* Using the rating scale provided, please indicate the extent to which you have changed in the indicated areas as a result of this leadership development program.

*Response anchors:*

1 = Not at all

2 = To a little extent

3 = To some extent
4 = To a great extent
5 = To a very great extent

Design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcome/Learning Objective/Targeted Behavior</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Example 2

Survey prompt: Use the rating scale provided to rate your effectiveness and improvement in the following areas as a result of this leadership development program.

Response anchors:
1 = None
3 = Moderate
5 = Great

Design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcome/Learning Objective/Targeted Behavior</th>
<th>Current Effectiveness</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3

Survey prompt: Using the rating scale provided, provide ratings about the extent to which you exhibited the indicated behavior before the program and now after program completion.

Response anchors:
1 = Not at all
2 = To a minimal extent
3 = To a small extent
4 = To some extent
5 = To a moderate extent
DESCRIPTION OF TEACHING PROCEDURE

I. **Ice Breaker:** What have you found to be most challenging and/or intimidating in attempting to measure leadership development over time? What has been your experience, if any, with degree-of-change methodology and/or what is your interest in degree-of-change methodology?

II. **Getting Everyone on the Same Page: Basic Overview of Degree-of-Change**
(Targeting the learning objective ‘Describe and distinguish degree-of-change methodology from other forms of assessment methodologies’)
   a. Distinguish pre-post vs. retrospective assessment (see Intro and Background)
   b. Distinguish degree-of-change vs. post-then-pre forms of retrospective assessment (see Intro and Background)
   c. Core characteristics of degree-of-change methodology (see Intro and Background)

III. **When and How to Use Degree-of-Change in Research and Program Evaluation**
(Targeting the learning objective: ‘Recognize and distinguish applications of degree-of-change methodology in program evaluation and research’)

*Linkage:* Now with a basic foundation of degree-of-change methodology, let’s play with examples in both program evaluation and research
   a. Distinguish assessment, evaluation, and research

*Assessment* – measuring the accomplishment of learning objectives and program outcomes
Evaluation – placing value on assessment data to determine the program’s effectiveness in meeting its intended outcomes

Research – Using program participants to answer broader questions to the field of leadership about relationships between and among leadership variables.

  b. Examples!

Research: Degree-of-change methodology allows leadership researchers to use LD program participants to answer broader questions for the field of leadership.

- Example (see Appendix A): A 2015 mixed methods study revealed that college student leaders who mentor demonstrated significantly higher generativity than their peers. A follow-up research study was conducted to ascertain whether or not generativity developed over the course of the mentoring program. An initial MANCOVA analysis revealed that age cohort (year in college and years spent mentoring) did not have a significant effect on participants’ generativity, despite the vast majority of the qualitative phase participants in the 2015 study indicating perceived generativity growth. This unanticipated finding led to the use of pictorial degree-of-change methods to answer the following research question: How, if at all, does generativity develop among college student leaders who mentor? What changes, if any, in participants’ generativity do they associate with their mentoring experience and why?

Program Evaluation: Degree-of-change ratings can be used to indicate the accomplishment (or lack thereof) of learning objectives and the associated value of that assessment data in determining program effectiveness.

- Example 1 (see Appendix B): Degree-of-change ratings to assess growth in leadership competencies and associated program outcomes as a result of participating in a leadership mentoring program
- Example 2 (see Appendix C): Pictorial degree-of-change and follow-up open-ended questions to assess growth on learning objectives for a leadership course

IV. Making it Meaningful for YOU (Targeting the learning objective: ‘Formulate a defensible plan for using degree-of-change methodology in their program evaluation and/or research efforts’)

Linkage: Now that we’ve seen applications of degree-of-change methodology in both research and program evaluation, let’s apply what we’ve learned toward your programs and research projects. We’ll start with examples to warm up, then you’ll work independently.

[Participants will be placed in small groups.]

Direction Set: Half of the groups will receive a program evaluation challenge and the other half a research challenge. Your group’s task is to use degree-of-change methodology to address the challenge.
Program Evaluation Example: You are a member of the Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) for your College. The FAC, in consultation with the Dean and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, has drafted the following desired “attributes” for every student upon graduation:

- Evidence-based decision making for a complex world using a systems-thinking approach
- A spirit of entrepreneurship, leadership, civic engagement, and service to positively impact communities.
- A global mindset and appreciation of diversity across cultures, ethnicities, religions, gender, sexual orientation, and age.
- A collaborative, inclusive approach to problem solving and innovation.

The Dean has asked the FAC to create a vehicle through which to assess growth on these attributes. How will you use degree-of-change methodology to address the Dean’s request?

Research Example: You are a faculty member at a land-grant institution with a partial Extension appointment. You have been tasked to be the community leadership expert on the Community Vitality team. Extension is trying to document its impact on community development. How will you use degree-of-change methodology to help?

Processing questions:

- How did our groups demonstrate core components of degree-of-change methodology?
- How would our groups respond to critics who say, “Why don’t you just use pre-post assessments?”

Formulate Your Own Plan: Now it’s time to formulate your own plan for using degree-of-change methodology in your program evaluation and/or research efforts

Direction Set: Using your own leadership development program or research study, formulate a program evaluation plan or research question and associated data collection plan that would use degree-of-change methodology.

For a program evaluation plan, addresses how you will:

- Measure participant change to document that learning objectives and associated program outcomes have been achieved
- Measure development in the leader and/or leadership development
- Cross-pollinate outcomes assessment data with developmental change data
- Use assessment data to make program evaluation decisions

For research questions, remember…we’re utilizing LD participants to answer a broader question about relationships between and among leadership variables.

[Participants will be repositioned into small groups based upon whether they completed a program evaluation plan or research plan.]
Processing: In small groups, provide feedback to each participant on the following:

- What will be one benefit to using degree-of-change methodology within their program evaluation or research plan?
- How might they improve their plan to maximize the benefit of using degree-of-change methodology?

WORKSHOP IMPLICATIONS

The multilevel and longitudinal requirements of effective leadership development efforts necessitate evaluating and researching change beyond pre-post assessments. Degree-of-change methodology has considerable utility for leadership educators in program evaluation and research as it addresses several forms of bias and has stronger consistency across raters. Sharpening ALE member acuity in degree-of-change methodology will improve program evaluation and research outputs, thus allowing stronger and more compelling demonstrations of impact from leadership education efforts.
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APPENDIX A: DEGREE-OF-CHANGE RESEARCH EXAMPLE

How Degree-of-Change Data Were Collected
Interview prompt...Please draw the line graph of generativity and years spent mentoring that you would predict based on your experience. Generativity is the y-axis and years spent mentoring (time one, time two, time three) is the x-axis.

*Figure 1. Demi’s generativity development.*

*Figure 2. Darcy’s generativity development.*
How Degree-of-Change Data Were Analyzed

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Meaning Unit</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generativity Before Mentoring</td>
<td>“I was pretty low”</td>
<td>“I would say I was pretty low honestly. Yeah, I, I’d never been in a position where I’d mentored someone before.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Those skills were just so raw and I really wasn’t using them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I came into college pretty selfish.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was pretty decent”</td>
<td>“It’s been internalized that you treat others well and you should be…a leader.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I was pretty good at it from beforehand. I used to be in Boy Scouts…a lot of it’s about leadership and helping all of those around you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Antecedents</td>
<td>“LEAD 111”</td>
<td>“LEAD 111 made me a lot better at all the different things we do in [the leadership mentoring program (LMP)], be it communicating or understanding others, helping others, and improving the world around you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“…having the information lectured upon and then at the same time being able to apply it to a relationship.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context of Being a College Student Leader Who Mentors
APPENDIX B: DEGREE-OF-CHANGE PROGRAM EVALUATION EXAMPLE

Map of Program Outcomes and Associated Objectives and Competencies
How Degree-of-Change Assessment Data Were Collected on Competencies

NHRI Outcome Assessment

The response options indicate the following about your self-evaluation of growth through NHRI over the past year:
1. Did Not Increase
2. Slightly increased
3. Moderately increased
4. Greatly increased

My ability to reflect on experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly Increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My understanding of my strengths and values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly Increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The skills I need to build productive relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly Increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Degree-of-Change Data Were Analyzed to Evaluate Assessment Data on Competencies

Table 1

*Self-Evaluation of Competencies Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Targeted competency</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>(% \geq 3.0) rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My ability to reflect on experiences</td>
<td>Reflection and Application</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My understanding of my strengths and values</td>
<td>Self-Understanding</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The skills I need to build productive relationships</td>
<td>Productive Relationships</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to engage in mentoring to help others reach their full potential</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The skills I need to foster empathy-level relationships</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to provide feedback, guidance, and/or advice to improve the actions or thoughts of others</td>
<td>Providing Feedback</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My understanding of how to act in ways that benefit society</td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to see commitments through to the end</td>
<td>Follow-Through</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Degree-of-Change Assessment Data Were Collected on Program Outcomes

NHRI Program Assessment

Indicate your level of proficiency for each program outcome statement. The response options indicate the following:
1. Limited Proficiency
2. Basic Proficiency
3. Advanced Proficiency
4. Exceptional Proficiency

Apply knowledge of the investment relationship model and positive psychology to help others reach their full potential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reinvest personal leadership strengths, values, and skills for the purpose of positive social change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide active listening, feedback, and/or guidance to sharpen the actions and thoughts of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Degree-of-Change Assessment Data Were Analyzed on Program Outcomes

Table 2

Program Outcomes Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program outcome statement</th>
<th>Targeted competencies</th>
<th>Average perceived proficiency level</th>
<th>% ≥ 3.0 rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge of the investment relationship model and positive psychology to help others reach their full potential</td>
<td>Reflection and Application Self-Understanding Productive Relationships Mentoring</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinvest personal leadership strengths, values, and skills for the purpose of positive social change</td>
<td>Reflection and Application Mentoring Social Responsibility</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide active listening, feedback, and/or guidance to sharpen the actions and thoughts of others</td>
<td>Mentoring Providing Feedback</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively utilize interpersonal skills and responsible patterns of behavior to develop empathetic and trusting relationships</td>
<td>Productive Relationships Empathy Follow-Through</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Perceived Growth in Program Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program outcome statement</th>
<th>Ranking of most perceived growth</th>
<th>% of respondents identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge of the investment relationship model and positive psychology to help others reach their full potential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinvest personal leadership strengths, values, and skills for the purpose of positive social change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide active listening, feedback, and/or guidance to sharpen the actions and thoughts of others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively utilize interpersonal skills and responsible patterns of behavior to develop empathetic and trusting relationships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Map of Course Objectives and Associated Activities and Evaluative Mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Teaching Methods/Activities/Course Activities</th>
<th>Mechanism used to Evaluate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-create a stimulating and supportive learning environment that illustrates the</td>
<td>• Pre-Survey to determine small groups</td>
<td>• Small group discussion rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive characteristics we are seeking to build or enhance - both individually</td>
<td>• Small group discussions</td>
<td>• EvaluationKIT common student learning experience questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and organizationally</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Open-ended questions on Final Reflection Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnose and analyze leadership and leader behaviors and the effects of</td>
<td>• Reading materials</td>
<td>• Practice Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership interventions</td>
<td>• Lecture videos</td>
<td>• Mid-Term Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small group discussions</td>
<td>• Final Case Study (Mini Proposal and Full Client Proposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concept map and reconfigured concept map</td>
<td>• Final Reflection Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss and practice the application of leadership theories and concepts to the</td>
<td>• Reading materials</td>
<td>• Practice Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment, design, delivery, and evaluation of leadership and leader development</td>
<td>• Lecture videos</td>
<td>• Mid-Term Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small group discussions</td>
<td>• Final Case Study (Full Client Proposal and Client Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concept map and reconfigured concept map</td>
<td>• Final Reflection Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the effects of leadership programs and interventions on individuals and</td>
<td>• Reading materials</td>
<td>• Mid-Term Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td>• Lecture videos</td>
<td>• Final Case Study (Client Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small group discussions</td>
<td>• Final Reflection Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Degree-of-Change Assessment Data Were Collected on Course Objectives

Directions: Click on the image below, then select ‘Edit’ at the bottom - this will bring up Google Drawing. Click on ‘Line’ at the top to select your desired line type and then draw how you have grown in each of the major learning objectives throughout the semester, specifically how you changed at the Practice, Mid-Term, and Final Case Study timepoints in the semester. Be sure to click “Save and Close.” Then, indicate in the question below, which class activities (if any) promoted growth within that learning objective.

Follow-up questions:
- Which class activities (readings, assignments, videos, discussions, etc.), if any, were helpful (or not) in promoting growth in this learning objective between the Practice and Mid-Term time points?
- Which class activities (readings, assignments, videos, discussions, etc.) were helpful (or not) in promoting growth in this learning objective between the Mid-Term and Final time points?
- Was the slope of your line different between Practice and Mid-Term time points than between Mid-Term and Final time points? Why or why not?
How Degree-of-Change Assessment Data Were Analyzed on Course Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Analysis of Student Learning Memo 3</th>
<th>Reflection on the Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diagnose and analyze leadership and leader behaviors and the effects of leadership interventions | • Select samples that represent high-pass, mid-pass, and low-pass work  
  • Have students draw a graph self-evaluating their growth on this learning objective across the Practice, Mid-Term, and Final Case Studies  
  • Analyze graphs for trending patterns and match trending patterns with open-ended responses | • Refine grading rubric from analysis of student learning to clarify high, mid, and low-pass expectations  
  • Emphasize in time and grade weight the course activities that students indicate as being most helpful in promoting growth  
  • Re-evaluate course activities that are not mentioned as being helpful in growth promotion |
| Discuss and practice the application of leadership theories and concepts to the assessment, design, delivery, and evaluation of leadership and leader development | • Select samples that represent high-pass, mid-pass, and low-pass work  
  • Have students draw a graph self-evaluating their growth on this learning objective across the Practice, Mid-Term, and Final Case Studies  
  • Analyze graphs for trending patterns and match trending patterns with open-ended responses | • Refine grading rubric from analysis of student learning to clarify high, mid, and low-pass expectations  
  • Emphasize in time and grade weight the course activities that students indicate as being most helpful in promoting growth  
  • Re-evaluate course activities that are not mentioned as being helpful in growth promotion |
| Evaluate the effects of leadership programs and interventions on individuals and organizations | • Select samples that represent high-pass, mid-pass, and low-pass work  
  • Have students draw a graph self-evaluating their growth on this learning objective across the Practice, Mid-Term, and Final Case Studies  
  • Analyze graphs for trending patterns and match trending patterns with open-ended responses | • Refine grading rubric from analysis of student learning to clarify high, mid, and low-pass expectations  
  • Emphasize in time and grade weight the course activities that students indicate as being most helpful in promoting growth  
  • Re-evaluate course activities that are not mentioned as being helpful in growth promotion |

Michael Linville, Indiana Wesleyan University
Mark Rennaker, Indiana Wesleyan University

Abstract

For all of the advantages that society typically grants to leaders (influence, prestige, even power), time and time again many leaders display poor character and bad behaviors that result in unmotivated, disillusioned followers and, ultimately, produce failures in meeting organizational goals (Crossan et al., 2012). Given leader failures, Harvard professors Rob Goffee and Gareth Jones (2006) once posed the question: “Why should anyone be led by you? The audiences to whom they spoke often fell silent as those in attendance considered their right to lead others as well as the willingness of followers to be led. Collectively, the right and willingness considerations surface an additional question: where does leadership begin? Leader failure as well as leader success with others and organizations emerges from the same foundation: self-leadership and whether it is effective or poor. Much leadership education focuses on learning theories of leadership or good behaviors of leadership. However, two fundamental assumptions will undergird this proposed workshop for leadership educators: people lead out of who they are, and one must lead self well before being well suited to lead others. Based on those key assumptions, this workshop will consider the use of andragogical principles to enable holistic self-leadership. Through the extensive use of interactive discussion questions, hands-on activities and group collaboration, attendees will gain insights that stimulate fresh thinking and reflection in teaching students of leadership.

Introduction

On the day that President John F. Kennedy was assassinated, he was prepared to remind Americans that “leadership and learning are indispensable to each other” (Brazeau, 2008, p. NA). What was clearly relevant in 1963 is no less relevant today, as leadership and learning should never be considered to exist separately from one another. Education has relied upon a pedagogical system of instruction since the Middle Ages. The term pedagogy literally means child-leading, which raises questions about application in organizational and adult education contexts where leadership development seems to most frequently be centered. Thus, over recent decades, learning theorists began to recognize the shortcomings of pedagogy in teaching adults, even young adults. Research following World War I laid the foundation for the andragogical – or adult-leading - system of learning for adults.

Malcolm Knowles’ andragogical approach involves six characteristics of adult learners that emphasize the need to focus teaching on the learner’s experiences and interests. Learners have different personalities, backgrounds, learning styles and motivators. Educators who understand these differences will enhance the quality of their teaching and the acquired skills of their adult students (Knowles et al, 2005). Knowles’ six characteristics form the theoretical foundation for this workshop; the six characteristics include:
• Adult learning is self-directed/autonomous
• Adult learning utilizes knowledge & life experiences
• Adult learning is goal-oriented
• Adult learning is relevancy-oriented
• Adult learning highlights practicality
• Adult learning encourages collaboration

A key synthesis of the six characteristics is that effective educators of adults do not teach students as much as they create conditions for adult students to learn. Adult students possess a motivation and orientation to learn, grounded in an autonomous self-concept and contextualized in a reservoir of experiences and social roles. Effective educators must create opportunities that help activate and support the adult learner’s will to develop and apply that development. The self element of adult learning provides some conceptual linkages to self-leadership concept. While various self-leadership models exist, the four key areas of self-leadership included self-responsibility, self-declaration, self-care, and self-controlling. The practical application of the six adult learner characteristics to the development of self-leadership will constitute the primary focus of the proposed workshop. Moreover, the workshop presenters will share how the use of andragogical principles to support self-leadership growth is enhanced by coupling them with a holistic approach to the topic (emotional, psychological, spiritual). Consistent with andragogy, the workshop is based largely on hands-on activities and examples.

Background

The process of learning that ascribes full responsibility to an instructor about what will be taught and how that will occur is called pedagogy (child-leading). Pedagogy is the approach used in teaching schoolchildren, based on the assumptions that the learner needs to know certain knowledge and they are dependent upon a teacher to provide it. Pedagogy, however, is criticized for its potential to neglect the learner’s experience and readiness to learn, as well as motivation to learn (Knowles et al., 2005). Andragogy (adult-leading), in contrast, accommodates the adult’s need to understand why something must be learned (Knowles, 1984). Andragogy also allows for adult motivation and life-centeredness, which considers the learners’ experiences and goals (Thompson & Deis, 2004).

The concept of self-leadership is gaining attention within leadership circles. However, a conundrum exists: can self-leadership be taught by someone external to the leader? Such a challenge is especially relevant for leadership education. Adult learning theory provides a conceptual way to navigate the conundrum. Instructors create conditions and opportunities that guide willing learners through several aspects of self-reflection to enhance self-awareness, self-determination, and both intra- and inter-personal effectiveness. MBTI research, as one example, reported that increased leader self-awareness led to improvement in confidence, decision-making, people skills, and stress management (Myers-Briggs Co., 2020).

Study of self-leadership in the leadership discipline and practice is still in relative infancy with a general lack of self-leadership models and guiding frameworks (Neuhaus, 2020). Despite this deficiency, the importance of utilizing self-leadership principles to enable enhanced awareness and development in leaders is no less diminished. Consistent principles in the emerging research suggest four key areas of self-leadership including self-responsibility, self-
care, self-declaration, and self-controlling. Stated as a set of questions, these four key areas address (1) How do I take initiative and accountability? (2) How do I care for myself in holistic fashion? (3) How do I determine and focus on who I am, what I do, and where I am going? (4) How do I move with intentionality and persistence toward my personal and professional goals?

Within the framework of leadership education, leveraging andragogical principles in the design and execution of the educational environment provides the opportunity to leverage both individual and collective experiences to enhance self-leadership development by each learner. Neither andragogy or self-leadership imply that learning occurs within a contextual vacuum or in isolation. Rather, each suggests, implicitly or explicitly, that interaction with others may be a necessary element to facilitate the greatest depth and breadth of self-development. While both andragogy and self-leadership principles move focus away from dependence on others, the direction is not toward isolated-independence but social interdependence. Approaching leadership education by utilizing group collaboration processes is useful in facilitating adult learning across a variety of diverse perspectives. Learning among diverse groups of students may be categorized as constructivist learning, when each participant builds upon prior knowledge in extrapolating meaning from the collaborative discussions. With each individual group member sharing their respective knowledge with other group members, the result is a cross-pollination of ideas that benefits each adult learner and the entire group on their respective journeys of self-discovery and development – that is, self-leadership. Leaders demonstrating stronger and more positive self-leader will be stronger and more positive leaders for organizations and society.

Description

This proposed workshop plan includes the following steps:
1. The workshop will begin with a very brief overview of andragogy and its contrast with pedagogy.
2. The session will continue with highlighting of the four key areas of self-leadership (self-responsibility, self-declaration, self-care, and self-controlling) and how andragogical principles may be used to address them. A holistic approach to self-leadership will also be integrated into the workshop, with attendees invited to participate in each phase. The workshop will be highly interactive, using discussion questions and soliciting attendee experiences for the benefit of all.
3. The majority of the workshop time will be allocated to hands-on individual and group activities – experiential examples of creating self-leadership learning conditions - specifically aligned with Knowles’ six characteristics of andragogy:
   a) Adult learning is self-directed/autonomous – use inner transformative activities to address character, authenticity, worldview, and values; example: VIA Character Strengths assessment
   b) Adult learning utilizes knowledge & life experiences – use of self-reflection activities to capitalize on learner’s experiences
   c) Adult learning is goal-oriented – use of personal mission statements, SMART goals to guide personal development
   d) Adult learning is relevancy-oriented – use of DAE tool (description, analysis, evaluation) to stimulate discussion
   e) Adult learning highlights practicality – use of activities to demonstrate how student leverages strengths and builds upon knowledge and learning; example: student-created
TED Talk, acquiring perspectives from others via one-on-one interviews with established leaders

f) Adult learning encourages collaboration – use of group skill builder activities that include a post-assessment reflective component designed to assess trust-building and to analyze self-leadership in context

The final few minutes of the workshop will be devoted to a time of group reflection for the purpose of distilling learning into key takeaways for practical implementation.

Foreseeable Implications

In order to facilitate adult learning, three key components within the successful learning organization (the workshop facilitators contend that these include the classroom) are necessary: an environment where learning is encouraged, specific learning procedures and methodologies, and leaders who are committed to advocate learning (Garvin et al, 2008). Moreover, “supportive learning environments allow time for a pause in the action and encourage thoughtful review of the organization’s processes” (Garvin et al, 2008, p. 110). As demonstrated within the literature of andragogy and transformative learning, the relationship between educator and adult learner shares many of the characteristics and qualities of the leader-follower relationship (Gabriel, 2008; Ghanem & Castelli, 2019). To that end, a primary outcome for this workshop is to stimulate thoughtful and practical learning among educators in the discipline of leadership. A key distinction of this workshop will be its focus on character development and values as underlying foundations to effective self-leadership. Author and entrepreneur Brenda van Camp once wrote: “When we talk about leadership development, the focus is often on people skills, communications skills, vision, intelligence, business acumen, even boldness. Yet none of that will make a leader without the foundational leadership quality of good character. Character is fundamental to effective leadership because good character builds trust, and without trust, people will not follow you. Without followers, obviously, one cannot lead” (van Camp, 2017, para. 1). A focus upon self-leadership, draws attention inward to the person of the leader as the foundation upon which any leader attitudes and actions build.
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Abstract

The purpose of this scoping review was to analyze the scholarship regarding leader(ship) identity development and meaning making for leadership educators. A scoping review method was utilized to explore the current research and identify key characteristics related to the intersection of leader(ship) identity development and meaning making with a specific focus on New Directions for Student Leadership, a thematic sourcebook series for leadership educators. Thirteen chapters published between 2011 and 2020 met the inclusion criteria. The chapters contributed to knowledge about the most heavily referenced theories when discussing leader(ship) identity development, as well as the processes of meaning making highlighted within and outside of the leader(ship) identity development context. In response to these findings, we (a) call for a more interdisciplinary approach to leader(ship) identity development, (b) urge future scholars to definitively articulate how leadership educators can utilize meaning making to facilitate leader(ship) identity development, and (c) recommend a careful empirical consideration of the role meaning making has in learning.
Exploring Implicit Leadership Theories in the Arts

Alie Gillespie, University of Nebraska - Lincoln
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Abstract

The arts not only promote cultural development within society, but the arts also serve as a major economic force. The importance of arts is also expressed through burgeoning research on arts organizations and the leadership needed for the industry. Leadership within the arts may serve as a unique context, where leaders must balance business acumen with artistic sensitivity. To address the specific needs of arts leadership, we propose to examine the implicit leadership theories held by arts educators, arts students, and arts practitioners using content analysis. Results from this study will afford valuable insight into the breadth of desired characteristics of leaders in the arts. This knowledge will aid in the advancement and enhancement of education and training for future and current arts leaders.
“I am because we are”:
Developing leaders through community-engaged learning on the global stage

Elizabeth Goryunova, University of Southern Maine
Tara Grey Coste, University of Southern Maine
Mary-Anne Peabody, University of Southern Maine

Abstract

Community-based pedagogy is recognized as high-impact experiential learning that meaningfully combines real-life experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. It is a worldwide phenomenon, implemented across various academic disciplines in both domestic and global contexts. This study explores the benefits of global community-engaged learning for leadership education by examining The Montagu Project, a global leadership program in South Africa developed by a leadership department at a public university in the United States. Qualitative analysis of students' reflections written about the project suggests life-changing experiences that prepare learners for engaged citizenship and leadership by strengthening individual democratic values, civic responsibility, critical thinking, and creativity.

Introduction

An increasingly uncertain and dynamic global environment is characterized by growing economic inequality, political, social, and racial divides, and sustainability concerns. The jagged edges and fault lines in our global society have only been magnified by the sweeping digital transformation of the pandemic disruption. This serves as a compelling argument that the complex problems before humanity can only be solved through collaboration across cultures and communities, by engaged citizens and responsible leaders. Leadership educators agree that developing leaders capable of enhanced social awareness, critical reflection, collaboration, and civic engagement can be achieved through the high-impact pedagogy of community-based (service) learning (NERCHE, 2020). In the most recent decades, institutions of higher education have been utilizing community-engaged projects and scholarship as a springboard for strengthening learners’ capacity for civically responsible practices and for building inclusive social processes and policies (Boyer, 1996; Brown-Luthango, 2013; authors’ journal article, forthcoming).

Community-engaged learning takes place within multiple disciplines, both domestically (in local and national contexts) and in studies abroad (in a global context). Recent research demonstrates that global community-based programs offer deep multi-level learning opportunities, heightened civic awareness, team collaboration, and creativity (Beitman et al., 2015; Casey, 2008; Gillis & MacLellan, 2010; Souers, 2009). Additionally, leadership-centered study abroad programs afford students opportunities to develop their leadership skills in a global context, in other words, to learn the essence of global leadership (Earnest, 2003).
Because contemporary and future leaders are functioning in an increasingly volatile and complex environment, their effectiveness depends on a comprehensive range of cognitive, behavioral, and attitudinal competencies, including complex problem solving, adaptability, intercultural competency, collaboration, communication, and ethical decision making (Caligiuri, 2006; Mendenhall et al., 2017). Research demonstrates that the actual “immersion experience” of global community-engaged learning facilitates the development of these competencies by translating leadership course concepts into real-life scenarios and affording students the opportunities to acquire practical global leadership skills (Riggio et al., 2003).

Recent leadership studies point at yet another critical leadership skill: creativity. Compelling evidence suggests that in a complex global environment, creativity helps leaders integrate comprehensive information, recognize emerging opportunities, design unique solutions, and, above all, stimulates team collaboration, innovation, and success (Hughes et al., 2018; Mumford et al., 2014). Cabrera and Unruh (2012) note that the ability to connect, create, and contribute can make or break a global leader. Consequently, enhanced creativity should be among the key outcomes of a leadership development course and could be achieved through an effective learning laboratory for global leadership practice that allows for choice, experimentation, feedback, and reflection in the interplay of people, cultures, and imagination.

This study examines The Montagu Project: a global community-engaged, creativity-enhanced, leadership development program developed by a well-established leadership department at a public university in the United States. The project is a Montagu-community-based partnership between seven South African non-profits, corporate partners, a global training corporation, and an American university deeply committed to engaged learning and community empowerment. Their shared objective is to empower emerging leaders across continents, by increasing their self-awareness, emotional intelligence, and resilience, thus enhancing their effectiveness and ability to create positive social change in their respective communities and beyond. We discuss the structure, pedagogy, and lessons learned through this initiative as the Montagu Project enters its eleventh year.

**Literature Review**

Community-based pedagogy is a type of experiential learning that benefits learners by meaningfully combining real-life experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (Kolb, 1984). It prepares learners for engaged citizenship and leadership by strengthening individual democratic values, civic responsibility, critical thinking, and creativity. It also benefits community organizations by providing them with support and access to applied and scientific expertise. Common features of community-engaged learning include the centrality of community partners to the practice, service activities that benefit the community, and the participants’ reflection about their learning experience as it relates to the course content (Bringle & Clayton, 2012; Jacoby, 2015).

Community-engaged learning is not limited to a local or national context. The growing interconnectedness of economies and cultures facilitates opportunities for community-based (service) learning in a global context. Currently, community-engaged pedagogy is incorporated into higher education in the U.S., Canada, U.K., Hong Kong, Philippines, Mexico, Japan, and
other countries and is supported by global educational networks, such as the International Association for Research on Service-Learning & Community Engagement that advances knowledge on the topic (Annette, 2002; Aujla & Hamm, 2018; IARSLCE, 2020; Law, 2019).

Critics of global learning argue that the contemporary national environment offers significant exposure to diverse cultures domestically. However, recent studies demonstrate that global (study abroad) community-based programs offer additional benefits including deep multi-level learning opportunities, heightened civic awareness, team collaboration, and creativity, where the latter is critical for participants in host countries with inadequate community resources (Beitman et al., 2015; Casey, 2008; Gillis & MacLellan, 2010; Souers, 2009). According to Hartman & Kiely (2014), the differentiating objectives of global service-learning are intercultural competence, considerations of power and privilege, and a global civic mindset. Lough and Toms (2018) refer to those as the increased awareness of the interrelatedness and complexity of global issues and cultural diversity.

Global community-engaged learning is successfully implemented across a variety of academic disciplines, from those that are more applied to the liberal arts (Kilgo et al., 2014). Thus, in geoscience, its outcomes include increased knowledge and interest in course content as well as students’ empowerment to make difference in their community (Brand et al., 2019). Nursing students report shattered stereotypes and increased advocacy on behalf of the community (Knecht & Fisher, 2015). In liberal arts, service-learning is found to be a predictor of students’ political and social activism (Kilgo et al., 2014). Pless et al. (2011) found that engaging students internationally in cross-sector partnerships with NGOs, social entrepreneurs, or international organizations led to the development of responsible mindsets, ethical literacy, cultural intelligence, global mindsets, self-development, and community building. Overall, scholars acknowledge positive effects on students’ cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development, including learners’ civic awareness, advocacy, diversity-related outcomes, and global perspective (Engberg & Fox, 2011).

Thus far, scholars agree on a comprehensive range of cognitive, behavioral, and attitudinal competencies that are critical to leaders’ effectiveness in a global context, yet the most recent compelling evidence places a premium upon leaders’ creativity and innovation (George, 2008; Hughes et al., 2018; Mumford et al., 2003; Mumford et al., 2002; Rickards & Moger, 2006; Shalley & Gilson, 2004; Sternberg et al., 2004; Williams & Foti, 2011). Hughes et al. (2018) conceptualize creativity as “cognitive and behavioral processes applied when attempting to generate novel ideas” (p. 551) and suggest a relationship between creativity/innovation and leadership/organizational success. Other studies suggest that leaders’ creativity is a core component of effective leadership, as it helps develop original solutions to complex problems and novel ideas, recognize emerging opportunities, integrate comprehensive information, and build empowered and innovative teams (Acikgoz & Günsel, 2016; Li & Yue, 2019; Li & Zhang, 2016; Mumford et al., 2000; Reiter-Palmon, 2004; Shalley & Gilson, 2004; Slavich et al., 2014).

It is in this spirit of providing students with an opportunity to engage in transformative, creativity enhanced, global community-engaged learning that strengthens their capacity for responsible citizenship and leadership that we embarked on the path of The Montagu Project. The key steps
in the design and implementation of the project were identifying the community in South Africa to engage with for the project and securing organization-partners in South Africa and the United States. Thus, in South Africa we sought partnership with organizations experienced in using expressive and creative arts to engage disadvantaged youth in social change (such as the Rural Arts Foundation). In the United States, our focus was on securing procedural support and adequate funding to ensure that participants in the project are engaged in a meaningful shared learning experience and an “equal exchange” between U.S. and South African peers, as opposed to something that more closely resembled a volunteering experience. In other words, the project intended that the U.S. participants would learn as much from the delegates from Africa as the delegates from Africa would learn from them.

It took two years to arrive to implementation from our initial program design. However, from the first year of program implementation we could see that the groundwork had been laid for a creative communal learning space that would have significant impact.

The Montagu Project: Description of the Practice

The Montagu Project is an innovative leadership education initiative that partners faculty, students, and alumni from a U.S. public university with regional leaders in the Montagu area of South Africa. It has been envisioned as a global community-engaged leadership development lab facilitated through creativity pedagogy. Interwoven throughout the program is the traditional African philosophy of Ubuntu “I am because we are”: the belief that “there exists a common bond between us all, and it is through this bond, through our interaction with our fellow human beings, that we discover our own human qualities” (Nelsen & Lundin, 2010, p. 119).

To thoroughly prepare for their global experience, the undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the Montagu Project (a study abroad course in South Africa) are provided with a solid foundation in cross-cultural communication and leadership, augmented by a strong knowledge of South African history and its current political and cultural environment. This information is interwoven with a close examination of students’ own core beliefs and values, so they are aware of the lens through which they are filtering their experience in Africa. Additionally, key learning experiences during the pre-trip classroom sessions include exercises in critical thinking, analysis, and synthesizing of content material. Working in small groups, communicating through discussions, and setting a classroom environment where creative thought is welcomed and encouraged represent the intentional pedagogical strategies of the professors.

In addition to four months of “book learning,” the time in South Africa is also highly curated. Days preceding and following an intensive community leadership workshop in Montagu are carefully structured to allocate adequate time for the U.S. students to process what they are experiencing. Both reflection and processing take time and are critical to creative thought (Kolb, 1984; Porter-O’Grady & Malloch, 2011). Therefore, we added activities that ease students in and out of the global leadership immersion experience in a way that facilitates their full engagement while in the workshop and their ability to apply knowledge gained through the workshop to their own communities upon return to the United States.
Developing this aspect of the programming was a challenging task. On the front end, we had to design a set of experiences that would peel away the “otherness” we too-often create for ourselves and prepare students to connect with their South African counterparts at an authentic level. We also had to bring them face to face with the realities of the apartheid struggle in a way that enabled them to view people immersed in the current day struggle not as some sort of disadvantaged collective but as real people living real lives.

In reality, many of our U.S. students themselves come from backgrounds that could be classified as disadvantaged. Some of them have experienced homelessness; some are first-generation college students; some are veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder; some are individuals in recovery; some are recent immigrants to the United States; some have struggled with mental health issues, and many have come from low-income households. For these individuals, the journey to believe that they could partake in a study experience abroad is not a straight path. They have to overcome many fears and doubts. They have to secure funds for their expenses and care arrangements for those relying on their daily support. They have to overcome friends’ and family’s concerns about traveling across the world. In other words, for most of them participating in this project becomes a testament to their leadership qualities.

Most program delegates from Africa are coming from farms or townships with extreme and intergenerational poverty. Crime-ridden neighborhoods, HIV-AIDS, malnutrition, poor health care, sexual abuse, and substance abuse are the everyday reality for many of these youth. Those who are selected for our leadership program are working hard to find alternate pathways by staying in school and being involved in healthy pursuits, indeed, exhibiting healthy leadership qualities.

As the community leadership workshop begins to unfold, coming face-to-face with other individuals who do not define themselves by their circumstances provides a breadth of discourse fundamental to global leadership development for all participants. Additionally, during the workshop, participants work through their visioning for the future; they generate new and attainable opportunities for themselves and the communities they live in. To accomplish that, workshop participants learn to use the Osborn-Parnes Creative Problem Solving Process (Parnes, 1997). In particular, they learn to use this tool to become innovative and effective leaders (Puccio, Mance, & Murdock, 2011). The Osborn-Parnes process involves six carefully articulated stages: exploring the vision, gathering data, formulating challenges, exploring ideas, formulating solutions, and formulating a plan. Key to the successful implementation of the process are four basic tenets: divergent and convergent thinking must be balanced; problems should be addressed as questions; judgment should be deferred or suspended, and focus should be on “yes, and” rather than “no, but” statements.

One of the pedagogical strategies of the program—a culminating performance of creative expression delivered in the local community—manifests the genuine connection established between U.S. participants and South Africa participants in a truly celebratory way. The performance unfolds in front of invited family, friends, representatives of non-profit partners, and most notably township children who see their older brothers and sisters participate in the leadership program and learn that they could be the next ones selected for participation.
Upon completing the program, students are tasked with utilizing their creativity and critical thinking to identify ways to continue the Montagu Project efforts and maintain effective interactions between project participants, faculty, and staff. For example, U.S. students take responsibility for various parts of the program, such as creating a map and safety plan of the primary locations we will use, developing a workbook for the weeklong workshop in multiple languages, or building a series of mindfulness exercises to help students create a reflective processing space. South Africa delegates take the lead on integrating new participants from the start, welcoming them and making sure everyone is involved. They also lead the group in activities and the dance and rhythm portions of the workshop, adding their talents to those of the facilitators in a way that draws the circle together, young and old, daring or shy, African and American.

Overall, the Montagu Project, as community-engaged learning, is not just an educational trip abroad. It is a life-changing opportunity for the participants to confront critical issues of social justice, privilege, and oppression and develop skills necessary for 21st century leaders, including social awareness, cross-cultural competency, critical thinking, relationship building, teamwork, and creativity. There are many moving parts in the program, and to accurately evaluate their impact on students’ learning outcomes, we sought to capture both formative and summative assessments of students.

Method

In this study, we examined the reflections of students at a U.S. public university about their experiences participating in a two-semester community-engaged study abroad course, through the lens of global leadership and creativity. As with case studies in general (Merriam, 2009; Pickard, 2013), our objective was to provide an insight into real-life events through an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single, bounded unit situated in a specific context: the Montagu Project.

The defining feature of a case study approach is its focus on how and why questions (Myers, 2009), and for this reason, it is appropriate for descriptive and exploratory studies such as ours (Mouton, 2001). A case study often describes processes, both individual and group behavior, and the sequence of events in which the behaviors occur (Stake, 2005). The case study method was particularly appealing for our multi-year commitment to the leadership study abroad program as processes, problems, and course components could be studied together to inform and improve our pedagogical practices.

A constructivist approach was chosen for this case study because it honors the participants’ understanding of their experiences and fits with the theoretical foundation of the leadership study abroad course. Consistent with constructivism, the faculty involved in the course consider leaders-in-preparation as experts in their own experiences who can relate to their perceptions of the global leadership experience in a manner that is meaningful and relevant (Crotty, 2003; Grbich, 2007). Because reflective experience is essential to leadership development, students were asked to journal daily on their experiences during the trip and write (in the month after the
trip) a final paper on theory-to-practice application. These reflections were examined to understand how the students made sense of their global leadership experience. The examinations were conducted using both a thematic analysis and a constant comparative method. Thematic analysis is a data-driven approach to coding data into meaningful concepts or themes (Boyatzis, 1998). This approach was selected as it relies on the data to formulate ideas and is consistent with a constructivist paradigm. The constant comparative method was also used (Patton, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) so that we might develop themes across student data to determine similarities and differences.

**Participants**

The study sample included 17 leadership students (14 female, 3 male) both graduate and undergraduate, enrolled in the Montagu Project’s leadership study abroad course. Three of the graduate students had been involved in the course two years prior and had been asked to return as peer leaders to create specific projects contributing to the success of the study abroad experience. These 17 students represented a criterion-type purposive sample as they were all required to meet the following criterion (Patton, 2002): enrolling in the leadership course, completing the post-workshop survey, doing the required daily journaling; and submitting a required final reflective paper tying personal experience and course reading material together.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

A data collection approach that uses multiple sources of data and multiple participants is preferable to a narrower one and is critical given that it can provide triangulation (Yin, 2009) and validation while allowing significant insights to emerge (Myers, 1997). Accordingly, our data collection methods included direct faculty observation, students’ daily journals, students’ final papers, reflective notes from the faculty, and post-survey responses. Thus, the post-workshop evaluation survey was administered to provide valuable feedback to improve the structure of the workshop. The survey asked participants to rate: 1) the direct application of the workshop to everyday life; 2) relevance of the workshop experience to future leadership; 3) application of the workshop experience to personal responsibility for their own learning; 4) heightened leadership skills; 5) a better understanding of the concepts of the appreciative inquiry method; 6) potential for increased confidence and 7) awareness of mutual benefits for all participants.

It is important to note that although the journal and final reflection paper were part of the overall grade in the course, the consent for these materials to be part of the study was given after the course was completed because the faculty did not specifically require reflections of students to collect data. According to Bryman (2012), documents for qualitative content analysis should not “have been produced specifically for the purpose of social research” (p. 543).

While we collected both qualitative and quantitative data, our emphasis in this paper was on the qualitative data and the qualitative content analysis that examines communication to study indirect human behavior (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Huyn, 2012). By analyzing student journals and final theory-to-practice reflective papers, we allowed “categories to emerge out of [the] data” and
recognized the “significance for understanding the meaning of the context in which an item being analyzed appeared” (Bryman, 2012, p. 291). Using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), the data were compared and integrated to investigate emergent themes in students’ perceived awareness of global leadership behaviors.

Findings

Analysis of students’ journals and papers revealed three overarching themes: personal growth and development (developing confidence, sense of community), an increase in understanding leadership in global (understanding of issues of social inequality, oppression, privilege, cross-cultural competence) and creative contexts, and connecting the global community-based experience to domestic community engagement.

Personal and professional growth

Personal and professional growth appeared as a prominent theme across many of the student journals and papers. For some students, traveling (many for the first time overseas) allowed them to confront a range of personal anxieties and test their limitations. Journal entries included comments about a personal increase in risk-taking, enhanced relationships with others, and stepping outside of traditional comfort zones. One student shared:

I also felt some pride for myself as there were several things today that I felt like I did that were outside of my comfort zone. I spoke up to classmates and reached out to others to include them. I felt like I was able to come out of my shell more in this one day than any other throughout the entire trip.

And of the students that had returned for a second trip to Montagu, one reflected:

I started this journey with no clue what I really wanted to do with my professional life. I only knew that I wanted a change. Through the courses offered with the Leadership Program and the courses that I was able to develop myself, I have been able to find something that I am very passionate about and something that I feel prepared to tackle now and in the future. I am excited to see the flourishing future of the Montagu Project and of the participants that have been part of my journey and a very important part of my life.

The recognition of being “otherwise” was an unanticipated discovery in many of the student reflections. Being away from their home environment and engaging in a range of creative pedagogies allowed students to learn the value of family, recognize privilege, and reflect that individuals in the community of Montagu may, in fact, understand community at a deeper level than the individuals who were American university students. This last understanding was depicted by one student recalling the community performance the Montagu Project participants created and performed.

In America, we make everything too complicated, too “official.” Everything requires regulations, tickets, process discussions, and concrete outcomes. We are materialistic and concerned with image and items. That night in Ashbury, we came together, just to be together. We performed, just to perform but also for more than that. In many African countries, tribes, regions, etc. there is a rich history of dancing, singing, drumming, and
public performance. These performances aren’t about capitalism. They are about community. America could learn a lot from this rich tradition and culture.

Cross-cultural and creative awareness

Cross-cultural awareness through creative expression also crossed into the second theme. Students began to examine the stereotypes they may have held of others, to question their awareness and emotional intelligence, and to shift perspectives in cross-cultural understanding. One student shared:

The systematic oppression that one group of humans can exact on another is depressing, and yet, the people of Langa, whether at the Heritage Museum or the Langa Quarter NGO project, are so positive, upbeat, and proud of how far they have come, despite what they have experienced. The graffiti project that showcased the history and the diversity of this proud people, along the wall that lead to town’s athletic fields was beautiful and brilliant. Mike looks at people surviving and sees opportunity!

And another entry:

I think most people, if they know anything about South Africa, are aware of black vs. white tension. That is far too simplistic. The San language key represents 15 different languages. These people don’t share the same language. They are different tribes, people, and cultures. Some of them cannot understand each other when they speak in their tribal tongue. South Africa cannot be seen as black vs. white, and these ancient people are a perfect example of why. But their ancient and still modern presence was highlighted by the second experience of the day.

When the pedagogical practices of group study abroad and expressive arts are integrated, students experienced notable cultural and creative learning. One student commented that:

Song and dance seems to be the stickball of South Africa. Music, rhythm and dance, in the most ancient human land on earth, makes for an experience that leaves an impression. The power of song and dance, and the power to connect through it cannot be captured with words.

Another student commented on the power of dance in her writing:

I learned that even the most confident and outgoing people get nervous and that’s what makes us whole. I was shown there is so much depth in someone’s soul and that is part of being a role model, to not be afraid of that. I was shown humor can make a bad story make sense and good story be great. I was shown a passion for movement and of emotions and that intimate connections can be made without words and through the common love of dance. What I learned about myself is that I have a way of guiding people in a situation, to be a mediator when needed, a facilitator when needed, an onlooker, and a participant. I can play these roles, because they are all part of who I am.

And one student reflected on a chance musical encounter:

After leaving the San village we headed for Table Mountain. A simple visit to such an amazing site is worth the travel half-way around the world. We were joined by African musician and professor Dizu Plaatjies and he played a variety of original African instruments, many of them primitive or ancient in nature. The whole experience with Dizu seemed to have a spiritual nature and it was capped with a chance encounter. What are the odds of a friend from Dizu’s past, twenty years gone by, would show up on a
chance occasion hoping to play the bagpipes, for the first time ever, on top of the mountain? It was an eerie moment, but in hindsight, an amazing foreshadow of the power of music.

Connecting Community Experience Back Home

The third theme that emerged was the professional impact and desire to engage in community leadership efforts back home. Evidence emerged in journal entries that included dreams and visions of specialized leadership lessons that would stay with them as leaders in their own communities. For example, one student reflected on the leadership lessons embedded in an afternoon spent at Robben Island:

Such an amazing place, such awful history, such awful symbols of corruption both past and present. But that is not the lesson. Nelson Mandela spent 27 years in prison. He spent 18 of those years on Robben Island. Most of those years were spent in a solitary cell and doing hard labor in a limestone mine. Mandela was imprisoned for seeking justice. Mandela was imprisoned for being black. What did he do when he was finally released from prison? He forgave those who had treated him with injustice. Mandela used forgiveness to create a milieu of positivity. In Mandela’s situation, dwelling on the past was a function of negativity. Revenge creates negativity. It was time to look to the future and only forgiveness and positivity could allow for that forward-thinking. Not only is this a valuable lesson for anyone interested in leading, but it is a valuable lesson that South Africa is using.

And in the final transitional day back to the United States, one student reflected:

I couldn’t run even if I tried from the feeling I felt in South Africa. I am so blessed and yet so exposed, like a nerve. Walking around this hotel with lovely elevator music feels so alien to me now. I want to pull away from people, to hibernate, to regroup. Yet, maybe that's half the lesson. That even though I am incredibly uncomfortable in my own skin, my mind is evolving. Maybe I don’t hide. Maybe the trick is to step into the darkness and dare to be the light.

The interconnectedness of local and global intersections of identity, discrimination, privilege, and power dynamics turned many students inward to focus their attention on the experience abroad and how that may more strongly connect to their local issues. Many wrote about feeling empowered to be change agents, at whatever level they could. The global leadership experience within a multicultural creative pedagogy framework appeared to serve as a stimulus to advance student’s desire to be more civically engaged. This revelation shows great promise on both domestic and international fronts.

Although the analysis depicted above only examined the written reflections of the American students involved in one iteration of the study abroad course, we are encouraged that we are heading in the right direction. We look forward to seeing whether these same global leadership themes emerge as we analyze the writings of the three other groups of university students who have participated in this program of study thus far and the reflections of the groups of students who will participate in the future. Additionally, we expect we will be expanding our use of
survey data to compare the workshop evaluations of both American and South African participants over time.

Conclusion

The Montagu Project has become a model of how global community engagement can be paired with other high-impact educational practices to create a powerful integrative experience in leadership education. Using multiple creative lenses to examine issues and real-time experiential learning, the exchange between U.S. university students and South Africa community members notably advances both their global leadership knowledge and skills in creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration. By connecting curriculum with direct experiences that address, analyze, and solve real-life dilemmas in the global community, learning becomes deeper and more memorable, while simultaneously preparing program participants for citizenship, interprofessional dynamics, critical problem solving, and vital roles in community development.
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Collaborators Needed: Predictors of Self-Assessed Teamwork Competence in Agricultural Faculty

Jonathan Orsini, University of Florida
Nicole Stedman, University of Florida

Abstract

The current study explored agricultural faculty self-perceived teamwork competence using an exploratory cross-sectional survey design. The survey was sent to a professional association of agricultural faculty, the North American Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture. The quantitative study evaluated 338 survey responses using multiple regression. Results from the regression analysis found that discipline self-efficacy, feelings of impostorism, the presence of prior teamwork training, participation in administrative teams, and gender were all significant predictors of faculty self-perceived teamwork competence. Results from this study advance leadership research in team science by demonstrating the importance of faculty differences based on gender, feelings of self-efficacy, and the influence of the impostor syndrome on teamwork self-assessment.
Building Effective Student Project Teams: What Has Shared Transformational Leadership Got to do With it?

I. Dami Alegbeleye, University of Southern Maine.
Eric K. Kaufman, Virginia Tech University

Abstract

The central problem this study seeks to solve pertains to the inability of college graduates to engage effectively in teamwork. To solve this problem, we explored the antecedent and outcome of teamwork quality—*shared transformational leadership* as an antecedent and *team effectiveness* as an outcome. We hypothesized that the effect of *shared transformational leadership* on *team effectiveness* will be mediated by *teamwork quality*. The sample consists of 98 GSA students, sub-divided into 20 project teams. The findings, using MPLUS software, provide support for the hypothesis, as evidenced by a significant indirect effect between *shared transformational leadership* and *team effectiveness* ($B = 0.56, p < 0.01$), through *teamwork quality*. We also hypothesized that *individual-level transformational leadership* will predict *shared transformational leadership*. The hypothesis was rejected, as it was not supported by the findings. The findings have important implications for leaders, leadership educators, leadership researchers, and organizations.

Introduction

The nature of problems that organizations face today are increasingly complex and require teamwork (Roberts et al., 2016; Western, 2010). As a result, employers are highlighting the importance of teams while de-emphasizing the significance of the individual leader (McIntyre & Foti, 2013). For example, according to the Job Outlook 2019 survey of the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE, 2019), 78.7% of employers identify the *ability to work in a team* among their most desired attributes in college graduates (moving from fifth place in 2014 to third place), while 67.4% identify *leadership skills* among their most desired attributes (moving from second place in 2014 to eighth place). However, while the ability to work effectively in teams has been identified as one of the top skills employers want in college graduates (NACE, 2019; Stewart et al., 2016), employers have noted that college graduates are insufficiently prepared to work effectively in teams (Humphreys et al., 2015; NACE, 2019). The skills gap problem can be attributed to the nature of the curriculum being used by many leadership programs, which is too focused on the development of the individual leader, with little attention paid to leadership within teams (DeRue & Myers, 2013; Martin et al., 2018; Riggio, 2008). As such, leadership programs produce graduates who lack the capacity to work effectively in an interdependent environment that is necessary for teamwork (Han et al., 2017; Lehmann-Willenbrock et al., 2015).

While many studies have explored the effect of shared leadership on team effectiveness (Boies et al., 2010; D’Innocenzo et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2014), only a relatively few studies have examined shared transformational leadership as a predictor of team effectiveness (Ensley et al., 2006; Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002). Also, the research on the mediating effect of teamwork quality (or processes) on the relationship between shared transformational leadership and team
effectiveness is sparse and mostly theoretical (Dionne et al., 2004). Therefore, the current study seeks to supplement limited empirical evidence regarding the effect of shared transformational leadership on team effectiveness, as mediated by teamwork quality.

**Literature Review/Theoretical Framework**

To effectively conceptualize the current study, previous literature will be reviewed on key variables: (a) team effectiveness, (b) shared transformational leadership, and (c) teamwork quality.

**Team Effectiveness**

Team effectiveness has been widely studied in the literature, and many theories of team effectiveness exist (Mathieu et al., 2008). McGrath (1964) conceptualized team effectiveness as consisting of input, process, and output. According to this model, inputs refer to individual differences such as personalities, team-level variables such as resources and external leader influences, and organizational-level variables such as organizational structure. Processes refer to the interactions among team members during task work (e.g., teamwork). Outcomes are the results of both the task work and teamwork (e.g., effectiveness).

McGrath’s (1964) input-process-output model, while largely consistent over the years in team research, has seen several modifications. Ilgen and colleagues (2005, p. 520) argued that the term process is rather insufficient, and that “many of the mediational factors that intervene and transmit the influence of inputs to outcomes are not processes.” Consequently, those authors (i.e., Ilgen et al., 2005) proposed an input-mediator-output model, as a more inclusive term. According to the input-mediator-output model, inputs (e.g., team members’ characteristics) influence team mediational factors (e.g., teamwork quality), which in turn mediate the relationship between inputs and outputs (e.g., team effectiveness). This input-mediator-output (IMO) model serves as a framework to guide further study (see Figure 1). Based on the IMO framework, we proposed a *Shared Transformational Leadership-Effectiveness Model*, where individual-level transformational leadership of team members (MLQ) would predict shared transformational leadership (TMLQ), which would, in turn, predict team effectiveness (TE), through teamwork quality (TWQ).

**Figure 1**

*Shared Transformational Leadership-Effectiveness Model*
Shared Transformational Leadership

The first usage of the term transformational leadership has been attributed to Burns (1978), who used the term to describe a type of leadership where the leader elevates the follower to a higher level of motivation, and both the leader and follower are transformed in the process. Building on Burns’ work, Bass (1985) conceptualized the transformational leadership theory, which suggests transformational leaders possess four behaviors: (a) charisma, (b) inspirational leadership, (c) individualized consideration, (d) intellectual stimulation. Bass and Avolio (1990) later proposed the full range of leadership, which consists of seven behaviors on a continuum—four transformational leadership behaviors (i.e., inspirational motivation, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration), three transactional leadership behaviors, and laissez-faire behavior.

A potential limitation of Bass' (1985) theory of transformational leadership is the ambiguity that comes with its intended level of analysis—that is, whether individual-, team-, or organizational-level of analysis (Schriesheim et al., 2009). While transformational leadership has been traditionally analyzed at the individual level, Bass and Avolio (1996) extended its analysis to the team level. As is the case with transformational leadership at the individual level, team transformational leadership consists of four behaviors—inspirational motivation, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Avolio et al., 1999). Avolio and colleagues (2002) conceptualized team transformational leadership as a measure of shared leadership within teams. According to Sivasubramaniam et al. (2002, p. 68), shared leadership refers to the “collective influence of members in a team on each other.” Consequently, team members, through shared transformational leadership, would collectively inspire, influence, stimulate, and consider one another. At the team level, Wang and Howell (2010) identified 3 transformational leadership behaviors for team development, which include: (a) emphasizing group identity (derived from idealized influence), (b) communicating a group vision (derived from inspirational motivation), and (c) team-building.

Previous research has explored the antecedent of shared leadership. For example, Carson et al. (2007) and Fausing et al. (2015) found external factors such as coaching and empowerment from an external leader to be predictive of shared leadership (Carson et al., 2007; Fausing et al., 2015). Those researchers also identified internal factors such as shared purpose, social support, and voice (Carson et al., 2007), interdependence among team members (Fausing et al., 2015), and personality factors such as the Big Five (Hoch & Dulebohn, 2017), as antecedents of shared leadership in teams. While considerable research has explored the antecedents of shared leadership in general, research on the antecedents of shared transformational leadership is rather sparse (Nielsen & Cleal, 2011; Sun et al., 2017).

As a result of the similarity between transformational leadership behaviors at the individual and team level (Schriesheim et al., 2009), as well previous studies suggesting team member’s characteristics as an antecedent of shared leadership, we predicted that the transformational leadership capacity of the individuals that make up a team would be an antecedent of shared transformational leadership in teams. In other words, the transformational leadership capacity of the individuals that make up a team would predict their ability to collectively inspire, influence,
stimulate, and consider one another. Moreover, previous studies have shown that shared leadership is more likely to develop organically in self-managed teams (i.e., a team with no formally assigned leader) (McIntyre & Foti, 2013; Yang & Shao, 1996). Consequently, we hypothesized, in the current study, that the individual-level transformational leadership of team members will be positively related to shared transformational leadership in a self-managed team (Hypothesis 1).

Shared Transformational Leadership and Effectiveness

Previous studies suggesting that shared leadership would predict superior team outcomes such as team effectiveness and performance are abundant in the literature. For example, researchers found shared leadership to predict consulting teams’ performance (Carson et al., 2007), and virtual teams’ performance (Hoch & Dulébohn, 2017). Similarly, considerable research has suggested that team transformational leadership would predict team effectiveness and performance. However, most of those studies have explored the phenomenon on a leader-follower basis—that is, the effect of a positional team leader’s transformational leadership on team effectiveness (Bass et al., 2003; Braun et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2011). However, with the increasing popularity of self-managed teams in today’s organizations (McIntyre & Foti, 2013; Yang & Shao, 1996), it is imperative to explore the extent that the shared transformational leadership capacity of team members influence their team effectiveness. Quite surprisingly, the research on shared transformational leadership and team effectiveness is relatively sparse (Dionne et al., 2004). Nonetheless, few studies have found that shared transformational leadership predicts superior team performance and effectiveness. For example, Sivasubramaniam and Colleagues (2002) found that the shared transformational leadership of undergraduate student project teams predicted group potency and effectiveness (as measured by team grades). Similarly, Ensley and colleagues (2006) found shared transformational leadership to predict new venture performance.

Based on the abundant evidence of the positive relationship between the transformational leadership of positional team leaders and team effectiveness (Bass et al., 2003; Braun et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2011), as well as the limited evidence of the positive relationship between shared transformational leadership and team effectiveness (Ensley et al., 2006; Sivasubramaniam et al., 2002), we hypothesized, in the current study, that the shared transformational leadership of team members will be positively related to team effectiveness in a self-managed team (Hypothesis 2).

The Mediating Role of Teamwork Quality

Hoegl and Gemuenden's (2001) model of teamwork conceptualizes teamwork as consisting of six components: (a) communication, (b) coordination, (c) balance of member contribution, (d) mutual support, (e) effort, and (f) cohesion. Although many studies have reported a direct effect of transformational leadership on team performance outcomes (Braun et al., 2013; Wang, Waldman, & Zhang, 2014), they have often done so without accounting for the mediating effect of teamwork processes in such relationship (Dionne et al., 2004). Zaccaro, Rittman, and Marks (2001) proposed a model of team leadership whereby teamwork processes such as team conflict control and team coordination mediate the relationship between leadership behaviors and team effectiveness. Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003) found the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and performance to be partially mediated by team cohesion—a component of teamwork quality.
Dionne and colleagues (2004) proposed a theoretical model whereby teamwork processes would mediate the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and team performance outcomes. Those authors hypothesized a relationship between the four I’s of transformational leadership (i.e., inspirational motivation, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and teamwork processes of cohesion, communication, and conflict management. First, they hypothesized that inspirational motivation/idealized influence will foster shared vision, which will in turn positively impact team cohesion (Dionne et al., 2004). Second, they hypothesized that individualized consideration will positively impact team communication (Dionne et al., 2004). Lastly, they hypothesized that intellectual stimulation will generate functional team conflict, which will in turn positively impact team conflict management (Dionne et al., 2004).

Based on Dionne and colleagues’ model, Boies, Fiset, and Gill (2015) hypothesized that team communication would mediate the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors (i.e., intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation) and team trust, while team trust would mediate the relationship between team communication and team performance. Those hypotheses were supported, providing empirical support for the mediatary role of teamwork processes (i.e., team communication and team trust) in the relationship between transformational leadership and performance outcomes (Boies et al., 2015). Similarly, Lehmann-Willenbrock, Meinecke, Rowold, and Kauffeld (2015) found that transformational leadership has an indirect effect on a team’s communication style, as mediated by the leader’s communication style. Several other scholars (e.g., Pillai & Williams, 2004; Stashevsky & Koslowsky, 2006) found that team cohesiveness partially mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance.

All the aforementioned studies have explored the mediating role of components of teamwork quality (e.g., cohesion) and have failed to examine the mediating role of the composite measure of teamwork quality, except for a few studies (e.g., Cha, Kim, Lee, & Bachrach, 2015; Yang, Huang, and Wu, 2011). For example, Yang, Huang, and Wu (2011) found that project managers’ transformational leadership styles predicted teamwork quality (as measured by a composite scale of team communication, team collaboration, and team cohesiveness), which in turn predicted team performance. Also, Cha, Kim, Lee, and Bachrach (2015) explored the mediatory role of teamwork quality on the relationship between transformational leadership of team leaders and inter-team collaboration. Those authors (Cha et al., 2015) found teamwork quality fully mediated the relationship between transformational leadership of team leaders and inter-team collaboration. Consequently, we hypothesized, in the current study, that the effect of shared transformational leadership on team effectiveness will be mediated by teamwork quality (Hypothesis 3).
Methods

Context

Participants from a Governor School of Agriculture (GSA) program, which took place in a large-sized land-grant university in the Southern part of the United States, were sampled for the study. The specific GSA was chosen because its participants are required to work in self-managed teams. A self-managed team is an autonomous team, where “team members are empowered to produce an entire product or service with little or no supervision” (Yang & Shao, 1996, p. 521). The GSA is a 4-week pre-college residential program with a mission to develop future leaders and scientists for careers in Agriculture (Friedel, 2019), with participants comprising of junior and senior students from various private, public, and home schools from across the state (Duncan et al., 2004). Students are required to complete a project that solves a major societal issue such as climate change, food security, etc. (Friedel, Cletzer, Bush, & Barber, 2017). In the end, students are required to submit a final team paper and deliver a presentation.

Procedures and Sample

To investigate the study’s hypotheses, we designed a cross-sectional study to explore the effect of shared transformational leadership on team effectiveness, as mediated by teamwork quality. The study sampled 100 GSA students, sub-divided into 20 project teams. Of those, 98 students that made up 20 project teams \((n=20)\) completed the survey. The majority of respondents (82.7%) were between the ages of 16 and 17 years old. Sixty-five percent (65.3%) reported they were females while 34.7% reported they were males. While four major races were reported (i.e., Spanish/Hispanic/Latino, White American, Black/African American, and Asian American), Asian Americans (38.8%) and White Americans (33.7%) make up the majority of the respondents. Team size ranges from four to five. We received approval from the Institutional Review Board before engaging in this study.

Measures

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X Short).** An individual-level questionnaire developed by Avolio and Bass (1995) was used to measure individual team member transformational leadership. Twenty items were used from the 'MLQ-5X Short Form' to measure four transformational leadership behaviors (i.e., Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration). Sample items rated by participants include: "As a leader, I talk optimistically about the future" and "As a leader, I spend time teaching and coaching." The MLQ-5X instrument uses a five-point scale ranging from 0 for 'not at all' to 4 for 'frequently, if not always.' This instrument has been well validated in the literature and has yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85 (Bycio et al., 1995).

**Team Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (TMLQ).** A team-level questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (1996) was used to measure the shared transformational leadership. Twenty-five items were used from the TMLQ to measure four transformational leadership behaviors (i.e., Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration). A sample item rated by participants is: "Members of my team instill pride in being associated with each other." The TMLQ instrument uses a five-point scale ranging from 0 for ‘not at all’ to 4 for ‘frequently, if not always.’ Avolio and colleagues (2002) validated the TMLQ in prior research and reported Cronbach's alpha of 0.86.
**Teamwork Quality.** Hoegl and Gemuenden's (2001) teamwork quality instrument (TWQ) was used to measure teamwork quality. This instrument measures teamwork quality along six subconstructs: communication, coordination, the balance of member contributions, mutual support, effort, and cohesion (Hoegl & Gemuenden, 2001). This is a 38-item questionnaire that uses a five-point scale ranging from 0 for 'strongly disagree' to 4 for 'strongly agree.' Sample item rated by participants is: “The team members communicated mostly directly and personally with each other.” This instrument has been validated by the authors and yielded a high Cronbach's alpha of 0.91 (Hoegl & Gemuenden, 2001).

**Team Effectiveness.** The team effectiveness scale of the teamwork quality instrument developed by Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001) was used to measure team effectiveness. This instrument was originally intended for project teams in organizations. Since the population in this study comprises student project teams, there was a need to adapt some of the wordings. Consequently, the team effectiveness scale was adapted by changing some of the words to reflect a student project team. Eight items were used from the team effectiveness scale, which uses a five-point scale ranging from 0 for 'strongly disagree' to 4 for 'strongly agree.' A sample item rated by participants is: "The team was satisfied with the quality of the project result." Hoegl and Gemuenden (2001) validated the scale, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87.

**Analysis**

Descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, SD) of all variables (i.e., age, gender, individual-level transformational leadership, shared transformational leadership, teamwork quality, and team effectiveness) were conducted (see Table 1). Pearson product-moment correlation and Cronbach’s alpha test of variables were conducted; the significance level was set at the 0.05 level. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and inter-rater reliability (i.e., \(R_{wg}\)) were also conducted. SPSS 27 was used to conduct those analyses. The hypotheses were tested by conducting a structural equation modeling procedure called path analysis, using MPLUS software (Muthén et al., 2017).

**Results**

The results are organized into three sections: (a) Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), (b) Data aggregation, (c) Results of correlational tests, and (d) Results of hypotheses tests.

**A. EFA**

Since ratings of individual-level transformational leadership, shared transformational leadership, teamwork quality, and team effectiveness were collected from a single source, there is a chance that our data might have a single source bias (Charoensap et al., 2019). To reduce the likelihood of a single source bias, previous studies have recommended Harman’s single factor test to show that a single factor does not explain a major portion of the variance in the data (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thus, we conducted an EFA to examine the possibility of a single factor solution. The EFA result showed that a one-factor solution is inadequate, as a one-factor solution only explains 21.30% of the variance in the data.
B. Data Aggregation

Data were aggregated to the team-level before further analysis. To justify aggregation for data collected at the individual-level with team-level scales (i.e., TMLQ, TWQ, and TE), we conducted the $R_{wg}$ (i.e., inter-rater reliability) within each of the 20 teams (Demaree & Wolf, 1984). Mean $R_{wg}$ for each of the three scales met the recommended cut off point of 0.7 (Demaree & Wolf, 1984). The mean $R_{wg}$ for the shared transformational leadership scale (TMLQ) was 0.86, with at least 85% of the teams having an $R_{wg}$ of 0.70; the mean $R_{wg}$ for the teamwork quality scale (TWQ) was 0.95, with all of the teams having an $R_{wg}$ of at least 0.70; and the mean $R_{wg}$ for the team effectiveness scale (TE) was 0.90, with all of the teams having an $R_{wg}$ of at least 0.70. Besides, all median $R_{wg}$ values were above the recommended cut-off value of 0.70. Thus, individual-level scores for each of the three scales were then aggregated to the team level.

C. Results of Correlational Test

As shown in Table 1, there was no significant relationship between any of the demographic variables (i.e., age and gender) and other variables. We excluded race from the analysis, as it loses its meaning at the team level. Similarly, we excluded team size from the analysis, as we believe its effect with other variables is already controlled for in the data—All 20 teams had 5 members each, except for 2 teams, which had 4 members each.

Also, individual-level transformational leadership was not significantly related to other variables. However, shared transformational leadership, teamwork quality, and team effectiveness were significantly related to each other (See Table 1 for significant relationships.).

### Table 1

**Summary of Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations and Cronbach’s Alpha of Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMLQ</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWQ</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N (individual) = 98. Variables are aggregated to team-level. N (team) = 20. VAR = variables; MLQ = Individual-level transformational leadership behavior of team members measured with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; TMLQ = shared transformational leadership behavior measured with the Team Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; TWQ = teamwork quality; TE = team effectiveness.

*p < .05 level, **p < .01 level.
D. Results of Hypotheses Tests

**Hypothesis 1.** In hypothesis 1, we predicted that the individual-level transformational leadership of team members will be positively related to shared transformational leadership in a self-managed team. Results (Table 2) showed that the individual-level transformational leadership of team members was not directly related to shared transformational leadership ($B = 0.07, \text{ns}$). Hence, hypothesis 1 was rejected. See Figure 2 for the path diagram.

**Hypothesis 2.** In hypothesis 2, we predicted that the shared transformational leadership of team members will be positively related to team effectiveness in a self-managed team. Results (Table 2) showed that the shared transformational leadership of team members was positively related to team effectiveness ($B = 0.54, p < 0.01$). Hence, hypothesis 2 was supported.

**Hypothesis 3.** In hypothesis 3, we predicted that the effect of shared transformational leadership on team effectiveness will be mediated by teamwork quality. Results (Table 2) showed that the effect of shared transformational leadership on team effectiveness was mediated by teamwork quality, as evidenced by a significant indirect effect ($B = 0.56, p < 0.01$). Hence, hypothesis 3 was supported. The mediation model suggested a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 2.72, \text{df} = 2, p > 0.05, \text{CFI} = .98, \text{TLI} = .94, \text{SRMR} = 0.08$).

**Table 2**

*Results of Standardized Direct, Indirect, Total, and Total Indirect Effects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate (SE)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TMLQ on MLQ</td>
<td>0.07 (0.27)</td>
<td>-0.29 – 0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMLQ (direct)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.16 – 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWQ (indirect)</td>
<td>0.87* (0.08)</td>
<td>0.73 – 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWQ on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMLQ (indirect)</td>
<td>0.65* (0.11)</td>
<td>0.47 – 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMLQ $\rightarrow$ TE</td>
<td>0.54* (0.13)</td>
<td>0.36 – 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMLQ $\rightarrow$ TWQ $\rightarrow$ TE</td>
<td>0.56* (0.11)</td>
<td>0.39 – 0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standardized estimates based on StdY standardization in MPlus are reported. MLQ = Individual-level transformational leadership of team members measured with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; TMLQ = shared transformational leadership behavior measured with the Team Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; TWQ = teamwork quality; TE = team effectiveness.

*p < 0.01 (two-tailed).*
Discussion

In the study, we found that teamwork quality mediates the relationship between shared transformational leadership and team effectiveness. The findings suggest that shared transformational leadership improves team effectiveness by improving the quality of teamwork in a team. The significant mediation effect was consistent with those of theoretical models positing that teamwork processes would mediate the relationship between team transformational leadership and team performance outcomes (Dionne et al., 2004; Zaccaro et al., 2001). The findings are also in consonance with the empirical research by Boies and colleagues (2015), who found that team communication and team trust mediated the relationship between team transformational leadership behaviors (intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation) and team performance. Moreover, the findings provide support for the study by Yang, Huang, and Wu (2011); those authors found that project managers’ transformational leadership styles predicted teamwork quality (as measured by a composite scale of team communication, team collaboration, and team cohesiveness), which in turn predicted team performance. Finally, the study provides support for the study by Cha, Kim, Lee, and Bachrach (2015); those authors found that teamwork quality fully mediated the relationship between team leaders’ transformational leadership and inter-team collaboration.

Interestingly, individual-level transformational leadership of team members was not significantly related to shared transformational leadership. This finding suggests that the ability of a team to share transformational leadership may be more important than team composition based on personal characteristics (Hoch & Dulebohn, 2017). Put simply, because a team is full of transformational leaders does not mean such a team will be successful in sharing transformational leadership.
Implications
The current study has implications for leadership theory, future leadership research, and leadership practice.

Theoretical Implications
Although leadership scholars have hypothesized a positive relationship between shared transformational leadership and team performance outcomes, only a few studies have tested those propositions empirically (Ensley et al., 2006; Han et al., 2017). This study adds to the body of knowledge by contributing empirical support for the relationship between shared transformational leadership and the outcome of team effectiveness.

Moreover, while previous studies have accounted for the effect of mediating variables such as teamwork quality (Cha et al., 2015; Yang, Huang, & Wu, 2011), team communication and team trust (Boies et al., 2015), on the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance outcomes, many of those studies have been conducted with teams with positional team leaders (Braun et al., 2013; Cha et al., 2015; Yang, Huang, & Wu, 2011). The current study, therefore, supplements limited existing evidence regarding the mediating effect of teamwork quality on the relationship between team members’ shared transformational leadership and team effectiveness in a self-managed team (Gupta et al., 2010).

Implications for Future Research
The current study explored the mediating effect of teamwork quality on the relationship between shared transformational leadership and team effectiveness. However, other types of shared leadership models exist in the literature (Grille & Kauffeld, 2015). Therefore, it is recommended that future studies explore the mediating effect of teamwork quality on the relationship between other types of shared leadership and team effectiveness. Moreover, while this study was conducted with self-managed student project teams, it is recommended that future studies explore other contexts such as professional work teams, virtual teams, etc.

We observed during this research that many existing theories used to describe and/or measure shared leadership lack the capacity to account for the type of leadership displayed (Grille & Kauffeld, 2015). For example, many researchers have used social network analysis to measure shared leadership (Carson et al., 2007; McIntyre & Foti, 2013). In many of those studies, team members were asked to nominate any of their teammates that have displayed leadership in the team; while this approach may measure whether or not leadership is shared, it fails to account for the type of leadership being shared. Therefore, it is recommended that future studies develop theories and instruments that more accurately measures shared leadership, as well as the type of leadership being shared.

Finally, individual-level transformational leadership of team members was not an antecedent of shared transformational leadership. We believe the small sample size of the study might have been responsible for the non-significant relationship. Therefore, it is recommended for future research to replicate the study using a large sample size. It is also recommended that qualitative studies explore the antecedent factors that support the development of shared transformational leadership.
Practical Implications

The findings of this study suggest that shared transformational leadership was positively related to teamwork quality. However, transformational leadership has, for a long time, been conceptualized as an individual-level construct by leadership scholars (Bass & Avolio, 1990b). Consequently, students are taught transformational leadership skills to lead change in their communities as individuals. However, the nature of the challenges we face in our society today are becoming increasingly complex (Rosen, 2008), and solving them requires individuals who can work collaboratively with others in a team. It is, therefore, recommended that leadership educators devote more attention to teaching college students about shared transformational leadership to foster their ability to work effectively with others in a team (Avolio et al., 2002).

Moreover, the study found that the individual-level transformational leadership of team members was not significantly related to shared transformational leadership. In other words, having a team full of transformational leaders does not guarantee a team’s ability to share transformational leadership and team members need to learn how to collectively share transformational leadership in a team (Avolio et al., 2002). Consequently, it is recommended that leadership educators teach college students how to build and share transformational leadership (and other positive types of leadership) in a team.

Equally important as teaching shared leadership, is providing college students with the opportunities they need to practice shared leadership. What better ways for college students to learn how to build and share leadership with team members than completing course projects as part of a team? It is recommended that the leadership curriculum be designed in such a way that it necessitates students to complete a semester-long team project in their courses. Such projects should be problem-based, reflecting the problems in the real world. Moreover, the project should be set up as self-managed, where teachers provide guidance, while at the same time granting autonomy to teams, especially in matters of team leadership.

Finally, the study has implications for how organizations carry out human resource development. One outcome that employers have prioritized is the ability of college graduates to work effectively in teams (NACE, 2019), as many organizations are increasingly reliant on project teams, where employees are required to work as part of a team (Muethel & Hoegl, 2013). However, since the findings of the study showed that shared transformational leadership is germane for high-quality teamwork, employees who lack the skills to share (transformational) leadership with their teammates may harm teamwork quality and team effectiveness. It is therefore recommended that organizations invest in shared (transformational) leadership training for employees.

Study Limitations

A potential limitation of this study is its small sample size. Twenty teams (n [team] = 20, n [individual] = 98) completed the surveys, which is relatively small in team research (Bonett & Wright, 2015). The lack of power due to the small sample size might have resulted in the non-significant relationship between individual-level transformational leadership and shared transformational leadership.

Another potential weakness is the common source bias, since ratings of transformational leadership, shared transformational leadership, teamwork quality, and effectiveness were self-
reported (Charoensap et al., 2019). However, to reduce the chances of a common source bias, Harman’s single factor test was applied to see if a one-factor solution would explain a significant proportion of the variance in the data (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Exploratory factor analysis results suggest that a one-factor solution was inadequate in explaining the variance in the data, thereby reducing the likelihood of a common source bias affecting the findings (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Also, the sample in this study may not generalize to college students, since we sampled high school students. Although we do not anticipate the results to be significantly different with college students—since most of the students in the study are seniors, and many were already taking college courses—we realize its limitation. Therefore, we encourage studies to replicate the study in a college setting.

Lastly, the study utilized a cross-sectional survey, with survey data collected at a single time point, which makes it inappropriate to infer causal relationships with the findings (Kozlowski, 2015). Also, because team processes are dynamic processes that are sometimes not linear, it is recommended that future studies adopt a longitudinal approach to explore the relationship between shared transformational leadership, teamwork quality, and team effectiveness at different time points (Kozlowski, 2015).

**Conclusion**

The central problem this study seeks to solve pertains to the inability of college graduates to engage effectively in teamwork. To solve this problem, we explored the antecedent and outcome of teamwork quality—shared transformational leadership as an antecedent and team effectiveness as an outcome. We hypothesized that the effect of *shared transformational leadership* on *team effectiveness* will be mediated by *teamwork quality*. The findings provide support for the hypothesis, as evidenced by a significant indirect effect between shared *transformational leadership and team effectiveness* (B = 0.56, p < 0.01), through *teamwork quality*. We also hypothesized that *individual-level transformational leadership* will predict *shared transformational leadership*. The hypothesis was rejected, as it was not supported by the findings.

In summary, the current study has added to the leadership literature by expanding our understanding of the relationship between *individual-level transformational leadership, shared transformational leadership, teamwork quality, and team effectiveness*, and offers insights into the reason why many college graduates may struggle to engage effectively in teamwork.
References


The Relationship Between Stoicism and Emotional Intelligence in Undergraduate Leadership Students

Amy Brown, University of Florida
Nicole Stedman, University of Florida
Matthew Sowcik, University of Florida
James Charles Bunch, University of Florida

Abstract

This study was the first to examine two related constructs within the context of leadership. Stoicism is an ancient philosophy offering practical advice for a virtuous and eudaemonic life. As a method to examine one’s emotional experiences (Sellars, 2006), leaders such as Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius and Teddy Roosevelt (Aurelius, ca. 160 A.D./2002) practiced Stoicism, yet mentions of it within the field of leadership research have been scant. Leadership academics contrast desirable emotional intelligence behaviors with Stoicism (Grewal & Salovey, 2005; Mayer et al., 2008). Regardless, these two constructs are both concerned with effectively managing emotions, practicing self-awareness, high levels of motivation, and sensitivity to the expression of emotion in others (Goleman, 2005; Pigliucci, 2017; Salzgeber, 2019).

Undergraduate students in a leadership minor (N = 445) at a public university completed the Emotional and Social Competency Inventory and the Liverpool Stoicism Scale. Assessment results were described, and the relationship of variables were examined using Pearson Product Moment. An Independent Samples T-Test and Analysis of Variance analyzed for differences based on race, gender, and age. Stoicism and emotional self-awareness showed a statistically significant correlation (r = -0.391; p = .05), and student’s Stoicism scores were significantly correlated with gender (t(113) = 2.479; p = .015 d = .564). The research findings provided baseline statistics for future exploration of Stoicism within the context of leadership. Future research that better aligns with the original doctrines of the philosophy is recommended, particularly in the interest of leadership development.
Conducting Leadership Program Reviews in U.S. Higher Education: A Comparative Case Study

Dan Jenkins, University of Southern Maine
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Abstract

Program reviews are a standard practice in higher education. Yet, due to the infancy of the leadership discipline, little is known about the process of conducting reviews of leadership programs. Through interviewing 13 experienced leadership program reviewers in both curricular and cocurricular contexts, the authors of this study aim to address this gap in the literature. A comparative case study was employed to learn more about what encompasses a leadership program review and elicit evidence-based practices for facilitating leadership program reviews in higher education. A thematic analysis of the interview transcripts was conducted by the researchers and the four major themes of review logistics, reviewer experiences, review outcomes, and lessons learned are shared in this study. The researchers found contextual factors related to the institutions and leadership programs, reviewer facilitation skills, setting clear expectations of the review process and outcomes, identifying resources, and nuances related to power considerations and political dynamics to be primary factors in conducting leadership program reviews. The authors close by offering implications for research and practice based on these findings.

Introduction

Program reviews conducted by experienced faculty and staff members are standard practice on college campuses. In recent years we have seen an increase from “nearly 1,000” (Brungardt, Greenleaf, Brungardt, & Arensdorf, 2006) to more than 1,500 leadership programs in the United States (Guthrie, Teig, & Hu, 2018). Yet, the organizational home for such programs varies both within and across institutions (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018). As a result, leadership program review processes are not consistent or standard. Further, little research exists that specifically explores program reviews for leadership education. This project seeks to fill the gap in our understanding of review for leadership programs.

The purpose of this comparative case study is to better understand the process and outcomes of leadership program reviews in higher education through the experiences of leadership education professionals who have served as program reviewers. The research questions guiding this study include: (a) What encompasses a leadership program review in higher education? and (b) What are some evidence-based practices for facilitating leadership program reviews in higher education? In conducting this study, we hope to provide insight into the logistics and outcomes of the review process, reviewer experiences, and lessons learned. This information can help the field of leadership education establish more consistent program review practices, as well as provide valuable information for faculty and staff members looking to invite others to review their program and/or who are asked to conduct a program review themselves.

Background
The area where leadership programs are found in higher education varies considerably from institution to institution (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Owen, 2012). And, while the vast majority of leadership programs are found within academic and student affairs departments, the disciplinary and organizational “home”, respectively, also varies considerably among different institutions (Guthrie, Teig, & Hu, 2018). For example, academic leadership programs are found amongst wide variety of colleges and academic departments, including business or management, education, agriculture, public policy, and various iterations of leadership (e.g., leadership and organizational studies, leadership studies, organizational leadership, etc.) (Jenkins, 2016; Jenkins & Dugan, 2013). Moreover, academic leadership programs may be found under the auspices of a President’s or Provost’s Office or through partnerships with student affairs (Buschlen & Guthrie, 2014; Harvey & Jenkins, 2014). In the same way, co-curricular leadership programs may be found in dedicated student centers, within student activities, residence life, or as part of other institutional or programmatic initiatives related to the student experience (Jenkins & Owen, 2016; Rocco & Pelletier, 2019). Consequently, the inconsistency in institutional home for leadership programs creates myriad challenges for leadership program reviewers.

Like their faculty and staff counterparts, program administrators within curricular and co-curricular leadership programs are faced regularly with the burden of assessment (Goertzen, 2009). Whether the requested activity to review a leadership program arises from institutional leadership, in the pursuit of resources or reorganization, or as part of a cycled process, conducting program reviews has become more commonplace (Perruci & McManus, 2012; Sowcik, Lindsey, & Rosch, 2013). And while leadership program stakeholders have a variety of resources at their disposal such as the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS Standards), International Leadership Association (ILA) Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs (2009), The Handbook for Student Leadership Development (Komives et al., 2011), and recent scholarship specifically on the topic of leadership program assessment (e.g., Nobbe & Soria, 2016), no clear guidance exists with respect to the process or shared outcomes of leadership program reviews (Ritch, 2013). Instead, there are ongoing debates within and among professional associations regarding the creation of accreditation, certification, guidelines, standards, principles, or some other kind of formalized program review as a way to answer these questions and as a path to reach a more legitimate standing in the academy (ILA Guiding Standards Task Force, 2021; Kellerman, 2018a, 2018b; Perruci & McManus, 2012; Ritch, 2013; Ritch & Roberts, 2005; Ritch et al., 2004). As a result, “questions of legitimacy and accountability persist,” and “more and more educators search for answers” (Ritch, 2013, p. 66). And, while there are artifacts of evidence-based practices and recommendations for future resources (e.g., Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018; Jenkins et al., 2012) as well as vast association initiatives currently underway to address these gaps, such as the ILA’s Task Force on Guiding Standards (ILA Guiding Standards Task Force, 2021), more information is needed to address the gaps related to the criteria and processes used to facilitate leadership program reviews in higher education.

Method

Understanding the nature of leadership program reviews requires insight from those who have been a part of these endeavors. As such, we chose to seek out those with program review experience within the field of leadership education as the source of data for our study, essentially viewing each program reviewer’s experience as a case. We employed a comparative case study approach to search for themes and patterns both within and across program reviewer’s...
experiences (Merriam, 1998). Findings in this method are presented as an examination of multiple, individual cases compared to one another to further inform understanding of the phenomena being studied. Comparative case studies provide the opportunity for deeper and more complex interpretation than what can be gleaned from a single case example. Finding themes, patterns, and even contradictions in a range of cases strengthen the precision, validity, and stability of the interpretation (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

**Sampling and Participants**

While program reviews are quite common in higher education, our earlier literature review points out that program reviews specific to curricular and co-curricular leadership education are rare. Often leadership programs are reviewed as a part of a larger departmental or unit review, with reviewers who may or may not identify professionally as leadership educators or have experience working with leadership programs specifically (Sowcik, Lindsey, & Rosch, 2013). As such, we sought to identify professionals for this study who had experience serving as reviewers for program reviews with leadership programs as a main or major focus. With such a niche population in mind, we employed a combination of purposive and recommender sampling. Purposive sampling involves the researchers using their own professional judgment in participant selection (Creswell and Poth, 2018). As leadership educators with reviewer experience ourselves, we first sought out colleagues whom we know have also served as leadership program reviewers. A snowball sample requires that researchers identify cases of interest from people who know of information-rich cases (Creswell and Poth, 2018). For this study, we turned to leadership educators in our professional networks and professional associations for recommendations on those who would match our participant needs. Sampling yielded 13 diverse participants ranging in social identity as well as professional roles and years of experience in leadership and higher education in the United States. Participants’ professional roles included clinical and tenured faculty, leadership center directors, and academic and student affairs administrators (see Table 1).

**Data Collection & Analysis**

Between January and March 2020, participants were interviewed using Zoom web conferencing. A semi-structured format was used with questions/prompts provided to participants in advance (see Appendix). Each interview was scheduled for 90 minutes with the average interview lasting approximately 75 minutes. Both researchers were present for and participated in all interviews. Interviews were recorded with participant knowledge and consent. No deception was involved in this study, participant identities were kept confidential, and data was securely stored on a password-protected computer.

Analytic memos were taken throughout each participant interview. Each interview was also transcribed verbatim using transcription software. A narrative analysis of interview transcripts and memos was conducted to uncover themes within and across participant experiences. Initial codes were determined through initial transcript and memo review. NVivo qualitative analysis software was used to confirm initial codes and assist in determining further subcodes for deeper examination and axial codes for organization (Saldana, 2013). Patterns and themes were determined and revisited throughout the analytic process, which included a second round of transcript reviews and consultation of original audio files as needed.
Table 1
Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty: Educational Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty: Leadership Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Program Director: Diversity, Inclusion, &amp; Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty and Program Director: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty: Leadership and Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty and Administrator: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Program Director: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Senior Administrator: Campus Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty: Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty: Leadership Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty: Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Academic Administrator: Leadership and Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R2 previously served in the capacity as a senior academic and student affairs administrator.

It is important to acknowledge our positionality as researchers in discussion of the analytic process, as this provides insight into our interpretation of the data and interest in the findings (Merriam, 1998). Both of us identify as leadership educators in higher education. We have also both engaged in leadership program reviews as participants and as reviewers. Our interest in this topic stems from professional experience in addition to general discourse in leadership education professional circles regarding the variance in leadership program review experiences. Noting this experience and perspective, we utilized a consistent interview protocol across interviews and were careful to transcribe and code interviews prior to analysis. A standard coding scheme was also maintained throughout analysis. Each of these measures helps to limit bias and ensure a systemic, consistent analytic process (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldana, 2013; Yin, 1994).

Findings

Findings for this study are categorized into four major themes: (a) review logistics, including the stated focus and reason of a program review, as well as the outlined process of conducting the review; (b) reviewer experience, including the various roles played by a reviewer, resources used to complete the review and contextual influences on the reviewer’s approach; (c)
review outcomes, including both findings from the review process and resulting recommendations; and (d) lessons learned, including necessary reviewer skills, logistical advice for conducting reviews, power considerations, and political dynamics in a review process.

**Review Logistics**

**Review Purpose and Focus**

Study participants noted that institutions sought to conduct leadership program reviews for a variety of reasons, both stated and unstated. We will discuss the more subvert reasons for review cited by participants later in this study. Though, in being formally introduced to a review opportunity by an institutional representative, reviewers were provided with a range of reasons, from examples such as external accreditation requirements from an affiliated academic unit, to internal requests by affiliated faculty and staff embarking on curriculum and/or organization redesign initiatives.

In some cases, regional accreditation, institutional review cycles, or other general institutional requirements were the motivation for a program review. G1, for example, tended to review academic leadership programs, and noted how accreditation was routine for some, stating “they had to do it every five years, I think their school required them all to.” While for others, budgetary adjustments and organizational realignment prompted the program review. As G1 notes about one review experience:

They were facing some budgetary issues and their program is very, very big, but they didn't have any dedicated full time faculty and… they were sort of hanging out there. And so, there were departments trying to claim them, I think. And so, it may have been sort of a hostile takeover actually, and I think the provost required them to do the accrediting.

Outside of formal or routine accreditation, leadership program reviews can have varied purposes based on the needs and wants of those requesting the review. S1 notes that reviews they have conducted “aren't necessarily formal.” O1 shares examples of more informal review requests, indicating that an internally driven review can come at the request of faculty and staff who “just want to learn” or who believe a review will assist an office “trying to get some more leverage for the right for resources or opportunities.” Other participants shared similar insights, noting that those requesting the review were seeking advice for program redesign, new initiatives, or identifying areas for potential partnerships. As R1 reflects: “either I'm going there because they're in the creation stage or I'm going there because they want some insights into what they already have built and how they can go further.” Other participants noted that review requests were motivated by the need for strategic intervention, such as identifying and resolving particular issues or challenges associated with organizational realignment.

In further demonstration of the variant nature of leadership program reviews, participants reflected on the leadership program types they had been asked to review. These included academic majors and minors, certificate programs, co-curricular units focused on leadership programs, co-curricular units including leadership and other programmatic types, and institutional leadership centers. For example, S1 shares a wide range from their experience:

I certainly have reviewed a number that their primary focus is leadership education in
both student development and academic realms. I have also been a part of a couple
that have a broader student activities kind of framework. You know, not just a
leadership, community service, or leadership and civic engagement. Or, just a
leadership office within career centers. … One was directly connected to a student
union and broader programmatic agenda… there were others that were in the group
that might be looking at it from a facilities perspective.

As S1’s statement alludes to, leadership programs are rarely housed in a single
academic or administrative function at an institution; rather, they exist across departments
and units serving varied purposes that align with missions of their institutional homes (Rocco
& Pelletier, 2019). Organizational homes and structures for leadership programs also vary
across institutions. Participants’ statements reflected this variety, noting that organizational
home and program mission informed review purpose and goals. R1 reflects on how the
variety of organizational homes for leadership programs at one institution informed his
approach to their review, specifically calling out this decentralization through a common
metaphor:

The other thing, too, is where's leadership housed? … I used the ‘1000 points of light’
kind of metaphor… I said, you know, it's really extraordinary here that there's leadership
going on in athletics, and in you know, communication and in business, and, you know,
but it’s- there's nothing connecting them together. And so, what we need is the network
to tie the lights together.

**Review Process**

Participants also shared experiences in review process and format, specifically regarding
data gathering and engagement with program personnel. First, most participants shared a
timeline of one to three days visiting in-person on campus. Campus time is spent in meetings and
conversations with stakeholders; the primary component of the review process. Stakeholders
could include faculty, administration, staff, students, donors, community members, and/or
alumni. In most cases, these meetings occurred on campus and required reviewers to travel, in
some cases staying overnight to conduct review activities over multiple days.

Meetings with stakeholders included standard listening sessions to understand diverse
perspectives on program components and personnel, including strengths, weaknesses, and
potential opportunities. Though, participants named that their time visiting with stakeholders
could also take the form of more collaborative design or brainstorming sessions in which they
were more actively facilitating a mutual planning process alongside stakeholders. As K1 notes
from many review experiences, “[they] have brought me into speak and then meet with staff and
meet with key people.” In this way, reviewers are welcomed and in some cases expected to share
their professional experience and knowledge regarding program design.

For example, some participants in this study were asked to share best practices from other
program reviews they had conducted, benchmark programs of which they were aware, or places
they had worked. M1 reflects on a program review experience that included a workshop on best
practices beyond the traditional review process:
I ended up teaching a workshop…. they did a review of other programs and they kept coming back to our program saying, we want to do something like this within our school of business. ... I did spend time with the committee… with some students and some staff members.

Reviewer Experience

Reviewer Roles

While the role of program reviewer may seem standard on the surface, participants in this study discussed how the reviewer role could adjust and adapt based on review need and/or institutional expectation. As mentioned in the findings regarding the review process, participants often found themselves using the professional knowledge, experience, and skill within the context of a program review to assist with activities beyond data gathering and analysis. In addition to the reviewer role, participants discuss serving in capacities such as consultant, facilitator, trainer, expert, fundraiser, keynote speaker, therapist, and messenger. At times the expectations for reviewers to serve in line with these other roles is explicit in the initial request for services. O2 recalls a time where multiple roles were negotiated up front:

Well, it's hard. I think there's a value story here… I will have schools come to me and say, ‘well, we want you to teach Strengths,’ or ‘we want you to come teach the Five Practices.’ So, I'm always like, ‘I will, but only if you let me do this as well,’ or ‘I want to be part of this bigger conversation.’ Like, I won't just ‘dance monkey dance.’

O2’s experience underscores the agency necessary for a reviewer in determining the work they will do and roles they will play as a part of a review request, when given the opportunity to discuss the terms. Though, in some cases institutions may ask for a program review, when-- whether it is clear to them or not-- they are also looking for a consultant or advisor. R1 recalls an example in which the role of keynote speaker was unexpectedly added to their reviewer responsibilities:

It was like, the whole board, and everything was a big dinner, and the President, you know, kind of introduced me, and I didn’t even know I was going to speak until he introduced me. And, I’m like writing on the napkin when I realized. Fortunately, I had the one copy of the competency model, so I held it up and explained it, but that wasn't as effective.

While this additional responsibility was placed upon R1 by the institution, role changes can also come from the reviewer themselves. Participants in this study noted that at times they adapted their reviewer role mid-review based on what they were learning or experiencing in their meetings with stakeholders. Whether planned or spontaneous, externally or internally driven, the expandable and dynamic nature of the reviewer role was clear.

Reviewer Resources

While participants in this study have the academic and professional experience relevant to conducting leadership program reviews, participants named additional resources they commonly used in the review process. Commonly mentioned were association standards such as the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) Standards for Student
Leadership Programs (CAS, 2012) and the International Leadership Association’s Guiding Questions: Guidelines for Leadership Education Programs (ILA, 2009). Association documents such as these can be used before, during, and after reviews to help frame and focus the review process and findings. For example, P1 shares that they have “used the Guiding Questions as a resource beforehand… as framework for the [institution] to build their self-study.” S2 reflects on using the CAS Standards for Student Leadership Programs throughout a review process:

Take those standards in the self-assessment guide and have a lot of different people do [the self-assessment]. And then, really look at that, and then for them to provide evidence. They weren’t really able to provide any evidence, and so when we went down there and interviewed people, we kind of asked some more pointed questions around the areas [in the standards.]

Some reviewers also turned to program models from their own experience or that are discussed in the literature as benchmarks for particular leadership program types. An institution’s benchmark schools were also looked to for guidance, particularly around chosen leadership frameworks or program scope. O2 discusses the experience working with a Catholic Institution on choosing benchmark schools and program type:

I think, letting schools pick their comparison institutions… When the Catholic schools got together to share data they started realizing again, like with a social justice tradition and Catholic universities, the Social Change Model was a natural fit. So, it was a values-based kind of choice.

In addition to Institutional type, O2’s mention of the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996) alludes to another common participant resource for conducting program reviews: leadership education literature, research, and models. Resources such as the Handbook for Student Leadership Programs (Komives et al., 2011), The Role of Leadership Educators: Transforming Learning (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018), the New Directions for Student Leadership series (Komives & Guthrie, 2015-2021), and the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership were all named by multiple participants in this study.

Participants also indicate that program reviews incorporate data gathered from the institution directly. This could include program documents regarding design and curricula, reviewer research on institutional mission, or even as mentioned above, a personnel self-study with questions provided by the reviewer in advance of a campus visit. As O1 states, “sometimes you’ll get kind of elaborate campus based plans that you receive beforehand or assessments, pre-assessments,” indicating that those responsible for the leadership program may have already completed an internal review that is shared with external reviewers in advance.

Contextual Influences

A reviewer’s approach to conducting a leadership program review may also be informed by a number of contextual factors, including the program’s theoretical and conceptual grounding, institutional orientation, political and financial considerations, and/or administrative influences. All of these factors influence the way that leadership is understood and approached by the institution through their leadership program(s). As G2 notes: “contextual factors influence everything, and that’s where we need to start. And I think that's often the misstep… not taking those contextual factors.” Participants in this study all shared reflections on the careful thought required to determine the appropriate guidelines, standards, literature, examples, and experiences
they use to help ensure that each review they conduct is appropriate for and relevant to the specific program. Additionally, all participants in this study noted that the definitions, theories, and models of leadership used to construct and inform implementation of a leadership program are key in framing their review process. A variety of factors can influence a program’s approach to leadership. For example, a program’s orientation toward leadership learning, leadership skill building, or leadership practice will guide reviewers to the resources they use, questions they ask, and recommendations they offer in a program review process. Whether a program focuses on individual leader development or leadership as a process in groups or communities is also a consideration. In any example, leadership language within a program impacts the review process and the reviewer’s approach.

Participants also cite a program’s disciplinary orientation as important context for the review. A leadership program could be rooted in a particular discipline, incorporate leadership approaches from a variety of disciplines (interdisciplinary), or use an approach applicable across disciplines (transdisciplinary.) Participants note that disciplinary orientation likely informs theoretical and conceptual grounding around leadership. For example, some participants discussed that a leadership program could be grounded in human development and learning processes, while another may focus on leadership outputs and performance. R1 shares a reflection on the variance in disciplinary approaches to leadership programs:

We’re looking at different disciplines that were offering [leadership] programs and the differences that emerged around those… this gap between like, ‘what we think we’re doing’ and ‘what we're actually doing’ … but we looked at like {a healthcare organization} and the military, but we also looked at agriculture programs, business programs, liberal arts programs… that's part of the difficulty--they're housed in different places and those places have their own cultures and practices.

Study participants notes that institutional factors such as mission, values, and budget influence leadership program approach and purpose, which then impact their approach to the program review. G2 illustrates the impact of these factors in her reflection:

I will even ask, ‘how does your institution view or define leadership?’ And they’ll be like ‘what do you mean?’ And so, I’ll pull up their institutional mission statement and it talks about leadership in their institutional mission statement. And I said, ‘Do you realize that?’ And they're like, ‘no, we didn't.’ Right? Like, not at all. And I said ‘so, my question for you is, ‘how does that influence, or does it not influence?’ because then that will change how I approach this. Especially with budgeting and finance because there are some institutions that will ask me to look at their budget and say, ‘Do you think we're spending enough money on this, or do you think there's more?’ And then there's other institutions that are like we can't give you that information. But I mean, it does. I mean, I think it's everything! That's where we should all be starting, not only with evaluation, but implementation.

The relevance and applicability of a reviewer’s work is dependent upon their access to and understanding of a variety of contextual factors that influence the purpose, design, and implementation of a leadership program.
Review Outcomes

Findings and Recommendations

Participants shared that the recommendations they offered to host institutions primarily spoke to programmatic needs such as resources, staffing, or organizational structure, but may have also included references to leadership models, approaches, programs, or initiatives at benchmark institutions or programs as well as support in the creation or revision of mission statements. P1 shared some of the recommendations they made related to curriculum and program staff.

I make lists in terms of resource use and allocation. Second… any kind of curricular or course deficiencies or the strength of a particular curriculum. … Another recommendation that is common, is to put the program in the context of the Leadership Studies community. … I have to rely some on my own bias… There are also, for instance, titles that have come up. And so, if a person is considered a coordinator, what's the difference between moving that person from coordinator to director or executive director? Does the executive or does the director have to be a faculty member? Does it have to be someone with a doctorate or can it be somebody with a masters from coming from the staff side? … And, there's that dynamic I mentioned earlier, in terms of recommendation, where [the leadership program] should be housed… that's a common question that I get.

R1 focused their recommendations more so on the organizational structure as well as the mission and vision of the program:

A lot of what I talk about would be the same kinds of stuff I would talk to a startup organization about, like, put time into your mission. And, and then one of the things is that mission should guide you, right? So, you should have a mission, you should have a vision statement, a mission statement, that kind of thing. And then I do talk about evaluation, right? So, I seek input and feedback for continuous improvement, right? So, you want to always be on that kind of like evaluating everything you do.

In addition to staff and curriculum, some reviewers were asked to evaluate specific models used and how they are delivered across the program or highlight a specific deliverable for the program staff to implement. O2 shares an example of a specific model here:

I always try to get them to do an audit of what they already do and map it onto their shared outcomes and have them say, for each program, or especially student affairs for each program, the service leadership intervention that you do. You have a social change mode--which one best fits with what that one does? And then we look at it and guess what, nobody's teaching these seven other C's, you know, nobody's talking about controversy with civility and you wonder why you have all these problems. With shared dialogue you find that nobody's doing it as their primary thing, so, I think that's the most useful kind of program intervention… when they do their own work and look and see what's missing.

The Report

Participants shared that in almost all cases they were asked to produce a written report and/or a final presentation of their major findings or themes. These ranged “from that informal
dimension all the way to written reports that evaluators were filed with an accreditation review process” (K1). K1 also shared some advice around the content of the report and the benefits of processing recommendations with the host institution’s point person prior to the formal sharing of the report in order to dive into some of the contextual and political dynamics uncovered in the fact-finding process:

I would be careful in a written report… I would try to catch your recommendation. Let me just make up a recommendation. And you can, that you would then verbally process or debrief with a good person that you're doing this for, let's say, but I might write in the report that I heard numerous disparate perceptions of what the office was doing. And people seeing it very differently with different motives and different goals and think it's very important that those who are central to this office's success be on board with the direction they want the office to go in or the offices going in. And then maybe debrief around that same when I talk to the Associate Dean this office reports to, ...but I'm not in a report saying this office reports to, ...but I'm not in a report saying this office reports to, you know, you might say, or the I did with one graduate program review, say, if this college doesn't want this program in it, because we heard a number of criticisms about the program being located where it is, then there are other colleges that would be happy to have these students and that that should be pursued, you know, just saying the college event didn't watch, they go over to the College of, you know, whatever it may arts and humanities, I mean, but you can still function as a program. If you're saying it in a way that it makes them have to talk about it.

The Good, Bad, and Ugly

Participants in this study shared that they often combined reporting on the strengths of the program they were reviewing while also pointing out opportunities or areas for improvement. Reviewers such as G1 shared how they tried to stay positive and helpful in their reviewer role:

I write more about, here's opportunities here--some areas for improvement. And I try to keep it kind of positive. I mean, I don't think it does any good to say, you know, that was really a problem or you know so many people are putting their lives into these programs and to like say things that would be hurtful ...I just don’t think it's helpful.

Lessons Learned

Active Listening

Multiple participants in this study stressed the importance of active and deep listening skills for reviewers. This advice stemmed from the large amount of fact-finding processes reviewers engage in as well as the often large number of stakeholders involved:

E1: Listening, I think, is probably the number one thing that I think we're offering, which for me shifts it from sometimes A review can have that evaluative component right that, I’m here to judge, like, I'm going thumbs up. You know, like doing this thing and I think it's less of that for me, then, to really just hold and listen and honor and then try to support them to whatever their next step is.

Reviewers also stressed how they found great use of skills they had developed in other careers:
K1: I have never used my counseling skills more than I have when I do consulting. But I mean, you do students and mentoring and all that. But I mean, there's a whole lot of really deep listening, active listening, you have to do to get a basis of conflict or misunderstanding of perception.

Team vs. Solo Reviewing

Several participants shared experiences related to being part of a review team and the differences between this approach and facilitating a review on their own. Like any team, relationships were a key factor and those who had the authority to choose their team members reported better experiences. Contributing factors included being amongst others they could trust to discuss complex political and personnel matters, share in decision making, and equal distribution of the workload, and most importantly, how writing the final report would be delegated. Participants, such as E1, shared the advantages of working with a strong team and stressed the importance of coordinating before meeting with stakeholders.

I believe a team is really useful—I think two to three folks. I would hesitate for somebody to go out and do a kind of formal review by themselves. But some of that was just, you know, our ability to connect with these different constituents and then for us as a review team to come back and debrief that and navigate the political landscape that were maybe not part of but now are implicated in depending on how we present these opinions and these thoughts. And so, we were clear that our role was not to make judgments or decisions on their behalf, but really to kind of synthesize that information.

Organization is Critical

Study participants offered advice related to organization before, during, and after the campus visit. These recommendations included identifying a point person of contact for scheduling and general questions during the review process, setting expectations around which stakeholders to meet with, who would schedule the meetings, and the format meetings should take. Participants O1 and M1 shared a few examples of where this showed up in their reviews.

O1: I think clarity really matters like what are we judging ourselves by and that then also helps with who to meet with how that schedule goes, and there is a sweet spot. I can't tell you what that sweet spot is but maybe you all will tell us that in your research, but there is a sweet spot between too few meetings and then like three-and-a-half days of back to back, which is just not helpful. … so, clarity of structure and then creating schedules that are aligned with that clarity is significantly important to get data that is helpful.

M1: Give yourself enough time… I just ran out of time. You know when you're going to write a consultant's report and that takes a lot of time, and, with [University], we went back and forth over email trying to draft a report… if you end up being on a campus, you need to make sure there's going to be students there to talk to. Now if you do it on their spring break, and there's nobody there to talk to except the staff members, you've missed the whole piece of trying to sort of assess what's happening there on that campus.

Facilitation Skills

Almost every participant in our study shared an example where they were asked to facilitate various types of meetings with program stakeholders. In some cases, the format was made clear, while in most situations the reviewer(s) were asked to conduct interviews, facilitate
large- and small-group discussions, or run focus groups. And, in doing so, reviewers such as O2 and P1 were tasked with the responsibility of forming a narrative and engaging in their own sensemaking to understand the situation at play within the context of the program.

O2: I'll spend a day just interviewing people and then I'll meet with the VP and people at the end, sort of, say, hear the story that's being told. And here's where students are telling a different story than faculty or where your students... your goals or your programs are not being realized in this way. So, I'll have that kind of narrative prospect or inquiry process.

P1: There's infighting between different factions within the program and one faction wants to go in one direction and another faction in a very different direction. And then they bring you in to try to mediate so you're, you're not really doing a report, you're doing more of facilitating--facilitation and mediation exercise.

**Power Considerations**

Several participants shared examples of reviews where they were asked to make recommendations related to program resources and personnel. In some cases, this was made clear at the start, but in most cases, these variables emerged from the fact-finding process. Similarly, reviewers such as S1 as R1 reflected on the level of influence they had been given in their invited roles and issued warnings to stay hyper aware of the implications of recommendations.

S1: We have to be careful with our voice and our participation in these types of experiences because it comes with great responsibility, burden, and the whole idea of leaving your weight behind.

R1: I think one thing is you got to be open-minded. You've got to be able to think broadly about what constitutes leadership education/development, because, people have different ideas about it. And so, you got to be open-minded, but I think at the same time, you better have some idea of sort of internal standards, right. So, you should be able to, if you're going to say what's right with a program, you've got to be able to justify what you consider to be wrong with the program. And in order to justify being wrong with the program is you got to offer guidelines for improvement.

**Political Dynamics**

This finding adds additional credence to the advice to keep one’s political acumen sharp, to stay humble and as neutral as possible, listen to all stakeholders, and keep in mind that the recommendations provided to the host institution may have staffing implications. 10 of the 13 study participants shared at least one example where they had to navigate the politics within the institution and were tasked with additional fact-finding responsibilities as a result. The quotes from S1, P1, and M1 below offer a few examples:

S1: like I said these are some of the politics of it you know, agendas. You know where staff start to feel insecure about their livelihood, you know, their jobs, their areas. There's been a couple of that it's been very evident that people are working to replace people.
P1: I mentioned the case where the provost had already made the decision to add the line, … The decision had been made to terminate the program and you were brought in and didn't know that before you arrived and asked to explain why it needs to be terminated and that puts you in a very awkward position.

M1 Different stakeholders who may want different things. And that can be delicate… you got to ask some questions:…. who's involved, who wants this. Why do they want, you know, it's not just one person's usually You gotta wade through it and dig deeper to find out what's really behind it if you can. And maybe you're never going to know.

Participants also stressed that reviewers do not get too involved in politics, to keep ethics front of mind, and to remember that what you leave at the institution can have lasting effects.

P1: I've had visits, where trustees were frustrated with the administration, that the administration was not moving fast enough with this program. And so, you have an ally there. But you have to be very careful politically. So, the context there is navigating the politics of the place. And without burning bridges and recognizing that you drop in, you stir the pot, and then you leave. So, you have to be ethical in the sense that you're doing what you think is best for the institution.

K1: I don't think you ever take just one person's perspective on a political situation and assume it to be valid, or the only perspective. I mean, obviously, we think that, but when I was somebody, and they're really a friend, they brought me in because they're a friend, and they got a mess going, you know, I just still can't assume that that's the only view on how that happened, or what, what one does, to get out of it, you know, so you got to talk tenderly to other people.

Discussion: Evidence-based Practices for Facilitating Leadership Program Reviews

Here, we offer five key principles shared by our study participants that influence the leadership program review process. These include contextual and organizational factors as well as required skill sets.

Context Matters

Institutional stakeholders initiate program reviews for a variety of reasons and reviewers should take the time to find out why. For example, institutions may be going through a cycled review process as part of accreditation, soliciting expert advice, engaging in strategic intervention, or weighing the resources used and value provided by the program—all of these factors have implications for program reviewers. In addition to the nature of the review, reviewers should be aware of the key contextual factors present at the institution. For example, are there non-negotiable approaches or perspectives related to how leadership is defined (e.g., Social Change Model of Leadership Development), reliance on religious or other values, institutional or program mission statements, classifications (e.g., Carnegie, AAU), or donor influences that may make particular recommendations moot? Additionally, many participants shared examples of institutional murkiness around leadership programming due to the multiple areas within an institution where leadership programs were found. The resulting ownership, and
often hierarchies, at play among stakeholders of varying leadership programs within the same institutions was a common challenge for reviewers to navigate.

**Facilitation is Key**

Reviewers should expect to meet with and engage in dialogue with multiple institutional stakeholders including faculty, administration, staff, students, donors, community leaders, and alumni, among others. In doing so, preparation, organization, and regular communication with decision makers are crucial to a successful review. Additionally, through these fact-finding meetings, reviewers should expect to engage in active listening, facilitate dialogue and small-group discussions, run focus groups or interview key stakeholders, and keep one’s political ears and eyes alert.

**Expectations**

Reviewers should inquire at the onset of the process about the time required, size of the review team, and scope/format of recommendations (e.g., report, presentation, etc.). Too, reviewers would be wise to ask whether or not there are benchmark programs, internal reports or self-studies, or other institutional documents or criteria that the review or recommendations may be weighed against. Additionally, reviewers should inquire whether any duties beyond the role of a typical reviewer are expected. For example, participants in our study were asked to present on leadership program best practices, their own programs, and on specific leadership models such as the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (HERI, 1996) and The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2017), while others have been asked to lend a hand in program and curricular design and meet with donors.

**Resources and Benchmarks**

Reviewers should have access to resources such as association standards (e.g., CAS Standards, ILA Guiding Questions) as well as identify benchmark institutions and leadership programs. Attention should also be given to unique institutional and programmatic factors when determining appropriate benchmarks for a review. As reiterated in many ways by participants in this study, the variance in leadership program purpose, structure, and organizational home cannot be ignored in the review process.

**Reviewer Beware**

In addition to the multiple hats reviewers wear, many participants shared examples where they were asked to play a mediating role between or among institutional programs, administrators, and staff. Moreover, reviewers have also been asked to share recommendations related to program resources and budgets, including staffing and personnel issues in particular. Reviewers also shared experiences where what they were being asked to accomplish was outside of the scope of what may be considered standard in a higher education program review. As a result, participants in this study commented on the seriousness of the role of the reviewers as well as the implications of recommendations they might offer.

**Implications for Research and Practice**
Our findings outline the various contexts where individuals who facilitate leadership program reviews may find themselves working, the impetus for performing such tasks, the resources available and employed, and sound advice for practitioners. Clearly, limitations in the study exist such as the individuals selected to participate in this study, the institution and program types reviewed, and that the study focused specifically on the experiences of reviewers versus the documents produced or gathered during the reviews. Yet, there are several implications for leadership educators and program architects elicited from the themes found in this study:

1. There is a clear need for professional development related to the practice of conducting leadership program reviews. This could come in the form of trainings or workshops offered through professional associations at annual or regional conferences, through webinars or other virtual events, and through the publication of manuals that outline the process in-depth. Moreover, these resources should provide both general and specific--to curricular versus co-curricular programs--guidance.

2. The vast majority of participants in our study shared that they were explicitly asked about benchmark institutions for comparative data or examples of program structure, outcomes, and programs. Arguably, more concrete and robust resources beyond conference sessions that showcase leadership programs such as “Chapter 7: Distinctive Contextual Leadership Program Examples” (Guthrie & Jenkins, 2018) and leadership program examples offered in the *The Handbook for Student Leadership Development* (Komives et al., 2011) are needed to fill this gap.

3. Examples of and artifacts from completed program reviews are desperately needed. While the individuals interviewed in this study were chosen both by the researchers and the institutions where they performed their program reviews because of their experience and expertise, keeping the intricacies of these processes secretive does more to hinder than to progress the field.

4. Jenkins et al. (2012) and others have demonstrated that leadership educators and program architects are seeking out criteria from which to evaluate leadership programs. While this ongoing debate is documented in the review of the literature here, it is important to draw attention to this glaring gap. Leadership program reviewers use a variety of resources to conduct their reviews and future research is needed to evaluate the quality of these resources and effectiveness of using them for both conducting program reviews and creating recommendations for the institutions under review.

Future research as well as human capital are needed to identify criteria, or at the very least, guiding principles, for evaluating leadership programs. When compared to other professions such as Social Work, Medicine, or Law where clear standards, criteria for licensure, or accreditation guidelines are established, leadership programs are at a disadvantage (Kellerman, 2018a). At the same time, the diversity in leadership program purpose, design, and organizational home both within and across institutions requires review resources and guidance that address this variety. Even so, if such criteria are created and agreed upon by leadership...
educators, scholars, and practitioners, such progress may still not overcome the institutional and political dynamics present in the review processes experienced by participants in this study. In any event, we hope this study sparks new thinking about conducting leadership program reviews in higher education and provides resources and perspectives that future reviewers can utilize to improve their practice.
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Appendix

Interview Protocol - *Exploring the Process of Leadership Program Reviews in Higher Education*

1. Please tell me about the leadership program evaluations that you’ve done.

2. What prompted the institution to initiate the program review you participated in?

3. What are the expectations of the institution?

4. What resources did you use?

5. What was the scope of the evaluation?

6. What did you find/recommend?

7. What were you expected to produce or report for the institution before, during, and/or after the program review?

8. What are some lessons learned? For other practitioners?

9. What contextual factors influence/impact your approach to conducting a program review (e.g.):
   a. Co-curricular v curricular
   b. Liberal arts v. research institution
   c. How the program is structurally situated within the institution

10. Is there any additional information you would like to share?
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Abstract

Since its introduction into agricultural education programs in the 1970s, agricultural leadership has continued to change due to the needs of students and trends within the field (Cletzer, et al., 2020; Jones, 2004; Williams, 2007). One of the major changes was inclusion of the discipline in graduate level education (Jones, 2004). However, there still exists a scarcity of research on graduate level agricultural leadership programs. A single research question guided the study: What is the scope and nature of graduate agricultural leadership courses offered in the United States? A qualitative content analysis was conducted to capture the meanings, emphasis, and themes of agricultural leadership graduate coursework. The frame for this research consisted of all departments or programs in the United States offering agricultural leadership programs at the graduate level; established by the American Association of Agricultural Educators member list. University course catalogs were reviewed, and graduate courses offered by the agricultural education departments of those institutions that included any of the following terms in the course title were noted: (a) lead, (b) leader, and (c) leadership. A total of 62 courses from 11 institutions met the criteria and were analyzed. The findings clustered the courses into 21 distinct categories, further compiled together into the following six overarching themes: (1) individual-level focus, (2) organizational-level focus, (3) societal-level focus, (4) professional focus, (5) methodological focus, (6) developmental focus. The findings and recommendations should be considered by agricultural leadership educators and academic leaders as they evaluate how to grow their programs.

Introduction

Leadership education can provide students with the skills to effectively engage with organizations, establish meaningful dialog about the role of leadership, increase their ability to fulfill leadership roles, and expand upon a students’ capacity for thoughts and ideas (Huestedde & Woodward, 1996; McCauley, Moxley, & Van Velsor, 1998; Day, 2000). Additionally, when exposed to leadership theory and practice, students are better suited to assume prominent roles in organizations within their community and contribute to the growth of businesses, industry, and community development (Kristick, 2009; Russon & Reinelt, 2004). One particular context that benefits greatly from leadership education is the field of agriculture (Weeks et. al, 2020). While agriculture is critically important to the survival of humankind, those working in this context continually face complex problems such as climate change, droughts, flooding, and water scarcity (Jordan et al., 2013). These wicked problems need effective leaders at all levels within the industry, if these issues are to be addressed.

Since its introduction into agricultural education programs in the 1970s, agricultural leadership has continued to change due to the needs of students and trends within the field (Cletzer, et al., 2020; Jones, 2004; Williams, 2007). One of the major changes that occurred in
Agricultural leadership was the inclusion of the discipline in graduate agricultural education (Jones, 2004). However, despite the growth of graduate level agricultural leadership education programs, there still exists a scarcity of research on the topic in this context. As agricultural leadership graduate programs further develop, research is critical to better understand both the current state of the field and changes needed to improve the educational outcomes of programs. As Alexander (2015) suggests, “Having a better understanding of agricultural leadership-related programming will be an asset to the discipline regarding restructuring programs to students’ needs, creating growth among academic programs, and increasing the knowledge of educators within the field” (Alexander, 2015, p. 26). The current study provides insight into graduate level agricultural leadership coursework in the United States and explores how the coursework fulfills the needs of the agricultural industry.

**Literature Review**

**Agricultural Leadership in the Context of Agricultural Education**

Agricultural education programs have been providing leadership education to students since the 1970s through programs such as the National FFA and 4-H Organization (Brown & Fritz, 1994; Simonsen & Birkenhoz, 2010; Weeks et al., 2020). These programs were created to address a need identified by agricultural education teachers who wanted to develop leadership capacity within their students. The importance placed on leadership education for student development ultimately led to the creation of formal university agricultural leadership programs. While this occurred at the undergraduate level first, agricultural leadership programs later expanded to include the specialization at the graduate level (Jones, 2004). At both the undergraduate and graduate level, agricultural leadership is defined as, “the study of leadership applied to the agricultural context” (Stedman & Weeks, 2013, p. 83).

The agricultural industry’s demand for an educated workforce possessing both technical, and soft skills has contributed to the growth of agricultural leadership programs in higher education over the past two decades (Morgan, et al., 2013). The goal of formal leadership education in any context is to increase students’ leadership capacities and provide them the skills to be proactive in the face of unforeseen challenges (Kaufman, et al., 2010). Therefore, agricultural leadership programs prepare students for unforeseen challenges unique to the agricultural industry. The primary focus of agricultural leadership programs is to prepare both undergraduate and graduate students to become educated, empowered, community members (Velez, et al., 2014). While there is limited research on the outcomes of agricultural leadership programs, the research that has been done on this context suggests agricultural leadership programs have appropriately responded by successfully facilitating the development of students’ leadership skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors (Strickland, et al., 2010).

Due to the rapid growth of leadership studies in all disciplines, the structure and foundations of leadership education programs, within higher education, should be explored (Brungardt, et al., 2006.) Graduate agricultural leadership programs are no exception. As Weeks and Weeks (2020) point out, “Most graduate-level programs in agricultural leadership focus heavily on leadership education within the agriculture context, but some take a broader approach
to the study of leadership” (p. 40). As the discipline continues to quickly grow and evolve, research is needed in a number of programmatic areas if consistency of practice is to occur (Velez, et al., 2014). One example is exploring the way agricultural education departments have been reshaped by the growth of agricultural leadership programs (Linder & Baker, 2003). Other areas, such as agricultural leadership education programs’ framework, curriculum, and content, need to be examined to gain insight into how to best lead these programs into the future (Williams, Townsend, & Linder, 2005).

Alexander’s (2015) dissertation on the perceptions of agricultural leadership programs found that agricultural leadership faculty believed the field needed to establish a set of standards targeting course work, curricula, theory, and research. This is in line with actions taken by members of the agricultural leadership discipline, who in 2004 and 2013, held a summit to “develop a vision, mission, and goals for a unified national agricultural leadership strategy” (Weeks et. al, 2020, 41). In addition to these actions, Alexander (2015) points to, research on agricultural leadership programmatic areas being another avenue to increase consistency across the field. Despite these research needs, few national studies have explored the programmatic components and outcomes of agricultural leadership programs (Brown & Fritz, 1994; Fritz & Brown, 1998; Moody, 2001; Fritz et al., 2003; Cletzer et al., 2020). Furthermore, the few studies that have been conducted on agricultural leadership education have been overwhelming focused on undergraduate level programs (Jones, 2004).

Agricultural Leadership Graduate Program Coursework

Despite most research being focused on undergraduate programs, in 2004 Jones focused their research on the graduate level. The researchers asked both agricultural leadership faculty and agricultural industry representatives to rate the importance of various leadership competencies for graduate students to possess upon graduation (Jones, 2004). Both groups rated communication, interpersonal relationship building, and collaboration as the top three leadership traits graduates should possess. While the two groups agreed on the top three traits, beyond that their responses differed. Faculty next ranked industry awareness and program evaluation as important (Jones, 2004). Industry representatives ranked the importance of change management and advocacy as the next two most important (Jones, 2004). Additionally, Jones found that agricultural leadership faculty suggest graduate level coursework should include leadership, communication, research, presentation, negotiation, and skill working in diverse groups (Jones, 2004).

However, what agricultural leadership graduate coursework actually included at the time was leadership development and theories, organizational leadership, foundations of agricultural leadership education, change management, and leadership in a diverse society (Jones, 2004). The majority of agricultural leadership faculty taught graduate level courses in leadership development, leadership theories, organizational leadership, foundations of leadership, and research (Jones, 2004). They noted that because many of the competencies ranked as important require cognitive thinking abilities, it is important for agricultural leadership curricula to emphasize “how to think” rather than “what to think” (Jones, 2004). This idea supports the
previous work of Doole and Lindner (2002) who found applications knowledge to be important for students in the field of agricultural education.

Consequently, Jones (2004) recommended graduate agricultural curricula incorporate both the human resource development competencies established by McLagan (1989) and exemplary leadership practices established by Kouzes & Posner (1997). They also suggested related studies be conducted periodically to determine the current curricula used in agricultural leadership programs (Jones, 2004). The current study intends to build on the work done by Morgan et al., (2013) who completed a delphi study exploring the elements of undergraduate agricultural leadership programs and Cletzer et al., (2020) who provided a national portrait of undergraduate level agricultural leadership coursework. In this way the study looks to fill gaps in the literature examining graduate agricultural leadership programs and provide a more comprehensive look at agricultural leadership programs as whole, rather than solely those at an undergraduate level.

Purpose and Research Question

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the scarce research on the evolution and development of agricultural leadership education programs by identifying themes between graduate level course descriptions. The importance of the programs themselves is captured by Research Priority 3 of the American Association for Agricultural Education’s National Research Agenda. Titled, “Sufficient Scientific and Professional Workforce That Addresses the Challenges of the 21st Century” (Roberts et al., 2016) it tasks agricultural educators with preparing graduates with 21st century skills, such as leadership (Crawford, et al., 2011). A single research question guided the study: What is the scope and nature of graduate agricultural leadership courses offered in the United States?

Conceptual Framework

This study utilized Finch and Crunkilton’s (1999) program systems model (PSM) as its conceptual framework. The PSM describes a basic feedback loop using a systems approach demonstrating how academic programs revise the process by which they educate students using new information (Finch and Crunkilton, 1999). This model has been used repeatedly as the framework for examination of agricultural education and communication programs over the course of the last ten years. Cannon et al., (2016) used it to develop a national portrait of undergraduate agricultural communication courses. Morgan et al., (2013) used it to explore elements of undergraduate agricultural leadership programs. Additionally, research has been conducted within the field of agricultural education related specifically to each component of the model. Specifically, Watson and Robertson’s (2011) research on students, Morgan and Rucker’s (2013) research on faculty, and Morgan’s (2012) research on graduates.
In this study the model’s systems theory approach was employed to understand how graduate level agricultural leadership programs are operating within and seemingly influenced by the external environment. Specifically, this study will utilize the curriculum component of the process portion of the model, as it is directly related to programmatic coursework. In Cletzer et al., (2020) the model was used similarly to explore the scope and nature of undergraduate agricultural leadership coursework. This consistency and cohesion between the two studies will allow both to more fully become valuable contributors to the national conversation regarding the development of the agricultural leadership field.

Methods

Research Design

This study utilized a qualitative content analysis, as defined by Krippendorff (2004) as, “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (p. 18). The purpose of qualitative content analysis is to, “capture the meanings, emphases, and themes of messages to understand the organization and process of how they are presented” (Altheide, 1996, p. 33). Therefore, this design was most appropriate to capture the meanings, emphasis, and themes of agricultural leadership graduate coursework.

Data Sources and Collection

The frame for this research consisted of all departments or programs in the United States currently offering agricultural leadership programs at the graduate level. The population frame
was established by consulting the American Association of Agricultural Educators member list and determining who was listed as offering a masters or doctoral degree or graduate level specialization in agricultural leadership. Eleven institutions were identified: 1. University of Florida, 2. University of Kentucky, 3. University of Nebraska, 4. Ohio State University, 5. Oklahoma State University, 6. University of Tennessee, 7. Texas A&M University, 8. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 9. Oregon State University, 10. Georgia State University and 11. University of Missouri. Publicly available university graduate course catalogs were reviewed, and all graduate coursework offered by the agricultural education departments of those institutions that included any of the following terms in the course title were noted: (a) lead, (b) leader, and (c) leadership. Then, the corresponding course descriptions were collected. A total of 62 courses met the criteria and were included in the study.

Data Analysis

After initial collection the data was first analyzed to determine a variety of factors. These included the number of graduate level agricultural leadership courses offered by the individual institutions and how often the terms: (a) agriculture, (b) natural resources, (c) Extension, and (d) agricultural education were included in the course descriptions. Because the literature indicates a potential disconnect between the study of leadership and agricultural leadership specifically, these terms were important to understand if leadership courses were including an agricultural and/or life science focus. While qualitative content analysis is not often focused on quantification of individual words or terms, Krippendorff (2004) argued the two are inextricably linked when he stated, “ultimately, all reading of texts is qualitative, even when certain characteristics of a text are later converted into numbers” (p. 16).

Next, a qualitative content analysis approach was used to identify patterns within the course descriptions. Following the recommendations of Krippendorff’s (2004) hermeneutic loop the researcher engaged in an iterative process of reviewing and re-reviewing the entirety of the data while continuously re-contextualizing, reinterpreting, and redefining it. The intention of this was to co-construct themes from the content using an abductive research approach as suggested by Delputte and Orbie (2017). From this the researcher compiled a list of codes for categories all the courses would fit into. Leaning on previous research of agricultural leadership courses these categories were compared to Cletzer et al.’s (2020) and then compiled into corresponding themes. While Cletzer et al. had seven themes and 24 categories for undergraduate course work, due to the differing nature of undergraduate versus graduate programs, the graduate coursework more appropriately fit six themes and 21 categories.

Trustworthiness

Throughout the data collection and analysis process the researcher kept a detailed memo journal not only noting their reaction to the data but also exploring their own perceptions and assumptions of leadership and the role it plays in agricultural education. This was meant to provide the reflexivity Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated was necessary when conducting qualitative research. Additionally, the researcher has completed an upper-level degree in agricultural leadership from an agricultural education and communication program. This gives
them valuable extended first-hand experience with agricultural leadership courses that contributed to the study’s credibility. Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated this too was a way to ensure trustworthiness of a study.

Limitations

Without asking the professionals tasked with teaching these courses about the courses they teach, there is a chance some courses are being taught that were not included in the study. It is worth noting one institution included in the study had no leadership courses listed within the agricultural education department and another had only one. Presumably there is an explanation for these outliers, but based strictly on content analysis, that is impossible to know. This method is effective for categorizing data, as was done in this study, but the results lack the thick rich description qualitative research is known for.

Results

Of the 11 institutions listed as having graduate level agricultural leadership programs in the AAAE membership directory, 90.9% (n=10) list at least one graduate level leadership course housed within their agricultural education department in their university course catalog. Total number of graduate level agricultural leadership courses offered nationwide was 62. Number of courses offered per institution ranged from 0 to 15 with a median of 5 and mean of 5.64.

When examining the intentionality of connecting the leadership courses specifically to agricultural and life sciences, the researcher found only 41.9% (n=26) courses included the terms: (a) agriculture, (b) natural resources, (c) Extension, and/or (d) agricultural education in the course description found in the university course catalog. Respectively each term occurred in a course description the following number of times: (a) agriculture = 16, (b) natural resources = 3, (c) Extension = 10, and (d) agricultural education = 11.

The content analysis of course descriptions resulted in all 62 courses fitting into 21 distinct categories. These were further compiled together into six overarching themes specifying the shared collective focus of the course categories (Table 1). Because the categories and themes so closely aligned with Cletzer, et al.’s (2020) findings, the researcher used their established definition of themes. This provides important consistency of language to national conversations about agricultural leadership programs.

Description of Themes:

1. **Individual-level Focus**: “…courses focused on the individual student, such as introductory courses designed to provide a survey of leadership theories, or personal leadership courses designed to help students discover their individual leadership strengths, styles, or values.” (Cletzer, et. al., 2020. p.4)

2. **Organizational-level Focus**: “…courses designed to improve bounded systems, such as teams, organizations, and communities.” (Cletzer, et. al., 2020. p.4)

3. **Societal-level Focus**: “…courses discussing how leadership impacts broad societal issues, such as diversity, change, and ethics.” (Cletzer, et. al., 2020. p.4)
4. **Professional Focus:** “…courses intended to prepare students for leadership roles specifically as agriculture teachers, or more broadly in the agriculture industry.” (Cletzer, et. al., 2020. p.6)

5. **Methodological Focus:** “…defined by the structure of the course, rather than content or focus.” (Cletzer, et. al., 2020. p.6)

6. **Developmental Focus:** “…courses related to teaching students to develop, deliver, and manage leadership programming. A distinction was made between courses focusing exclusively on youth and those intended for broader applications.” (Cletzer, et. al., 2020. p.6)

The range of courses making up each individual theme was 8-13, indicating the courses were distributed among the themes relatively evenly (Table 1). The mean number of courses in each theme was 10.3 and the median number of courses was 10. However, the number of courses offered nationwide, when examined by category, was much more varied. The range in number of courses offered per each of the 21 categories identified was 1-8 while the mean number of courses per category was only 2.95 and median only 2.

Table 1.

*Organization of leadership courses by category and theme*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Courses by Theme</th>
<th>Number of Courses by Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual-level Focus</td>
<td>Introduction to Leadership Theory</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Leadership Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational-level Focus</td>
<td>Organizational Leadership Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team and Group Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal-level Focus</td>
<td>Global Diversity and Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Focus</td>
<td>Leadership in Agriculture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications and Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership for General Career</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Focus</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of this study indicate that graduate level agricultural leadership programs in the United States have both grown in size and expanded content in recent years. In 2003 Fritz et al. identified 34 graduate leadership courses offered by agricultural education programs. This means, in the last 17 years, the number of courses offered has increased by 82.4% (n=28). A year later in 2004, Jones found agricultural leadership graduate coursework could fit into the following categories: (a) leadership development and theories, (b) organizational leadership, (c) foundations of agricultural leadership education, (d) change management, and (e) leadership in diverse society. This study found similar results.

The category with the most courses (n=8) was introduction to leadership theory. The organizational leadership category included five courses and leadership in agriculture included six, both more than the mean number of courses per category (n=2.95). However, it is worth noting that only one course was classified under the change category, and only two under the diversity category. So, while change and diversity were still both identified as categories in this study, they were less prevalent than the mean (n=2.95). Where potential expansion of content is seen is in the prevalence of courses within the program development, delivery, and volunteer management category. The number of courses in that category (n=7) is substantially higher than the mean (n=2.95) but because that content wasn’t capture by Jones (2004) study, it’s possible those courses have developed in agricultural education programs more recently.

When considering the results of this study through the lens of the Finch and Crunkilton’s (1999) Program System’s Model, we must first consider what the model suggests about the formation of program curriculum. It suggests academic programs, including curriculum such as academic courses, are influenced by both the rest of an academic program, such as faculty and graduates, which in an academic context includes industry representatives. What is most interesting when considering this is that the results of this study do not correspond with Jones (2004) findings identifying what leadership traits faculty members and industry representatives’ rate as important for graduates of agricultural leadership programs to possess. Both groups agreed the top three most important traits were communication, interpersonal relationship building, and collaboration. The PSM would suggest because both faculty and industry representatives influence curriculum, that the categories corresponding to those traits would have an above average number of courses included in them.

However, the opposite seems to be true. The communications and leadership category includes only one course, and the team and group leadership category, which would apply to
both interpersonal relationship building and collaboration, includes only two. Again, both less than the mean number of courses (n=2.95) included in each category. To determine what the majority focus of graduate level agricultural leadership courses are focused on in the United States today, we must look to the categories with the greatest number of courses. Of all 62 courses, 48% of them (n=30) fall under only five of the 21 total categories. When compared to the mean (n=2.95) number of courses in each category they all exceed it.

The five categories and the number of courses in them is as follows: (1) individual-level focus (n=8), (2) program development, delivery, and volunteer management (n=7), (3) leadership in agriculture (n=6), (4) organizational leadership development (n=5), and (5) agricultural teacher preparation (n=4). Additionally, when considering content, it is important to consider how few courses included the terms: (a) agriculture, (b) natural resources, (c) Extension, and/or (d) agricultural education in the course description in their course descriptions. Despite 100% of the analyzed courses (n=62) being offered within Colleges of Agricultural and Life Sciences, by agricultural education departments, only 41.9% (n=26) included any of the terms. This suggests despite being housed in agricultural departments, graduate level agricultural leadership courses are often lacking agricultural context.

**Recommendations**

Based upon the growth of agricultural leadership programs identified by this study, and the literature, graduate level agricultural leadership programs should continue to be examined more in depth. There is opportunity to analyze additional components of the programs such as syllabi, course objectives, specific theories taught, text assigned, and curriculum vitae of course instructors. This study provided an overview of agricultural leadership graduate coursework in the United States but expanding the research to include these components would provide a more complete picture of the field.

To take it a step further, the current state of the field should be compared to the history of the field in a more in-depth matter to determine how it is evolving. There is ample opportunity for robust qualitative research interviewing faculty members within and/or department chairs of agricultural education programs that include a graduate level agricultural leadership specialization or degree. A valuable contribution to the national conversation around the future of agricultural leadership education would be to determine if the direction the field is heading aligns with the direction leaders within the field feel it should be heading. Further research is also needed to identify potential other influences on an academic program not captured by the Program Systems Model so the model can be appropriately revised to include them.

The findings of this study indicate that to appropriately prepare students to meet the unique challenges of the agricultural industry, agricultural leadership graduate programs need to be intentional about developing courses that meet industry needs. The Program Systems Model suggests curriculum should be influenced by both faculty and graduates of programs, presumably those who have gone into industry. As programs expand and grow, there is opportunity for programs to increase the number of courses offered that focus on developing leadership skills specifically related to communication, interpersonal relationship building, and collaboration.
Finally, research on agricultural leadership programs should consider the role context and contextual expertise (Kellerman, 2014) has on leadership education in an agricultural context. To best meet the unique challenges of the agricultural industry, should coursework focus on leadership education through an agricultural lens? Research into this area would provide agricultural leadership faculty instructing graduate level courses insight into the need to introduce context specific areas like agriculture, natural resources, or Extension into the leadership education curriculum. This research can also provide best practices on how the curriculum can be revised to incorporate these contextual areas into the leadership coursework. It is possible that being housed within agricultural education departments in colleges of agricultural and life sciences is not enough if faculty members aren’t engaging students in examination of leadership challenges or development of skills specific to agricultural industry needs.

**Conclusion**

Over the past five decades, the number of agricultural leadership programs have continued to increase within higher education. Over that time, these programs continued to change and evolve to address the needs and interests of those in academia and industry. While those working within the discipline have recognized a need for research and possibly standardization within agricultural leadership programs, the research is still in its infancy. The current study looked to add to the body of knowledge on agricultural leadership programs by providing an overview of themes found in graduate level course descriptions. This research is a first step to address commonalities and differences within agricultural leadership programs and purposefully move the discipline forward.
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Abstract

Higher education institutions face fragmentation and inconsistency with the planning and execution of leadership development programs. Student affairs divisions are often charged with developing leadership programs to link scholarship and practice. This qualitative research study explored the desired leadership development outcomes and the interventions that are occurring in the context of student affairs. This study present valuable considerations for administrators and practitioners within higher education who seek to create a sustainable leadership development effort across disciplines and offices.

Introduction

Higher education has long been a place of development and learning for students. Ingrained in the roots of the American higher education culture, there is an expectation that institutions are helping shape the character and development of students in addition to providing a rigorous education. Institutions are called to create leaders for our society; (Komives & Woodard, 2003) however, many do not believe that outcome is being met. Leadership scholars have identified the U. S. as being in a leadership crisis (Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977), and, in that light, many solutions and theories have been put forth calling for leaders who demonstrate a variety of essential skills. Leadership educators have highlighted many different strategies including the use of adaptive techniques to solve complex problems (Heifetz, 1994), morale and motivation (Burns, 1978), or that a leader should understand himself/herself as a servant first (Greenleaf, 1977). While definitions and expectations of leadership continue to evolve, higher education institutions are held accountable by both government and society for the skill level and leadership capacity of their graduates. By emphasizing leadership development at higher education institutions, leadership programs will be able to capitalize on the movement toward prestige and preparing graduates to gain employment as effective members of the workforce (Fox, 2018).

This study identified the perceived desired outcomes and interventions of leadership development in Student Affairs. Through qualitative research, the study explored the desired outcomes for graduating students as it relates to leadership development and what interventions are used to contribute to leadership development among the student population.

Literature Review

Leveraging Leadership Development in Higher Education
There is an increasing sense of competition within higher education as institutions vie for positive reputations and prestige (Cutright, 2003). While there are various measures for success, one of the more prominent measures is the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher
Education, which defines itself as the “leading framework for recognizing and describing institutional diversity in U.S. higher education” (Carnegie, 2018, About the Carnegie Classification, para. 1). Additionally, U.S. News compiles national university rankings which are highly promoted among ranked colleges and universities and allow the public to compare and contrast the perceived worth of various institutions. Prospective students are choosing which institution to attend based on potential benefits from that institution and potential successful career outcomes (HERI, 2016). State funding for universities reinforces this competition with initiatives that define specific metrics and award institutions that meet the criteria.

In 2013 as part of the Florida Preeminence Initiative, the Florida legislature introduced Florida Senate Bill 1076 which outlined 12 academic and research excellence standards, of which at least 11 would be required to obtain preeminent status and to be eligible for additional funding (Hurdle, 2018). With an increased pressure for universities to not be left behind, internal and external forces place a burden on institutions to brand themselves in a crowded marketplace and stand apart from other institutions (Fay, 2016). While the pressure is often palpable, DiMaggio and Powell highlight the prospect of isomorphism and tendency toward this “constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions” (1983, p. 149). Leadership programs will continue to develop, and work to set themselves apart while aligning their work with the mission, vision, and values of national standards and the institution to which they belong. Developing high quality leadership programs will be important for higher education institutions and will provide them with an opportunity to be leaders in creating exemplary leadership programming, teaching, learning, and assessment that inform a nationally renowned status (Andenoro et. al., 2013).

Importance of Leadership Development Programs
As the value of the college degree consistently becomes heavily scrutinized (Brown et. al., 2014), higher education is turning to employers to identify skill sets needed for success after graduation. A research study conducted by Hart Research Associates (2015) found that employers perceive a skills gap between the competencies students are learning while attending university and the skills needed for their career. It was found that employers “feel college graduates are falling short in their preparedness in several areas, including the ones employers deem most important for workplace success” (Heart Research Associates, 2015, p.11). In recent years, institutions have begun to focus on the top attributes identified by employers as critical to success. These attributes include teamwork, problem-solving skills, written communication skills, strong work ethic, verbal communication skills, leadership, initiative, analytical and quantitative skills, flexibility/adaptability, detail oriented, interpersonal skills, and the ability to apply learning experiences to real-world settings (NACE, 2016, Heart Research Associates, 2015) with leadership being the highest ranked at 80.1% of respondents (NACE, 2016). While it is telling that leadership is clearly identified the most important attribute, many of the other attributes closely align with leadership frameworks (Fox, 2018). Institutions can leverage the need for graduating more effective leaders into support for leadership development programs. The need for strong leadership programs is clear; however, programs and centers have struggled to adequately position themselves within the university. Although developing leadership within the student body is an espoused goal of most institutions, few programs describe themselves as having achieved sustained institutionalization (Owen, 2012).
Current State of Leadership Development
Leadership educators at universities have worked with minimal resources and institutional support to create “complex, multi-faceted programs that make a profound difference in students’ lives” (Owen, 2012, p. 20). Undergraduate leadership centers can be found at the majority of top public and private institutions across the country and are often well-funded and well-staffed (Lunsford, 2016). Additionally, most leadership programs identify themselves as being grounded in post-industrial, relational, complex theoretical approaches to leadership, utilizing Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) Student Leadership Programs Standards (Owen, 2012). While leadership development programs are established at many institutions, there is still “incongruity between what is known about effective leadership education and what is enacted in programs” (Owen, 2012, p. 20). In one study (Lunsford, 2016), directors of leadership centers selected multiple guiding theories (six on average) and did not have a clear focus for their center. Additionally, the 2016 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership found that leadership program educators often lack proper leadership education themselves (Owen, 2012). Furthermore, it was noted that leadership centers do not participate in consistent strategic planning; do not utilize campus collaborations effectively; and do not leverage assessment findings to their full potential. These disconnects between scholarship and practice might result in fragmented efforts by leadership programs (Lunsford, 2016) and highlight a need for program improvement.

Much of the ambiguity of leadership development stems from tailoring an experience to the context in which a leadership development program is based. The CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education (2015) state that student leadership programs must be consistent with the mission and goals of the institution and must prepare students for leadership roles and responsibilities. While this places leadership development as a priority, the guidelines do not give clarity as to how programs should be tailored or executed (Peck, 2018). Eich (2008) found that high quality leadership programs participate in the formation of a sustained learning community, offering student-centered experiential learning experiences in addition to having continuous research-grounded program development. Identifying key attributes important to student learning can create increased focus for the leadership programs and aid in the development of new programs (Eich, 2008). Identifying those key attributes can be difficult, as shown in Seemiller’s work with student leadership competencies (2016). To narrow the focus of student leadership goals, Seemiller suggests narrowing the list to 6-10 competencies that reflect a model or theory; that are in alignment with the institutional mission, vision and values; that are part of a framework already being used by the institution; and/or that emphasize strengths or growth areas for specific experiences (Seemiller, 2016). With an increased focus on developing leaders within higher education, leadership education must focus on institutional goals and context when developing programs.

Methodology

Purpose and Objectives
The purpose of this study was to explore the role of leadership development in student affairs, and the connection between leadership development outcomes and programs within a division of student affairs. Leadership is an espoused goal for many universities and student affairs divisions across the country. This study was guided by the following research objectives:

1. Desired leadership development outcomes for graduating students
2. Interventions that are occurring and how they contribute to leadership development

Sample
This research study utilized an intensive case study approach to generate in-depth, detailed discovery within the bounded system of leadership development practices within a division of student affairs at a land-grant research institution in the Southeast. The study adhered to a purposive sampling strategy which allowed the researcher to select “individuals and sites for study because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 125). Applying a critical case sampling strategy in qualitative inquiry, this study highlights information “representing the most critical or relevant cases for transfer of findings” (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2016, p. 138) and allows for a rich landscape for identifying the desired leadership development outcomes and what interventions are occurring that contribute to leadership development.

Seven university employees were selected to participate in the study based on their expertise and knowledge with leadership development at the university. Members included selected faculty, staff, and administrators. As seen in Table 1, three of the participants had between 30-40 years of full-time professional student affairs experience. These participants included the Vice President, an Associate Vice President, and an Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs. One participant had 20-30 years of full time experience and served as an Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs. Three participants had 10 years and under of full-time experience, and served as staff members within Sorority and Fraternity Affairs, Student Government, and Multicultural and Diversity Affairs.

Table 1
Participant Codes and Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years of Full Time Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant A</td>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>30-40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant B</td>
<td>Associate Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>30-40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant C</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>30-40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant D</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>20-30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant E</td>
<td>Sorority and Fraternity Affairs Staff Member</td>
<td>Under 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant F</td>
<td>Student Government Staff Member</td>
<td>Under 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant G</td>
<td>Multicultural and Diversity Affairs Staff Member</td>
<td>Under 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection
A semi-structured face to face interview was conducted to allow for follow-up questions and a deeper understanding of the current context (Creswell, 2007). Personal interviews were recorded, and member checks were conducted to ensure confirmability and trustworthiness. Additional data was collected through digital materials and documents for triangulation purposes (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2016). Trustworthiness and validity were maintained through the process through the use of an audit trail and member checks. This allowed for participants to clarify or correct responses. It is important to note the researcher served as a full-time staff member within student...
affairs in the leadership office, and worked with colleagues outside of student affairs when analyzing the data to maintain objectivity.

Analysis
Data was analyzed through a holistic analysis (Yin, 2003) in which categorical aggregation (Yin, Merriam & Stake, 2009) provided an analysis of themes. Analysis focused on the research objectives and focused on the desired outcomes for graduating students as it relates to leadership development and the interventions that are occurring to support the desired outcomes.

Findings

RQ1: Desired Outcomes

Multiple paths to leadership. A key underpinning of the data shows that it was largely agreed among participants that there is “not a clear path” to effective leadership, and that the process is not singular in nature (Participant F). Administrators acknowledged differing styles of leadership can be effective, and that leadership is not defined by a specific position or trait. Participant A noted

There’s so many styles out there, so many ways to lead… And all those different styles are effective, but they’re different. I think the best student leaders are the ones who learn to have a variety of styles, to use not just one.

Leadership was largely described as a continual journey that takes time, mentorship, reflection, failure, and a multitude of different skills, styles, and traits. Participant B highlighted the continual nature of leadership development, stating, “I think I want them to know that you will never be perfect. There is no silver bullet or yellow brick road to becoming the most effective leader possible.”

Self-Awareness. The theme of self-awareness appeared throughout the data, and the idea of fully understanding one’s self. Participant A shared that “a major component of leadership is management of self.” Additionally, being knowledgeable of motivations, personal character, and how one engages in the world is an important component of leadership. Participant E highlighted this through a desire to have students better understand “What is the thing that you want to be invested in? Why do you care about those things? What made you want to be a part? What made you want to take part in whatever it is?”

Self-awareness was also described as a process, where levels of self-awareness change over time. Participant D explained this cyclical journey stating, “Definitely the self-awareness on the front end and probably somewhere near the back end understanding how to mentor others through that journey that always needs to start with some self-awareness.” The importance of a second person, or mentor, to share insights and help on increase self-awareness levels was seen as an important component that should occur on a consist basis.

Practical Application. A strong focus for desirable leadership outcomes included practical application for the students. Participant B noted that increasing one’s “skills in a competency that you know you’re going to need to reach your aspiration” was essential in leadership development, and Participant D wants students utilize their experience into practical
application by asking themselves “how do I apply that? And how does that impact my ability to lead, work with, or collaborate with others?” Skill building specifically for future aspirations including the work force was a strong focus and seen as a component of leadership development. Building abilities around communication, conflict management, and interpersonal skills were seen as areas needed for leadership development. Based on the responses, leadership development skills were seen as valuable when they could directly contribute to tangible application with a team, group, or situation.

**Relational.** In addition to leadership development needing to be future focused on a specific tangible outcome, it was also recognized that leadership outcomes should encourage a positive impact in relationships and in the community. This was called a “two-way street” by Participant E, who wants to highlight that the relational and reciprocal aspect of leadership is not often considered, stating “that’s the part of leadership that we don’t think about a lot is that it’s not just benefitting us or the people that we serve, but it should be a two-way street.” There was a desire for students to know how to have strong relational skills with others, and to use those relational skills to make a “contribution to you know positively impacting their community” (Participant D). This relational aspect also highlighted the importance of ethics and values in leadership development. As Participant C noted, “leadership education needs to be pretty comprehensive, it’s got ethical parts, it’s got individual parts, it’s got values, but it has to relate to others, and understand those and the interaction.”

**Reflection.** Frequent reflection on a student’s leadership development journey was seen as a large piece of continued growth and expansion of leadership capabilities. Administrators identified inward looking as an important component of leadership development. The importance of making meaning of how they lead, and what they want to do with their leadership capabilities was identified. Practitioners aiding in this reflection was identified as one of “the more important thing that all of us have the opportunity to do…to talk with the students we work with…about what their own leadership means to them” (Participant D). Additionally, continual “self-discovery” and deepening self-awareness was a critical component of a leader fully being able to grow and be effective in their current role and in the future (Participant E).

When considering reflection, the component of a student experiencing and learning from failure was impactful as it related to desired outcomes. The experience of failure being part of one’s success is based in reflection, and how imperative it is for students to not just experience, but learn from failure. The role of mentorship in failure is seen as a strong component that can guide a student through intentional reflection and learning from a failure experience.

Failure. I think that’s a big one for me…there are certain things that I will die on the heel for as far as like trying to get a student to understand that…I’m fine with the failure, and not because I don’t want to see you be successful, but I know this is going to be a part of your success” -Participant E

**RQ2: Interventions**

**Academic Connection.** Leadership development efforts were seen as an area that could have natural and impactful collaborations with academic units across campus, producing a “strong working relationship with one another” (Participant F). The division of student affairs identifies as “the place (students) get to apply” academic knowledge, and that a partnership
between academic curriculum, specifically the leadership coursework on campus, and programmatic initiatives would be highly beneficial to the student, coursework, and student affairs departments alike (Participant D).

**Mentorship.** Mentorship was seen as a tool within an intervention that should be utilized frequently in leadership development opportunities. Mentorship was seen as an intentional effort that allows for the mentor to ask probing and insightful questions to the student, and encourage them to consider their experience and what it means in the context of the leadership development. This also allows a space for constructive feedback to be used to “continue their evolution in leadership” (Participant C).

When I think about the practicality of leadership education, it’s really about being able to talk with someone, being able to sit down, delve into who they are as a person, and what do they love to do, what they don’t love to do, what areas do they wish to improve in, and also being able to help them fundamentally find a way to meet those needs in which they are missing in their leadership or capacity or just personal development. -Participant E

**Student-Led.** The perceived value of student led initiatives was clear, and believed to be where significant student learning takes place. In an applied experience, students leading other students toward a goal was an important way to have strong leadership learning take place, practice their leadership capabilities, and make them aware of challenges leaders face. Participant A noted “they’d have the opportunity to follow other students and see how that leadership-followership dynamic works.” Student-led initiatives was also seen as having “better buy-in from students” and a a strong motivator for the student population, and a way to get students excited and eager to practice their leadership capacity (Participant F).

A challenge around student led initiatives was a perception that student leaders who are in positional roles “don’t necessarily feel room for leadership education that is going to help them”, and already believe they are strong leaders. Some students are not receptive to leadership development effort aimed at helping them continue to grow and develop because they believe “they don’t need anything, they are perfect” (Participant F).

**Lack of Quality Interventions.** While themes around effective leadership development interventions were highlighted, a large theme was around the lack of quality interventions, and the reasoning behind the disconnect. While many programs were referenced, interventions seemed to have a lack of consistency or standard expectation across the division. Participant E noted that programs may be done out of “obligation” and had doubts on how well the division “evaluates some of those things” or ensure “that they make sense.” Participant F did not believe there was currently a leadership development program “with a curriculum” that “utilize and have detailed data that it works or has an impact.” Leadership development programs across the division lacked focus, and generally were not able to clearly show their goals or impact through evaluation.

There is also a lack of collaboration around leadership development. Areas within the division work on leadership development separately without addressing common goals or seriously considering ways to collaborate. While Participant G stated that they “value leadership
education” they noted that “we struggle with thinking we have to stay within our functional area within leadership development.” Efforts are not coordinated together, and there is not a common language or understanding around leadership development goals, outcomes, or how to implement effective leadership development programs. The value of a “unit office that can drive a common leadership” (Participant D) and a “more coordinated effort across campus” (Participant B) was also highlighted.

**Conclusion**

As previously mentioned, the literature indicated that institutions of higher learning face fragmentation and inconsistency with respect to the planning and execution of leadership development programs, particularly those realized by leadership centers or pertinent units within divisions of student affairs (Owen, 2012). The present study was successful in its endeavor to elicit administrative perspectives on leadership development outcomes for graduating students and the realization of successful interventions to further leadership development efforts. Indeed, the perspectives garnered are well-informed and provide a snapshot of quality views of leadership outcomes and present interventions that are helpful and meaningful to students in the present study’s research context (the university under study). Nevertheless, while data analysis for both questions has presented commonalities, and perhaps even a small degree of consensus, regarding the leadership development in the present study’s research context, the reality is that a formal, standardized, cross-disciplinary, and, above all, sustainable effort in carrying out the aforementioned interventions or attaining the purported outcomes warrants further consideration. There are a variety of reasons that might serve as the root cause for this situation. On the one hand, administrative perceptions of what constitutes guiding leadership theory generally differs. In addition, as noted by Owen (2012), program educators and administrators often lack the adequate leadership training and/or formal education generally perceived as complementary to carrying out leadership development initiatives. In the case of the present study’s participants, all have had different stops along their personal and professional academic walks. Furthermore, the points in time that they were exposed to any formal and/or nonformal leadership training differ and might not always reflect the most robust and current paradigms with respect to leadership theory and practice. While the consensus regarding prospective successful interventions and what presently constitutes a successful intervention in the given research context are helpful, the participants did not always make it apparent if such endeavors will continue to be carried out or realized at a future time. Indeed, thinking back to Seemiller’s 6-10 competencies (2016), it is reasonable to ponder whether the next steps for the participants’ university will be to codify leadership development outcomes and standardize leadership development practice and programming. Although not necessarily addressed by the participants themselves, it might be advisable to consider the student perspectives in this process as Eich’s work (2008) noted.

**Recommendations**

Moving forward, there are both practical as well as research recommendations as a result of the present study. Practically speaking, it is recommended that the present study be used as a launching point for the development of a formalized leadership development framework for the division of student affairs at the university under study. This should be inclusive of embedded theories, outcomes, and evaluations plans to ensure effectiveness, thoroughness, and
sustainability. In so doing, leadership development efforts will be better coordinated across the division of student affairs in question. Furthermore, leadership development program directors, educators, and students will benefit from a set of universally agreed upon leadership development outcomes.

In addition, it is recommended that, in light of the testimonies highlighted in the present study, interventions such as mentorship programs, student-led initiatives, and collaboration with academic units that teach or administer leadership development programs should be pursued as viable options for leadership development programming for the university under study. Not only will these be beneficial to the students that they are intended to serve, but they will also provide cohesion for the aforementioned division-wide leadership development framework and its implementation. These interventions will certainly need student and administrative input prior to their conception, but a paradigmatic/theoretical base will also be crucial. Special consideration should be given to the High-Impact Educational Practices (Kuh, 2008) as a prospective theoretical base as these interventions are developed.

The primary empirical application of this study relates to research transferability. Namely, as the literature has implied, leadership development as it is conceived by divisions of student affairs in various universities is disjointed. As such, this qualitative endeavor could be replicated and produce results equally as illuminating and helpful in other contexts as it was in the present one. Furthermore, the practical applications mentioned previously could also then be realized as the result of other studies such as the present one.
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The purpose of this innovative practice paper is to share a theory-driven approach to developing Congruence, an individual value of the Social Change Model of Leadership, among college student mentors and adolescent mentees. Specifically, we discuss the development and implementation of a leader development intervention with two parts: (a) a two-hour content block with interactive activities and an emphasis on discussion in the fall and (b) a small-group meeting with in-depth discussions in the spring. Grounded in theory, the intervention focused on identifying values in the self and others, recognizing congruent leadership, and considering a situation from the perspective of multiple values. The intervention will be evaluated based on the learning objectives. By providing an in-depth description of the intervention, as well as an evaluation strategy, the current innovative practice paper leadership educator to utilize this curriculum to facilitate a Congruence intervention in a curricular or co-curricular setting.
From talk to action: An appreciative inquiry approach to diversity and inclusion work within a community of practice

Roberta Maldonado Franzen, Kansas State University
Mac Benavides, Kansas State University

Abstract

There is growing interest in learning and development around diversity and inclusion (Hartwell et al., 2017). The Inter-Association Leadership Education Collaborative and National Leadership Education Research Agenda calls for increased awareness on diversity, inclusion, social identity, power, and systemic inequity efforts to be a priority for leadership educators (Andenoro & Skendall, 2020; Beatty et al., 2020; ILEC, 2016, p. 6). This practice paper will describe how a community of practice (CoP) emerged to further explore diversity and inclusion activities. Specifically, the action taken by the CoP to create a systematic approach to develop a leadership development program activity utilizing evidence-based practices. The CoP adapted the work of Dr. Eddie Moore and created a 28-Day Equity Challenge and examined four overarching topics: gender, (dis)ability, race and ethnicity, and becoming an ally (America & Moore, n.d.) The 28-day challenge incorporates leadership and learning theories: social change leadership, transformative leadership, and intercultural learning to advance the activity. The appreciative inquiry framework provides a solution-focused tool to further the conversation. Reflections and recommendations are explored.

Introduction

In recent decades, interest in learning and development around diversity and inclusion (D&I) has continued to rise across disciplines (Hartwell et al., 2017). Motivations behind this increased focus on including diverse perspectives often stem from an interest in the convergence of enhanced production and inclusive practices (Fine & Sojo, 2019; Park & Liu, 2014; Stevens et al., 2008). There seems to be consensus that cultivating students’ competence in navigating cultural differences is necessary to prepare the emerging workforce for success (Lantz-Deaton, 2017). However, focusing on employability or other extrinsic sources of motivation allows students and educators alike to settle for a more superficial commitment to diversity by which meaningful change is unlikely (Gilbert & Ivancevich, 2000).

The May 2020 events in Minneapolis, Minnesota, exposed the inadequacy of extrinsic approaches to D&I within leadership education. Racial unrest in the United States that followed sparked national awareness around the need to improve our collective understanding of racial inequity. What began as a public discourse around racial justice has expanded to include a broader consideration of the leadership needed to address inequitable systems as a practice of social responsibility (Dugan & Komives, 2010). Interweaving a sense of social responsibility into leadership development and education is not a new concept. However, recent racial unrest leads us to believe that we need a heightened commitment to theorizing and practicing leadership with a socially just lens. Within the United States, citizens across the nation are engaging in critical
conversations about D&I and the systems that foster inequalities and inequities. There is a renewed awareness of the need to shift our efforts from talk to action.

For leadership education, moving from talk to action means fostering safe spaces where students can explore diverse perspectives and engage in challenging dialogue (Chunoo et al., 2019). Helping students put the mantra of D&I into action aligns with the Inter-Association Leadership Education Collaborative (ILEC) priority: building inclusive leadership learning communities. Central to this priority is the idea that educators must recognize that “a gap exists between espoused and enacted values in our rhetoric, teaching, research, and service” (ILEC, 2016, p. 6). Building self and other awareness are paramount to addressing this gap and developing students’ capacity for engaging meaningfully in the work of D&I (Holliday, 2018). The focus on building awareness around topics of social identity, power, and systemic inequity also aligns with priority 1 of the recently updated National Leadership Education Research Agenda (Andenoro & Skendall, 2020; Beatty et al., 2020). This priority calls on researchers to “define how social identities relate to leadership education and the leadership process” (Beatty et al., 2020, p. 42).

This paper will describe how [author] brought students, faculty, and staff from a mid-western university and industry members from Minneapolis, MN, to establish a community of practice (CoP) committed to D&I. Through this effort, community members took steps to move beyond talk and put their learning into action. The CoP created a 28-Day Equity Challenge based on the work of Dr. Eddie Moore and examined four overarching topics: gender, (dis)ability, race and ethnicity, and becoming an ally (America & Moore, n.d.). We begin with an overview of our theoretical and pedagogical framework and then highlight strategies for moving from words to action – from theory to praxis – by incorporating strategic tools to ground D&I work. Finally, we will discuss the outcomes of practice and offer recommendations for leadership educators to take action.

**Theoretical and Pedagogical Framework**

Throughout this paper, we will explore three guiding principles that influence our theoretical and pedagogical framework: engage community, lead change, and advance communication. This approach establishes parameters for leadership educators to mobilize and inspire others to act. It is a perspective that demands collective leadership action toward creating a more just and equitable world and which recognizes the communicative and relational nature of leadership.

**Community of Practice**

Drawing on social learning theory (Omidvar & Kislov, 2014), a CoP creates an environment of learning and solutions-focused outcomes (Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002). For example, experienced people from academia and industry can come together to create a space to share what they know about leadership skills, thus forming a CoP. An effective CoP brings together people invested in resolving an issue while improving their knowledge and expertise through collaboration (Wenger et al., 2002). A leadership development program that blends partners’ knowledge and expertise may lead to new ways of proactively preparing skilled talent (Palmer et al., 2016). In this case, the CoP provided the opportunity to learn with and from others. It also allowed those engaged to hear from multiple perspectives to develop the awareness and understanding necessary to engage effectively in an increasingly diverse world. If knowledge is to
become the key to success, then the CoP can maintain its competitive edge by aiding in the growth of essential skills in future leaders.

This is critical because knowledge transfer to individuals can lift entire industries where common problems exist (National Association of College and Employers, 2016). Obtaining university and industry partners’ perspectives to help prepare the future workforce creates space to understand better the essential skills needed for change. Raelin (2016) suggested the future of leadership shifts towards collaborative agency that focuses on the community’s role to provide solutions, instead of one individual identified as the leader. This process supports deliberative dialogue and encourages everyone to have a voice, inspiring collective decision-making for the community (Post et al., 2016).

Three elements support a CoP: domain, community, and practice (Wenger et al., 2002). A domain consists of an action that creates shared purpose and encourages sharing knowledge and experiences to better the learning community (McCormick & Dooley, 2005; Wenger et al., 2002). In this practice, university and industry partners developing students to enter the workforce formed the domain. A community comprises interactions amongst people committed to learning and collaborating (McCormick & Dooley, 2005; Wenger et al., 2002). University and industry partners demonstrated such a commitment to this practice as they built trust and relationships through communication while developing a leadership development program. A practice expects to explore how to accomplish activities (McCormick & Dooley, 2005; Wenger et al., 2002). In this case, a university and industry partnership identified a leadership development framework for creating a D&I activity. Both parties engaged in a CoP and enhanced their skills by creating and evaluating a leadership development activity.

Social Change Leadership
The curriculum for this 28-day equity challenge was informed, in part, by the concept of social change leadership (Ospina et al., 2012). This leadership model leads change initiatives and mobilizes people to acknowledge current inequities, reimagine a future in which these do not exist, and then engage in the necessary work to achieve that vision. With a collective lens, the social change model seeks to “offer alternative narratives to counter a [traditional] leadership paradigm that ignores the wide range of experiences constituting the human condition” (Ospina, 2019, p. 155).

Practicing social change leadership – and other leadership perspectives that seek to benefit the collective – requires a foundation in the value of grounded humanism (Ospina et al., 2012). Grounded humanism goes beyond merely appreciating the humanity of all people and their potential to contribute to society. Instead, this appreciation is grounded in social awareness and a recognition of the need to reconstruct systems of power in more equitable ways. Social change leadership centers diversity at the heart of success by recognizing the “strategic value of difference” (Ospina & Foldy, 2010, p. 297).

Underlying the entire model are foundational understandings and values of social change. Ospina et al. (2012) explained that the work of social change requires that those exercising leadership (1) recognize that social issues are interconnected and rooted in structural and institutional inequities and (2) develop a core value in promoting equity and inclusion. By identifying social issues that inhibit community members or organizations’ inclusion, leadership actors come together to engage
in the leadership action required to envision and construct a reality that dismantles these barriers. To accomplish this, Parés et al. (2007) discussed how leadership for social innovation and social change must consider the relational ways that “the self and others are inseparable and coevolve as they coexist” (p. 14).

One component we suggest is missing from this model is the work required to arrive at a place where grounded humanism can take hold and flourish. The model assumes that social change is a priority or that social inequity is a priority. To address this gap, [author] intentionally designed the 28-day equity challenge to expose the CoP to issues facing people within their local communities, engage the community in exploring human interconnectedness, and mobilize the community to move beyond a passive understanding of allyship. In doing so, the CoP explored leadership as a practice of transformation.

**Transformative Leadership**

Another model of leadership that informed this project was transformative leadership (Weiner, 2003). This theory “begins with questions of justice and democracy; it critiques inequitable practices and offers the promise not only of greater individual achievement but of a better life lived in common with others” (Shields, 2010, p. 559). Caldwell et al. (2012) described transformative leadership as “an ethically-based leadership model that integrates a commitment to values and outcomes by optimizing the long-term interests of stakeholders and society and honoring the moral duties owed by organizations to their stakeholders” (p. 176). Cultivating learners’ commitment to values of equity by strengthening their sense of human interconnectedness is one way transformative leadership theory as a pedagogy sets the stage for social change to occur.

Benavides et al. (2020) suggested that “teaching transformative leadership starts with helping students develop critical thinking skills” (p. 112), which encourages them to consider how they can contribute to transforming inequitable systems. By engaging students in critical reflection, they can understand how they are embedded within these systems and how they are implicated in the inequities that the status quo creates. However, this increased awareness does not necessarily translate into action toward disrupting and dismantling inequity. Bruce et al. (2019) described transformative leadership in action as a developmental process. Especially when dealing with complex issues like inequity, leadership learners begin their journey with conscientization (Freire, 1970) and move towards action. Bruce et al. (2019) explained that:

> when using the skills of transformative leadership to confront the pressing issues of justice, equity, and liberation, individuals are on a continuum where they start with the identity of learner and work toward ever increasing active and visible identities (ally, advocate, activist). (p. 537).

Montuori and Donnelly (2017) explained that “at the core of transformative leadership are four orienting concepts, being, relating, knowing, and doing” (p. 1). With Bruce et al.’s (2019) model in mind, learning about our own and others’ ways of being, relating, knowing, and doing sets the stage for collectively making progress on social issues. This foundation of knowledge, coupled with empathy and humility, encourages learners to act. However, it is important to note that ethnocentrism is on the rise across the Western world (Bizumic et al., 2020), which can severely hinder the ability to meaningfully engage with cultural, philosophical, and ideological differences.
In other words, moving beyond learning and into action will be unlikely without intentional attention to developing intercultural humility.

**Intercultural Learning**

Intercultural learning is an excellent overlay to teaching leadership (Hobson et al., 2020). This transformative approach to learning about cultural similarities and differences acknowledges ways that ethnocentric and ethnorelative orientations affect the inclusion of diverse voices (Bennett, 2004). It deepens the conversation around change initiatives and encourages those involved to question how to approach their work critically. Additionally, the developmental nature of intercultural learning invites leadership educators to design learning experiences appropriately. We must remember that acknowledging, identifying, understanding, and adapting to social inequity are all developmental tasks that cannot reasonably be expected of leadership learners and practitioners who have not yet developed an ethnorelative mindset.

The basic concept of intercultural learning is developing capacity to understand and adapt perspectives and behavior appropriately to meet the situation in which people find themselves (Hammer, 2012). While many terms are used to describe the outcome of intercultural learning (e.g., competence, sensitivity, capacity, and awareness), we embrace the notion of humility as the foundation for interculturality. A widely accepted tenet of intercultural learning is the capacity to engage in perspective-taking (Deardorff, 2011). Humbly taking on others’ perspectives requires that we first accept that our socialization—that is, our own culturally normative ways of being, relating, knowing, and doing—is neither the only acceptable way nor the only right way to approach a given situation. Throughout the 28-day challenge, the CoP was encouraged to withhold initial sensations of judgment and instead lean into practices of empathy and curiosity. Given the collective nature of social change and transformative leadership, developing intercultural humility sets learners up for meaningful engagement in the learning and doing processes of change.

**Appreciative Inquiry**

Appreciative inquiry (AI) was introduced over 40 years ago and continues to evolve as a resource for driving change (Magruder, 2011). Coghlan et al. (2003) advanced this discussion by writing, “appreciative inquiry is an approach to seeking what is right in an organization in order to create a better future for it” (p. 5). In other words, AI provides a mechanism to explore what is working well and supports the practice of continuous improvement. As learners move through the five components of AI, they (1) define their work by identifying a topic or explore what to inquire about; (2) discover the best of what currently is; (3) dream about possibilities of what could be; (4) design that better future and steps to get there; and (5) inspire and mobilize others to act toward that destiny (Coghlan et al., 2003; Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Hammond, 2013; Priest et al., 2013). The five stages of AI provide a roadmap to guide the continuous improvement process through facilitation.

Practices of AI are examples of dialogic discourse, which focuses on the rhetoric to communicate (Carroll et al., 2015). For instance, a facilitator may mobilize others to co-create solutions by providing a space to share previous experiences of success. The facilitator may utilize the AI model, asking a question: *Tell me about a time you participated in an activity where the facilitator created an engaging environment. What made it a supportive learning atmosphere?* Rooted in social constructionism, AI can lead to a positive change in relationships (Marshak &
Grant, 2008) and strengthen partnerships with intentional and purposeful intervention through discourse. In Fairhurst and Grant’s (2010) view, “appreciative inquiry recognizes the power of language to help construct a more positive, life-affirming way to lead organizations” (p. 185). The model is a tool to strengthen the communication between participants. It serves as another learning experience because individuals observe a unique way to be curious and frame questions to seek input from others positively.

A CoP creates a systematic approach to develop a leadership development program activity utilizing evidence-based practices. The authors found it beneficial to incorporate leadership and learning theories: social change leadership, transformative leadership, and intercultural learning to advance the activity. AI provides a solution-focused tool to further the conversation.

Description of Practice

This paper examines the partnership between a public land-grant institution in the Midwest region of the United States (university partner) and a privately held corporation based in Minneapolis, Minnesota and focused on providing creative and proactive solutions (industry partner). The CoP developed the Industry Fellowship Program, a supportive environment to prepare and empower students to lead in their community. The goal of the program was to identify a cohort of undergraduate students in their junior year and engage them in leadership development activities.

Following the aftermath of the death of George Floyd in 2020, the industry partner shared that they sought an opportunity to inspire students to learn more about inequitable systems. To accomplish this, they wanted to create an experience that would educate undergraduate students about this topic. The university partners were similarly committed to developing students’ capacity to lead in a diverse environment. Therefore, the two entities established a CoP with plans to design and deliver an activity to support D&I efforts.

This paper will highlight one specific D&I activity implemented by the CoP. The CoP identified one learning outcome for the 28-day challenge: students will demonstrate awareness of the skills and the self-understanding necessary to live and work in a diverse world (Maldonado Franzen, 2020).

Overview of 28-Day Challenge

After the murder of George Floyd in 2020, a member of the CoP wanted to learn more about social injustices impacting the nation. This person remained curious and participated in the 21-day challenge designed by Dr. Eddie Moore (America & Moore, n.d.). During a CoP brainstorming discussion on incorporating D&I curricula, he mentioned how impactful the experience was for him and encouraged others to partake. This resulted in the adaptation of Dr. Moore’s challenge for students.

The 28-Day Challenge consisted of daily activities and small and large group discussions. The daily activities allowed students to explore topics individually through short assignments over 28 consecutive days, incorporating readings, videos, or podcasts. Following these independent learning activities, the CoP then provided space for a small group discussion with their peers. To conclude the challenge, the CoP identified a panel of industry partner employees to engage in a large group conversation about the topics.

Daily Activities
Students received a daily tracking form to document their learning experiences (America & Moore, n.d.; Figure 1). Each day students would participate in reading, listening, watching, connecting, or engaging in program activities, followed by critical reflection over their learning.

**Figure 1**

*The 28-Day Challenge Personal Reflection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Listen</th>
<th>Watch</th>
<th>Connect</th>
<th>Engage</th>
<th>Reflect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This is a condensed example of the daily tracking form students received to document their learning throughout the 28-Day Challenge. Adapted from America & Moore, n.d.

The CoP designed a 28-day challenge based on Dr. Moore’s 21-day challenge. The CoP identified seven short readings, videos, and other resources correlating with the week’s theme (Table 1) and provided this information to students. The first theme focused on exploring and recognizing multiple gender inequities. The purpose was to introduce students to the intersectionality of issues affecting people from various gender identities. The second week invited exploration of ability status to expand students’ understanding of lived experiences of people with disabilities. The third week introduced history through the lens of systemic racism, during which students explored racialized experiences impacting Black, LatinX, Asian, and Native American communities. The fourth theme transitioned from building awareness to acting. Students learned about allyship, and we focused learning around building capacity and agency.

**Table 1**

*Overview of 28-Day Equity Habit Building Challenge*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Example of Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Exploring and recognizing multiple gender identities</td>
<td>To Watch: What is intersectionality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Read: How equality and equity are different and why it matters in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Read: Economic inequity by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Read: Understanding the transgender community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Connect: Complete Safe Zone training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Education Perspective: Learn more about university Safe Zone programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry Perspective: Taking Pride everywhere we work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Small Group Discussion

Two  An exploration of abilities

To Read: Ableism and the academy: What college has taught me about my disabled body
To Read: Employers and the ADA: Myths and facts
To Read: Disability language style guide
To Read: Disability etiquette
To Engage: Differences make us stronger

Higher Education Perspective: University Student Access Center

Industry Perspective: Mental health awareness statistics

Small Group Discussion

Three  History through the lens of systemic racism

To Watch: Systemic racism explained
To Watch: 50 states, 50 different ways of teaching America’s past
To Watch: The disturbing history of the suburbs
To Engage: Participate in an International Coffee Hour event
To Engage: Attend Indigenous Peoples Day conference

Higher Education Perspective: Leading after a racial crisis: Weaving a campus tapestry of diversity and inclusion

Industry Perspective: Putting people first: Standing up against racial violence, hatred, and discrimination

Additional Resources:

To Watch: Netflix series, Gentefied
To Watch: ABC series, black-ish (highlighted episodes: Hope, Black like us, and Juneteenth)

Small Group Discussion

Four  Being an Ally

To Read: The four A’s on Anti-racism
To Read: Guide to allyship
To Watch: Inclusion starts with “I”
To Watch: All that we share

To Engage: Implicit bias test

To Read: Making people aware of their implicit biases doesn’t usually change minds. But here’s what does work

Higher Education Perspective: Driving campus diversity one decision at a time

Industry Perspective: Making strides on creating a healthier workplace

Large Group Discussion with Industry Partner

Note. Adapted from America & Moore, n.d.

Small Group Discussions

After completing activities related to the week's theme, students participated in small group discussions to debrief with their peers. However, before these discussions could effectively be facilitated, students needed an opportunity to create a sense of community and build trust with their peers. In doing so, the debriefing and application stages of the practice fostered a safe and creative space for dialogue and action.

By creating a sense of community, we provided a space for students to share their commitments as they engaged in the learning experience. Students were encouraged 1) to join the conversation by being curious and exploring conflicting viewpoints, 2) to seek to understand by listening with empathy, 3) to appreciate communication differences, and 4) to embrace the courage it takes to participate in this conversation. They received communication that this was a learning community experience for them and their peers, and we provided recommendations for strategies to initiate, maintain, and conclude small group discussion.

Each week, students engaged in small group discussions around the weekly topic. To continue to build on the foundation of trust they developed early on, students worked with the same group of three peers throughout the 28-Day challenge. The industry partner did not engage in these weekly conversations to allow students the opportunity to express their values and vulnerabilities openly. The small group discussions’ guiding questions were informed by two AI stages, discover and dream (Table 2). Students revisited these same questions each week to strengthen students’ capacity to conduct appreciate inquiry analysis of each topic.
Table 2

*Question Identified By Appreciative Inquiry Stages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciative Inquiry Stage</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discover “What is?”</td>
<td>Thinking back on your experience with the daily activities, what was your most memorable learning experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discover “What is?”</td>
<td>Again, reflecting on your daily experiences, remember an activity that helped you identify areas of growth. How has the activity helped you identify areas of growth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream “What could be?”</td>
<td>Let us think about the future. In what ways would you like to continue to develop your ability to lead others on this week’s theme: [insert weekly theme]?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large Group Discussion with Industry Partner

At the end of the 28-Day Challenge experience, students participated in a question and answer session with panelists from the industry partner. This opportunity to engage with our industry partner provided students space to consider how to apply their learning around these topics in professional settings. The students engaged panelists with questions about the diverse and inclusive culture and initiatives at the workplace (see sample questions in Table 3).

Table 3

*Question Created By Students For Large Group Discussion With Industry Partners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Appreciative Inquiry Stage</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Discover/Dream</td>
<td>As we transition to today’s topic, can you share why you start meetings with a moment of reflection on diversity or inclusion topics? How has that practice influenced conversations around the topic of diversity and inclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, Abilities, and Racism</td>
<td>Discover</td>
<td>What action items does the organization implement to increase diversity in leadership roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an Ally</td>
<td>Dream</td>
<td>How does the organization expect employees to address situations where they observe colleagues engaging in racism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td>Discover</td>
<td>What resources does the organization have to ensure that the workplace is functional and inclusive to people of all abilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Outcomes

Through this D&I initiative, industry and university partners adapted Dr. Moore’s activity and implemented the 28-day challenge for students. Additionally, they engaged in an activity to support others’ learning environment. The coordinating members of the CoP benefited from the experience in an unintentional way. In a few incidents, industry partners participated in the 28-day
challenge individually and then shared the activity with their peers. Afterward, they reflected that the experience built a sense of community within their workplace. The participants expressed that the 28-day challenge created opportunities to engage in difficult discussions on inequity and to explore the topic with others in a professional setting. As a result, they established another professional network to progress intercultural learning.

Additionally, the university partner benefited from the activity by experimenting with intercultural learning and AI practices. Specifically, researching activities for weekly themes that supported and expanded learning from multiple perspectives. There was value in incorporating higher education and industry perspectives on each theme. Also, leveraging this learning experience as a building block for future activities by encouraging critical thinking amongst the students. The university partner drafted the AI questions for the small group discussions, observed students’ interactions, and found it rewarding to observe their progress.

Another outcome that influenced students’ ability to practice new skills was AI. The AI framework utilized each week and facilitated by students also created a learning space to engage others through curiosity. Students received questions to explore during small group discussions, and they led those conversations using these pre-determined questions. Students were empowered to develop questions to ask a panel of four industry partners during the large group conversation. As shown in Table 3, students created questions to guide the large group discussion. Questions to industry panelists were action-oriented and related to the weekly themes. Without being guided or influenced, students’ questions emerged organically and leveraged the discover and dream stages of AI. Furthermore, this experience engaged students in raising awareness as one step to taking action. This is consistent with the journey of D&I efforts as a progressive experience incorporated through many learning activities. While conscientization was the primary outcome for students engaged in this case, this challenge was just one part of the CoP larger commitment to action.

Reflections of the Practitioner

Leadership educators can influence talk to action by incorporating three guiding principles:

- **Engage community.** Everyone can address issues around inequities by inspiring action within personal/professional networks and communities. These actions can begin with a horrible incident like the murder of George Floyd and empower people to engage others about next steps. However, by developing students' commitment to grounded humanism, leadership educators can avoid waiting until the next high-profile example of inequity and mobilize students to create change today. In this case, the inspiration for the 28-day challenge started with a curious industry partner. A member of the CoP recommended that students experience the 28-day challenge, and protests in Minneapolis, MN influenced this engagement. To further extend the discussion around engaging community, the CoP can include students’ perspectives in developing and implementing learning activities.

- **Lead change.** Everyone can take steps to influence others to make meaningful and sustainable change. Sometimes it is daunting to do D&I work, and the 28-day challenge intentionally focused on challenging assumptions around intercultural learning. It created the space for learners to read, listen, watch, connect, engage, and then reflect. Each activity created space to act. To further develop social change leadership, the CoP can build into
the curriculum the expectation that students incorporate the 28-day challenge within their networks.

- **Advance communication.** Sometimes, actions begin with encouraging dialogue and applying learning. AI and transformative leadership support both practices by teaching others how to frame questions positively and with curiosity. Each conversation can shift individual understandings and turn talk into action for continuous learning and change. To further advance communication, the CoP can explore opportunities to integrate other stages of AI in future engagements. For example, incorporating the other stages (define, design, and destiny) could offer space for students to design ways to act on their increased social awareness.

An important lesson learned is the impact of D&I experience within the program. This challenge builds the foundation for future learning experiences, such as case studies. Therefore, the timing of the activity should occur early in the process. Case studies engage students in the critical thought process. Specifically, students prepare solutions to complex and challenging issues impacting a diverse workplace (Maldonado Franzen, 2020). Therefore, the 28-day challenge can raise awareness now and influence the decision-making process in the future.

**Recommendations**

This practice paper emphasizes that partners in industry and academia can collaborate to explore evidence-based theories to advance students’ learning. Leadership educators can achieve the ILEC priority to help build inclusive leadership learning communities for students by creating an environment to explore inclusive practices and embrace equity-minded learning. The following are recommendations to pursue this goal:

- **Engage Community.** To engage communities, involve various communities with a shared vision of developing others. Creating a CoP with an industry partner committed to participating in a learning community and sharing their expertise can merge best practices and renew energy on the topic.

- **Lead Change.** To advance social change leadership, incorporate intercultural learning throughout all educational programs. When elements of D&I are part of the culture, it demonstrates leading by example. Furthermore, institutionalizing D&I within the culture can serve as the building blocks for future learning through other program activities. Leadership educators can also operationalize AI as a tool for diagnosing current inequities and designing interventions that lead to social change.

- **Advance Communication.** Embrace transformative leadership by teaching how to engage in difficult dialogue through a strengths-based approach. AI and intercultural learning also serve as mechanisms to actively contribute to students’ capacity for challenging conversations.

Now is the time to shift the landscape and raise awareness of systems that create inequities in our environment. Let us create a safe space to explore and listen to others’ curiosity on difficult and challenging topics. Furthermore, embedding D&I into the foundation of our work rather than compartmentalizing it into one class, one unit, or one meeting can lead to change. Everyone can
listen and learn. What is more important is that learners apply their learnings throughout their communities and feel empowered to address inequity.
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Abstract

This innovative practice paper explores a theoretical framework supporting leadership self-assessments — leadership self-efficacy theory. The paper describes the theory’s application in an exemplar self-assessment instrument and explains our approach to understanding the inner workings of assessments by creating and testing our own.
Building an e-Leadership Toolbox: An Online Exercise Equipping Students with Digital Tools for Leadership Development

Kathryn Woods, Austin Peay State University

Abstract

The purpose of this application manuscript is to explore an assignment given to students in an online leadership development graduate course as a tool to help them synthesize the concept of e-leadership, beyond the management of online teams. The assignment directs students to develop a “tool” for leadership development as a first step toward curating a larger-scale “e-leadership toolbox” that could serve as a portfolio of resources designed to help them develop and thrive as leaders in a digital environment. The featured assignment for this course directs students to describe how they could create and leverage a virtual board of directors, implement and reflect on personal branding efforts, or find value in e-mentorship strategies. Students use this assignment as an opportunity to apply the course material that relates to strategies used to cultivate accountability in the leadership development process. The assignment encourages students to think critically about course concepts and provides an opportunity to apply the concepts directly to their roles in their current or desired future workplace or industry. Reflecting on the assignment has allowed this researcher to provide recommendations intended to inspire creative ideas and inform curricular best practices in online (and often interdisciplinary) leadership programs that seek to prepare students to thrive in technology-mediated work environments.
Teaching Leadership Skills for Cross-Sector Partnerships

Barbara W. Altman, Texas A&M University-Central Texas

Abstract

This paper will describe the pedagogical approach and activities of a new leadership class designed to teach graduate students in a College of Business Administration the skills necessary to participate in cross-sector partnerships. These partnerships involve semi-structured relationships between organizations representing different sectors, which could be government, business, non-profit, or civil society. The specific application is leadership skills to achieve improved sustainability. Sustainable development goal (SDG) 17 proposes that cross-sector partnership are necessary to solve many of the other SDGs, however how to form, maintain and succeed at such partnerships is not fully explored in the literature. Recent studies show many of these partnerships fail. Leadership skills to run and participate in cross-sector partnerships are critical skills if we are to succeed at solving a variety of global social issues. This paper reviews the relevant leadership theories and leadership education studies relevant to forming and succeeding at cross-sector partnerships. How this prior research informed the basis of the class is discussed. The format of the new course, readings, high impact activities and results of the first experience running the class are presented. Participants in the conference session will receive the Syllabus for the class. While intended for graduate students in a Leadership for Sustainability program, many of the components of the class could be adapted to other leadership classes, as the ability to work across sectors is a very important leadership skill in today’s complex environment.

Introduction

Leaders are called upon to solve complex issues at the global level. Sometimes described as “wicked” (Churchman, 1967) problems, these complex social issues cannot be solved within just one sector, be it business, government, non-profit or civil society. Wicked global social issues require innovative cross-sector partnerships to design and implement solutions (Waddock, 1989). One set of these wicked issues is solutions to environmental sustainability, as laid out in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

There are calls for higher education to play a critical role in helping achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Arruda Filho, 2017; Sedlacek, 2013). Mader and Rammel (2015) specifically mention the need for higher education to adopt different approaches to teach innovative approaches to five SDG’s. SDG17 is among these. As articulated by the United Nations, SDG 17 is “strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.” (https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg17).

The literature on environmental partnerships and collaborations document only a slight majority are successful, many fail. In one of the largest studies on this topic, based on a survey of over 2,500 corporate executives, collaborators at MIT, the Boston Consulting Group and the UN Global Compact (Kiron et al., 2015), point out that:
Corporate sustainability is moving steadily from the old model – comprised primarily of ad hoc or opportunistic efforts that often produced tense relationships with the public sector – towards strategic and transformational initiatives that engage multiple entities. (Kiron et al., 2015, p. 5).

The researchers conclude that business managers have a rising awareness that they cannot address sustainability issues alone yet only 47% of those sampled had attempted cross-sector partnerships and of those that had, only 61% claim any success.

The United Nations has organized several initiatives to operationalize SDG 17. For example, it publishes a yearly “Partnership Exchange” report for information sharing on successful partnerships. The 2018 report concludes, “Achieving the level and quality of partnering required to deliver the SDG’s requires a significant and targeting effort to build an enabling environment for partnering.” (UNDESA, 2018, p.3) They point out that the key element of building this enabling environment involves skills building to train leaders who can accomplish these partnerships. The “Partnering Initiative” is another United Nations program and its newer reports do begin to speak to leadership skills (The Partnership Initiative, 2020).

While the literature on cross-sector partnerships has grown significantly (Clark & Crane, 2018), it has tended to focus on areas other than its connection to leadership skills. Research has heavily focused on partnerships governance and organizing models (Austin & Seitanidi, 2018; Bryson et al., 2015; Seitanidi & Crane, 2009; Wassmer et al., 2017), and the impacts of cross-sector partnerships (Kiron et al., 2015; Van Tulder et al., 2016; Seitanidi, et al., 2010).

While the work on the leadership skills which will support better success for cross-sector partnerships is only starting to emerge, largely driven by work by the United Nations, and higher education based centers for sustainability, there is transferable knowledge from related fields of leadership than can inform this challenge. The remainder of this paper will describe a new graduate leadership course in “Cross-sector Partnerships for Sustainability” that draws on multiple leadership theories and applied research to train business graduate students to lead and succeed working toward SDG 17. The remainder of this paper will describe the course in some detail and the results of the inaugural class experience.

Background

This graduate class is part of a new graduate leadership program in “Leadership for Sustainability” within a regional public university’s College of Business Administration. This program follows a similar pattern to another new graduate leadership program addressing the need for transformational leaders that can operate successfully at a number of levels, with the top being the global sphere (Rhee & Honeycutt Sigler, T., 2020). Like the formation of the new graduate program described by Rhee and Honeycutt Sigler, the faculty task force charged with designing the “Leadership for Sustainability” curriculum, was intentional in striving for graduates who would be self-aware and who would achieve an understanding of complex issues at many levels of analysis, including the inter-organizational and systems levels. These individuals would need to be both change agents and social entrepreneurs to address the issues inherent in the SDGs. The Cross-sector Partnerships class was deliberately included in the curriculum to build awareness of a multi-sector approach. Also, like the program Rhee and Honeycutt Sigler describe, experiential activities were included as a critical part of our program.
The new graduate program launched fall 2018 however, the first section of the partnerships class not offered until fall of 2020. The class is intended for students near the end of their coursework when they are fully versed in sustainability issues and have completed courses in organizational behavior and organizational change and development.

The course designer spent over a year developing this course. The goals for the development process included:

1. Finding leadership theories that were both conceptually relevant but that could inform practice.
2. Balancing readings from the business, non-profit and public sector perspectives to build sensitivity to different perspectives.
3. Strong applied cases that demonstrate both successes and failures.
4. Designing high impact experiential exercises that would promote deeper thinking and understanding.

After an extensive review of related streams of leadership theory, the designer and instructor of this class decided on grounding the class readings in three streams of leadership theory. First is work on “responsible leadership”. As explained by Maak and Pless (2006, p. 104) responsible leadership “is the art of building and sustaining good relationships with all relevant stakeholders.” Heavily based in stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility, this definition of leadership is very relevant to work in partnerships and sustainability. Maak and Pless outline the various roles responsible leaders must undertake including: visionary, servant, steward and citizen; and the skills they need in their toolkit: change agent, storyteller and meaning enabler, coach and architect. Pless and Maak (2011) build on multiple empirical works that attempt to measure, further define and explain responsible leadership as a relational phenomenon between leaders and stakeholders.

The second stream of leadership theory relevant to cross-sector partnerships is “systems leadership.” This field draws heavily on work by Senge and his colleagues (Senge et al, 2015) that defines systems leadership as “those who catalyze collective leadership, to address society’s most intractable problems.” They identify three core capabilities that systems leaders demonstrate: 1) the ability to see the larger system; 2) the ability to engage in deep reflective thinking opening up to alternative mental models; and 3) a focus on co-creating the future as opposed to reactive problem solving. Drawing heavily on Senge’s seminal work on organizational learning (Senge, 1990), the systems leadership model has expanded to its own network and multiple consultancies (https://www.academyforchange.org/). In an important linkage for this class, the UN Partnering Initiative draws heavily on this work.

The third and final stream of leadership theory relevant to cross-sector partnerships is work by public sector leadership scholars on “Integrative Leadership” (Bryson et al, 2015; Crosby & Bryson, 2010). Integrative leadership attempts to move beyond traditional leadership theories by espousing an explicitly collaborative model, leaders bringing together – “diverse groups and organizations together in semi-permanent ways, and typically across-sector boundaries, to remedy complex public problems and achieve the common good” (Crosby & Bryson, 2010, p. 211). This model of leadership focuses on the skills leaders need to form and maintain successful partnerships, for example, ability to deal with turbulent environments, a belief that multiple
sectors are needed to solve certain issues, commitment to full stakeholder analyses, trust building capacity, an openness to negotiating between partners, dealing with power imbalances, practicing resilience, and managing conflict effectively. Newer work on integrative leadership (Sun & Anderson, 2012) extends integrative leadership theory to weave in aspects of transformational leadership and define a specialized skill of civic capacity. In an empirical examination of Sun and Anderson’s hypotheses concerning civic capacity, Soria et al. (2015) investigated whether higher education institutions civic engagement and multicultural programming contributed to college seniors’ development of an integrative leadership orientation. Their study did find a positive correlation.

Beyond theoretical grounding, the course designer wanted the course to have a heavy experiential component, given high impact practices promote deeper understanding of complex issues (Andreu et al., 2020). Weaving together extensive readings and high impact practices together in one class that was not overwhelming for students was a key goal. The Instructor strived to choose readings and activities intentionally, an approach Jenkins (2020) in his review of the best practices leadership educators use in their classes, notes as important.

**Description of the Practice**

The class ran for the first time fall 2020. The learning objectives for the course, as shown in the course syllabus are:

- **Upon successful completion of this course, students should be able to:**

  1. Identify and describe the range of partnerships being utilized to realize Sustainable Development Goal #17.
  2. Identify and describe the skill sets necessary to lead and/or participate in a successful cross-sector partnership.
  3. Summarize the state of knowledge related to factors that promote or inhibit successful formation and implementation of cross-sector partnerships.
  4. Evaluate case studies of sustainability partnerships to discern qualities that promote success.
  5. Evaluate case studies of sustainability partnership efforts to identify challenges and opportunities for intervention.
  6. Reflect on personal leadership abilities and identify developmental activities to increase effectiveness in cross-sector partnership efforts.
  7. Conduct field research to write a case of a cross-sector partnership in the region.

Designed originally to be a hybrid or blended class that would meet biweekly face to face for 3 hours in the evening, and have online content in between, the face component of the class converted to online synchronous sessions via Zoom web-conferencing due to the pandemic. This blended format with biweekly meetings is optimal as it focuses class sessions on discussions critical to deeper understanding of the topics. The format is also very popular with students who live further from campus and are juggling work, family and school.

The 15-week class has three distinct parts. The first six weeks were text based, with extensive readings. A text based on a collection of research articles on partnerships was used (Seitanidi & Crane 2014). In addition, a library eReserves site with a long list of articles was offered for
students. Readings were divided into “core” readings, assigned to all students and “supplemental” readings. Each student was required to present a supplemental reading once during the semester. These readings, while offering insights into partnerships, were tangential. As a graded assignment, the supplemental presentations required students to summarize the findings in their assigned article and discuss how it added to the core readings for that week.

Weekly modules were organized as follows: 1) Calls for a Partnership Approach; 2) Overview – the State of Knowledge; 3) Leadership Models for Collaboration; 4) Leadership Models continued; 5) Perspectives from the Sectors; and 6) Barriers/Obstacles and Overcoming Them. In-class sessions were designed around assigned discussion questions based on the readings. Online weeks included readings coupled with Discussion Forums and reflective journal assignments. One journal assignment challenged students to identify their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the skills described in the readings. In another journal, students assessed their preparedness to work across-sector lines given their prior work and volunteer experiences. Mini-case studies mixed with heavily theoretical readings several weeks to keep students engaged. The UN partnerships web sites were particularly timely and helpful with these mini-case studies.

As a culminating exercise for this portion of the class students had to write a “Themes Paper” identifying what for them were the most important determining factors for success in a partnership and the leadership skills that promoted those factors. The Syllabus description of this paper:

*All of the assigned background readings will offer varying perspectives on the critical components and processes necessary to have successful cross-sector partnerships. In this paper, students will analyze and track readings for these factors and compose a combined analysis of these features. Early in the semester, students will submit a preliminary analysis to gain feedback on an outline they will use for the paper. After all the readings are completed, the full themes paper will be due.*

The second section of the class lasted four weeks and consisted of a series of partnership cases. Chosen from several well-known case depositories these were complex global cases on several different environmental issues. One of the cases included a separate role play/negotiation exercise that was interesting and a bit of a challenge to complete online but the class had fun with it.

In the final section of the class, lasting five weeks, students conducted field research and wrote two new case studies on local partnerships. The Instructor had sought out and gained the cooperation of two local sustainability partnerships prior to the class for this purpose. Students participated in the research design and the IRB (Instructional Review Board) protocol process, including taking CITI training, as required by the IRB. Students worked with the Instructor to design an interview guide (Exhibit 1), drawing on the themes they identified from the readings. Students learning the IRB process was a side benefit, that students were exposed to the IRB process and the federal requirements for human subjects research.

Working on the case study research began with representatives from the chosen partnerships joining a class session introducing their partnerships and answering questions from the students. Students then choose which partnership case study they wanted to work on. They formed groups...
and then scheduled and conducted interviews with the key leaders of the partnerships, as identified in class sessions. Students transcribed the interviews and wrote up their group’s case study as the final assignment for the class. This experiential experience was critical to students’ learning, as they met with individuals leading partnerships and challenged with many of the issues they read about either in early readings or the published case studies.

Discussion of Outcomes/Results

The student evaluations of the class were among the best the Instructor has ever received. On a five-point scale, of the students that completed the end of semester evaluation (87%), all factors unanimously received a five rating. Representative comments were:

- This was a great course as partnerships are the key to a sustainable future.
- The coursework was really exciting. I enjoyed the workload and the other students.
- I liked the group project for this course; it was fun yet challenging.
- The instructor was great. I really enjoyed attending her course.

This class is scheduled once a year so the Instructor has time to reflect and make changes for the fall 2021 course. Thinking through each section of the course, preliminary reflections and potential changes follow below.

Readings/background section of course: The textbook is not necessary, there are so many articles available online that the class should be converted to totally OER (open educational resources). Students will appreciate not having to purchase a text. The level of readings were challenging, but students got through them and both class and online discussions were rich. The students did quite well on the supplemental article presentations so those should continue. The reflection journals are a critical part of the class, to increase self-awareness, and those will stay. Students struggled on the “themes” paper at the end of this section of the class. The Instructor was surprised this was problematic as the students identified themes in an early assignment and were constantly reminded them to take notes in accordance with the themes they identified. The grades on this assignment were the lowest in the class. The Instructor is still pondering how to change this assignment.

Published Case Study analysis section of the course: This section of the course was a good segue between assigned readings about partnership challenges and writing their own case study. The global settings of the cases made a couple of them hard to identify with, although this is a critical skills building exercise also, for students to be more culturally aware. It is interesting that they are very few United States based published environmental partnership cases. The one Canadian case was well received. While a number of well-respected case repositories were consulted to find cases for the class, not all the case journals were explored. For the fall 2021 class the Instructor will search further for U.S. based cases.

Research case study section of the course: The case studies were quite good for the time the students had to produce the work. The case study accomplished its purpose; students got to talk to leaders on the front lines and their challenges. As an Appendix to the case study, students were required to reflect on those challenges and identify if there were any additional solutions they would suggest to the
partnership leaders. These appendices were very well thought out. One case study was stronger than the other was, however this was not a surprise, as this group had several weaker students. On the stronger case study, one student is continuing to work with the Instructor to prepare the case to submit to a case journal. Students report that the Interview Guide worked well. The only change to this section of the course will be to carve out six weeks, instead of five, to do the case study. It is a rush to schedule the interviews, get them done and transcribed and then write up the case in five weeks.

**Reflections of the Practitioner**

This course was a delight to design and teach. It is an important component of the Leadership for Sustainably program and teaching it finally was a culmination of the work on the original faculty task force designing the curriculum. The Instructor’s perspectives on what needs to change in the class were discussed above.

**Recommendations**

This course was designed patching literature on different leadership theories. There is a gap in the literature on skills for partnerships. While the Instructor is convinced, the skills learned in this class will enable graduate students to engage and lead partnerships in the future, that theory will only be tested as the graduate’s progress in their careers and report back. There is work to be done to document further partnership successes not just in terms of environmental measurements but interviewing the individuals on the ground doing the work – what backgrounds do they come from and what enabled them to be successful.
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Appendix 1

Sustainability Case Studies Research Project

Interview Guide

Background on each case study will be developed via a combination of both archival document review, web site investigation, an initial guest speaker presentation, and virtual interviews. Interview questions below may be skipped if archival and web site review or the guest speaker presentation already addresses the questions.

1. When was this partnership formed?
2. Who were the original partners?
3. What steps were taken to formalize the partnership?
4. Where there hurdles or challenges to be addressed when you initially formed the partnership? Can you please describe those? (follow-up, if not addressed. How were those challenges resolved?)
5. Who are the partners and key stakeholders now, and what are their roles?
6. When did additional partners join? (date and organization)
7. Have any organizations left the partnership? Why?
8. Do you anticipate any new partners joining in the future? Who?
9. What are the main goals of the partnership?
10. Do you believe you have all the stakeholders represented that you need in order to address your organization’s mission/purpose/goals?
11. How were these goals developed? (follow-up if not addressed: Who is involved in the goal setting?)
12. Are the goals revisited on an ongoing basis? How does that process work?
13. Do you see the goals differently based on coming from the (insert name of sector – public, private, academic, government, military) sector?
14. How does the mission/goals of your partnership address the sustainable development goals?
15. Has the partnership faced challenges continuing its work as a result of the COVID pandemic?
16. What strategies/actions/projects have you had to adapt?
17. What do you see as your signature accomplishments? (Is there written documentation of this work and would you be willing to share it.)
18. What goals do you hope to accomplish in one year? Three years?
19. Do you foresee any impediments to achieving those goals? How do you anticipate overcoming them?
Implementing Uhl-Bien and Arena’s Model of Leadership for Organizational Adaptability

Jeff Johansen, Kansas State University

Abstract

This application paper describes a workplace leadership development intervention based on Uhl-Bien and Arena’s (2018) model of leadership for organizational adaptability within a traditional business structure. The purpose of the intervention was to explore the applicability of the model and to identify learnings for future work. The results indicated that Complex Adaptive Theory can be applied within the context of traditional organizational structures behind the efforts of a high performance work team. Communication flows were critical to foster effective leadership practices. Additionally, team facilitation was necessary to create the conditions of collective leadership. The implications of this work offer insights for leadership educators and developers of training programs. It also identifies that more research is warranted to better understand the application of theory to practice across different organization types and leadership challenges.

Introduction

“One of the biggest challenges facing leaders today is the need to position and enable organizations and people for adaptability in the face of increasingly dynamic and demanding environments” (Uhl-Bien, 2018, p. 89).

Workplace uncertainty is driven by technological progress, globalization, and vastly increased customer demands. Organizations are required to implement a constant flow of innovation to adapt to these shifting market conditions. Scholars echo calls for the evolution of leadership models that “foster and strengthen relational bonds among stakeholders with differing perspectives” (Ospina, 2010, p. 292), and “enable organizations and people to cope effectively with change and uncertainty” (Uhl-Bien, 2018, p. 89).

To survive, organizations and their leaders need a distinct set of capabilities. They must be able to sense and assess new opportunities, to seize value from these opportunities and ultimately reconfigure organizational structures in order to enable change and maintain a competitive advantage (Teece, 1997). Unique leadership capabilities are needed to develop the necessary skills and create more optimal conditions for effectiveness.

Uhl-Bien and Arena’s (2017 and 2018) model of leadership for organizational adaptability centers on the concept of leadership ambidexterity – the ability for groups to navigate between an organization’s need to efficiently leverage existing capabilities against the need to create new ones to ensure long-term viability. To accomplish this, leaders must create adaptive space
within the organization, or the safe conditions required to engage in the tensions between organizational forces.

This model of leadership for organizations remains highly conceptual with little empirical evidence on how this proposed type of enabling leadership can actually work in practice. Uhl-Bien and Arena provided a provocative call to action for researchers to study how “leaders enable (or stifle) the adaptive process” (Uhl-Bien, 2018, p. 100). This paper addresses their challenge by sharing a work-based adaptive leadership intervention within a global business organization as it developed and commercialized an innovative new product. The purpose of this paper is to describe the leadership intervention itself, as well as reflect on the resulting leadership learning and development outcomes.

**Background**

**Theoretical Framing**

The leadership intervention described in this paper is rooted in a relational, constructionist lens, which situates leadership as “the outcome of human social construction emerging from rich connections and interdependencies of organizations and their members” (Ospina, 2010, p. 293). From this frame, leadership is subjective and co-constructed through meaning-making of lived experiences and interactions between people and the material (space, things). When viewing leadership as relational, the focus of inquiry is found in the interactions between people, calling attention to processes and conditions that facilitate the collective achievement of organizations and their shared accountability (Dugan, 2017; Ospina, 2010). In this context, leadership is defined as the “collective process of people working together toward common goals or collective leadership development efforts” (Dugan, 2017, p. 18). Leadership actions, therefore, draw from models and practices that emphasize learning through experiences, improvisation (i.e. bricolage) as sense-making, the facilitation of co-created experiences to improve situations (Wick, 1993).

Uhl-Bien and Arena (2018) contend that the glue that helps to hold relational leadership processes together is adaptability. Organizations reluctant to change will experience many obstacles along the way. Resilient organizations require nimble and behaviorally complex managers that can perform a variety of functions. Cross functional teams rarely, if ever, just show up. They have to be built by leaders who can be team facilitators and, as Uhl-Bien and Arena suggest, “have an adaptive capacity to provide teams with the ability to value, assimilate and apply new knowledge for learning and problem solving” (Uhl-Bien, 2018, p. 92).

**Organizational Systems and Teams**

Teams cannot and do not work in isolation; they are part of larger organizations that they are dependent on for resources (formally and informally) to drive the activities of the team and to implement their decisions. A high performance work team may likely identify the optimal solution, but ultimate success is in the implementation. Levine (2013) stated, “It is insufficient to wish for better outcomes and determine that those outcomes are possible. We need a path to the
desirable results” (p. 25). Success is the goal in any type of organization but forging this path requires interactions and integration with a broad group of constituencies and those with greater organizational power. “Many good ideas never come to fruition because people do not have the formal or informal influence to get them into play” (Arena, 2017, p. 41).

According to Deetz (2005), “managerial control often takes precedence over representation of conflicting interest and long-term company and community health” (2005, p. 87). He describes managerialism as the root of the problem because it sets systematic logic, a set of routine practices and ideologies that value control above all else. Deetz goes on to challenge team members to be politically attentive and recognize the use of communication for political motives. This perspective of organizational dynamics highlights the need for individuals and teams to maneuver through the organization to help rebalance the power between managerial control and codetermination from the teams.

With this concept in mind, then, it becomes critical for high performing teams to be aware of these tendencies in organizations and shift their communication strategies accordingly. Accomplishing team goals requires a steady flow of communication and information throughout the work of the team and to all of the key constituencies across the organization. “Two way communication with the stakeholders in the organization to keep them informed and current on the complex combination of data to help the teams to get organized and move quickly to get the job done” (Ancona, 2007, p. 29). This perspective brings into light the connection of the group with the rest of the organizational structure and sets a flow of continual communication from the team to its stakeholders at key milestones in the progression of the decision-making process.

Leadership for Organizational Adaptability

The process of team decision making is limited by ambiguity and uncertainty (Hirakawa, 1989; Uhl-Bien, 2017, Uhl-Bien, 2018). In increasingly uncertain conditions, adaptive organizations and effective groups must be able to innovate and evolve beyond the bounds of the team to gain the information needed to adapt to complex problems. Uhl-Bien and Arena’s work explores organizations as complex adaptive systems. Their theory of complex adaptive leadership identifies structures and behaviors necessary to create highly adaptive, fluid organizations that are dynamic in their ability to evolve and change. At a macro level, they conceptualize that organizations can become a collection of distinctive teams that work autonomously to tackle problems and create new innovative solutions to the organization’s problems. This is a highly diffused organizational structure with much of the power resting with the teams. The practice of leadership in these organizations is adaptive and relational so it can respond to the needs of the individual groups to help them accomplish their goals. Those in formal leadership roles must accommodate to the needs of the various teams.

As the teams work to gain approval and resources for implementation, they are most always met with resistance from the operational side of the business or one of the levels of management – consistent with the managerialism issues as delineated earlier in Deetz’s critical theory of communication in organizations. This resistance or “tension” as described by Uhl-Bien and Arena, stymie’s change and makes it difficult for the teams to implement their recommendations,
particularly since the operational side of the organization most always wins these battles (Uhl-Bien, 2018).

Figure 1, adapted from Uhl-Bien & Arena (2018) offers a representation of how communication and information is impeded by the tension between the organization and the team in a traditional structure, as represented in this practice application.

Complex Adaptive Theory (CAT) recommends turning the organization’s “tension” into “adaptability” by anticipating this resistance and developing communication strategies to seed the recommendations and gain support. Central to this model is the need to break down hierarchical silos and structures that most traditional, bureaucratic organizations create. To help facilitate teams through these silos are three leadership roles: the brokers, the central connectors and the energizers (Uhl-Bien, 2018). The brokers are leaders/mentors in the organization that help to build bridges from the group to key resources that have information or talents that are necessary for the group to strengthen their options and enhance effective decision-making. These connections that they broker can be both inside and outside of the organizations.

The second role is that of a central connector, to help the teams to maneuver through the hurdles and issues within the organization to drive effective implementation. They are key communication points between the group and the rest of the leadership in the organization. They help to facilitate knowledge, insights and communication. They also have a strong understanding of the political workings of the organization.

Finally, the energizer’s role is critical to rally enthusiasm and support for the team’s ideas. They are typically highly visible people with a reputation in the organization for bold actions and
success. They have a talent for selling ideas to key stakeholders and make the connections across the organization necessary for building alignment of new ideas.

This organizational structure as designed by Uhl-Bien and Arena is chaotic with no clear hierarchy since group assignments and managing leaders are ever changing and evolving. Unfortunately, their work does suggest that this structure works best in organizations that are heavily reliant on innovation to drive growth and not particularly relevant to other types of organizations. Additionally, they also recognize that as an emerging concept, there are still few proven examples of this model in practice.

But that said, this model does provide valuable insights for application and optimization to the decision-making path; to expand the group’s thinking through the formal stages of the process; to improve the communication strategies and interactions with others outside of the group to gain alignment with the team’s decisions; and to improve the probability of successful implementation. Additionally, this approach helps the teams to tap into leaders that can facilitate the closing of information gaps or counteracting dissonance in organizational communication that Deetz’s has also identified and was reviewed earlier in this paper.

**Description of the Practice**

**Site and Context**

This workplace leadership intervention was designed through an engaged scholarship approach, conducted with a cross functional team of seven professionals within a Fortune 500 consumer products company. I (author) was embedded in the team, which provided a rich understanding of the implementation of the project and was a key observable vantage point. Of note, the sharing of this information was approved by both the President of the business unit that participated in the research as well as the divisional Vice President of Human Research.

The onset of the Covid-19 pandemic brought much change and uncertainty. The closing of retail stores and the suspension of sports programs had significantly impacted sales and operating profits of an athletic apparel business. One of the company’s divisions was asked by its regional president to identify product ideas that would capitalize on the emerging need for protective masks. He also assembled a team of seven people across three geographies (Kansas, Missouri and from the corporate headquarters in North Carolina). By and large, the team members had limited history and interaction with those from the other locations and combined, the six individuals reported into four different organizational divisions. The complexity of the assignment task, the team and organizational structure therefore, possessed the core conditions necessary to apply and evaluate this new theory in practice.

**Intervention Design**

The inquiry focus for this leadership intervention was in keeping with the call to action that Uhl-Bien and Arena (2018) issued to provide validation of CAT and in this example to (1) determine if a team within a traditional organizational structure could be successful at implementing core elements of CAT to perform against a collective leadership model and drive innovative change,
and (2) inform learning, education and the development of future activities and/or training programs necessary to advance complex adaptive leadership practices. It was expected that if this application was successful then it could be applied more broadly within traditional organizations that have not made the leap to a fully functioning complex adaptive organization.

This modification was predicted to be feasible based on an extensive review of high performance work teams and their widespread use in many companies. A Deloitte Consulting (2014) survey of 7,000 companies found that 62% are using teamwork systems rather than traditional business structures and an Ernst and Young (2013) survey found that over 90% of companies believe that high performance work teams lead to superior performance.

The high level objective of this team was to develop a new functional mask for the business unit to sell to its existing customer base. Since the project was identified quickly against the rapidly changing business climate, and the organization had little knowledge about the market, there were few expectations or much direction provided to the team. These conditions made this initiative particularly appropriate for the application of CAT.

The current social distancing practices made face-to-face meetings impossible and posed significant communication challenges. The initial meeting of the team did not exhibit many of the behavior’s representative of a collective, highly engaged group. Few team members participated in the conversation and most of the questions were framed in negative tones. For example one member asked, “Did you make a mistake when you said this is to be launched in 2020?” (Field notes, May 18, 2020). As a result, the team lead dominated the conversation and thus little information was shared from other members of the team; no new ideas were generated; and no behaviors were exhibited of active sensemaking or collective leadership.

From this disappointing first meeting, it became clear that steps needed to be taken to facilitate the formation of the team dynamics. Much like individuals, teams experience stages of development and mature from early formation through various phases into a high performance collective provided certain positive actions are taken. Teams like individuals also can get stuck and suffer a case of arrested growth and ineffectiveness. Every member has an important role to play in each stage. Effective members can successfully move a team toward maturity with specific, positive actions. Teamwork does not happen by accident. Many of today’s organizations must tap into the collective brain power, experiences and insights of all its employees if it is to succeed. Effective decision making requires pulling together people from across the organization, with different skill sets, areas of expertise and cultural diversity to bring forward all the knowledge, insights and creativity to solve the complex issues of the day. Diverse teams are more likely to critically evaluate facts and remain objective. “By breaking up workplace homogeneity, you can allow your employees to become more aware of their own potential biases — entrenched ways of thinking that can otherwise blind them to key information” (Rock & Grant, 2016, p. 3).

Tuckman’s (2001) work provided a powerful roadmap as to the stages a group must work through in order to gain alignment to their common goals, to build trust in the other members of the team, and to establish the processes of how they will work together before they can become a functional instrument for dealing with their objectives. When this is achieved, “interpersonal
problems lie in the group’s past, and its present can be devoted to realistic appraisal of and attempt at solutions to the task at hand” (Tuckman, 2001, p. 78). This process has become a potent theory to help groups to facilitate their way through the joining up process so they can reach the performing stage more rapidly and become a high performance work team.

Tuckman’s model has become the most predominantly referred to and most widely recognized in organizational literature. Cassidy noted that it “remains one of the most commonly cited group development models” (2007, p. 413). Tuckman recognized that the “natural-group settings are distinguished on the basis that the group exists to perform some social or professional function over which the researcher has no control”, in other words, “they come together to do a job” (Tuckman, 2001, p. 68). But as he contended, the work cannot begin, until the right climate was developed to build the confidence and trust across all of the members before they could engage in the communication flows that were required to tackle the four functional phases of effective decision making.

Tuckman simply described this core process as “forming – storming – norming – and performing” (2001, p. 66). As the new team comes together, they are in the forming stage. At this starting point, individual group members are hesitant to participate and are testing the nature and boundaries of the team dynamic. They are task oriented and still dependent on roles developed outside of the group. Communication flow is weak, and members are guarded in sharing their knowledge. In formal organizations, the individual participants are still tethered to their existing teams and direct management chain-of-command.

Through strong facilitation of the group through the storming and norming phases, the team begins to let go of the siloed structures and breaks tightly held allegiances to form a “new organizational structure that fosters different groups of people working together” (Manville & Ober, p. 69). As the new team relationships are solidified and the trust is established, they can move together into the final stage of growth to achieve high performance outputs. Tuckman describes these groups as, “integrative-creative-social instruments” (Tuckman, 2001, p.73). They are positive, interdependent and members can operate freely with any combination of participants. Communication flow is at its peak, and ready to effectively tackle the requirements facing a complex organization.

Quipped with this process thinking, the team observed in this study began to co-create meaning and progressed through the stages of group development. The second meeting started by asking the team to brainstorm some ideas collectively on how to address these challenges. One suggestion was to conduct a Friday afternoon virtual happy hour which provided an informal forum to meet. To break the ice, the facilitator asked that everyone wear their favorite hat and come prepared to share a story from their home isolation experience. This team exercise was successful in building informal relationships and opening channels of communication.

After this social experience, the next meeting focused on all members sharing their thoughts, hopes, fears and the hurdles that each saw in completing the project. The group also established team norms and key practices to help build trust and communication across the team. A few
examples that came from this exercise included agreeing to have cameras on during all video interactions and to share correspondence with everyone on the team, even if it was a specific question relevant to only one person.

From these activities, the team began to exhibit behaviors consistent with collective leadership and co-creation of knowledge so the facilitator reintroduced the concepts from Uhl-Bien and Arena’s complex adaptive leadership model. At this point, the team was highly receptive and quickly identified the three people in the organization who were most likely to provide the brokering, central connecting and energizing that would facilitate a successful process. The facilitator reached out to these three individuals and requested their assistance against core activities for each role.

Immediately, the broker was able to connect the team with three key resources; a new product development expert who helped to kick start the design process; a laboratory at the flagship State University to conduct air flow testing of various materials; and a supply chain manager in the China office who was able to connect the team with potential material suppliers and production facilities. These resources provided valuable information to educate the team on the technical and legal requirements for a functioning mask, the identification of readily available materials, open production capacity across the company’s manufacturing plants and contacts with qualified company suppliers (a bureaucratic step that likely saved three to six months to the qualification process).

The individual selected as the central connector provided valuable insights into key members of the organization that the team would need to communicate with to keep the project on track. He orchestrated two meetings with these leaders when the process reached the evaluation phase, to get their issues, concerns and suggestions out in the open. This not only opened a “two-way” line of communication but provided additional information that was helpful in the evaluation process. Most importantly, it provided the team with insights into crafting an optimal communication strategy once we were ready to gain approval of the decision and secure the appropriate resources for implementation. A key insight gleaned was the importance of keeping the product offering focused on custom decoration options. As the central connector shared, there were two other mask initiatives within the organization (a white, cotton mask and a paper disposable mask), anything in the team’s recommendation that was perceived as too close to these offerings would meet quick resistance from the head of global supply chain and the head of U.S. sales.

Finally, the team rallied support from the global president to be the energizer. He was able to showcase the plan to the CEO and counter a critical tension source, the global supply chain division president by highlighting the business necessity and urgency of the project. The energizer was also able to step into a last minute meeting with the head of U.S. sales and diffuse his objections by providing an understanding of the incremental customer base that this would open up. He succeeded in building excitement about the team’s plans and helped to gain alignment from the team to open up production capacity to make this decorated option also available to additional company divisions. The collection of these actions helped to build and maintain momentum for the project across the organization.
Additionally, these conditions and norms developed by the team created a number of instances when collective leadership thrived. This was particularly apparent when the team approached the plan to understand the technical performance attributes of masks and navigated the process to qualify materials. As the various issues presented themselves, three different members of the team seamlessly jumped in and out of leading the discussion as the issues moved from technical performance to material weave to the construction of the material seams. This demonstrated the fluidity of the dialogue and examples of influence by emergent leaders who create turning points in a team’s interaction to drive collective actions (Fairhurst, 2012).

The net of these activities was the team’s ability to identify a product design option and two sourced materials within six weeks for launch in a record breaking four months. Approvals were achieved with minimal delays, and year to date sales have exceeded projections.

**Discussion of Outcomes**

Overall this process was successful in driving a successful outcome and although the overall organization was not functioning with Uhl-Bien and Arena’s definition of a complex adaptive system, the smaller team was able to model and exhibit the leadership behaviors required to function in a highly adaptive way and achieve the goals set forth in the model.

The first finding was that organizational leaders can function in core leadership roles as delineated by CAT. While the leaders in the organization did not directly understand the functional process of a highly adaptive organization, they were able to complete the behaviors required of more advanced systems. The team demonstrated that with detailed requests, senior leaders could perform the tasks required to connect with other teams both inside and outside of the organization, broker information flows and kept the teams energized to overcome adversity and stay focused on accomplishing the required tasks. By effectively identifying the appropriate leaders in the organization with the skills and propensity for courageous leadership, the team was able to facilitate their activities against the requirements of a complex adaptive organization.

Secondly, communication flows were critical to effectively foster leadership practices and implement this theory in practice. Without the depth of understanding or alignment with the adaptive process, it was incumbent on the team to establish a continuous and frequent flow of communication throughout the course of the process. This communication flow was not only required for maintaining strong collective leadership and alignment within the team but also across the organization and with all key stakeholders. Information and communication provided the necessary elements that push through the inherent tensions and resistance to achieve alignment and ultimately the adaptability necessary to drive the required change.

Thirdly, team facilitation was critical to create the conditions of collective leadership. By aligning team membership to common goals, behavioral norms, and overcoming past history, they were able to function as a high performance team. This gap was addressed by focusing the team’s orientation on Tuckman’s Group Development process. Adding this phase to the team
formation process helped to mitigate dysfunctional behaviors, instill a culture of trust that opened up the flow of communication and created the conditions necessary to drive a collective leadership experience. Facilitation through the four phases of group development was instrumental in the team’s ability to exhibit characteristics of collective leadership needed to make effective decisions and drive alignment with the rest of the organization.

**Reflection of Practitioner**

In a constructionist theory research study, it is customary for the researcher to be highly engaged with the respondents and the data. This is necessary to have the intimacy with the research for sensemaking and constructing meaning in the data. In this practice application, there were times, as documented in the intervention section, where it was difficult for the researcher to be objective, particularly when he was observing a group where he was a member. These watchouts are heightened when the researcher is in a position of power over the respondents as in this study. Many of the verbatims and evaluations could likely be taken personally and/or interpreted from only the framing of the researcher. It was therefore critical to keep the framing focused on the respondents. Robert Yin suggests that “one test of possible bias is the degree to which you are open to contrary findings” (2009, p.72). This was demonstrated by the researcher’s flexibility, adapting to the situation at hand. It was also informed by leveraging the skills acquired in a formal leadership studies education and practical application of those theories and techniques as demonstrated in this practice example, thus allowing the researcher to establish the conditions necessary for collective leadership behaviors to address complex adaptive challenges.

**Implications & Recommendations**

Based on the learning from this practice, CAT has broader applicability on organizations. Even though the proposed model was adapted, these additions helped to drive the process flows necessary to create conditions of collective leadership and the co-creation of knowledge. It also drove an effective decision making process that allowed the team to identify an innovative solution and capitalize on a significant change initiative.

Uhl-Bien and Arena’s adaptive organizational model led the team to identify key leaders who helped access resources, (internal and external), and assisted in formulating and implementing the proactive communication strategy necessary to effectively drive successful implementation of the team’s decisions. This process turned the organizational resistance and tensions into adaptability. Additionally, with the bridges that were connected, the team could access information to optimize their effectiveness at each phase. This also provided the depth of information necessary to make “better” decisions in light of uncertainty. Figure 2 illustrates the modified model, incorporating learning from this application.
In this optimal state, the team exhibited behaviors of collective leadership and achieved results consistent with demands that complex systems require. Communication flowed in all directions, the organization’s behaviors were co-created, and success against the core objectives was achieved – even in record time.

The final system, while a bit messy and chaotic in the spirit of Uhl-Bien and Arena’s guidance did appear to create an environment in which the team’s behaviors had changed in some very important and often dramatic ways. “The team was no longer simply a group of people working for the same company in complementary functions” (Parker, 2008, p. ii), they were a dynamically functioning, high performance group.

Conclusion

Based on this practice application, it is plausible to expand the perspective of CAT beyond just organizations that are fully structured around the theory as delineated by Uhl-Bien and Arena. This case illustrated a process of creating conditions of highly adaptive teams and collective leadership within a traditionally structured organization. Understanding the application of theory to practice opens up the possibilities of adapting this approach within other organizations. Indeed, CAT itself has been critiqued as difficult to apply; yet there is great possibility for continued understanding through team applications in contemporary organizations. This study brings new information for the practitioner and teachers of leadership and addresses Uhl-Bien and Arena’s challenge to inform how “leaders enable the adaptive process” (2018, p. 89). It also illustrates how leadership development can be embedded in workplace intervention processes. The learning from these experiences make a case for the inclusion of complex adaptive theory and practice in leadership studies and leadership training programs.
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Leadership Education Pathways & Centralized Student Services

*Seth Kastle, Fort Hays State University* 
*Jeni McRay, Fort Hays State University* 
*Haley Moon, Fort Hays State University*

**Abstract**

In 2020, [a state comprehensive university] launched a University-wide *Transfer and Military Center* (TMC), which provides centralized student support services from recruitment through graduation for all military-connected students. This innovative practice poster takes ALE attendees on a visual tour of this University’s journey in developing the center, an endeavor that resulted in a suite of military-specific leadership education programs, which maximize college credit for prior military training and experience to shorten their path to degree completion. The poster includes a comprehensive overview of the characteristics of military-connected learners, details of the leadership education degree pathways, and a depiction of best practices for serving military-connected student populations. This will be an instructive poster for other schools and educational organizations interested in serving military-connected populations.

**Introduction & Background**

Since September 11th, 2001, over 2.77 million United States (U.S.) service members have been deployed in support of the Global War on Terror (GWOT) and Overseas Contingency Operations (Garshick et al., 2019). Due to the size and scope of these operations and the legislative passage of the Post 9/11 G.I. Bill, a large number of both current and former service members have entered higher education (Niv & Bennett, 2017). Universities are often welcoming and enthusiastic about supporting the military population, but are unsure how best to customize high quality academic programs and student services to ensure maximum retention and persistence to degree attainment (O’Herrin, 2011). As the percentage of service members making up post-secondary student bodies continues to grow, it is a conscientious decision for institutions to better understand how to provide comprehensive student services to military-connected learners, particularly for state comprehensive universities (SCU), often referred to as the people’s universities or “the workhorses” of public higher education (Gardner, 2017).

By extending programs that widen educational opportunity through increasing access to admission and valuing teaching over research (Supplee, Orphan, & Moreno, 2017), the SCU fulfills its mission by engaging military-connected students with expanded student services and diverse academic programming. These measures also promote retention/persistence. Institutions who wish to engage this group must alter their support systems and infrastructure to help these students succeed.
Military-Connected Learner Characteristics

Military-connected learners are not new to higher education, but the steady increase of active duty and veteran students over the last several years has led to a growing level of research regarding what type of people make up this subgroup, and how to support them best. First, it is essential to define what, specifically, is meant by “military-connected” learners. To clarify, at this institution it means any individual or combination of the following classifications: active duty, guard, reserve, retired, or veteran seeking a formal academic credential and transferring in military training as part of their course of study. Second, each of these subgroups of military-affiliated students enters the institution with differing levels of experience, maturity, expectations, motivations, and preparedness for study. These factors may impact their persistence to a degree; therefore, understanding these characteristics is vital.

Those who enter military service come from all socioeconomic classes, ethnicities, religions, and backgrounds (Kane, 2006, 2005; Molina, 2015; Molina & Morse, 2015), and there is often overlap with non-traditional, first-generation learners (e.g., older, delayed entry, parents, financially independent, etc.) Ford and Vignare (2015) state that military learner demographics are most similar to the non-traditional, first-generation learners, “although military learners face additional challenges associated with service-connected injuries and disabilities” (p. 1).

Military-connected students come from low-income and racial/ethnic backgrounds to a greater extent than traditional and non-traditional civilian students (Molina & Morse, 2015). Further, they do not approach higher education completely devoid of formal, structured learning that has taken place since graduating high school (Nelken, 2009). That distinction applies explicitly to those learners who have extensive military experience and often expect efficiency in pursuit of their goals. These students may carry an expectation of credit for prior learning, defined educational pathways, or clear connections of how each step in the educational process will lead to the attainment of their vocational and personal educational goals (Crissman, 2018). Additionally, military-connected learners enter higher education during a variety of phases in their careers and have often operated in and been shaped by an environment heavily governed by command, control, and structure (Naphan & Elliott, 2015). This requires intentional support services.

Best Practices in Academic Programming and Students Services for Military-Connected Learners

A synthesis of military-connected literature reveals recurring themes around best practices in supporting this population of students in the areas of enrollment, community-building (engagement/trust), and advising (American Council on Education, 2014; Hanover Research, 2019; Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006; Molina & Morse, 2015).

Enrollment

Best practices in enrollment management include identification of military-connected students, assessment of their preparedness, and providing them with a single point of contact to manage their needs like a peer or a “one-stop-shop” service center to
function as a hub for advising, counseling, orientation, transition courses, early warning systems, and intervention (Hanover Research, p. 3, 2019).

**Community-building**

To support military service members and veterans in their transition from the military to higher education and the civilian workforce, the American Council on Education (ACE) held a summit in 2014 that identified five emergent themes they recommend institutions urgently implement “to improve the postsecondary outcomes (i.e., college access, persistence, and completion) and employment success for service members and veterans” (p. 8). Those are:

1. Individualized, flexible, and relationship-centered support services;
2. Self-advocacy of service members and veterans;
3. Cross-stakeholder communication and information consolidation;
4. Full-spectrum (military-to-career) navigation;
5. Capacity, knowledge, and awareness building;

Additional studies also posit that military-friendly institutions can benefit from developing “community college partnerships.” These partnerships allow four-year institutions direct outreach to students who want to eventually earn a bachelor’s degree (Fain, 2017). Other suggestions include campus-wide, military-friendly “student pipelines” (Erisman & Steele, 2015). Other community-building strategies involve veteran-specific transition courses and student veteran organizations consisting of advising, admissions, credit transfer, and financial aid (pp. 22-28). These strategies are crucial in what is known as “Integrated Adult and Military Student Supports.”

**Advising**

Advising is one of the essential best practices in supporting and retaining military-connected students toward success. These students require advising before and during earning a credential because, as the literature indicates, they are often unfamiliar or even intimidated by institutional and academic processes. Therefore, they need special assistance in course selection, academic progress, and where to receive academic support. Advisors should know licensing and certification requirements, course availability and formats, and career and life planning (Hanover Research, 2019).

**Description of Innovative Practice: Transfer & Military Center**

In fall 2020, [a state comprehensive university] launched the Transfer & Military Center (TMC). The purpose of this center is to provide prospective transfer and military-connected students with a seamless transition to the university by developing innovative pathways to degree completion. By launching this center, the university has dedicated resources specifically to support the unique needs of the military-connected community. Students are supported from initial inquiry through post-graduation employment assistance. In addition, a primary function of this center is to develop new and innovative academic programs that utilize the training and experience gained through the military to shorten the military-connected learners’ path to degree
completion. The following is a detailed description of the additional support services offered through the TMC.

**Leadership Education Academic Programs**

The U.S. military considers leadership training as a key component of personal development and career advancement, so the discipline of leadership studies is a natural entry point to awarding Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) for military training and experience. There is a fast-growing acceptance of CPL in higher education (Palmer & Nguyen, 2019), and one function of the TMC is to create new academic programs which take advantage of the knowledge gained in the military, specifically in leadership education. [A midwestern SCU] offers four innovative pathways for military-connected students, detailed here:

1. **Associate of Applied Science, Technology and Leadership (concentration in Leadership Studies)**
   - 60-hour degree program
   - Up to 36 hours accepted from military CPL
   - Uses multiple methods of CPL transcription
     - American Council on Education (ACE) Credit
     - Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) Credit for Military Alignment Initiative (CMAI)
     - Military Common Core Leadership Professional Military Education (PME)
   - Completes curriculum for Certificate in Leadership Studies
   - Can be finished in two 12-hour semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Type</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE Credit</td>
<td>Up to 30 hrs combined with KBOR CMAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBOR CMAI</td>
<td>Up to 30 hrs combined with ACE Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Common Core Leadership PME</td>
<td>Up to 6 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Studies Classes</td>
<td>9 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Classes</td>
<td>15 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **“4 in 4” Certificate to Master’s Program**
   - Students can complete four credentials in four years
     - Certificate in Leadership Studies
     - AAS in Technology and Leadership
     - Bachelors of Science (BS) in Organizational Leadership
     - Masters of Professional Studies (MPS) in Organizational Leadership
   - Stackable credentials that build on each other
   - Predicated on military CPL
### 4 in 4 Timeline (Full-Time Study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential Type</th>
<th>Year of Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate in Leadership Studies</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS in Technology and Leadership</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS in Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Years 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS in Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Kansas Army National Guard (KSARNG) Officer Candidate School (OCS)**
   - Eight classes
   - Military Science (MIL) designation housed in the Department of Leadership Studies
   - Six classes available to all students without commitment to the military
   - Combination of resident KSARNG training and university classes
   - Results in students commissioning as Second Lieutenants in the KSARNG

4. **Military Leadership (ML) Minor (In Development)**
   - Combination of OCS classes and Leadership Studies classes
   - 21 hours of course work
   - Split 12 hours of Leadership Studies classes and 9 hours of Military Science classes
   - To be launched in Fall 2022

In addition to these innovative programs, the TMC is also pursuing additional partnerships with various military branches and education offices. These partnerships include the U.S. Army Sergeants Major Academy, The U.S. Air Force General Education Mobile Program, U.S. Naval Community College, U.S. Marine Corps University, and the U.S. Coast Guard Education, Training, and Quota Management Command. Through this diversified programming, service members in all branches of the military will have access to top-notch education and shortened paths to degree completion.

### Student Support Services

While development and implementation of innovative academic programming is important, it does not address the needs of students once they come to the university. Failure to understand the needs of this student population will result in an unsuccessful experience for both the student and the institution (Brown & Gross, 2011). For this reason, a myriad of student support services has been developed to support the military-connected population.

- Unofficial transcript analysis for prospective students prior to application
- Multiple methods of credit articulation are available; credit is accepted from the Joint Service Transcript (JST) as well as from all regionally accredited institutions.
- Dual advising through partnerships with multiple community colleges
- Onboarding assistance to assist students in being successful their first semester
• Assistance for students who need help navigating their federal and state education benefits
• Prior-service behavioral health providers in the university counseling center
• Tutoring services for student veterans
• Faculty and staff education training titled “The Green Zone Initiative,” which aims to educate participants on at-risk behaviors of student veterans
• Student Veterans Association chapter which provides a peer support network
• Multiple military-specific scholarships

**Foreseeable Implications**

Innovative programs in leadership education for military-connected learners, delivered through a centralized support organization where best practices remain current at department, institution, and branch-specific levels, are likely to have wide-reaching positive impact. If the TMC operates according to intentional research-based frameworks using a continuous improvement approach, a win-win-win for the institution, its military-connected student population, and the community will result. This helps fulfill the important mission of state comprehensive universities and serves those who serve us.
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Developing Capacity for Leading in a Digitally Transformed World
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Abstract

The world has gone digital, but the benefits of digital transformation for organizations (such as increased innovation and efficiency) are accompanied by unique challenges and costs (technology, training, security, etc.). To effectively carry out essential leadership functions in a digital environment, leaders need to develop the capacity to utilize the advantages of digital technology. Based on MIT Sloan Research (2021), 88 percent of organizations believe in the importance of a critical mass of digital-savvy leaders, but only 22 percent have achieved this objective thus far. “Digital savvy” here implies a combination of technical savvy and the capacity to sense social interactions and organizational dynamics in digital environments. Here we discuss the best practices, considerations, challenges, and strategies for the design and facilitation of impactful leadership instruction that results in developing skills important for leaders’ effectiveness in a digital environment.

Introduction

A digital transformation of global society, accelerated by the pandemic disruption, brought the attention of scholars and practitioners to the challenges of leading in a digital environment and the importance of digital fluency for effective and responsible societal and organizational leadership of the future (Barnes, 2020; Pan & Zhang, 2020). As the latitude of leadership functions becomes broader, the task before leadership educators, therefore, is more complex, as “digital savvy” is added to the “responsible”, “effective” and other critical skills that leaders of the future need to actively contribute to building a better world (Cortellazzo et al., 2019). “Digital savvy” in a leadership context means not only technical savvy, but also a capacity to work with social interactions and organizational dynamics in digital environments. Accordingly, in order to be able to develop effective future leaders, leadership educators themselves have to master digital technology, integrate its benefits into their instructional practices and further explore its potential in organizations and leadership contexts.

Apart from the commonly recognized benefits of digital technology for organizational innovation and increased efficiency, its utility for successful leadership in the 21st century and beyond is in the capacity to serve as the medium for communicating, leading, learning, and community-building, by using virtual tools to integrate online and in-person interactions (Fitzerald et al., 2013). The same is true for the leadership education that is currently adapting to the online learning environment and mastering new ways to evolve, design, teach, learn, and facilitate leadership development experiences in virtual and hybrid environments. Along the way, leadership educators discover the limits and affordances that virtual tools have for creating learning environments that facilitate leadership, and for engaging in the development and design of learning experiences and interventions.
In this poster, we discuss approaches to digital-technology enhanced leadership education, as well as best practices, considerations, challenges, and strategies for the design and facilitation of impactful digital leadership instruction.

**Background**

The core objective of leadership education is to build human capacity to shape the future they desire, individually and collectively. This process is informed by leadership theory and research and engages diverse curricular and co-curricular activities and interactions (Adenoro, 2013, Senge et. al, 2008).

The volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous (VUCA) nature of today’s world results in the expanded latitude of leadership responsibilities that, in turn, requires transformative approaches to leadership development. Forced worldwide transition to digital technology, courtesy of the pandemic disruption, has added another layer of complexity and raised the bar for future leaders in what it means to be digital-savvy, beyond technology-savvy. Here we define the capacity for utilizing the advantages of digital technology to carry out essential leadership functions such as mobilizing groups to change, regulating disequilibrium, etc. as digital leadership.

To prepare learners for digital leadership, leadership educators must themselves espouse digital leadership. In addition to becoming technology savvy, the same capacities for leading in today’s VUCA world are essential in conducting leadership education. As pointed by Tarafdar et al. (2019), utilizing technology platforms and information systems introduces a particular form of stress. This presents an added layer of uncertainty for embodying digital leadership. While encountering this uncertainty in the transition to online modalities, leadership educators are discovering new ways to evolve, design, teach, learn, and facilitate leadership development experiences in virtual and hybrid environments.

There are a number of challenges experienced by leadership educators when delivering online instruction. Thus, among the most recognized is ensuring meaningful experiences of online learners that requires their behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004, Henrie et.al., 2015). Pekrun (2011) argues that emotions can influence a “broad variety of cognitive processes that contribute to learning, such as perception, attention, memory, decision making, and cognitive problem solving” (p. 26). Therefore it is important to create a learning environment that supports emotional experiences that foster learning.

Additionally, in leadership education, regardless of modality, it is essential to create a psychological environment that is conducive to leading change, responding to disruption, and empowering learning. This aspect of leadership learning is called “the holding environment” or container (Bion, 1959; Winnicott, 1960). Holding refers to the way an authority figure, or group, contains and interprets what’s happening in times of uncertainty to buffer distress and help others make sense of confusion. Holding is both interpersonal and institutional and applies in unique ways when interacting virtually (Petriglieri, 2020). Without holding, anxiety, anger, and fragmentation ensue, and therefore it is essential to create mutual support and continued engagement, so a truly shared vision will eventually emerge.
These challenges are often addressed in leadership programs within adaptive leadership and group relations traditions. The concept of a holding environment in both traditions enables learning about other key concepts in each of these traditions. Adaptive leadership (Heifetz et al., 2009) distinguished between technical problems (which can be solved with expertise) and adaptive challenges (in which expertise alone cannot accomplish required change). In situations with high degrees of uncertainty, authority functions (or dysfunctions) to regulate disequilibrium at a level that motivates deep learning without overwhelming a group’s capacity to work through resistance and mobilize toward adaptive change.

Authority is also a core concept in group relations events, along with boundaries, roles, and tasks (Zachary Green & Rene Molenkamp, 2005). This framework is used to make sense of unconscious dynamics in groups and organizations operating within the “group-as-a-whole” (Schermer, 2012). The idea of a group-as-a-whole supposes that groups can be thought of as if they had a mind of their own. This framing enables learners to sense how individuals in the group become activated by larger dynamics. Sometimes this serves a working purpose and sometimes it serves survival tasks of the group, such as a fear of uncertainty. These dynamics are lying beneath the surface in organizations and leadership requires learning to explore how they may be operating in any given system (Stapley, 2006).

Adaptive leadership and group relations traditions are well established, however, the heightened focus on using them online is a recent development. The process of developing the online manifestations of such programs has revealed important insights to inform best practices for digital leadership that are described next.

**Description**

When facilitating online leadership education and development, we must be aware of implicit assumptions and how our mental models affect our strategies. Assumptions about online leadership education became apparent during the transition to online modalities. Some implications for practice also emerged while redesigning and implementing group relations and adaptive leadership programs in digital environments (See Table 1).

Leadership educators should review these assumptions and implications, and then consider some strategies to incorporate in virtual leadership instruction. For example, one assumption is that the instructor is solely responsible for accommodating students’ comfort zones, while in reality students and teachers share responsibility for co-creating a learning environment that regulates a level of challenge at the edge of our comfort zones (French, 1997). Instructors can address this by designing activities that position the students as the experts on their own learning edges.
Table 1. Assumptions in facilitating online leadership education and development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should avoid getting lost. Design to prevent confusion.</td>
<td>Get lost on purpose, be curious to explore the unknown, but don't panic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure and scaffolding do not equal emerging experience.</td>
<td>Social structure and process are enabled by &quot;virtual space&quot; and form parallel social structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual cognitive engagement is a barrier to authentic developmental experiences.</td>
<td>Use intellectual approaches to get started and relieve some anxiety. Technical solutions reduce disequilibrium when it gets overwhelming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings or individual activities have 1 purpose at a given time.</td>
<td>Group purposes can be at least two-fold: task, process, and/or social. Name the purpose in design of each meeting, interaction, or activity. Add intention to clarify purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance, from a reductionist view, is the only aspect of a challenging response from students.</td>
<td>Resistance is complex, deep listening is essential and possible, there is a longing for community and craving to learn embedded beneath resistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education system: Grades are zero sums demanding finished products, prescribe learning, accommodate rather than buffer disequilibrium, teacher is the responsible party, downloading knowledge is the focus, content=outcome.</td>
<td>Co-create learning, buffer and hold group disequilibrium, everyone is a source of learning, learning has many levels including cognitive, emotional, social, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-in-point is an ideal experiential pedagogy.</td>
<td>Many methods are tremendous, and all have pros/cons. Experiment with how there are new affordances online that aren’t reconstructions of physical spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some suggested best practices for implementing online leadership education and development:

- The instructor(s) should be competent with the technology platforms being used and aware of how video/sound/text communication presents to learners. These platforms should be limited to a few and made clear in advance for participants. It is helpful to have an administrator role that assists in managing technology during larger events.
- Resist the temptation to control interactions provided by the technology platforms, while still ensuring secure online interactions. Test functions in advance.
- Make expectations explicit. Assume students are the experts on where their comfort zone transitions into discomfort that helps learning or when it is too much. Ask learners what they need. Create multiple ways to engage.
- Instructions for activities need to be very clear, consistent, and explained in advance, including how the activity is linked to the learning objectives or purpose of the program.
- Be clear about the role of intellectualizing and sharing emotional experiences, model these forms of engagement.
• Openly discuss the challenges and range of experiences using technology. Discuss trustworthiness and how this group will interact online.
• Make regular time and space for learners to check in and communicate about their energy level and emotional experiences, even just to name them. Pause for mindfulness. “Are you existing, exhausted, or excited right now?”
• Online transitions can be stark. Formerly natural casual interaction needs to be intentional online. Create opportunities for casual online interaction. Utilize “hallway time” by not cutting the meeting off for everyone abruptly. This lets people transition out and have small talk if they want.
• Utilize small group (4 person) breakout rooms for discussions to help learners connect with each other differently than in larger video conference meetings.
• Be aware of how certain cues are not transmitted the same online and that there is much going on within individuals that may be affecting them.
• Focus on support to balance the added challenges of interacting online. Provide opportunities for peer support and affirmation at higher rates or before critique.

Foreseeable Implications

The benefits of digital transformation are yet to be fully understood, embraced and utilized. Its challenges are yet to be conquered. As scholars are focused on exploring the phenomenon, leadership educators and practitioners respond to the need for leaders capable of effectively functioning in a digital environment by identifying impactful pedagogies and practices. Our experience indicates that integrating the adaptive leadership and group relations traditions into online leadership instruction increases its effectiveness and emerges alongside digital leadership in a time of great disruption.
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Developing Future Cybersecurity Leaders through ePortfolios: Purdue Cyber Apprenticeship Program Leadership Academy
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Abstract

Cybersecurity jobs are expected to have a 350% growth rate between 2013 and 2021, with an estimate of 3.5 million unfilled cybersecurity jobs globally by the end of 2021 (Morgan, 2019). In addition to technical cybersecurity knowledge, skills, and abilities, leadership competency is vital for the cybersecurity workforce, which relies on collaboration and coordination among employees with complementary skills (Deming, 2017). To fill this critical workforce gap, we have undertaken the development of an ePortfolio-based leadership development program for professionals entering fields in cyber-related areas. The Purdue Cyber Apprenticeship Program (P-CAP) Leadership Academy is a work-based educational leadership development program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor. The P-CAP Leadership Academy is designed to develop the leadership competency of cybersecurity professionals who are participating in an apprenticeship program that includes both work and educational components. The educational component involves academic degrees related to cyber-fields as well as the P-CAP Leadership Academy. As part of the Leadership Academy, participants serve full-time as an apprentice and pursue an academic degree in an area related to a cyber-field, culminating with the P-CAP Leadership Academy experience in developing an ePortfolio and identifying artifacts through CRS that best represent a leadership competency area including teamwork, problem-solving, interpersonal skills, and integrity. As part of the Program, a virtual learning community is offered to provide an informal learning environment through peer support and mentoring. Participants join this virtual learning community upon completion of the Program to further engage in continuous development and lifelong learning as leaders.

Introduction

The leaders of today’s global world are expected to demonstrate competence in communication, collaboration, and self-regulation. While initially such competencies were recognized as vital for non-task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993), today work is completed in a collaborative context, making these competencies more closely related to the successful achievement of task performance than ever before (Deming, 2017; Jacobs, 2017; Hickman & Akdere, 2018). As the nature of work is changing from being task-oriented to people-oriented, human interaction both with fellow humans and with machines is becoming the new norm of the workplace with increasing needs for further employee development, engagement, and empowerment. To address these emerging workplace challenges and prepare successful and effective leaders of tomorrow, critical self-reflection (CSR) and self-efficacy have become significant to organizational efforts at all levels. Technological, social, and industrial changes as well as pandemics and natural disasters resulted in more virtual connectedness in the workplace, both among employees and leaders. This contributes to the increased complexity of leadership dynamics and requires leaders to successfully interact with all of their followers without the comfort and convenience of a
physical work environment. In today’s flatter organizational structures and gig economy, leaders need to demonstrate a strong desire, will, and intention to successfully collaborate with employees, customers, and suppliers who are culturally diverse (Cumberland et al., 2016).

CSR is a foundational requirement for the development of leadership competency (Bandura, 2001). CSR can be used to help employees maximize the impact of past experiences by assisting them to consider these as learning tools (Heslin & Keating, 2017). Furthermore, observation and reflection is the third stage of Kolb’s (1984) Experiential Learning Cycle. Our leadership development program utilizes CSR approach as part of the practice in the field of leadership. Previous programmatic approaches to CSR (Cope, 2003; Terhune, 2006), together with portfolio development (Lenburg, 2000), have been proposed elsewhere but have not been specified nor practiced as part of a leadership development program. CSR can help individuals examine their existing presuppositions and interpret their past experiences, and it can also enable more learning opportunities than would otherwise occur (Mezirow, 1990). CSR can maximize the influences of informal daily workplace activities, engagements, interactions, or work tasks experiences that are critical components of leadership development (DeRue et al., 2012; McCall, 2004; Ohlott, 2004).

Through critical self-reflection and ePortfolio development, participants of the Program are given the opportunity to develop into leaders who are grounded in technical expertise as well as organizational leadership skills, creating stronger foundations for success as future cybersecurity professionals.

**Background**

As part of the P-CAP Leadership Academy, apprentices develop leadership competency through the Academy’s self-paced curriculum that is based on CSR and ePortfolio development to help participants develop self-efficacy as well as a number of skills, such as teamwork, problem-solving, interpersonal skills, and integrity. Self-efficacy is based on an individual’s perceptions based on their reflections on previous events pertaining to their knowledge, skills, and abilities on performing a task or demonstrating a skill (Bandura, 1977). Accordingly, organizational members who possess higher levels of self-efficacy are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of perseverance and reliance in the face of issues and challenges. Instead of ascribing any failings to individual inadequacies, they embrace them as part of lacking previous experience and prior exposure to such problems in the organizational context (1977), a mindset which contributes to personal leadership development through self-efficacy (Akdere, 2015; Boyce et al., 2010).

**Description**

The P-CAP Leadership Academy is an interrelated group of activities enabling individual learners to develop their leadership competency through CSR. Participants were introduced to the program by being told that it will help prepare them by helping them develop leadership competency for career success. Participants first engage in written CSR, which provides additional learning opportunities and advancement in verbal communication. This was done through relating experiences in their past to each of four knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) identified as essential by the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education (NICE) Cybersecurity Workforce Framework (2017). These include teamwork, problem-solving, interpersonal skills, and
integrity. These KSAs are essential components of leadership competency in cyber-related fields (NICE, 2017). The participants were given descriptions of each of these KSAs to guide them during their CSR. To facilitate the self-reflection process, they were asked to identify an artifact that would be related to each KSA and develop their written reflections as they relate to these artifacts. The key here was to select an artifact that would best relate to that specific KSA and then engage in the written CSR.

The participants were provided feedback on the first draft of their critical reflections. Feedback was provided to accomplish two objectives: to ensure that they were engaging in adaptive, not maladaptive, critical reflection and to ensure that the writing was of high enough quality to enhance written communication. Based on the feedback they received, the participants then revised their written reflections of each of the KSAs, composed a summative critical reflection that brought together their most impactful experiences into a single reflection, and added these written reflections to an ePortfolio where they also showcased their skills, experiences, and career goals. The ePortfolios followed a standard format in which participants included relevant biographical information, tying the critical reflection process to something concrete and deliverable. Upon successful completion of the ePortfolio component for each skill, apprentices received a digital badge, which collectively culminate into a Certificate of Completion of the P-CAP Leadership Academy. Figure 1 gives an overview of the Leadership Academy model.
Apprenticeship programs are gaining popularity across the country. Similarly, the field of cybersecurity is emerging as one of the critical areas for any given organization in the digital workplace. Therefore, the P-CAP Leadership Academy plays an important role in advancing leadership education through exploring the effectiveness of a workforce development model through CSR and ePortfolio building.
Appendices

Personal Leadership Vision Template

Developing Your Personal Leadership Vision
As you conclude your journey in the P-CAP Leadership Academy, this next activity will help you bring together many of the knowledge, skills, abilities (KSAs), and competencies you have acquired and uncovered along the way, setting the foundation for your own leadership vision.

How it works?
We developed this tool to help you articulate and synthesize all the instructional content of the Academy, further reflecting on how it relates to your previous, current, and future work and life experiences. While you will undoubtedly continue to increase your KSAs and develop leadership competence, this is an opportunity to prioritize those that matter most, in line with your individual goals for the short and mid-terms.

Charting the development plan
The goal of this tool is to assist you in defining a three-year development plan, giving you an opportunity to visualize the goals and think through the steps necessary to accomplish them. You should then revisit this plan periodically, at a minimum once every six months, and continue to update it as your priorities and goals evolve or change. To help you create a personal and achievable leadership development plan, we have included below four key guidelines:

1. **Less is More.** Focus on **no more** than three development areas. Based on the learnings acquired during your Academy journey, you should prioritize areas you consider to be most relevant for development in the short/mid-terms based on your career and life goals. As goals are accomplished, new ones can always be added, but it can be de-motivating and ineffective to spread your development focus too thin across multiple goals.

2. **Use SMART Guidelines.** Goals should be Specific, Measurable, Actionable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART). Although crafting goals that meet each of these requirements can feel burdensome, the payoff should far exceed the upfront effort.

3. **Get Feedback.** Like the critical self-reflections you have engaged in the previous modules, this is not necessarily a straightforward exercise, so we encourage you to submit the drafts of your personal leadership vision as much as needed. This is an iterative process and it will require multiple drafts and revisions, so do not expect to get it all done perfectly the first time. We will work with you, providing feedback to each draft and helping you progress towards completion of your leadership vision statement.

4. **Measure Progress.** Establish measures to evaluate the plan on a regular basis and track progress toward goals. Leaders follow through on their development plans much more when others are informed about the goals, which creates an opportunity for both communicating progress as well as gathering ongoing feedback from key stakeholders. In fact, we encourage you to routinely update your leadership vision statement as part of your professional career development journey.

Now let’s get started. Remember, the end goal of this activity is to help you draft a personal leadership vision and articulate what it means to YOU!
Development Plan Outline:

Name: ___________________________________
Current Job Title: _________________________
Current Employer: _________________________
Date: ________________________________

Based on your experience in the P-CAP Leadership Academy and the KSAs (Knowledge, Skills, Abilities) outlined in NIST NICE Framework (see the Appendix A at the end of this template), select the three key competencies or KSAs that you are most interested in developing.

• _______________________________________________________________________
• _______________________________________________________________________
• _______________________________________________________________________
LEADERSHIP VISION TEMPLATE FOR P-CAP LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

The table below allows you to break down each of these competencies into specific objectives and activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Competency 1</th>
<th>Competency 2</th>
<th>Competency 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What competencies would you like to learn, improve your knowledge of, change, and/or accomplish three years from now?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Think broadly!</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you interested in these specific competencies? How do they benefit your personal and career growth in the long-term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you develop these competencies? What resources will you use? Who might you work with? Who will you go to for help? (This includes attending meetings, shadowing someone at work, taking a course, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes and results…</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the sentence: You will know you have been successful in your development when_____.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessing College Students’ Leadership Mindsets as a Way to Facilitate the Leadership Coaching Process

Sumner Odom, Texas A&M University
Tearney Woodruff, Texas A&M University
Dylan Murray, Texas A&M University

Abstract

Leadership aptitude and self-awareness require ongoing reflection and development. The mindset of student leaders are adaptive to situations, but draw from personal experiences to establish a shifting leadership paradigm. This practice aimed to equip leadership coaches and mentees within a leadership program with a holistic overview of each student's understanding of leadership and to guide reflection discussions to further student development. Students in a leadership program completed the LABS instrument and results were calculated to determine their hierarchical and systemic scores. An infographic was created as a visual to depict where student scores were on a continuum and given to the student’s leadership coach to be used in helping guide the student in their leadership journey. The LABS instrument has been found to help differentiate students at Stage 3 or Stage 4 of the Leadership Identity Development Model (LID). This practice sought to provide context for the mentees leadership mindset while also providing a loosely structured framework as to where the students may experience further leadership development.

Introduction

The Leadership Identity Development (LID) model (Komives et al., 2005) is a model used to assist leadership educators in facilitating leadership development in students. The model consists of six stages of a process of which students experience cyclically and can go between stages and repeat stages as they learn and acquire information. The model also incorporates five factors that contribute to leadership identity. While the model is useful in understanding the factors that contribute to leadership identity and elements that make up leadership identity, there is no tool to assess students’ leadership identity within the model. The LABS instrument has been used and found to assess whether students are in Stage 3 or Stage 4 or higher of the model (Komives et al., 2005). Leadership educators mostly use reflections to assess students and estimate where students are at on the LID model. Reflections can be a great tool; however, it takes time and is a challenge to read the reflections and then to assess a student’s answers and how this fits within the model as each student’s reflection can vary significantly. This innovative practice poster will outline how one student leadership program utilized the LABS instrument and packaged it in a way to make the feedback on students’ leadership mindsets helpful to the leadership coach for purposes of guiding the student in their leadership identity journey.
Background

The purpose of the [Student Leadership] program is to guide participants in developing their identity as leaders by engaging in leadership development, education, and training opportunities while at the university (Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, & Osteen, 2006; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007; Allen & Roberts, 2011). Participants of the [Student Leadership] program are committed to honing skills, developing an appreciation for lifelong learning, and striving to be an engaged citizen post-graduation. Upon completing the program, which includes a final capstone project, students are inducted into a leadership society. Ultimately, it is the goal of the [Student Leadership] program that participants see their leadership journey as a lifelong learning process. Fundamental components of the program are that students engage in and reflect on, both in oral or written form, at least six different leadership experiences which exhibit a balance of leadership training, education, and development experiences. Each student is paired with a leadership coach who facilitates this critical reflection process and supports the student’s intentional, individualized, and holistic development as a leader.

The LID model serves as the theoretical framework for the [Student Leadership] program. This theoretical foundation affords the program an opportunity to offer intensive and purposeful leadership mentorship, to gather rich qualitative data about leadership learning across campus, and to integrate theory and assessment seamlessly throughout the program. The program utilizes the LID model to approximate the stage of leadership identity of its students upon acceptance to the program by evaluating application and interview responses in comparison to the LID model. Each of the leadership coaches are also trained to utilize the LID model to evaluate their student’s LID stage on a regular basis and to provide an individualized and responsive mentorship experience that challenges and supports students according to their approximated LID stage. The program also evaluates its students upon completion of the program through an exit interview, synthesis paper, and capstone project to determine growth along the LID model during a student’s tenure in the program.

Researchers who developed this model were initially interested in how leadership identity developed over time, “specifically in terms of how one comes to the self-acceptance of knowing one can work effectively with others to accomplish shared goals from any place in an organization—that is, to engage in leadership and see oneself as a leader” (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007, p. 393). A key finding from the study focused on developing the self, which includes “deepening self-awareness, building self-confidence, establishing interpersonal efficacy in working with others, applying new skills, and expanding one’s motivations—from joining groups just to make friends to being involved in groups to make a valuable contribution” (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007, p. 394). Furthermore, group influences and the importance of engaging meaningfully in groups are central to developing a leadership identity. Individuals who stay with the group over time see the value in learning from the continuity of group membership, and more importantly, see the group as an organization with structure and purpose rather than a collection of friends. As such, the students’ perceptions change over time. Initially,
they see themselves as dependent on others, then they moved to an independent view from others, and finally they see the need for interdependence with others.

The educational setting can create an environment that supports and facilitates learning for both students and groups. Education cannot force people to change, but it can help students reflect and make meaning of their lives (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Identity development is connected to the changing nature of relationships with others. Day (2000) proclaimed that "the primary emphasis in leadership development is on building and using interpersonal competence" (p. 585). As such, a central component of the program is the development of self as leaders. Understanding oneself as a leader does not equate to being able to lead others. Students must also engage in leadership with others to further understand the relational aspect of working in groups and organizations. To assist students in their development, every student is assigned a leadership coach. Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, and Osteen (2006) shared that “students need a safe place to reflect and make meaning of their experiences” (p. 415). Leadership coaches guide participants in reflecting about how they work within group contexts and what they are learning from these interactions, which is emphasized in the LID model. Coaches are critical to the affirmation and support needed to develop self-confidence and shape a leadership identity (Komives, Longerbeam, Owen, Mainella, and Osteen, 2006).

The Leadership Attitudes and Beliefs Scale (LABS) was designed for assessing attitudes and beliefs (or mindsets) about leadership in college (Wielkiewicz, 2000; Wielkiewicz, 2002). The assessment produces two results based on statements given to the students on how important aspects of leadership may be: and provides a snapshot of the assessment taker’s Hierarchical Thinking and Systemic Thinking mind frames. A systemic thinker recognizes the importance of cooperation and collaboration while approaching a long-term thinking approach and need for organizational adaptation. Alternatively, hierarchical thinking tends to rely more on the structure of an organization, with power and control focused towards the top of the organization’s leadership where the success of an organization also relies. Based on these scores, a student may be identified as either “low” or “high” ranking in their preference for these two Leadership Mindsets. These scores are reflected inversely, on a scale of 14-70, and the combination of scores provide some insight into where a student leader’s development should focus.

The LABS has been found to characterize students with strong hierarchical thinking in Stage 3 of the LID model whereas students with strong systemic thinking as Stage 4 (Komives et al., 2005). Students with both hierarchical and systemic thinking would be characterized at Stage 5 or Stage 6 (Wielkiewicz & Stelzner, 2005). Gender differences have been found on leadership mindsets with males in first year college experiences leaning more toward a hierarchical mindset and females with more of a systemic mindset (Ho & Odom, 2015; Wielkiewicz et al., 2012). Differences in leadership mindsets have been found between juniors and seniors enrolled in an academic leadership program (Ho & Odom, 2015) and freshman in a leadership-themed living learning community had slightly higher systemic thinking scores and more neutral hierarchical thinking scores (Dunn, Odom, Moore, & Rotter, 2016).
Description of the Practice

The LABSII instrument was sent to students upon acceptance into the [Student Leadership] program. Data was captured through Qualtrics and downloaded to Excel where scores were analyzed. Student scores were reported with a Systemic score and a Hierarchical score. An infographic was created to communicate a visual of where each student’s scores fell on a continuum.

Leadership coaches were sent an email with a general explanation of the LABS III instrument and what it measures including the infographic. The email also included how their student scored on the instrument. Coaches were also given a more specific explanation of the student’s scores. Based on student’s scores, coaches received one of the following explanations:

High Hierarchical/Low Systemic

Low systemic scores could mean less adaptive thinking. This lack of adaptive thinking could potentially lead to drawbacks in changing markets and even branch further into issues involving ethics and sustainability. These individuals show less dexterity in listening to feedback from their organization members, and may have a lower likelihood in believing in individuals single-handedly making decisions.

High Hierarchical/High Systemic

A higher systemic score (14-42) would mean that individuals are more adaptive in their thinking, while still progressing in fully conceptualizing what some of the cons of a strictly hierarchal leadership style may be. These individuals may show dexterity in listening to feedback from their organization members, though may have a higher likelihood in believing in individuals
single-handedly making decisions. These leaders may struggle identifying when their systemic or hierarchal beliefs may be best used, and may adapt to their environments by reducing value of one particular style. While this adaptation is important, Allen et al. (1998) highlights that a higher belief in systemic thinking can lead to organizations with higher adaptability, ethics, and sustainability.

Low Hierarchical/Low Systemic

Individuals scoring with both low hierarchal and systemic scores may still lack enough organizational context to connect experience to practice. Individuals with this score may need alternative reflections on their previous experiences with leadership, or additional organizational leadership roles to better define the concept of leadership to establish their beliefs.

Low Hierarchical/High Systemic

According to research, this would be ideal score for individuals looking to create adaptable and influential change in their organizations. According to Allen et al. (1998) these individuals are the most likely to make themselves aware of the forces that have the potential to impact the organization. These individuals show dexterity in listening to feedback from their organization members, and would have a lower likelihood in believing in individuals single-handedly making decisions. These individuals, while practicing an ideal leadership style, may struggle in organizations led with High Hierarchal thinkers- where a leader may believe that their position eliminates the need for feedback from those reporting to them.

The information sent to coaches was used to aid the leadership coach in guiding their student. Coaches also received an estimation of the student’s LID score based on a subjective assessment from a panel of interviewers of the student during their initial interview for acceptance into the program. Students were not sent this information to try and limit their likelihood of feeling judged or boxed into a “score” or position.

**Foreseeable Implications**

Leadership coaches appreciated the specificity of information about the leadership mindset of their student as it provided greater intentionality of leadership identity development, especially in combination with the approximation of the LID model stage. As students are interviewed for the program, the interviewees assess where they believe the student is in regard to their LID stage. Our future plans include a comparison of the approximation of the LID model stage by the interviewees to the systemic and hierarchical thinking scores on the LABS instrument.

The LABS instrument provides an avenue for forward progress and the potential development of a specific measure of leadership identity development by offering an initial platform to predict certain stages of leadership identity. An assessment to identify the student’s LID model stage would be ideal to provide leadership coaches with a tool to help them guide students in their leadership journey.
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Building College Students’ Capacity to Solve Wicked Problems in Teams: Implementing the Design-Based Thinking for Engaged Learning (DTEL) Model in a Leadership Course

Summer Odom, Texas A&M University
Jonan Donaldson, Texas A&M University
Rachel Stoltzman, Texas A&M University

Abstract

Employers believe college students need problem solving skills and the ability to work on a team and they lack these skills upon entering employment. Design-based thinking for engaged learning (DTEL) provides structure for project-based collaborative learning and was used in a leadership course for teams of undergraduate students to facilitate their problem-solving of real, wicked problems presented by local organizations. Students developed solutions to these wicked problems and presented them to organizations. In assessments of the process, students reported gains in problem-solving and teamwork skills. While the design thinking process was a challenge at the beginning for students, it was described by students as providing a useful structured framework for problem solving and teamwork projects. Instructors used feedback to refine the structure of the design thinking process including more instructional components like videos and designed a template to be used by other faculty who desire to implement design thinking into their courses.
Fostering Growth Mindset and Design Thinking in Undergraduate Advising: Presenting and Evaluating a Manual

Addison Sellon, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Hannah Sunderman, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
L.J. McElravy, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Abstract

The purpose of the current poster is to present an innovative way to improve the academic advising experience in leadership education. Academic advising is well-recognized as a critical component to the undergraduate experience; however, scholars and practitioners have called for improvement of the advising process for the betterment of both student and advisor. Growth mindset and design thinking are complementary concepts that may meet this need by providing students with tools to increase their problem-solving skills while allowing advisors to provide a structured yet personalized experience. This poster outlines a proposed manual designed to integrate growth mindset and design thinking into the advising process, providing a useful document for advisors to use while also encouraging students to take charge of their academic experience.
Understanding Women in Leadership From the Inside: An Analogical Representation of Women in Leadership Positions from a Phenomenological Lens

Sakshi Bhati, Kansas State University

Abstract

Women in leadership positions around the world face personal and professional obstacles which distinguish them individually since their phenomenological experiences are unique. These subjective experiences shape their social interactions and leadership practices, and this concept is developed with the help of an iceberg analogy, highlighting the surface above the iceberg (material, physical and objective place) as a woman’s outer world where she interacts and exerts leadership practices and the bottom (mental and phenomenological space) as her mental state which is filled with subjective experiences built by personal and societal barriers created by the outside world. The analogy implicates a need for effective leadership development practices to prevent barriers from transpiring and urges institutions to foster and promote women and leadership scholarship.

Introduction

Leadership is a relational and ethical process of people together attempting to accomplish positive change (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2013). To pursue a positive change in women’s leadership, scholarship needs to move to an expanded conversation that can provide a framework for a shift in thinking about women and leadership (Haber-Curran & Sulpizio, 2017). There is a disproportionate gap in the representation of women in most industries’ leadership ranks, and the higher the roles, the more imbalanced it is (Lennon, 2013; Pew Research Center, 2015). To fill this gap, leadership development must be treated as a learning process or objective beyond just the labels of role or trait (Haber-Curran & Sulpizio, 2017) to strengthen confidence and self-efficacy in women leaders.

In this conceptual research poster, I offer an illustration to better understand how the experiences of women in leadership positions affect their leadership styles and communication. Utilizing a phenomenological lens, I will explore how experiences shape social interactions and leadership practices. For this research, leadership positions may include a variety of professional roles such as managerial staff, higher education faculty, or executive positions at multinational companies. I will use the analogy of an iceberg to propose the connections between the phenomenological tradition of human communication, concepts of space and place in sociomateriality, and effective leadership and communication practices. Finally, I will identify implications for leadership education and development. These implications will aim to focus on women and leadership and advanced leadership practices.

Background

Constructivism

The current research poster has been developed under the constructivism paradigm of leadership research which treats reality as subjective and constructed through experiences and perspectives.
(Dugan 2017). It argues that the activities of scientists of all types - including behavioral scientists [including leaders]- are not exercises in pure rationality. Rather, they involve complex webs of social relations where actors develop strategies, cultural capital and habitus which constitutes a field of practice (Sant'Anna et. al 2011). These social relations are a direct impact of subjective experiences which exerts certain leadership practices.

**Phenomenology**

The phenomenological tradition of human communication introduced by Robert Craig treats communication as the experience of self and others through dialogue (Apuke 2017). It emphasizes the interpretation of one’s own subjective experiences (Apuke, 2017). These subjective experiences construct reality through dialogue and communication in the outside world while exerting leadership as a practice.

**Women’s Leadership**

Women in workplaces around the world have witnessed great challenges due to the absence of gender neutrality which sees the male counterpart as the ideal worker (Burkinshaw & White, 2017). A key impact of organizational masculinity is the emotional labor expended by women to succeed (Burkinshaw & White, 2017). Women often face challenges in breaking through the ‘glass ceiling’ to achieve their personal and professional goals. Academic women are therefore often building their careers later than their male colleagues and are less likely to have a traditional trajectory starting as a lecturer and then progressing through the ranks to senior lecturer, associate professor and full professor (Bagilhole & White 2011). Women in administrative roles are more likely than male colleagues to have interrupted careers and to work part-time (Burkinshaw & White, 2017). Phenomenologically speaking, each person’s experiences are different. However, common barriers identified by Kalaitzi et al. (2017) other than gendered workplace are personal loss, work-life balance, racial inequality sacrifice, failure etc. which may or may not be influenced by gendered workplaces.

**Sociomateriality**

The accumulated experiences can be understood by associating it with space as a concept of sociomaterality. According to Ropo et. al (2013), ontologically, space is mental and phenomenological and is embodied based on experiences, emotions, and imaginations. Meanwhile, the physical world resonates with the concept of place since it is more material [physical] and objective (Ropo et al., 2013). Epistemologically, “place is more rational and objectives, driven by measurable and rational planning, whereas space is more subjective and embodied and is imagined” (Ropo et al. 2013, p. 382)

**Description**

The analogy of iceberg has been developed to map out the phenomenological experiences of women in leadership positions in relation to their leadership practices. This paradigm is aiming to promote a direct relationship between women’s experiences and their leadership practices and communication on the outside.
Unpacking the Iceberg Analogy

The iceberg represents a woman’s mental (top) and physical (bottom) environment. While the top of the iceberg is often visible in the outside world, the bottom is surfaced beneath the ocean and goes unnoticed. Let us imply the study of women in leadership to the iceberg.

Above the Surface

The top, visible part of the iceberg on the outside represents the physical world where women practice leadership through social interaction driven by their knowledge, emotions, and experiences. This physical world is where she engages in discursive leadership influenced by experiences and leadership knowledge. The power of language in social interaction and the construction of reality is driven by thoughts and experience. Entities [women] make sense of
social world through interactions, influenced by their experiences, which can be an effective tool for storytelling in leadership practice.

Since the attention is on individual entities of the leadership process, it is vital to address the importance of understanding the psychological approaches and influences on identity. Self is assumed to be an entity that is indulged in the process of social interaction (Clifton 2018, p. 623). Potter and Witherell’s (1987) three central (social) psychological approaches to identity can help understand this iceberg structure.

1. Trait theories – “consideration of self to be an amalgam of relatively consistent character trait which drive behavior” (Clifton 2018, p. 623). Women’s experiences and emotions reflect on their leadership styles and contributions.
2. Role theories – “leaders identity occurs when an individual takes on a leader role and through a process of socialization, this role is internalized and becomes part of the leader's identity” (Clifton 2018, p. 623). The socialization in leadership practices in the physical world exerts a leader role and identity, shaped by their experiences.
3. Humanist theories – “Humanist approaches to identity consider that an individual’s life is a process of trying to recover the true self which once achieved will lead to self-actualization” (Clifton 2018, p. 623). This self-actualization will modify the women’s leadership style.

Beneath the Surface

The surface beneath represents the personal experiences of women which are packed with personal barriers and experiences that contribute toward exerting a certain style of leadership on the outside. Societal factors, identified by Kalaitzi et al.’s (2017), like racial and gender inequality, fear of being stereotyped, personal health concerns, work-life balance, the pressure of past failures, sacrifices, and persistence to succeed, that shape their leadership practice, are submerged here and serve as barriers.
Work-life balance. Women often face the pressures of balancing their work and their personal lives. This includes family as a factor of work-life balance. This constitutes 10 percent in both academia and business sectors and 9 percent in healthcare (Kalaitzi et al., 2017, p. 465). “Women are somewhat more likely than men to see family responsibilities [including having children] as a significant barrier for them, hoping to reach the top levels of corporate leadership; 26 percent of women and 20 percent of men say this is a major reason that more women are not in top executive business positions” (Pew Research, 2015, p. 3).

Fear of Stereotypes. Women often face the fear of being stereotyped by their peers in their leadership role. These stereotypes can be based on gender, race, or/and nationality. Gender stereotypes in leadership and particularly in terms of equal opportunities, gender-related corporate culture, inflexibility in workplaces structures and inadequacies in social policies, as well as gender roles in family responsibilities and the social acceptance are deeply rooted constraints which may foster the “ambition gap” (Kalaitzi et al., 2017, p. 470). Stereotypes are a fundamental barrier in the business sector (12 percent), followed by 10 percent in healthcare and 8 percent in academia (Kalaitzi et al., 2017, p. 465).

Gender inequality. Gender inequality is unfortunately a historic barrier that often causes pressure and discrimination in women’s survival. Eagly and Carli (2007) asserted that there is a gender bias that exists such that men are associated with being leaders. After all, they more commonly demonstrate assertive masculine traits that connote leadership, such as dominance, whereas women are less apt to be perceived as leaders because they are more likely to demonstrate communal qualities such as compassion. This sense of differentiation demonstrates unequal treatment and women in leadership positions are often expected to lead within a narrow band described as the small range between not too wimpy and not too bitchy (Bronznick & Goldenhar, 2008).

Racial inequality. Being a woman in a workplace is challenging. Being a woman of color, unfortunately, is more disadvantageous. Some of the reasons behind these disadvantages include “lack of line experience, inadequate career opportunities, racial differences in speech and socialization, ethnosexual stereotypes, “old boy networks,” and tokenism (Oakley, 2000). Racial discrimination prevails in the “healthcare sector (1 percent), Academia (2 percent) and Business (5 percent)” (Kalaitzi et al 2017, p 465).

The Interconnectivity

The relationship being constructed here interconnectivity. The physical world and leadership practices through social interactions are driven by the mental environment of feelings and experiences of an individual. For example, the leadership styles of two racially distinguished leaders are going to differ due to their past experiences and since experiences are phenomenological, the perspective each leader exemplifies will be different, therefore distinguishing their leadership practices. Similarly, the barriers are a direct result of the actions that women in leadership positions experience in the outside world. For example, the inability to achieve professional goals may ignite the emotions of loss, failure, and depression in some leaders. So, the emotions and barriers represented at the bottom of the iceberg and leadership
practices through social interactions are interconnected and interrelated since they transpire each other. This conceptual research aims to focus on this interconnectivity of phenomenological experiences and social interaction to promote the importance of efficient leadership development and prevent such barriers from transpiring, further empowering engaged and effective leadership practices.

Implications

This conceptual poster aims to relate communication principles to leadership development, focusing primarily on women's leadership obstacles and how they contribute to distinct leadership practices. The study also attempts to suggest that the functions of discursive leadership are distinguishable because their origins are also phenomenological, implying that social encounters are the product of an individual's experiences that make their style of leadership and communication practices distinct. This conceptual model tries to allocate place and space in context to provide a new leadership perspective to the sociomateriality concept, discovering how mental and physical environment can be effective influencers to leadership.

Personal and societal obstacles can lead to mental health concerns if they are left unaddressed. It is imminent that these barriers are communicated with experts to seek help at an early stage. Another implication of this study is to address gender inequality and workplace discrimination which contributes toward experiences that create barriers. Organizations around the world must take efforts in becoming more gender-neutral and build safer and more inclusive workplaces for all genders and elimination of the “glass ceiling.”

To foster effective leadership practices in women, higher education institutions must undertake leadership efficacy (Haber-Curran & Sulpizio, 2017) to build [women] leaders from an early age. Leadership programs across campuses must pay attention to women and leadership scholarship and provide mentorship and stimulate research engagement (Haber-Curran & Sulpizio, 2017) in topics of women’s leadership development. Engaged leadership is a result of social interactions. Since such interactions are influenced by experiences, efficient leadership development practices need to be introduced to educate and engage young women and men in equal opportunities and engagements.
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Check Yes or No: Assessing Students’ Critical Thinking Behaviors using the QUEEN Checklist Assessment

Bethany A. Busa, Texas A&M University
Barry L. Boyd, Texas A&M University
Jennifer Strong, Texas A&M University

Abstract

Effective leaders are critical thinkers. We, as leadership educators, understand the correlation, but sometimes find it hard to assess critical thinking behaviors. Therefore, a model of behaviorally-anchored critical thinking was created (the QUEEN model) and a subsequent assessment developed. One version of this assessment is a check-list instructors and leadership development practitioners can utilize to measure critical thinking behavior. This assessment was used with students in an applied leadership ethics course to appraise their critical thinking behavior before and after critical thinking instruction. Results found students used critical thinking behaviors more frequently after engaging in purposeful critical thinking instruction.

Introduction

Dating back to the time of Socrates, critical thinking has played an integral role in education by challenging students with purposeful inquiry to create meaning from knowledge and experience by applying reasoning and reflection skills (Nappi, 2017). Qualities of an adept critical thinker include, but are not limited to, curiosity, open-mindedness, honesty in confronting intrinsic biases, diligence in examining information and sound judgement (Facione, 1990). According to The Association of American Colleges and Universities, approximately 93 percent of employers believe critical thinking skills are more important than undergraduate major and report job preference will be given to individuals who deliver innovative ideas (AAC&U, 2013), indicating the importance of creativity as part of critical thinking, an often underrepresented category in evaluations (Ennis, 1993).

Researchers posit that a disparity exists between teachers’ understanding of critical thinking outcomes and their ability to recognize when students are displaying these attributes, thus, providing a list of explicit behaviors indicative of higher order thinking is imperative for classroom achievement (Choy & Cheah, 2009). A significant deficiency in understanding critical thinking was revealed amongst instructors at a prominent land grant university, suggesting a need to assess the instructors’ personal disposition and skills regarding critical thinking prior to classroom implementation (Stedman & Adams, 2012). Differing educational strategies to gauge learner comprehension can be explained by the dichotomy of productive query, which defines questions stimulating higher order thinking, and reproductive query, referring to questions prompting recollection and regurgitation (Tienken et al., 2012). Pressure from school systems, and institutes of higher education, to meet standardized learning objectives within a restricted time frame prevents cultivating an environment designed to encourage self-directed, interactive learning.
learning which limits the possibility of developing critical thinking skills (Fadhlullah & Ahmad, 2017).

Student accomplishment emanates when instructors provide written expectations of critical thinking in the form of specific assessment criteria which is monitored throughout the course term and shared with the student for self-evaluation (Broadbear, 2003). Optimal development of critical thinking occurs when instructors focus on progressing both students’ disposition and hard skills (Ricketts & Rudd, 2005). Different from intelligence tests, assessments should include criterion sampling which requires behavioral analysis and practical application, and be designed such that progress is monitored throughout successive tests which are inclusive of competencies measured beyond occupation or subject, such as communication and leadership skills (McClelland, 1973). Prioritizing faculty development and implementing valid assessments to measure higher order thinking is paramount to the success of institutions, as without which there is no incentive to track progress and invest monetarily in the growth of critical thinking initiatives (Haynes et al., 2016).

**Theoretical Framework**

Competencies are behavioral measurements delineated as knowledge, skills and abilities, which distinguish between productive and unproductive performance (Maxine, 1997). Buford and Lindner define these three competencies as; knowledge consisting of information substantiated by academic literature used by students to achieve effective performance, skills as observable proficiencies needed to complete an action, and abilities as proficiencies necessary to execute an observable behavior or behaviorally-driven outcome (2002). Behavioral anchors categorize specific attributes which contribute to students’ mastery of content (Dooley and Lindner, 2002), while competency-based behavioral anchors act as indicators of competency performance (Buford and Lindner, 2002).

Progress in the classroom is expedited when students are advised on the competencies they exhibit for future improvement in designated areas (Drawbaugh, 1972). Additionally, competency models are applicable to the workforce as behavioral constructs are used to merge organizational strategy and individual performance to maximize cumulative outcomes (Rothwell and Lindholm, 1999). In order to remain current with an evolving workplace, employers are relying more on competency-based professional development, allowing employees to advance skills required for specific job responsibilities (Dooley et al., 2004). Therefore, by fostering a learning environment which assesses student achievement using competency-based behavioral anchors, individuals are more apt to produce innovative solutions to resolve challenges faced outside of the classroom (Muller-Frommeyer et al., 2017).

This study used a competency-based, behavioral-anchored model to assess student growth in critical thinking behaviors. The QUEEN model was developed using data from a national Delphi study and a critical thinking literature analysis to identify critical thinking behaviors that students exhibit in the classroom. The model contains 28 critical thinking behaviors broken into five
categories: Questioning behaviors, Understanding behaviors, Explaining behaviors, Evaluation behaviors, and Neoteric behaviors (open to new ideas).

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to use competency-based behavioral anchors to assess critical thinking behaviors in selected assignments in an applied leadership ethics course.

**Methods**

The researchers analyzed two written case studies in a summer online ethics course using an assessment tool developed from the QUEEN critical thinking model. One case study was assigned at the beginning of the semester, prior to critical thinking instruction, and the second case near the end of the semester. Each case study required students to apply ethical theories and develop and articulate an answer to an ethical dilemma. In between the two cases, students were instructed in critical thinking behaviors and given opportunities to practice the behaviors. The researchers examined the content of each case study to identify any of the 28 critical thinking behaviors described in the QUEEN model. The QUEEN Model of critical thinking identifies Questioning behaviors, Understanding behaviors, Explaining behaviors, Evaluation behaviors, and Neoteric behaviors (open to new ideas).

Two researchers used deductive thematic coding to analyze 27 student assignments. Deductive thematic coding examines data to determine the degree to which it conforms to existing conceptualizations or frameworks (Patton, 2015). The QUEEN critical thinking behaviors served as the existing framework. The Critical Thinking Behaviors Checklist (CTBC), derived from the QUEEN model, was used to identify students’ critical thinking behaviors on these two assignments. Both researchers read each student’s assignment and marked all critical thinking behaviors observed on the CTBC.

**Findings**

For the first assignment administered at the beginning of the semester, each researcher recorded within the Questioning competency list a much greater frequency of students exhibiting an understanding of the main question, with far fewer displaying behaviors of asking clarifying questions, stating questions clearly and questioning perceptions. Data revealed that among Understanding behaviors, both researchers reported the largest frequency of students understanding context, while the remaining seven competencies varied greatly in the number of observations documented by each researcher. Additionally, drawing appropriate conclusions was the most commonly observed behavior within the Evaluation category. A difference of twelve and fourteen observations were found between the two researchers' documentation of students’ ability to identify potential consequences of decisions and ability to identify and examine own
assumptions or those of others, respectively. Students’ proficiency to state results or conclusions clearly was among the top recorded behavior for the Explanation category, with the successive behavior being students’ capacity to provide examples to connect points. A large discrepancy between researcher observations is noted for the behavior described as a student’s ability to justify and defend positions, found among the Explanation competencies. In the final category, Neoteric thinking, the two highest ranked behaviors identified were students’ open-mindedness to new ideas or viewpoints and ability to engage in self-examination.

Observations recorded for the second assignment offered similar results in the Questioning competencies, as a student’s capacity to understand the main question of the issue far outnumbered all other possible behaviors. Moreover, researchers also agreed that most students displayed an understanding of the context, while other Understanding behaviors ranked lower and were recorded in a wide range of frequencies dependent on the data collector. Analogous to the first assignment, within the Evaluation competency, drawing appropriate conclusions using data and information available was the most common behavior observed. However, researchers disagreed considerably in finding qualities for judging the credibility of sources and relevance of information. Again at the end of the semester, both researchers noticed most students possessed the characteristic of stating results or conclusions clearly, and the three highest successive behaviors were using examples to connect points, justifying and defending positions and explaining the reasoning process. Furthermore, the second assignment also reflects similar findings from previous coursework for the Neoteric competency list, with the highest occurring behaviors recorded as open-mindedness to new ideas or viewpoints and engaging in self-examination.

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Primary considerations which could explain the difference in critical thinking behaviors observed in student assignments from the beginning to the end of the semester includes the students’ development of various critical thinking skills throughout the semester and the dissimilarity of the nature of prompts given each time which necessitate the use of different higher order thinking skills. Additionally, the experience level and familiarity with critical thinking instruction and awareness for each of the two researchers could potentially explain contrasting observations found for various behaviors within the data collected.

Aside from these caveats, increased critical thinking behaviors observed throughout the semester can be attributed to successful instruction and assessment of competency-based criterion. These findings indicate that the QUEEN model can serve as a foundation to inform instructors of primary critical thinking behaviors to cultivate and develop in the classroom. As results suggest, professional development has the potential to influence more consistent assessment outcomes, as teachers can only communicate critical thinking skills in as much as they understand and demonstrate the same competencies (Paul and Elder, 2019). Additionally, the CTBC can offer students an opportunity for self-evaluation and provide guidance for personalized instruction based on behavioral strengths and weaknesses (Broadbear, 2003).
Additional research on the CTBC is needed by using it in various classroom contexts to further assess the validity of the instrument independent of the educational context in which it is delivered. In addition, it is recommended that classroom instructors receive an orientation to the critical thinking behaviors expressed in the QUEEN model and how to recognize them in student assignments. Moreover, the impact of critical thinking development for instructors prior to implementation of the QUEEN model should be evaluated in more detail.
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Examining the transformational leadership level of youth coaches:
Developing the next generation of athletes/leaders
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Abstract

At what age can young people begin to learn leadership? Who is most able to impart leadership skills with this group? Are youth coaches transformational leaders? The answer to these questions has implications for educators at all levels and in all fields of study. According to Brinton, Hill, and Ward (2017), nearly 44 million students aged six to eighteen participate in youth sports programs. The sheer preponderance of youth athletes underscores the millions of coaches interacting with these adolescents. Therefore, athletic coaches are positioned well to impart leadership skills. Specifically, youth football offers a positive channel for athletes to develop life skills and highlights the importance of athletics as a platform for instilling positive leadership qualities (Christofferson & Deutsch, 2017). In this study, a national sample of youth coaches (n=334) took an online survey version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The results outline how these coaches exhibit consistent levels of transformational leadership, they impact an athlete’s leadership development, and further the discussion regarding the mentor’s influence on an athlete’s leadership lens.

Introduction

Leadership is a complex and multifaceted phenomena requiring education, a motivation to be successful, and many other particular resources (Rost, 1991). Organizations, regardless of discipline, aim to develop an understanding of the style of leadership that may best inform how to effectively lead within their groups. Understanding that leadership can be learned (Buschlen & Dvorak, 2011), society benefits by teaching leadership to adolescents. An adolescent’s participation on an athletic team provides a positive outlet and a leadership training opportunity in communities throughout the United States. With parents working full-time, many students seek afterschool programs such as athletics, clubs, and other organizations to fill their time.

Coaches have the potential to propel youth forward into a purpose and goal driven life. Students deprived of these co-curricular opportunities may choose to seek affiliations inclusive of drugs, alcohol, and crime. Since the 1990’s, many programs have been created to guide students in rural and urban settings toward youth mentoring programs, athletics, and leadership opportunities (Buschlen, Chang, & Kniess, 2018). According to Buschlen and Dvorak (2011), leadership is a skill that can be taught and learned. Therefore, it is critical to understand where these leadership development opportunities exist, and the role that coaches play within the leadership development spectrum. The goal of developing strong leaders in society starts with
understanding of the following questions, at what age can leadership be learned and how do youth athletic coaches impart formal and informal leadership qualities in the presence of an adolescent population? Constructive leadership coaching transcends the setting, beginning at the youngest levels, and sets the tone for developing the athlete’s perception of their future (Zenger, 2017).

Background

The study of how leaders impact follower’s dates back over a century and early historical literature purports that leadership has been examined from a trait or personality perspective (Rost, 1991). Today, transformational leadership is commonly viewed as an effective leadership style when considering youth athletic coaches. Youth comprehend the need for effective leadership and have the capacity to learn the tenets of leadership. During their adolescent time, leadership preparation comes in many forms: serving communities, participation in co-curricular organizations, religious affiliations, community engagement efforts, athletics, and fundraising for a cause. Some programs are actually structured on a leadership curriculum (Buschlen & Dvorak, 2011; Daugherty & Williams, 1997). Buschlen, Chang, and Kniess (2018) qualitatively examined an inner-city program for fatherless males and found that mentorship, along with structured athletic participation, and the act of being served by others led young men to demonstrate those same qualities when they became adults. In this study, youth football coaches self-reported transformational and transactional leadership levels over nine domains, measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The results in this sample were higher or more transformational when compared to the national averages found in MLQ. Additionally, the results of this study describe several links between the safety habits of the coaches and their transformational/transactional leadership qualities showcased to their athletes.

Description

Survey research was utilized to assess a national population of youth football coaches, from a single national youth organization, regarding their level of self-reported transformational leadership and possible relationships with organizational characteristics. Participants (n=334) voluntarily took an online survey, supported and emailed out by the national organization and coaches then completed the MLQ. Additionally, respondents answered questions related to demographics and characteristics related to: age, years of coaching experience, division of athlete coached, highest level of educational attainment, and safety. Statistical methods included a MANCOVA analysis to determine relationships between the dependent variables of the transformational leadership domains found in the MLQ (intellectual stimulation (IS), inspirational motivation (IM), individual consideration (IC), idealized influence – active (IIA), and idealized influence – behavioral (IIB)) and each of the independent variables (age, educational attainment, safety composite score, and years of experience). The control variables were race and region.
Results

Are youth football coaches transformational leaders? Yes. Based on their scores in this study when compared to national averages. Tests between-subjects effects were completed to determine significance between the dependent leadership behaviors (IC, IM, IS, IIA, and IIB – variables found in the MLQ) and the independent variables (age, years of coaching experience, division coached, safety composite score, and educational attainment). The results showed no significant relationships involving the independent variables of age, division of athlete coached, or highest level of educational attainment with the dependent variable, transformational leadership behaviors. In short, the coaches who participated in this survey scored higher than the national norms of the MLQ in all areas of transformation, scores in both Management-by-Exception and Laissez Faire (both areas are Passive/Avoidant aspects of the model) were lower than national norms.

The following highlight the primary results of the study:

- The independent variable, years of coaching experience, was found to be significant with two domains of the transformational leadership behaviors (dependent variable). These included idealized influence – behavioral (IIB) and individualized consideration (IC). Additionally, the independent variable, safety composite score, was significantly related to the dependent variable of idealized influence – active (IIA). These results implied that there is a significant relationship between these dependent and independent variables. In other words, national youth football organization coaches that have extensive experience exhibit strong transformational leadership behaviors and these coaches consider player safety a priority. These findings suggest that national youth football organization coaches with greater amounts of experience are able to create proficiencies for their athletes. Coaches with more years of experience are more able to instill more positive leadership attributes that athlete may emulate in the future.

- A key hypothesis was supported by the positive association between the transformational leadership dimension of individual consideration (IC) and years of coaching experience. According to Bass and Avolio (2004), IC is a dimension of transformational leadership that is characterized by the inclusion of people in the processes of the organization (or team), where the leader diagnoses the needs, abilities, and values of the person (athlete). This study found that as the years of experience of a coach increases, so does the level of Individual Consideration. Experienced leaders (older) in this study utilized IC to a higher degree than less experienced leaders.

- Another hypothesis described a positive association between the transformational leadership dimension of Idealized Influence – Active (IIA) and the independent variable of safety composite score. IIA leaders are thought to have high standards of ethical and moral behaviors which are then emulated by the followers (Bass & Avolio, 2004). As the level of IIA of the national youth football coach increased, so did the safety composite score of the coach. The safety composite score included mandatory trainings that the coaches were to complete. The high mean and median scores of the safety composite index supports the hypothesis that these coaches make safety a priority.
• There were two relationships found in terms of the passive/avoidant leadership domain; MBEP and years of coaching experience, and Management-by-Exception – Passive (MBEP) and age. The results showed no significant relationships involving the independent variables of division, region, safety composite score, and highest level of educational attainment with passive/avoidant leadership behaviors. This lack of relationship purports that these coaches are leaders who do not avoid important issues when leading athletes, actively promote safe play, and proactively look for educational opportunities regardless of the division of the athlete coached or the region in which they coach.

• Finally, the years of coaching experience and management by exception – passive (MBEP) leadership domain were negatively associated. This finding purport that as the years of coaching experience increases, the MBEP leadership behaviors decrease. In other words, these coaches include the athlete’s voices in leading the team, transmit individual coaching of the athlete, are motivational, open lines of communication between the coach, athlete, and parents, and are proactive in foreshadowing potential issues, mitigating as many conflicts as possible. National youth football organizations are appropriately transactional, through an exchange of rewards (playing time, etc.) for effort. These coaches are not passive/avoidant leaders, they do not wait for conflict to arise, and are swift in dealing with crises.

This set of coaches established that they are transformational leaders who display higher levels of transformational leadership behaviors compared to the general population. This was evident in specific transformational leadership domains, namely in the idealized influence and individual consideration leadership dimensions and more apparent for those with many years of coaching experience. Additionally, the coaches in this study prioritize the safety of their athletes by scoring extremely high on the safety composite score index. This safety index was added to the survey and is not part of the MLQ.

Implications for Leadership Educators

So, if these coaches are transformational already, how does that impact leadership educators? This group of coaches are likely “accidental leaders” in other words, they were not formally trained in transformational leadership habits nor do they possess an academic background in leadership development. This may be explained, in part, as many leadership theories are descriptive. Therefore, these coaches may simply exhibit behaviors based on their past experiences, which may or may not work, and then adapt. This creates a gap between where coaches currently exist and where they could be. Leadership educators are the primary experts in understanding leadership theory, analyzing current trends in leadership, teaching leadership to others, designing effective curriculum, instruction, and implementation of appropriate content. Leadership educators are knowledgeable in analyzing and using data to create an effective training regimen for these coaches. Therefore, extracurricular programs and youth sports organization should consider using leadership educators to fill this gap.
Implementing a local, regional, or national leadership education program taught by leadership educators may improve a coach’s leadership efficacy, enhance their teams, and guide the leadership lens of current players who may become future coaches. The effectiveness of these programs may be contingent upon the use of proper pedagogies (Lerman et al., 2015). A lack of development in pedagogically informed coaching practice may limit the overall effectiveness of coach education programs, and the scarcity of pedagogical information available to coaches (Vinson et al., 2016). This gap can be filled with the skills of professional leadership educators. With such a vast number of youth participating in these athletic events on an annual bases, the need for leadership educators to teach their trade to youth coaches has never been greater.
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Florida Extension Agents’ Perceived Level of Trust with Their County Extension Director
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Abstract

County Extension Directors (CED) act as the administrative leader of the County Extension office and also implement their own educational program. County Extension agents act as the leader of their program area and corresponding community audience. Because of the autonomous nature of the agents work, it is imperative that CEDs trust agents. The Trust in Leaders Scale (TLS) (Adams et al., 2008) was created to measure person-based trust between leaders and followers through four constructs: competence, integrity, benevolence, and predictability. A census study was conducted by distributing the TLS to the target audience, County Extension agents that report to a CED. Results indicated moderate levels of trust between agents and CEDs, as perceived by the agents. Recommendations include further studies, within the national Extension service and across multiple organizations, to find out if high levels of trusting relationships are perceived, qualitative studies exploring how followers perceive trust is built, and staff development professionals considering the importance of trust when hiring and training leaders.

Introduction

The Cooperative Extension Service provides practical education, to help people, businesses, and communities solve problems, develop skills, and build a better future (NIFA, 2021). Extension has a local presence in all 67 Florida counties, and Extension agents carry out this mission at the local level by providing research-based educational programs relating to agriculture, natural resources, family and consumer sciences, and 4-H youth development (Rasmussen, 1989). Florida County Extension Directors (CEDs) are Extension agents that have both programmatic and administrative responsibilities. The CED role is critical to the Florida Extension mission as they are responsible for their individual Extension programming, leadership for the local county Extension program, and administrative and management responsibilities (Florida, 2021). It is imperative for CEDs to have the appropriate leadership skillset in order to be successful in their role as a leader, administrator, manager, and supervisor (Sanders, 2014). Much like other organizations, it is important for Cooperative Extension to advance the capacity of employee leadership skills (Ricketts et al., 2012). Organizations that employ leadership education see improved situational approaches to leader/follower interactions, skilled leader mentors (Amagoh, 2009), and competency-based leader behavior change (Sowcik et al., 2018). Trust has been identified as one of the necessary CED leadership competencies through Extension literature (Bruce & Anderson, 2012; Cooper & Graham, 2001; Moore & Rudd, 2004; Sanders, 2014). Trust between CEDs and agents has not been studied in the specific context of Cooperative Extension, and therefore it is unknown whether CEDs are perceived to be trustworthy by Extension agents.
Background

Nyhan (2000) concluded that trust is the level of confidence that one individual has in their leader’s competence and his or her willingness to act in a fair, ethical, and predictable manner. Trust in the leader is described as the follower’s willingness to accept vulnerability on the basis of positive expectations of the intentions of the leader (Schoorman et al., 2007). Mayer et al. (1995) defined trust as the expectations of how another person will behave, based on that person’s current and previous claims. Adams et al. (2008) distinguished between person-based and category-based trust, with person-based trust involving attributions about the skills, integrity and genuine concern of other people. For the purpose of this study, and considering the nature of an Extension agent’s work, trust was defined as “the willingness of a party (the trustor) to be vulnerable to the actions of another party (the trustee) based on the expectation that the trustee will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor and control the other party” (Mayer et al., 1995).

The role of trust in leadership supports an environment “in which the leader believes in the follower’s ability to accomplish goals and enables the leader’s vision of and for the follower to occur” (Winston, 2003, p. 4). A climate in which employees feel trusted by their leader significantly influences follower work engagement and that climate can be created through the trustworthy behaviors of the leader (Engelbrecht et al., 2017; Wong et al., 2010). Pops (2009) stated that ethical leadership, especially relevant in the public sector, stresses the leader’s personal values of trust, fairness, courage, and integrity as they influence organizational effectiveness. Martinez and Dorfman (1998) identified six core aspects of the leader role, one of which was the establishment of relationships characterized by confidence, trust, and reliance. Adams et al. (2003) found that person-based trust between leader and followers was built through shared experiences and shared history. Person-based trust involves both prolonged interactions, as well as direct and personal contact with others (Adams, et al., 2008). Person-based trust addresses skills, integrity and genuine concern of other people. Adams (2003) created and later refined (2008) the Trust in Leaders scale. This scale measures for trust between leaders and followers, from the perspective of the follower, through four constructs: competence, integrity, benevolence, and predictability (Adams et al., 2008).

Within the Extension literature, Sanders (2014) found that empathy, trust, and honesty were interpersonal skills that were important CED leadership traits. Moore & Rudd (2004) created a list of 56 Extension leadership skills, among them were relationship builder, open/approachable, honesty/integrity, high values, stability, understanding social problems, maturity, and cultural awareness/diversity. Passmore (2010) identified interpersonal skills, such as being a team player and being trustworthy, as extremely important and perhaps more important than subject matter or technical expertise. Previous research has shown the importance of trust in leader/follower relationships (Savolainen, 2009), identified leader behaviors that support building follower trust (Gordon et al., 2014), and identified trust as a necessary competency in Extension leadership (Sanders, 2014).

The purpose of our study was to examine the perceptions of trust antecedents between Florida extension agents and CEDs. Our research objectives were: (1) to describe the level of trust between Florida extension agents and CEDs; (2) to determine if significant differences existed
between trust antecedents and participant characteristics; and (3) to determine if significant relationships existed between trust antecedents and participant characteristics.

**Description**

We obtained approval from the University of Florida Institutional Review Board to conduct our study, we attained the list of Extension agents (N = 349) from the Florida Extension Business Services office. Our quantitative study utilized survey methods to examine the perceptions of trust antecedents between Florida extension agents and CEDs. The population of interest for our study was county extension agents who were not CEDs, Regional Specialized Agents (RSAs), or State Specialized Agents (SSAs). After we removed CEDs, RSAs, and SSAs from the list, our target population consisted of 246 Extension agents.

We used the Trust in Leaders Scale (TLS) (Adams et al., 2008) which consisted of 20 items and yields high reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .97 (Cronbach, 1951). The scale is comprised of four trust antecedents which also yield high reliability: (a) competence (α = .95), (b) integrity (α = .89), (c) benevolence (α = .94), and (d) predictability (α = .90). The TLS items were measured using a 7-point Likert-type scale: (1 = Completely disagree, 2 = Very much disagree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Neither agree or disagree, 5 = Somewhat agree, 6 = Very much agree, and 7 = Completely agree). We also added six demographic questions, including year of extension experience, number of years worked with their CED, gender, their CED’s gender, extension district, and if their county was rural or urban. A five-member expert panel reviewed the survey for face validity (Ary et al., 2006), including the three researchers, one extension agent, and one CED. The instrument, including the (TLS) and the demographic items, were formatted into an online survey using Qualtrics. We used Qualtrics to create and deliver the survey due to its advantages, such as its ease distribution, anonymity, low cost, and access of both the researchers and participants (Dillman et al., 2009).

Because our target population was small, we used a census sampling procedure to gather as much data as possible (Ary et al., 2006). We used the Tailored Design Method (TDM) by Dillman et al. (2009) which yields high response rates, reduces sampling error, develops trust with the respondents, and allows the researcher to follow survey procedures that are scientifically founded. We sent a pre-notice letter to all Extension agents regarding the study one week prior to the invitation email. The invitation email was sent January 11, 2021, with three follow-up emails asking Extension agents to complete the study. The last follow-up email was sent January 29, 2021. There were 107 Extension agents who completed the survey, which yielded a response rate of 44%. Since our response rate was below 58%, we addressed nonresponse by comparing early to late respondents (Linder et al., 2001). No significance differences were found. We used both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the data to satisfy our research objectives. There were two limitations of this study. Respondents may have misinterpreted the questions, which would result in decreased validity. In addition, it was assumed the respondents in the study provided honest and accurate answers while self-reporting their responses to the survey.
Foreseeable Implications

Participants tended to moderately trust their CED across all four trust antecedents. Benevolence was the trust antecedent with the highest reported mean ($M = 5.23, SD = 1.55$), followed by integrity ($M = 5.21, SD = 1.52$), competence ($M = 5.19, SD = 1.47$), and predictability ($M = 5.02, SD = 1.21$). The three individual trust items with the highest means were “I believe my CD is honest” ($M = 5.6, SD = 1.65$), “my CED is genuinely concerned about my well-being” ($M = 5.34, SD = 1.73$), and “my CED has my best interests in mind” ($M = 5.31, SD = 1.62$). The three individual items with the lowest means were “I know exactly what my CED will do in difficult situations” ($M = 4.54, SD = 1.36$), “I can anticipate what my CED will do” ($M = 4.91, SD = 1.22$), and “my CED puts their words into action” ($M = 5.03, SD = 1.67$). There were no statistically significant differences or correlations between the trust antecedents and participant demographic characteristics.

Florida Extension agents reporting moderately high levels of trust could be attributed to three reasons: First, previous studies on leader/follower trust relationships are generally framed from the perspective of the leader. Followers might have a different perception of the existence of trust in this relationship than leaders. Secondly, there might be Florida Extension agents that simply do not feel trusted by their CED. There is a high turnover rate amongst Florida Extension agents (Benge & Harder, 2017), so perhaps these followers were not in that relationship for very long and simply do not have strong trust bonds because they do not know their CED well (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Finally, CEDs may not be trusting their Extension agents to do their job without much oversite. Considering (Katz, 1955), CEDs (top managers) should focus on human and conceptual skills when interacting with their agents and trust the agents’ technical skill. This is a concept that may not be understood by Extension leadership and can be taught through leadership education.

Working towards an environment where agents and CEDs experience trust should be a top priority for Florida Extension, as such environments supports follower’s organizational vision and engagement, and ability to accomplish goals (Winston, 2003, Engelbrecht et al., 2017, Wong et al., 2010). Florida Extension administration should include a trust measure to help ensure potential hires have the appropriate leadership skillset upon entering the job. In addition, leadership development specialists should be encouraged to provide leadership training to both new and seasoned CEDs to ensure the trust competency is being developed within the Extension organization. Other state Extension systems, as well as other organizations and institutions, should replicate this study to ensure employees trust their leaders and supervisors. Additionally, a qualitative research study would benefit the Extension and leadership literature to understand and both strong and weak trust relationships cultivate over time.
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Abstract

Women face unique barriers that their male counterparts do not experience in male-dominated disciplines and careers, such as agriculture. If we acknowledge that culture and leadership are inextricably connected, this study which explores the lived experiences, leadership dynamics, power relationships, and cultures surrounding female County Extension Directors (CEDs) within the Cooperative Extension System, will help us to make an assessment of the organizational viability and effectiveness of Cooperative Extension. This will allow us to better ourselves in the coming years, not just for organizational health, but for overall societal wellness and empowerment as aware global partners.

Introduction

Established by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, the mission of the Cooperative Extension System is to “advance agriculture, the environment, human health and well-being, and communities by supporting research, education, and Extension programs at land-grant universities and other organizations” to empower individuals on a local level (Extension USDA, 2019). As the non-formal educational program extension of each land-grant university, Cooperative Extension is tasked with the aim of assisting individuals to improve their lives and communities with research-based information in counties and parishes across the nation. Based within these counties and parishes, County Extension Directors/Coordinators/Administrators across the United States play a unique role in shaping their communities and agriculture as a whole, enabling this leadership position to serve as a powerful vehicle for creating change within the organization and our communities collectively. In the position of acting as a change agent, that one individual is tasked with providing oversight to an entire county’s Extension program, ensuring that it is all-encompassing, functioning properly, and adequately addressing community needs in alignment with the mission work of the respective land-grant university. Due to the mission of Cooperative Extension to advance agriculture, the environment, human health and well-being, and communities, Extension programming impacts each community - and all of those within it - in a multitude of ways. From a cultural standpoint, a challenge of this caliber taps into an organizational pipeline that feeds from our local communities to the federal government.

These females, within the agriculture discipline, are also not well represented in the scholarly literature. While limited literature exists which addresses the needs and barriers of those females who have positioned themselves in areas of leadership within this particular field, one may question whether this could be attributed to a particular disciplinary or organizational culture. This study will examine the lived experiences of female County Extension Directors across the United States in a concerted effort to bring light to these experiences related to leadership.
dynamics, power relationships, and organizational culture in hopes of furthering a cultural shift for the betterment of us all.

**Background**

In an effort to better understand the approach for this study, it is best to frame the problem in this manner:

- We analyze a traditionally male-dominated field/organization to seek out female leadership representation.
- When we analyze that leadership and see very small changes in the percentages of representation over the course of many years, we seek out answers as to why this exists.
- We tease out data as to why this occurs in one organization in hopes of changing this organization’s culture regarding females in leadership roles and hope, in all earnest, that this will bring about a cultural change for us all.

We seek to provide insight into the feminine experience to make meaning of leadership dynamics and power relationships within the Cooperative Extension organization. We will aim to make a determination as to whether the culture of Cooperative Extension is patriarchal at its essence and may impose limitations on female personnel seeking leadership opportunities within the organization. It is critically essential for us, at this time, to make a concerted effort to view the cultural constructs and overall culture of Cooperative Extension to ensure that its (our) practices, visions, and overarching identity are adequately and appropriately equipped to carry our people and our mission forward.

To guide data collection and seek to better understand the research problem that has been posed, the following research questions provide direction to gain insight into the understanding that fails us:

- How does Cooperative Extension respond to change?
- What are the cultural values exhibited by Cooperative Extension?
- What are the cultural beliefs exhibited by Cooperative Extension?
- In what ways does Cooperative Extension exhibit cultural globalization?

When we acknowledge that culture and leadership are inextricably connected, we are able to make an assessment of the organizational viability and effectiveness of Cooperative Extension. Unspoken behaviors, social patterns, and culture can perpetuate values, beliefs, and assumptions that persist for decades within our organization. It is necessary and prudent of us to ensure that what is being valued, and thereby espoused and enacted by our organization, is what will advance us - for the better - in the coming years, not only in terms of organizational health, but for overall societal wellness and empowerment as aware global partners.

Feminist theory and social cognitive theory constructs provided the theoretical frameworks used to ground this study. In an effort to bring a focus to empowerment and facilitate societal consciousness raising, feminist theory provides insight into both the constitution of gender and the resulting inequality present in gender relations. With the prominent role that culture plays, Khajehpour et al. (2011) posit that modeling, abstract learning through observation, is the most powerful means of transmitting attitudes and behaviors, cultural values, and thought patterns.
across generations. Social cognitive theory provides guidance for how observed behavior (i.e., modeling) can “influence values, attitudes, and thoughts, thereby affecting stereotypes and regulation of gender roles that are typically associated with the feminist label” (Rogers, 2016, p. 8). As a result, by fusing feminist theory with social cognitive theory, we are afforded both a political/social lens and a learned behavior (i.e., modeling) lens (Rogers, 2016) through which to view the impact of gender and culture on female County Extension Directors.

This study is guided by conceptual framework within the discipline of leadership. Bass and Bass (2008) noted that “leadership has been built into the human psyche because of the long period we need to be nurtured by parents for our survival” (p. 3). Early research in the discipline of leadership focused on how individuals came into leadership positions and the interaction between a leader and their followers (Gardner, 1987). This interaction between leader and follower is integral; Lipman-Blumen (1996) noted that “without the supporters’ consent, the aspiring leader cannot lead” (p. 32). Such affirmation lends credence to the notion that “leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (Hickman, 1998, p. 108). For any individual who has been tasked to lead, no one can deny that there is give and take from all involved.

Eagly and Carli (2007) noted that male domination in leadership roles, and the visibility of that domination, has made it easier for individuals to associate leadership roles with males. For females in leadership roles, they must act in contradiction to gender stereotypes to appear confident and assertive (Rudman, Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012). As a result, “a woman’s first hurdle to leadership is the ‘lack of fit’ between feminine stereotypes and leadership qualities” (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012, p. 165). Individuals expect females to be friendly, sympathetic, and polite; likewise, highly effective females are viewed as less friendly, similar to effective males who are deemed to be assertive and controlling (Eagly and Carli, 2007). Kinder traits of females are not viewed as leadership traits.

Oftentimes, in addition to traits, the style of leadership exhibited by females is generally more difficult to be accepted by society because it is unlike that of their male counterparts. Eagly and Carli (2007) noted that there “is a real penalty for a woman who behaves like a man. The men don’t like it, and the women don’t either” (p. 168). Likewise, females are tasked with finding a style that will gain acceptance by both their colleagues and society. Ultimately, female leaders are forced to adapt rather than being accepted for who they are and their unique leadership style (Eagly and Carli, 2007). Bergman and Hallberg (2002) noted that a female in a male-dominated field required “mental strength to apply different coping strategies” (p. 320) in an attempt to gain acceptance. Ultimately, society sets standards for females in leadership positions that actually prohibit their success in such roles, and this is even more evident when females situate themselves in non-traditional occupations and fields.

**Description of Research/Methodology**

Through a critical feminist autoethnographical approach and utilizing methodologies of interviews, dialogue, and prolonged engagement, this research will add to the existing knowledge related to female leadership within the field of agriculture, generally, and
Cooperative Extension, specifically. This study will show how females contribute to areas of agriculture and leadership, and what hurdles they may encounter. Furthermore, we will examine unique challenges and/or barriers with which their male counterparts do not contend. By giving voice to those in these unique positions, all of us can better understand the challenges and barriers to equality in this context.

The population for this study will be a purposeful sampling of female County Extension Directors across the United States. Ten participants will be selected with collaboration from the State Extension Director in each state, and based upon the frame provided in a previous autoethnographic study conducted by Defrancisco, Kuderer, and Chatham-Carpenter (2007), those 10 participants will join the researcher in a self-reflexive journey. Within the platform of asynchronous online interviews, each participant will be presented with a series of written prompts within the protective environment of an anonymous Google Doc. As Denzin (2014) notes, such technologies allow individuals to share “information about themselves, their biographies, and their intimate experiences” within a virtual community (p. xi). This particular method will provide individuals with the protection of anonymity, allowing them to share stories freely and honestly. Participants will then be invited to respond and comment to the initial responses of their peers after all identifying information has been removed. Four subsequent rounds of prompts will be posed to the participants, creating five separate rounds of responses and attributable commentary.

This study will derive classification schemes from the data derived instead of utilizing pre-existing category schemes to organize and analyze data; this is a commonly employed methodology (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) acknowledge that the “scheme can employ terms commonly found in the culture (an emic perspective) or terms constructed by the ethnographer (an etic perspective)” (p. 230). Data will be presented in the form of co-constructed narratives which will “illustrate the meanings of relational experiences, particularly how people collaboratively cope with the ambiguities, uncertainties, and contradictions” (Ellis, Adams, and Bochner, 2010).

Current Results

Data collection is currently taking place and should be completed by March 2021; these results will be presented within the poster. As noted above, such data will be presented in the form of co-narratives.

Conclusions/Recommendations

As noted above, data collection is currently taking place and should conclude in March 2021. Data, presented in the form of co-narratives, will be presented. Extending from this data, implications from the findings will provide directive to state and federal leadership to become more culturally competent and advance female leadership within Cooperative Extension and the field of agriculture as a whole. With regards to limitations, this study was limited to female County Extension Directors within the United States. Consequently, some factors contributing to their experience, leadership styles, and work environments may be unique to this group only. As a result, this research may not be generalized to groups outside of this population. However,
transferability is determined by how a reader/audience responds to a representation. A reader may question, *does this speak to him or her as a universal singular* (Ellis et al., 2010)? My sincere hope is that this performance text will be portrayed in such a way that it will move others to appropriate ethical action.
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Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Sophomore College Student Leaders and Student Organization Involvement
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Abstract

Structured leadership experiences like those in student organizations offer students an opportunity to build their leadership skills, develop confidence in their leadership abilities, and increase the likelihood of seeing themselves as leaders. College student involvement in student organizations has been impacted by the COVID 19 pandemic. To examine part of this impact, this study analyzed written reflections from sophomores (n = 151) who participated in a freshman leadership organization about how the COVID 19 pandemic has affected their involvement in student organizations. A content analysis of these reflections revealed four themes: students had to transition their involvement to online formats, they experienced social and relational difficulties, less involvement overall, and some students did report some positive impacts like new skills learned or no impacts. While student organization involvement directly impacts the development of student leadership skills, it has further implications for students’ leadership development for after graduation opportunities, students’ well-being, and students’ sense of belonging for the remainder of their university time. Leadership educators who work with student organizations on campus should focus on helping students develop relationships and create opportunities.

Introduction

Student organizations are an avenue for college students to develop their leadership ability and grow in their understanding and confidence as a leader. Studies show that students who are engaged in structured leadership experiences like student organizations are more likely to see themselves as leaders, rate themselves higher in leadership skills, and score higher on self-reported measures of leadership self-confidence and socially responsible leadership skill sets (Astin, 1993; Cress, Astin, & Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt; Dugan & Komives, 2007, 2010). Furthermore, student engagement has been linked to positive outcomes for college students including persistence, grades, and satisfaction (Kuh, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006).

The spring 2020 and fall 2020 semesters impacted college students in many ways, one of which is their involvement in student organizations and thus their engagement in structured leadership experiences. While it is hard to capture total student involvement in co-curricular activities, at [university], new students are sent a survey asking them to indicate how much time they thought they would spend on certain activities. In Fall 2019, 9% of students (n = 1,751) indicated they...
would spend no time (None) on co-curricular activities such as student organizations, volunteer efforts, etc. In Fall 2020, the same question was asked and 23% of students (n = 5,606) indicated they would spend no time (None) on co-curricular activities. This means 14% more students (a 155% increase) thought they would spend no time on co-curricular activities in the first full semester of dealing with COVID 19 protocols and adjustments. Understanding the impact that COVID 19 has had on college students and their involvement in student organizations can help leadership educators better assist students in filling in the gaps and navigate through these challenging times. This study examined how the coronavirus pandemic impacted college student sophomores’ involvement in student organizations.

**Background**

The effect of the COVID 19 pandemic on students’ involvement in student organizations is important to examine because we know that student involvement in co-curricular activities including student organizations and holding leadership positions has been linked with positive academic outcomes (Pike & Kuh, 2006). Astin’s theory of involvement (1984) describes the importance of student involvement in college. It has three major components: inputs (students’ demographics, background, previous experiences), environment (experiences students have during college), and the outcomes (which consist of students’ characteristics, knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and values that exist after a student has graduated). Astin’s theory of student involvement has five basic assumptions: (1) involvement requires both psychosocial and physical energy by the student, (2) involvement is continuous, and the amount of energy invested by students varies, (3) involvement may be qualitative and quantitative, (4) outcomes from student involvement (or their development) is directly proportional the the extent to which they were involved (in both aspects of quality and quantity), and (5) academic performance is correlated with the student involvement.

Through an understanding of the felt narrative from students on the impact of COVID 19 on their involvement in student organizations and thus, their academic outcomes right now, we can examine student perceptions of how COVID 19 has changed their involvement. This information can help leadership educators better understand how to best serve these students. The purpose of this study was to examine how students perceive their student organization involvement to be impacted by COVID 19. This has implications for student affairs leadership educators and academic affairs leadership educators who desire to help students navigate during these challenging times.

**Description**

This was a qualitative study using content analysis (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Huyn, 2012) of student responses to an open-ended question on a survey. The population in this study were college
sophomores who had participated in a freshman leadership organization their freshman year and were in the first semester of their sophomore year at the time of data collection. Participants were college students at a tier one research university in the southern United States. The survey was sent to second year students who had been involved in a first-year student leadership organization (N = 1,100) and 151 students (n = 151) participated in the survey. Students participate at a high rate in freshman leadership organizations at [university] as approximately 10% of all freshmen join one of these organizations. A survey was sent out from the Student Life Studies office to college sophomores who were involved in a freshman leadership organization their freshman year to gauge their involvement as a sophomore. As part of the survey, the participants were also asked to respond to this prompt: “Describe how the coronavirus pandemic has or has not impacted your involvement in student organizations.” A content analysis of the responses was conducted. There were 4 themes that evolved from the data: transition to online format, social and relational difficulties, less involvement, and some positive impacts or no effect.

Theme 1: Transition to online format

Many students mentioned the transition of their involvement to an online format, changing event landscape and activities that “instead of being in person it’s all online.” While many responses acknowledged that “everything has moved online,” some students attributed more negative descriptions to the change, noting that “Zoom doesn't foster a friendly, open environment in the way that meeting in person does.” Others directly addressed the negative consequences of this transition, saying “it sucks….and it’s hard to stay interested and engaged.”

Theme 2: Social and Relational Difficulties

There was an overwhelming response from students about the detrimental effects of the pandemic and subsequent online transition on their abilities to form relationships in their student organizations. A common iteration was “It is hard to get to know people” and “to make connections.” For those who provided more explanation, the main barriers that made it “more challenging to engage members” seemed to be the challenges posed by the “online or distanced format.” One student summarized the sentiment, writing “collaborating over the internet is more difficult than anyone expected, and building meaningful connections over zoom is nearly impossible.”

Theme 3: Less involvement

Many students described becoming “less involved” due to the pandemic. The impacts include deciding “not to apply to most organizations because of the pandemic” and engaging less in the organizations they are in. Some students found the online recruitment process presented extra difficulties and barriers. Other students were less motivated to be involved in their organizations.
since they “didn’t want to have to add another zoom meeting.” Another barrier to involvement included caution as students “want to keep [their] circle of exposure small.”

Theme 4: Some Positive Impacts or No Effect

Some students described positive effects of the pandemic, including providing opportunities to “think outside the box” and be “more proactive in fostering bonds between new members.” Some students indicated that they became more involved while others wrote that the pandemic “has not impacted [their] involvement.”

Foreseeable Implications

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the way college students are able to participate in structured leadership activities and thus, their ability to grow and develop as leaders (Astin, 1993; Cress, Astin, & Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhart; Dugan & Komives, 2007, 2010). The data for this study was gathered from students who had self-selected to be involved in freshman leadership organizations and will be graduating in approximately two years. The pandemic forced student organizations to find ways to continue their activities without meeting face to face. Students indicated that the pandemic led to all events being transitioned to online. The online format created less than ideal conditions for interaction and furthermore students faced social and relational difficulties.

A prominent theme from the data gathered is that students were less involved in organizations. While this may seem inevitable given the situation, we should consider how this lack of involvement could be realized in future years. This could impact students’ leadership development for after graduation opportunities, students’ well-being, and students’ sense of belonging for the remainder of their university time. Sense of belonging is also a predictor of retention and graduation rates. Impacts from this lack of involvement by sophomores could also create a gap in leadership due to seniors graduating and freshman and sophomores not having the experiences and exposure to be able to continue the mission of the organization. Leadership educators who work with student organizations should be mindful of ways to monitor students’ well-being and students’ sense of belonging and find ways to facilitate these characteristics beyond traditional student organization involvement on campus.

Students also expressed social and relational difficulties including challenges in building relationships. Leadership typically involves building relationships and this challenge could be a hindrance to college students developing as leaders. Leadership educators should prioritize ways to facilitate building relationships among their student groups they advise.
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Transforming Colleges of Agriculture: How LGBTQ+ Students Enact Transformative Behaviors
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Abstract

Significant research exists on the impacts and experiences of LGBTQ+ identified students in institutions of higher education related to climate. However, there is a gap in the current research related to the lived LGBTQ+ student experience and even less related to specific contexts, in this case, Colleges of Agriculture. This gap in the literature perpetuates the assumption that LGBTQ+ folx simply do not exist in these contexts, and that those contexts are not viable options for these individuals. This study seeks to investigate the lived queer experience in a College of Agriculture contexts, and to understand how LGBTQ+ actively enact the behaviors of Transformative Leadership to develop more equitable and justice climates in their college communities.

Introduction & Background

Universities often serve as focal points for societal transformation (Barnes, 2007). Marginalized students often report climates of fear and unsafety (Blumenfeld et al., 2016), and they also often report instances of microaggressions from faculty and other students in these environments (Vaccaro and Koob, 2018). Past research has indicated where these pockets continue to perpetuate negative climates and attitudes, including Colleges of Agriculture (Blumenfeld et al., 2016). Parent and Steede (2020) describe the current climate and stress that LGBTQ+individuals face in the agricultural industry, and we can infer that those issues translate into colleges that maintain a heavy focus on production. However, there has not been an intentional, focused approach to understanding the current climate of LGBTQ+ students in Colleges of Agriculture and how LGBTQ+ students are addressing it through their activism. Colleges leaders and students must actively deconstruct and reconstruct who they think should be involved in agriculture in order to work towards transformative change and equitable systems (Shields, 2018). While daunting, large issues of justice and equity can be framed in smaller, more tangible discussions surrounding the impacts of transformative education (Shields, 2010), but we must also seek to know what gaps exist in structures that continue to perpetuate injustices and inequities.

Chickering (1969; 1963) describes the impacts and benefits of a positive and inclusive culture for students from perspectives related to both student-to-student engagements and student-to-faculty engagements. Negative experiences and structures that do not build up community and positive cultures can drastically damage student-to-student relationships as they begin to focus on survival in educational settings and not social or cultural experiences. Additionally, Chickering establishes that student culture can be improved though softening “prejudice with a broader perspective (pg. 279, 1969). Shields (2010; 2016; 2020) provides the framework we can use to understand how LGBTQ+ students work to develop better climates for themselves through Transformative Leadership Theory. When we examine the research available on the experiences
of LGBTQ+ students in higher education, we find that it is often situated in culture and climate studies. However, many of these studies only focus on a 50,000-foot view of culture across the whole campus, and not specific pockets, or climate, within a campus community. There are eight major tenets that can be explored through narratives to understand the current climate of LGBTQ+ students in Colleges of Ag. These tenets (Shields, 2010; 2016; 2020) are:

- The mandate to effect deep and equitable change
- The need to deconstruct knowledge frameworks that perpetuate inequity and injustice and to reconstruct them in equitable ways
- The need to address the inequitable distribution of power
- An emphasis on both private and public (individual and collective) goods
- A focus on democracy, emancipation, equity, and justice
- The necessity of balancing critique with promise
- The necessity of balancing critique with promise
- The call to exhibit moral courage

Methodology

Past research has shown that purposive sampling — in this case, a convenience sample — is applicable when the population is most accessible to the researcher, and when the researcher is looking at a specific group because of their specific knowledge (Berg, 1998; Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). Since the researcher is a member of the community being studied, he had specific knowledge of how to engage and reach out to the population, so a convenience sampling was used.

Data was collected using semi-structured interviews with LGBTQ+ identifying students and alumni from a College of Agriculture at 1862 land-grant institutions. Each interview was recorded and transcribed. Once transcription was complete, they were given to the participants to allow member-checking (Creswell and Miller, 2000; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Referred to as, “the most crucial technique for establishing credibility (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, pg. 314),” member-checking puts the data back into the hands of the participants and lets them look at it to ensure the data captured is correct, while also allowing them time to double check they want everything that was said on record. After all recordings were turned into transcripts, participants were given a week to review the transcripts of their interview to make clarifications or strike parts of the interview.

For this study, the researcher generated a category list (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016) based on the eight tenets of Transformative Leadership (Shields, 2010; 2016; 2020). Using this method, the researcher immediately analyzed the first interview he completed to get a baseline of the experiences and perceptions that were recorded from the participant. Following the initial analysis, the researcher compared his transcript with his field notes to note any emotional responses, pauses, or physical behaviors that were relevant to the questions being asked or answers being discussed. This process was used throughout all the interviews. After additional interviews were completed and the initial analysis of new interviews were done, the researcher compared the analysis between interviews to 1) begin tracking similarities across multiple interviews, 2) begin developing themes of the findings and 3) begin building recommendations.
based on the results (Creswell, 1998). Once all interviews were completed, all transcripts were reviewed, with all categories, themes, and recommendations being finalized for discussion.

Current Results

Shields (2010; 2016; 2020) describes eight tenets of Transformative Leadership that leaders can enact to create meaningful and equitable change in systems. These eight tenets served as the codes for analysis to identify how LGBTQ+ students naturally enact those behaviors, what they see as lacking in their current college climates, and what needs to be changed to create more equitable climates.

The mandate to effect deep and equitable change

While no participants spoke about activities that connected to this specific behavior, many of them noted the lack of an effort to create equitable change in their colleges. Some students noted the severe lack of space to explore or affirm their identity. One student said, “I didn’t feel like I had a place where I could express myself fully in that environment. So I didn’t navigate those areas a lot for my sophomore, junior, or senior year.”

The need to deconstruct knowledge frameworks that perpetuate inequity and injustice and to reconstruct them in equitable ways

College is a time for formation and exploration of identity, but it can also be a time for exploring what has been ingrained in their minds. For many LGBTQ+ students, the beginnings of attempting to understand inequities and injustices comes from their own identities and experiences. One student acknowledged that he still thinks about what would have happened if he, “didn’t come to a university and get away from the rural community that I grew up in? I might still, you know, be in the closet still or not have accepted who I am.” Gaining a broader understanding of the world and the ways we all experience injustice is crucial to beginning to unravel the frameworks that have been ingrained in us all.

The need to address the inequitable distribution of power

Colleges of Agriculture are very hegemonic in nature, and most of the cultural, academic, and social power rests with white, straight men. One student pointed out that, overwhelmingly, the makeup of his college was, “a majority of… white, straight dudes.” He also acknowledged that he has a hard time owning his identity and power in the college, and that he splits his identities, saying, “I think that I am an academic on one side and I am an LGBTQ+ person on the other.”

An emphasis on both private and public (individual and collective) goods

LGBTQ+ students crave public space and resources for them to be able to fellowship with their community and to delve into their individual identities, but that space is either not present or not visible in these colleges. One student pointed out that he didn’t even know there was an effort in his college to increase equity and diversity, noting, “it wasn’t until recently that I know the College of Ag even had a diversity and inclusion department or individual that was promoting that in the college.”

A focus on democracy, emancipation, equity, and justice
Participants focused on how important it was to bring their community with them on their journeys to equity and justice, and how they actively work to build better systems through their actions and expressions. One participant talked about his current role as an instructor in a College of Ag, and how he acknowledges his identity, saying, “I’m very open about who I am and I talk about my partner. And I do that for the kid from rural [state] who’s trying to navigate how to do their passion and live authentically. And that’s how I contribute to the LGBTQ+ community. And that’s how I contribute to the ag community.”

An emphasis on interconnectedness, interdependence, and global awareness

LGBTQ+ students also focus on the importance of building their own communities and building unity as a community to face injustice in their college environments. One student pointed out that when thinking about other LGBTQ+ students in his program, it “makes it more comfortable and more freeing in a sense to be my authentic self.”

The necessity of balancing critique with promise

LGBTQ+ students in Colleges of Ag maintain an overwhelming sense of negativity and a stifling climate. However, they also tend to acknowledge that there is hope, especially with representation of other LGBTQ+ folx in their college. “The superintendent of our research station is a gay man. The Dean of our Graduate School is a gay man who actually came out of my [horticulture] department. So, as someone who maybe wants to end up in academia, it’s been cool to see to see like, ‘Okay, other gay men are doing things in academia.’”

The call to exhibit moral courage

Being out and proud with one’s identity requires exceptional courage, and using that identity to fight for a more equitable climate requires moral courage. Students exemplified this behavior throughout their narratives, with one perfectly summing it up with, “You know, if I could identify a potential student that might be queer to recruit them to come to [university], when I know that there might be some issues at a land grant university with marginalized and queer communities, that was interesting for sure.”

Foreseeable Implications

LGBTQ+ students do not experience welcoming, equitable, or inclusive climates in Colleges of Ag. Because of their identities and the injustices they face, they tend to naturally enact behaviors related to Transformative Leadership, because they seek to change the systems that oppress and harm them. LGBTQ+ students are an often unheard and underrepresented voice in discussions surrounding equity and justice in Colleges of Ag, so they are best positioned to critique and dismantle the systems that exclude them, if they are able to be part of the discussions. By using the eight tenets of Transformative Leadership to dissect the lived experiences of LGBTQ+ students in Colleges of Ag, specific, actionable recommendations and goals can be developed that will begin to establish more just and equitable climates for LGBTQ+ students and other marginalized communities.
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Abstract

The purpose of this poster presentation is to explore the leadership frameworks used in student and employee leadership programs at a variety of institutional types within the Pacific Northwest. By conducting this research, the authors can demonstrate whether current leadership approaches appropriately center the experiences of women and BIPOC student leaders. Further, the authors can explore existing correlations between student and employee leadership programs within the same institution. There are two research questions that will guide the authors throughout the process: What are the fundamental theories that are practically incorporated into student leadership co-curricular programs at a variety of higher education institution types in the Pacific Northwest? Further, what is the correlation, if any, between student and employee leadership philosophies at the same institution?

Introduction

Many scholars agree that there are no clear, consistent definitions of the terms “leader” or “leadership,” and that the gap between theory and practice is wide (Dugan, 2017; Dugan, 2001; Dugan & Komives, 2001; Eich, 2008; Murphy & Riggio, 2003; Ospina & Foldy, 2009; Van Seters & Field, 2007). Murphy and Riggio (2003) argue that although leadership scholarship is robust and leadership theories abound, there is a problem when it comes to implementing leadership development in a variety of settings, such as: “failures to match training needs to programs; failures to transfer training from the ‘classroom’ to the workplace; failures to integrate new leadership behaviors into the workgroup or team; and even too great a focus on the leaders, ignoring the realities of team-shared leadership, all work to weaken development efforts” (2). Further, little is known about the process of leadership development, especially at a systemic level Ospina & Foldy, 2009; Murphy & Riggio, 2003; Dugan & Komives, 2001). Transformational leadership theories acknowledge the connections between leadership and the contexts from which it emerges, yet “despite strong arguments for its relevance, systematic attention to organizational context in the literature is still scant and poor” (Ospina & Foldy, 2009, p. 890).

Perceptions of “leaders” and “leadership” often reinforce systemic inequalities, tending toward the Eurocentric/Western and focused on straight white men as the model or ideal leader (Dugan, 2017; Jackson & Rajai, 2021; Murphy & Riggio, 2003; Ospina & Foldy, 2009) Leadership scholars have studied gender and race in leadership education and practice, but the findings remain on the margins of leadership studies as a whole (Blackmore, 2013; Dugan, 2017; Kark, 2003; Ospina & Foldy, 2009; Pendakur & Furr, 2016; Rosile, Boje, & Claw, 2016). Whiteness and maleness are the defaults, while women and leaders of color are non-paradigmatic and othered, and their experiences undervalued and understudied. There is a desperate need for a leadership development framework that integrates leadership theories with theories that center
gender, race, and other identities by acknowledging and analyzing power, giving consideration to context, examining agency, and allows for expression of fluid and intersecting identities (Dugan, 2017; Murphy & Riggio, 2003; Ospina & Foldy, 2009). Leadership theory has evolved from (white male) leader- and management-centric models to those integrating leadership-as-process and social responsibility, yet leadership theory and leadership education still often marginalize various social groups, perpetuate inequalities, and uphold status quo systems of power (Blackmore, 2013; Dugan, 2017; Kark, 2003; Ospina & Foldy, 2009; Pendakur & Furr, 2016; Rosile, Boje, & Claw, 2016).

As Ostick & Wall (2011) state, “despite recognition of the significant influences of social identity on leadership, scholarship on the topic remains relatively thin.” (p. 340). The most common student leadership theories and models (e.g., social change model, servant leadership, relational leadership model, and the leadership challenge) used in the development of leadership programming are basic, and it is notable that theories that center minoritized groups are not prominently discussed or incorporated (Munin and Dugan, 2011). In addition, the authors of the poster session have not found any research on correlations between employee and student leadership philosophies at the same institution. While the research might be present, it is difficult to find and thus an indication that further research is needed. This led to the research questions:

What are the fundamental theories that are practically incorporated into student leadership co-curricular programs at a variety of higher education institution types in the Pacific Northwest? Further, what is the correlation, if any, between student and employee leadership philosophies at the same institution?

Background

This study is influenced by feminist theories and Critical Race Theory (CRT) constructs. CRT emerged from social theory and legal studies, and it examines racism, racial power dynamics, and racial subordination/oppression (Ladson-Billings, 2008; Omi & Winant, 1994). Race shapes individual and collective identities, as well as how individuals navigate larger social structures and institutions. CRT posits a reciprocal construction of race and its meanings; in other words, individuals are both constructed by and constructing race simultaneously. Further, a CRT perspective is applicable because it interrogates “where people construct their understandings of both their racialized identity and their experience of leadership, be it from a leader or a follower perspective” (Ospina & Foldy, 2009). Feminist theories attempt to understand gender inequality/oppression, and feminist analysis focuses on the social relations of gender including how they are constructed and reproduced through social, political, and educational discourses (Cannella & Manuelito, 2008). CRT and feminist theory challenge hierarchies of race and gender, interrogate hegemonic representations and ideals around leaders and leadership, and examine how gendered and racialized power structures produce patterns of inequality in order to work toward systemic change.

Blackmore (2013) states “as a concept that has significant normative and political capacities as well as consequences, leadership is discursively overworked and theoretically underdone in policy and much of the literature” (p. 140). The disconnect between leadership education ideals and the lack of representation of women and BIPOC in leadership roles (in both educational and professional settings) is vast (Blackmore, 2013; Jackson & Rajai, 2021). The
most common leadership theories (briefly mentioned in the previous section) are well-intentioned but allow educational and organizational structures and policies to remain intact, allowing women and BIPOC to “assimilate into the structure of organizations with minimal disruption to the status quo” (Kark, 2004, p. 165). This approach places the focus and onus on women and BIPOC to change or “fix” themselves individually in order to “fit” into institutions and organizations rather than challenging existing systemic power structures.

This study utilizes Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in examining leadership development online materials. CDA “engages in concrete, linguistic textual analysis of language use in social interaction” in order to examine power relations between groups of people (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2011, p. 4). Fairclough (1995) explains, “‘discourse’ is use of language seen as a form of social practice, and discourse analysis is analysis of how texts work within sociocultural practice” (p. 7). Jørgensen and Phillips (2011) argue that the use of language has three dimensions: text, discursive practice (the production and consumption of texts), and social practice, which affords dominant social groups the ability to exert power over other social groups through ideology and hegemony. The power to control public discourse both perpetuates systems of social control and actively disempowers marginalized populations at the same time. CDA allows for a discursive critique of prevailing, prominent structures of power, and, once revealed, advocacy for social change by analyzing textual representations of gendered and racialized social practices. CDA also allows for examination of the complexities of relationships between gender, race, power, ideology, hegemony, and discourse. Context is critical and must also be examined; Van Dijk et al. (1997) explains that “when we study discourse and communication within and between groups that are defined in terms of their ethnic or cultural specificities and differences, the fundamental contextualizing framework of societal structures, power and dominance also needs to be accounted for” (pp. 147-148).

Description

The authors will conduct research in four ways to answer the stated research questions. The research will include a scoping review of existing literature, a CDA of public-facing information on student and employee leadership, a mixed-methods survey, and a series of qualitative interviews with leadership educators. Each component of the research at this time will be within the four-state region of the Pacific Northwest: Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

First, the authors will complete a scoping review of the connection between employee leadership programs and student leadership programs. As Pham, M. T., Rajiće, A., Greig, J. D., Sargeant, J. M., Papadopoulos, A. and McEwen, S. A. (2014) indicate, “Scoping reviews are a relatively new but increasingly common approach for mapping broad topics.” Because the author’s initial review shows a likely gap in research involving the connections between student and employee leadership programs, a scoping review is appropriate.

After the scoping review, the authors will look at the public-facing materials describing any employee or student leadership programs or training. The authors will use a CDA framework to examine the prominent leadership theories that directly inform the practice of leadership educators. The human resources and student engagement (or similar) pages will be explored to see any information it contains about leadership training, including websites, published
brochures, and course descriptions. The authors will examine a sample of institution types, including private, public four-year, public two-year, tribal college, and Hispanic-serving—all within the four-state region.

After those reviews, the authors will send a survey to employee and student leadership trainers within a stratified sample of institution types, with a goal of having at least two institutions of each type participate in the survey. The survey will ask questions regarding the diversity of the student body, diversity of faculty and staff, training options that exist to promote leadership formally and informally, theories that inform the practice of leadership training, and any connections among different campus offices to provide leadership training. The authors will also invite anyone who completes the survey to discuss the topic in a virtual interview setting. Those who are open to a qualitative interview will be asked for more information about how leadership theories inform their practice and examples of cross-office collaboration to provide leadership training—with a specific goal of understanding what connections exist between the student and employee leadership philosophies.

**Foreseeable Implications**

This research has a variety of implications. First, it can encourage leadership educators to analyze the theories that inform their practice and reflect on whether the theories are adequate in de-centering a predominantly white male student experience. In addition, as there seems to be a gap in research involving connections between student and employee leadership training within an institution, it can encourage leadership educators to think of ways to promote cross-campus collaboration. Similarly, as discussed in previous sections, many researchers have concluded that a gap exists within scholarship on the intersections of leadership and identity. This research can assist in both seeking connections between employee and student leadership programs and in adding to the intersecting fields of social justice and leadership education.

While the authors believe this is an important step in filling the apparent gaps in the research, they realize that a few limitations exist. Because of the transition to mostly virtual learning that happened because of the global pandemic, the authors are aware that some student and employee practices changed because of the virtual transition, or the programs that existed for leadership development might have been reduced after institutional budget cuts. In addition, the authors have limited the study to only include the four states within the Pacific Northwest. While this is helpful in creating a manageable exploration of student and employee leadership, there are regional differences that exclude institutions within this study. A primary example is the four-state region examined does not have any institutions designated as historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), as described in *HBCU Connect* (2020). As the authors value looking at differences within institution types, this institutional type will not be included within this initial research. However, the authors hope to continue to research this topic and adapt to better answer questions after analyzing the initial results are gathered. Additionally, as the authors are submitting a poster presentation, they hope to hear ideas and feedback from ALE members for future work.
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Supporting Ethical Decision-Making Across Culture: Leadership Education On-Campus and Abroad

Graziella Pagliarulo McCarron, George Mason University
Nicholas Lennon, George Mason University
Aoi Yamanaka, George Mason University

Abstract

Committing to social justice and inclusion means fostering individuals’ sound decision-making about right and wrong across personal and cultural differences (Bell, 2020). What does this mean for college students? Practically, this means helping students develop ethical compasses aligned with values, purposes, and practices (Lawton & Páez, 2013) that not only sensitize students to social inequities (Ng & Sears, 2018), but also inspire them to lead change. As such, this study’s purpose is to unpack how ethical leadership education supports students’ journeys from ethnocentric to culturally-responsive decision-making - as underpinned by elements of the Intercultural Development Continuum framework (Bennett, 2004; Bennett & Castiglioni, 2004). Via this poster, we will present findings from a case study of 15 college students’ (undergraduate and graduate) experiences with ethics and leadership coursework on-campus and abroad - exploring student development and teasing out differences based on exposure to global contexts. By foregrounding students’ experiences, we hope to share promising practices for supporting ethical decision-making across curricular and co-curricular contexts.
Transformational Leadership and a Look into Corporate Cultism

Avery Hill, Arizona State University
Kate McCain, Arizona State University

Abstract

In the last twenty years, there has been rapidly increased interest in the leadership model of transformational leadership. This theory has been closely linked by researchers with the term ‘corporate cultism’ (Tourish & Pinnington, 2015, p. 1). This poster presentation will outline the components of transformational leadership theory while applying a critical lens to the analysis. In particular it finds similarities between the practices of transformational leadership and behaviors consistent with cults. As leaders of organizations continue to incorporate transformational leadership theory, they need to be aware of the possible negative outcomes this model can have on the employees and institution alike.

Introduction

Many researchers within the field of leadership studies have investigated transformational leadership theory, and there is currently a vast amount of material published on the positive effects that this theory can have within an organization (e.g. Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2017)). The suggestion is that the downside of transformational leadership (TL) has not been sufficiently researched and discussed (van Knippenburg & Sitkin, 2013). Therefore, this poster presentation focuses on the aspect of TL that has the potential to move organizations in destructive directions. The aspect I refer to is the relationship between TL and the dynamics of cultic forms of organizational behaviors that may apply to the business world. It is not my intention to state that TL practices are bad. There are many great qualities in TL and positive connections between the leadership style and productivity within a corporation. However, corporations in which TL practices are being implemented should be aware of and cautioned to the possibility of corporate cultism, and the ethical ramifications that may arise. This proposal will begin with a brief description of Transformational Leadership. Then it will go on to discuss critical theory, lens to analyze TL. Next, I will deconstruct TL and look at how discourse can cause power imbalances and lack of dissent in the workplace, resulting in a cult-like structure.

Background Information

Transformational Leadership (TL)

As described by Korejan and Shahbazi (2016), TL refers to leaders who act as change agents in creating ideas and new perspectives with the aim of designing a path of growth for the organization. Transformation leaders are often thought of as charismatic (although they do not have to be) and use rapport, inspiration and empathy to engage their followers. TL is a fairly new leadership style. The term “transformational leadership” was coined by James V. Downton in 1973. Credit for developing the framework for TL is given to Bass (1985). Bass’ describes leadership along a continuum of approach, starting from Laissez-faire (ineffective), moving toward transactional leadership (passive), ending at TL (active). TL which Bass indicates is the most effective, is characterized by a framework consisting of “Four I’s” (Avolio & Bass, 1995):
Idealized Influence simply put, is where someone leads by example. Leaders model the behavior and commitment they expect. These leaders are perceived to have strong morals and be highly ethical.

Inspirational Motivation is a factor that involves communicating a shared vision and inspiring followers by conveying how their contributions will bring about overall success for the organization.

Intellectual Stimulation encourages followers to bring their own creativity, beliefs and values to work collaboratively and problem solve.

Individualized consideration is where the leader listens to the needs of each team member, taking into account their aspirations to grow.

The main assumption is that a transformational leader creates goals for better results based on the greater good and are focused on the needs of their followers. TL as a practice involves motivating followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values. The leader must be able to design and articulate a vision for the organization.

Critical Leadership Theory

It is important to look at TL through a critical lens in order to better identify its shortcomings and improve TL as a practice. Critical theory critiques the modern social world looking for new positive implications for social action (Dugan, 2017). An overarching goal to critical theory is to deconstruct underlying pragmatic assumptions and look for a more effective reconstruction of theoretical frameworks (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012). Critical theory applied to leadership, shows how fundamental features and assumptions influence organizational life and the role leadership plays within the organization. The critical lens can even go so far as to show how organizations have become tools of social coercion and control (Chandler & Kirsch, 2019). Wilson (2016) argues, “Looking first at critically orient leadership studies these alert us to various troubling effect at macro (societal), meso (organizational) and micro (individual) levels which arise from mainstream understandings and approach to leadership.” (p. 32). This is one of the main aspects of critical leadership theory that I will be implementing in the next sections.

Corporate Cultism in Relation to Transformational Leadership

In order to understand the term corporate cultism, it is important to know and understand the difference between cult and culture. Having a strong workplace culture has proven to be a positive factor in employee motivation and overall productivity. Leaders in organizations have started focusing on ways to improve team and company culture in order to have an efficient and happy work environment (P. Robbins Stephen et al., 1970). Workplace culture is very important and this paper in no way means to imply that leaders should not try to consolidate a good work culture. Culture is the character and personality of an organization (Mallinger & Rizescu, 2017). A leader may work with a group to establish what makes them unique and the sum of the company’s values, beliefs, interactions, behaviors, and attitudes (Tourish & Vatcha, 2005). When everyone in a company is on the same page about the culture then you can guarantee a cohesive work environment.
A cult can be characterized as a social association whose members subscribe to a (sometimes) eccentric philosophy created by an individual leader (Rajan, 2018). People tend to dismiss cults and cult behavior with judgment and see them as obvious. However, it is so rare that someone who is being slowly eased into cult behavior, can see what is happening to them. This phenomenon can take place in a corporate setting too.

Earlier I explained Bass’ thoughts on TL which described transformation leaders creating goals for the greater good and focusing on the essential needs of the follower. But what if the leader did not? The assumption is that the leader is selfless. However, as Tourish (2013) argues, TL has the tendency to incentivize leaders towards narcissism and poor decision making, having a negative impact on their followers. Tourish makes this argument because TL grants an excess of power to leaders. TL encourages leaders to unilaterally decide the goals and direction of the group, and the followers of the group are expected to commit themselves to that vision without dissent. This can be categorized as cult behavior. The TL framework has gaps that allow for the elimination of dissent, the promotion of conformity and in extreme cases could have the potential to cause organizational collapse.

The third “I” of TL (Intellectual Stimulation), explains the process of getting followers on the same page and directing them towards a goal path (Avolio & Bass, 1995). This is an overlap in the definition of cult and culture, where there is a dependable constant system of shared beliefs and behaviors. This culture/cult overlap should raise caution against continuing to move an organization further along the dysfunctional cult continuum in the name of “corporate culture.” (Tourish & Pinnington, 2015, p.147). It is when there are restrictive values and beliefs created by an individual leader that leads to problems. It should not be a leader’s position to prevent or discourage a following from thinking differently from the group. This cult-like behavior of rejecting healthy dissent from followers, has negative ramifications not only on the follower whose cognition is stunted, but the organization. Having different perspectives within an organization is essential to its success.

The fourth “I” in the TL framework, Individualized Consideration, can also be a cause for concern. Individualized consideration was where the leader listens to the needs of each team member, taking into account their aspirations to grow (Avolio & Bass, 1995). This is potentially problematic because oftentimes, with all their other responsibilities leaders may not have the time to continually check in with all of their employees and listen to their needs. This may create marginalized groups within the organization. Unequal individual consideration is likely to cause gaps in communication and is perceived to the marginalized group as favoritism. Seemingly special attention to certain groups is another character trait of cults that is toxic in the workplace. The drift that this may cause in an organization is likely to prompt group meetings where team building, and group culture is reinforced.

**Power of Discourse**

The power of discourse and the extent to which it is used, is the key difference in what turns corporate culture into a corporate cult. Different terms and phrases have a tendency to unwittingly manipulate followers and consolidate power in favor of the leader. In a cult setting, this manipulation is very intentional, however, a leader of a corporation may be manipulating employees without understanding the full power of the vocabulary they are using (Tourish & Pinnington, 2015, pg. 152).
Oftentimes this happens during team meetings and training where the subject is workplace culture. A transformational leader may use company “curriculum” to explain their thoughts on what the culture and goals of the company should be. The discourse used in this curriculum uses motivational language and encourages/requires employees to commit themselves one hundred percent to the vision set forth by the leader. This has the potential to apply pressure to employees to: not question the leader or their vision, commit themselves entirely to the needs of the leader, and fear having different thoughts or ideas from the rest of the group (Kaplan & Kelly, 2008). These are all cult behaviors that can be experienced in the workplace if discourse is being used to consolidate power, and if the employee feels pressure from their higher-ups to conform.

**Conclusions & Implications**

Transformational Leadership has positive aspects that are successful for organizational outcomes; however, its effects can be detrimental to an organization if these aspects are abused. It is important in TL that the leader’s main focus is on the needs of the employees. This is not easy, and it is not a given that the leader will prioritize the needs of their followers over their own. In such an individualistic society it is more likely that you will see a leader use the devotion of their followers to improve their own means.

It is important to look at TL critically to identify where the theory is at risk for encouraging cult-like behaviors in a corporate setting. As a transformational leader, understanding the difference between culture and cult, and taking precaution using critical self-reflection to be able to identify it in your own practices.

It will be important to conduct further research on TL through a critical lens and develop a more collaborative approach while still maintaining the positive aspects of the practice. I would promote an alternative perspective based on feedback from employees into the organizational decision-making process. I propose a qualitative study be performed with participants from a company under transformational leadership, to address how corporate cultism may be developing and how that affects employees and success in the company. Such a study would allow the effects of corporate cultism under TL to be analyzed thoroughly and allow scholars of leadership to critically analyze and reflect on TL behavior and decisions. I think it is crucial to warn against trusting too much in the judgment of others, and not enough in our own judgment in the workplace. Doing so is more likely to maintain a healthier work culture and success within the organization.
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Lights, Camera, Action: Using Film as a Narrative Pedagogy for Leadership Educators

Kate D. McCain, Arizona State University

Abstract

Pedagogical practices, curriculum development, and building leadership capacity in college students is both an art and science. Sharing best practices for leadership education allows instructors to learn from one another on creative approaches for putting theory into practice and helping students grow in their leader identity development. Using film as a pedagogical tool allows students to view historical, classic figures in leadership and apply examples of behaviors, communication, and social change processes in action. Bruner (1996) explains historical narratives are constructed in our culture through the ways in which common stories are told through social and cultural influences. The purpose of this round table discussion focuses on pedagogical practices and curriculum development, sharing a film-theory course centered on narrative framework and Social Change Model (SCM).
Access to Collegiate Extracurricular Activity by Underrepresented Students

Jamie Thompson, Trinity University

Introduction

Evidence highlights that college students who identify as members of underrepresented groups are less likely to be involved in extracurricular activity (ECA) compared to their peers who identify as members of the majority (Purcell et al., 2012; Stevenson & Clegg, 2011; Stuart et al., 2011). ECA takes many shapes and forms, including internships, study abroad, student leadership, and athletic participation. A lack of financial resources (an indicator of low SES) negatively influences a student’s ability to participate in ECA (Purcell et al., 2012). In contrast, Bathmaker et al. (2013) found that students from middle-class backgrounds take ECA for granted because their pre-college experiences encourage and internalize ECA as advantageous. Access to collegiate extracurricular activity by underrepresented student populations is important to address because participation in ECA results in many positive outcomes such as employability advantage (Blasko, 2002; Clark et al., 2015; Purcell et al., 2012) and academic achievement and persistence (Astin, 1984; Kuh et al., 2007), among others. As a result, the impact of ECA for underrepresented students can be compensatory.

Roundtable Description

A roundtable discussion will address three goals: 1) Raise awareness of access to extracurricular activity; 2) Discuss this topic in relationship to the specific context and environment at participants’ institutions; and 3) Consider how institutions and stakeholders can address access to ECA and increase participation by underrepresented populations.

Participant interaction will be achieved through the following agenda:

1. Participant introductions, including relationship to the topic.
2. Summary of the problem as highlighted by the evidence (roundtable facilitator).
3. Discussion prompts (all): What does access to co-curricular activity by underrepresented students look like on your campus? What successful equity-minded strategies do you employ (or have you employed) to address/increase access to extracurricular activity by underrepresented students?
4. Closing prompt: How will you use this information and discussion to effectuate change on your campus?

Background: Literature Review

The Role of Capital in ECA

ECA is not equally accessible to all enrolled students due to systemic racism and other barriers for underrepresented populations, including an absence of capital (Strayhorn, 2012). Bourdieu (1997) defines three forms of capital: economic, social, and cultural. Economic capital is access to financial resources; social capital is the equivalent of networks, connections, and community resources (Yosso, 2005); and cultural capital reflects competencies that can be embodied and
institutionalized. Authors Lareau and Weininger (2003) suggest a broader interpretation of Bourdieu’s (1997) cultural capital as familiarity with institutional processes, expectations, and social skills.

Evidence demonstrates that students representing a majority identity are more likely to be involved in ECA (Purcell et al., 2012; Stevenson & Clegg, 2011; Stuart et al., 2011). In contrast, Black students are disproportionately unprepared for college and acquire different forms of cultural capital than is valued in higher education (Strayhorn, 2012). For example, upon entering college Black students must learn both the curriculum and the capital needed to succeed in this setting. In Stevenson and Clegg’s (2011) study of 61 U.K. students, student participants with strong orientations to the future had participated in a wide range of ECA. This group of students came from both middle and upper-class SES and none of the students in this group had caregiving responsibilities. Alternatively, another group of students held a present-only orientation. These students held paid jobs to support their current goals and needs. Parental support was not present for students in this group, thus, participation in and the benefits of ECA were not apparent to them or encouraged by others. In other words, "embodied social capital" matters in articulating a possible future self and the meanings students make of their participation in ECA and its ability to support potential future selves (p. 243). It is noted that Stevenson & Clegg’s (2011) research is limited by a small sample size at a single institution in the U.K.

Higher education is perceived as a compensatory system that can advance mobility, reduce racial disparities in income, and make up for lack of capitals (Billingsley & Hurd, 2019; Strayhorn, 2010; Yosso, 2005). Bathmaker et al. (2013) further underscore the point in identifying the impact of not engaging in ECA as a missed opportunity to form capital for future use.

The Role of Economic Factors and Participation in ECA

Additionally, economic factors negatively influence students’ abilities to engage in ECA (Purcell et al., 2012). Data demonstrates that student financial need is growing (Baum et al., 2019). One way to understand student financial need is through Pell Grants. Pell Grant recipients are low-income students with “exceptional financial need” (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). Pell Grant spending between 2008-09 and 2018-19 grew 35%. The number of recipients during the same period increased by 10% (Baum et al., 2019). Pell Grants expand access to college by relieving financial stress for students. Students who are employed while enrolled in college (often to relieve financial stress) are less likely to engage in ECA and gain positive outcomes (Stevenson & Clegg, 2011). Based on a government-funded longitudinal study of a cohort of U.K. students over a five and a half year time period, Purcell et al. (2012) found that a lack of finances negatively influences a student’s ability to participate in ECA.

Advantages Associated with ECA

There are many advantages to ECA, including employability (Blasko, 2002; Clark et al., 2015; Purcell et al., 2012), development of soft skills (Chia, 2015; Purcell et al., 2012; Stevenson & Clegg, 2011); and supporting student transitions (Tchibozo et al., 2007; Tieu et al, 2010). ECA is essential because employers are increasingly expecting more from college graduates than a degree. ECA is advantageous because it can help graduates distinguish themselves from other candidates (Stevenson & Clegg, 2011). Blasko (2002) suggests that ECA leads to successful
employment (particularly for women) while Clark et al. (2015) highlights the building of "weak ties" via multiple contacts and experiences. In a study of 83 graduate accounting students in the U.K., Chia (2005) described that participation in ECA signifies the development of soft skills, including leadership skills, organizational skills, and teamwork, which provide an advantage in interview success. ECA also supports students’ transitions into the college environment (Tieu et al., 2010) and into the post-college environment (e.g., shortening the time to employment) (Tchibozo et al., 2007). ECA nurtures supportive peer groups and builds social networks, thus easing student transitions into college (Billingsley & Hurd, 2019). Similarly, Strayhorn (2012) found social integration into the campus community was positively associated with satisfaction for Black males at two-year colleges.

ECA as a Compensatory Structure

Specific advantages exist for underrepresented students participating in ECA. Participation in racial or cultural student organizations positively shapes underrepresented student experiences and outcomes (Museus, 2008). Specifically, Harper and Quaye (2007) found that participation in Black and minority student organizations supported the racial identity development and expression of Black men at predominantly White institutions (PWIs). Student organizations serve as communities for racial and cultural groups to address multiple needs, including buffering the negative academic and psychological impact of discrimination and providing support to marginalized identities (Billingsley & Hurd, 2019). Billingsley and Hurd’s (2019) longitudinal research of 340 students at a public HEI in the Southeastern region of the U.S. underscores the role of ECA in building academic resilience in response to the harm of discrimination of underrepresented students at PWIs. As previously identified, ECA contributes to the acquisition of capital (Bathmaker et al., 2013). For example, social and cultural capital is positively connected to academic achievement for Black and Latino males (Strayhorn, 2010).

Significance of Access to ECA

Access to ECA for underrepresented students is important because of the benefits of engagement within the campus community (Astin, 1984; Schlossberg, 1989; Tinto, 1975). Tinto’s (1975) seminal theory on student retention demonstrates that students’ backgrounds influence their educational goals. These goals (or commitments) shape how students engage in the academic and social environments in college. Therefore, the more students are immersed and integrated into the collegiate academic and social experience (i.e., ECA), the greater their chances of being retained.

Foreseeable Implications & Recommendations

Mapping ECA

Institutions can map ECA to accomplish several goals (Educational Advisory Board, 2017). First, mapping ECA paints a picture of the wide variety of experiences available to students, and in many instances, illustrates ECA that meaningfully supplements academic experiences. Second, mapping ECA illuminates routes and journeys for exploration that provide utility for career and graduate school preparation. Third, and in relation to the problem of practice, mapping ECA identifies who is and is not participating in various forms of ECA. In this sense,
mapping can provide evidence of where access is of greatest concern and can help institutions strategically direct resources to remedy the problem. This recommendation involves participation by multiple units (Career Services, Experiential Learning, Student Activities, and so on) and across multiple divisions (Academic Affairs and Student Affairs). Institutional Research and Effectiveness units can be leveraged to support the collection, analysis, and presentation of data. Given academic year cycles, it is realistic for this assessment project to take a full academic year (10 months). While this recommendation requires significant collaboration across the institution, the utility of the data will be of interest to multiple entities; therefore, stakeholders may be motivated to accomplish this task. The literature related to this problem of practice doesn’t explicitly call for this recommendation, although research related to change management in higher education generally requires robust evidence of the diagnosis of a problem to propel change forward (Beer et al., 1990; Mader et al., 2013).

**Incentivize Participation in ECA**

Institutions can incentivize participation in ECA by providing course credit for ECA or making ECA a graduation requirement to integrate ECA as a part of the formal, academic experience contributing to college completion goals. Similarly, institutions can offer a monetary subsidy, via an “involvement grant,” that serves to offset employment for students from low SES backgrounds. Incentivizing participation by integrating ECA into the curriculum scales opportunities for students to effectively build social and cultural capital (Kuh & Kinzie, 2018). In other words, students can learn how to “play the game,” a tool that middle class families develop with and for their children in pre-collegiate experiences (Purcell et al., 2012, p. 14). Purcell et al. (2012) identified that graduates with low SES and disadvantaged social backgrounds benefitted from participation in ECA by increasing their employability post-graduation. At the same time, they had limited access to ECA, presumably due to the need to be employed. This recommendation also helps to overcome the barrier of an absence of economic capital and to offset income students would otherwise earn in on- or off-campus jobs.

This is the least realistic of the two recommendations because it requires significant financial resources to sustain a student grant and curricular change of this nature is slow and difficult. Change of this magnitude would require both top-down leadership from academic and student affairs and internal support from a variety of stakeholders to reduce resistance to change (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006). That said, a model for credit-bearing experiences such as study abroad, service learning, and undergraduate research (also known as high impact practices) already exists at many institutions. Examining how athletic participation, student organization membership, and other forms of ECA fit into this model would be appropriate next steps.

**Conclusion**

In summary, increased access to ECA can be a compensatory mechanism for underrepresented populations by building capital for future use (Bathmaker et al., 2013; Billingsley & Hurd, 2019; Strayhorn, 2010; Yosso, 2005), supporting HEI’s goals for students’ post-graduation success and preparation for employment (Blasko, 2002; Clark et al., 2015; Purcell et al., 2012; Thompson et al., 2013), and contributing to academic achievement, persistence (Astin, 1984; Kuh et al., 2007), and retention (Tinto, 1975).
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The Impact of Mentoring on Leadership Educator Professional Identity Development

Hannah M. Sunderman, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Kate McCain, Arizona State University

Abstract

While mentoring has been connected to leadership educator professional identity development (LEPID; Seemiller & Priest, 2015, 2017), there is much more to learn about the structures and experiences behind this connection. Therefore, the purpose of this roundtable discussion is to (a) facilitate a discussion on how having (or not having) a mentor influenced the LEPID of participants and (b) pending participant consent and IRB approval, record the discussion as data to inform future research. This discussion and research will provide a means of reflection and connection for participants and help develop current and future leadership educators by aiding in our understanding of how, why, and through what mechanisms mentoring influences LEPID, ultimately leading to recommendations for programs, departments, associations, and individuals who seek to develop leadership educator professional identity.
Abstract

Crisis is a “dangerous opportunity”. Leadership educators have been presented with the unique circumstance of a societal shared crisis in the form of COVID-19. Crisis itself is bad, but it can be used for good educational outcomes, provided that faculty can skillfully navigate the difficult balance of intellectual honesty and caring for students’ needs. This roundtable is designed to explore and discuss both whether this is an appropriate educational practice, and if so, how to do this skillfully and with care.
Framing Civic Leadership in the 21st Century: Helping Students Become More Than Good Neighbors

Jason Headrick, Texas Tech University

Abstract

Civic engagement has declined over the past 50 years in the United States. Societal challenges have leadership educators scrambling for ideas and programs that can address these challenges for the greater good. Civic leadership programming can address these challenges through curricular and co-curricular programming, but there needs to be a discussion to frame what civic leadership looks like in the 21st century. Leadership educators need to create programs that engage our communities and help our students find their path to being a good citizen. The purpose of this roundtable will be to engage in these conversations centered on the needs of modern-day civic leadership programming, the challenges we face, and to share impactful practices currently being engaged at our own institutions.

Introduction

Our friends at Merriam-Webster define “civics” as a social science dealing with the rights and duties of citizens (civics, 2021). The term may conjure thoughts of a high school civics course where the focus was on the rights and duties of citizens and how the government process works. However, in these times of elected official scandal, divided elections, racial inequality, insurrection, public discourse, the COVID-19 pandemic, and other economic and community challenges, the notion and needs of formal civics takes on different definitions for different individuals. In the United States, civic involvement has continued to drop in the last 50 years (Shaker, 2014; Malin, Hau, and Liauw, 2017).

At the core of leadership education is the idea that our students will graduate from our institutions and become stewards of leadership in their professions, communities, and daily life. Studies have shown that some graduates are not prepared with essential leadership skills upon graduation. These skills include problem solving, leadership development, team skills, communications, conflict management, decision-making skills, critical thinking, and professionalism (AACU, 2015; Crawford & Fink, 2020; NACE, 2020). As leadership education professionals seek to build human capacity and address complex problems (Andenoro & Skendall, 2020), examining the current state of civic leadership and engagement in our programs and communities is crucial to the national conversation regarding civics and to the preparation of our students to step into leadership roles and engage in the communities they settle into and are a part of.

The purpose of this roundtable discussion will be to allow the facilitator and participants to engage in discussion centered on the needs of modern-day civic leadership programming and share impactful practices currently being engaged at their own institutions. The facilitator hopes
to learn about the current state of civic leadership programming and strategies to push the idea forward in curricular and co-curricular settings. This roundtable discussion will be of interest to a wide array of audiences, including leadership instructors and practitioners, but also those with an interest in facilitating learning experiences and programs that benefit our students. The learner/participant objectives are as follows: (1) Participants will be able to share and better understand the broad concepts of civic leadership, (2) Participants will feel better equipped to add elements of civic leadership and engagement into their curricular and co-curricular programming, and (3) Participants will help expand the creative ideas and pursuits of civic leadership at our institutions.

Background

Defining Civic Leadership/ Civic Leadership Programs

Reed (1996) defined civic leadership as the “art and science” of leading in the public arena where an individual engages in the affairs of society through advocacy, debate, education, and creating dialogue. Civic leadership programs are leadership development programs, typically sponsored by community agencies, with goals of training future and current leaders in skills deemed necessary to serve in their communities (Azzam and Riggio, 2003).

Civic Leadership in Leadership Education

Civic involvement and civic leadership have been present in leadership education and evaluated in different ways for decades. Leadership instructors have used experiential learning to help students navigate experiences, problems, and issues across society (Pavlov, Saeed, & Robinson, 2015). While several of these activities foster learning through the act of “doing,” it can be critical to let students to debrief, process the experiences in the moment, and help lead them toward future application (Lederman, 1984).

Many civic leadership programming has previously used classroom instruction, but also require participants to work on real community challenges. This aligns civic leadership programming with the action learning approach to leadership development (Conger & Toegel, 2004; Dotlich & Noel, 1998). We know from early research that Generation Z students want to have a direct say in their college education (Seemiller and Grace, 2016), including the opportunities and experiences they can have.

A Changing Tide

In the year 2000, more than 85% of leadership programs used formal classroom presentation (Day, 2000). Given recent protocol and restrictions from COVID, educators around the world have had to change modalities and think about the way they deliver courses and programming in an online capacity (Allen, Rowan, and Singh, 2020; Orlov, McKee, Berry, Boyle, DiCicciio, Ransom, & Stoye, 2020). In these times of uncertainty, there must be discussion focused on how we continue to offer needed programming to students and campus audiences.
While community engagement continues to become a larger part of the philosophy for higher education to strengthen civic engagement, there is much more work to be done (Montoya, 2021). Leadership educators must be willing to take on creative and progressive means of providing these opportunities for students.

Description

The roundtable discussion will begin with a two-minute representation of past research and current conversations happening relative to civic leadership and civic leadership programming. The remaining time will be spent with participants adding to the dialogue and discussing civic leadership examples in the profession through curricular and co-curricular programming and research. These dialogue points include discussing the needs of civic leadership programming, modern-day interpretations of civic leadership, and evaluating future work and needs of civic leadership development across the leadership education profession.

The discussion will be guided by the following questions:

Primary Question: What are the goals and objectives of civic leadership programming to address the needs of our students and our communities?

Additional Questions:

1. What are the needs of a modern-day way of addressing societal challenges through civic leadership programming? (3 minutes)
2. What examples of modern-day civic leadership programming exists at our institutions? (3 minutes)
3. What leadership theories work well with civic leadership programming? (2 minutes)
4. What are your challenges in civic leadership in your instruction/facilitation? (2 minutes)
5. What questions and other considerations have we not addressed in regard to civic leadership programming? (3 minutes)

Foreseeable Implications

Educators have struggled with ways to make civic leadership more social justice oriented and to create strong programs that meet the needs of today’s students and their expectations (Kliwer and Zacharakis, 2015). Moldoveanu and Narayandas (2019) discuss the way that leadership development approaches often do not find their way into business or into practical application. As leadership educators, we should be focused on addressing the challenges of today with leadership development curricula and programming that promote civic engagement and leadership strategies into our students in creative and forward-thinking ways. This conversation
about civic leadership engagement for our students and communities is crucial to developing applicable content and programming to address current needs.
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How to Identify and Engage Gifted Student Leaders in Grades 3-12

Carlyn F. Fryberger, Gifted & Talented Leadership Specialist, K-12
Randi Rasco, Gifted & Talented Leadership Specialist, K-12

Abstract

There are unidentified potential leaders sitting in primary and secondary school classrooms across the country. How can leadership potential be discovered and developed to elicit a more positive outcome for these student leaders? Three years ago, an urban public school district began a Leadership Gifted and Talented program funded by a federal Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Program grant. Innovative identification and service models were developed to integrate this program.

Introduction

Identifying and engaging a unique population of gifted students is at the heart of this five-year, Javits-funded grant. In beginning to research how to identify 3-12 students as gifted leaders, Leadership Gifted and Talented (G/T) Specialists were surprised to find that little information was available. They began building the program from the ground up, learning through trial and error what was effective and what was not. The driving force for this unique and innovative program was to build leadership capacity in students’ early years by focusing on self-awareness, critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration. Facilitators will share the benefits and challenges encountered during the process and discuss the social-emotional implications of the program. The goal of this roundtable is to give insight into how to investigate and implement a G/T program for gifted student leaders. Resources helpful in identifying gifted leaders, along with some curriculum ideas and samples, will be available.

Background

Leadership can be defined as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2019, p. 5). Student leaders can be identified by looking for influencers in the classroom and in schools (Bisland, 2004; Nelson, 2016). Many of these students may already be in leadership positions: team captains or Student Council presidents. Many more, however, may be leading in negative ways, lacking ethical or moral fortitude. To identify these leaders, emotional intelligence and social awareness may be viable alternatives to using traditional gifted identification methods.

An intelligence quotient (IQ) is generally used to identify mentally or academically gifted students but may not be appropriate to identify gifted leaders. Instead, emotional intelligence and social awareness seem to be better indicators of leadership ability and potential (Goleman, 2006; Messick & Kramer, 2004; Murphy & Reichard, 2011; Sternberg, 2014). Only Dr. Alan Nelson (2016) explicitly discusses how to potentially identify those students with exceptional potential in the area of leadership. As such, there is little guidance on how to identify school-age children as gifted in the area of leadership. To successfully identify gifted student leaders,
multiple assessments were employed: TTCT-V (Torrance, 2016), NEO-FFI-3 (McCrae & Costa, 2010), SRBCSS for teacher feedback (Renzulli et al., 2010), student interview, student checklist, and a parent checklist.

Multiple curriculum resources exist to teach leadership skills to students, either as an extracurricular activity or as a full curriculum used within a classroom. There are a number of collections of supplemental lessons focused on leadership available for school-age children (Ginzel, 2018; Nelson, 2013), as well as fully-developed curricula (Kanoy et al., 2013; Kouzes et al., 2014; MacGregor, 2013; MacGregor, 2015; Seemiller & Cook, 2014; Shankman et al., 2015). Some resources provide general guidance for addressing leadership capacity (Covey et al., 2014; Komives, 2011). There are also focused lessons on specific topics related to leadership principles, like critical thinking (Seale, 2020) and passion projects (McNair, 2017).

Most of these resources, however, are designed for the average student, not necessarily those gifted in leadership abilities. In order to address the unique needs of gifted student leaders, a curriculum should specifically address both social-emotional needs and content related to developing capacity in the area of giftedness (Sousa, 2009). To accomplish this, a new program was developed to align to the state standards, the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) Gifted Programming Standards (National Association for Gifted Children, 2019), and the CASEL social-emotional learning competencies (CASEL, 2020). This curriculum was developed using resources that focus on the NEA “Four Cs” (National Education Association, 2011). Students specifically studied leadership principles and skills (Bradberry & Greaves, 2012; Maxwell, 2002; Maxwell, 2004; Maxwell, 2007; Maxwell, 2009; Rath & Conchie, 2009), creativity and innovation techniques (Fryberger, 2019; Michalko, 2006), and emotional intelligence (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009; Goleman, 2006).

**Description**

Facilitators will share their developed program model focusing on identification procedures and curriculum. Question prompts will be used to facilitate the discussion centered on identifying and developing gifted leaders in public schools. Facilitators will also field questions from participants.

The following are examples of question prompts that may be used:

- Why identify gifted leaders at all?
- How can we engage gifted leaders?
- How can we identify gifted leaders?
- Is morality a prerequisite for leaders?

**Foreseeable Implications**

Offering services and support for student leaders can help them to develop self-awareness and interpersonal skills, better preparing them to be successful in post-secondary institutions. Many of the students identified through this program were viewed as non-conformists, those who question authority and go their own way. Serving these students has given them an opportunity to consider other perspectives through ethical discussion. In addition, a significant
population of the students identified as gifted leaders were also found to be twice exceptional (2e), students who have identified areas of special needs and are also gifted. Identifying student leaders in schools may increase the number of identified 2e students in those schools.
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Barriers Mitigating Collaboration Among Higher Education Faculty and Staff

S. Jeannette Guignard, CalBaptist University
Cammy Purper, CalBaptist University
Greg Bowden, CalBaptist University

Abstract

The term collaboration has various definitions, depending on the context. Houldin, Naylor, and Haller (2004), define it as a complex phenomenon that is often formed between two or more people from various professional fields to achieve common goals. Wood and Gray (1991) define it as “a process in which a group of autonomous stakeholders of an issue domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (p. 437). According to Kouzes and Posner (2017), “as paradoxical as it might seem, leadership is more essential—not less—when collaboration is required” (p. 243) and thus, effective collaboration is an important facet of exemplary leadership.

In this roundtable, the researchers will discuss what are the perceived barriers and hesitations impeding faculty, (especially leadership faculty) from collaborating with their academic colleagues and/or administrative staff. While it is acknowledged that academia historically has valued individualism and that structures within higher education can pose inherent barriers to collaboration among faculty and staff, it is believed that the benefits of collaborative endeavors among faculty and staff not only benefit the individuals and the institution, it can also promote an enhanced learning experience for students. Obtaining an understanding of what are the perceived barriers and faculty members’ hesitations, can help academic leaders develop strategies and best practices that promote an environment that facilitates collaborative efforts for higher education faculty and staff.

Keywords: collaboration, higher education, academia, faculty, faculty development, interdisciplinary collaboration, synergy, teams, groups, leadership, organizational behavior, self-managed teams

Introduction

College and university faculty are not often required to collaborate. In many ways, professors operate much like sole proprietors; they focus on instructional strategies for the specific classes that they teach and strive to enhance and deepen the scope of their subject-matter expertise through scholarship efforts. Further, from an organizational perspective, higher education often groups individuals institutionally by similar content areas, where academic leaders focus specifically on the operations of the specific departments and majors under their responsibility. This can result in the creation of organizational silos.

Collaboration has a long history of being valued within business organizations because of its relationship to productivity and effective team performance. While corporate organizations in pursuit of innovation and efficiencies prize optimizing strategies that foster synergy, produce high-performing teams, and break-down silos, academia has traditionally rewarded individual achievement. A review of the literature reveals that, outside of medical and scientific majors,
there is not much research in the area of collaboration within higher education organizations (Kezar 2005).

The need for collaboration in higher education is more salient than ever as we consider the rise in interdisciplinary majors, such as the study of leadership, the need for consistency of learning requirements and student expectations, and enhanced student career-readiness skills desired by employers. In this round table, participants will reflect on their desires to engage in peer faculty/staff collaboration, related to research endeavors, team teaching, university initiatives, and/or curriculum development. Discussion prompts posed will ask participants to consider what are their hesitations and motivations for engaging in collaborations with the end goal of identifying best practices and strategies for effectively navigating collaboration endeavors.

Background

Institutions of higher education have historically not been structured to support collaborative endeavors among faculty related to teaching, research, and organizational functioning. Colleges and universities are typically divided into departments based on subject-matter areas, often resulting in silos. Additionally, bureaucratic and hierarchical administrative units, as well as other rigid structures such as the promotion and tenure process, can act as barriers to cross-divisional projects and partnerships (Kanter 1994; Senge 1990). These barriers may stifle collaborative efforts and their ability to be effectively sustained; it has been estimated that over half of undertaken organizational collaborative attempts fail (Doz 1996). Unfortunately, there has been little research centered on how to effectively structure higher education institutions, or how to better navigate within these structures, to facilitate positive and mutually beneficial collaboration among faculty (Kezar 2005). The barriers to collaboration that exist in higher education have significant repercussions, both for the work of individual faculty and for the culture of academia in general.

While research on collaboration specifically in higher education is limited, research on the benefits of collaboration in other organizational contexts is prevalent. This research has revealed the benefits of effective collaboration for organizations of all types, which include improved efficiencies and increased effectiveness (Senge 1990). Despite barriers, individuals within higher education institutions are beginning to recognize the need for facilitating collaborative endeavors. Additionally, in recent years, external stakeholders, such as grant agencies and accrediting bodies, have called for higher education to place greater value on collaboration (Ramaley 2001). At the institutional level, the need for innovation and collaboration is growing, as higher education institutions face increasing costs, stricter competition, a heightened emphasis on accountability, and more stringent accreditation standards. This begs the question, how can individual faculty and staff members break down silos and reap the benefits that result from collaborating with colleagues on enriching endeavors, especially when they have not been enculturated to do so and their academic infrastructure does not facilitate collaboration?

Description

Research on the topic of interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty and staff reveals several common factors that impede effective collaboration. These barriers can be classified into two categories. The first type is related to barriers resulting from administrative structures and
academic culture, while the second set includes factors related to individual differences. The first category of obstacles related to administrative policy and the nature of common academic infrastructures includes barriers such as time on tasks constraints, academic evaluation and reward structures (tenure and promotion), and the nature of academic culture, which may not be oriented toward promoting/supporting collaborative work. The second category is related to barriers resulting from differences among individuals, which include interpersonal/personality differences, disparity in perceptions resulting from familiarity in various disciplinary paradigms and academic training, and disparities in personal and professional values or beliefs (Kezar, 2005). In light of this research, we’d like to lead a discussion on the following:

Discussion Prompt Questions:

1. Are you interested in working collaboratively with colleagues? Why or why not?

2. Do you feel that at your institution there exist structural or bureaucratic barriers that discourage you or impede your ability to easily collaborate? If so, can you share what some of those are?

3. Do you believe that inter-personal or professional differences pose challenges/barriers to easily engaging in collaborative efforts? Can you provide an example?

4. Do you believe that there is a divide between senior and/or tenured faculty and junior or new faculty that inhibits collaboration? Do personal insecurities, or concerns often referred to as, “imposter syndrome” prevent you from initiating or suggesting collaborative endeavors?

5. Do you believe that your academic leader fosters an environment that encourages collaboration? Why/why not? Do you have any recommendations for how leadership can foster an environment conducive to greater collaboration?

Foreseeable Implications

Navigating the process of collaboration can be challenging, especially as a result of possible negative past experiences, and many faculty and staff working in an environment that doesn’t facilitate the process. By gaining awareness of common obstacles faced and having the strategies to navigate them, faculty and staff can develop the confidence to initiate opportunities for collaboration at their institution. As we have learned, finding other faculty members to share ideas with, work with, and celebrate successes with can truly be rewarding and transformative. In our experience, when a successful collaboration occurs, one finished project can lead to subsequent others: a paper can become a presentation, presentation can become a workshop for faculty, and so on. Committing to an open-ended project, or series of projects, may be too much for some in a new partnership or team; however, crafting a plan with a specific goal (i.e., the goal is to write and submit one paper to a chosen journal by the end of the academic year) allows each party to manage their level of commitment, one project at a time. When faculty are dedicated to enhance their behaviors and practices to successfully collaborate, they have the potential to positively impact their own professional careers as well as their colleagues and ultimately enhance student engagement. If the barriers to collaboration in higher education are not
recognized and understood academic leaders can’t foster environments that promote collaboration. If we as faculty and higher education staff can’t collaborate, how can we teach our students to do so?

References


Getting to Know Our Neighbors to Improve Group Dynamics

Wren Mills, Western Kentucky University
Kristie Guffey, Murray State University

Abstract
Regardless of whether you teach fully online, remotely, or in-person, an important component of each course is to quickly build a learning community amongst and with our students. This is especially true in courses that will involve daily small group work or significantly weighted group projects. During this round table, the presenters will share how to use three assessments and activities— the Jung Typology, the DISC, and the Compass Points— to help students get to know each other and their instructor in an extended, non-traditional ice breaker. Participants will also learn via a review of literature why doing so can help students perform better on and feel more satisfied with group tasks.

Introduction
Unless you teach in a closed-cohort program, for most classes, each new semester brings a new set of faces and personalities for both students and instructors to navigate. First days usually include awkward “who are you and where are you from”-type introductions and some sort of ice breaker that helps start to form a learning community. For some instructors, this is all they do to build a class culture. Other instructors might venture beyond that and have a small group activity or even begin covering content. Many cover the syllabus, and if it contains mention of group work, it is not uncommon for there to be a less-than-enthusiastic reaction to it. There is a way to change this response. If instructors can help students to learn about group dynamics, group work can be more fulfilling and successful. This is the focus of our roundtable.

Objectives:
1. Define “group dynamics” and discuss its implication for working in groups
2. Discuss assessments and activities to use to develop group dynamics in a classroom

Background
Before instructors can start to help students to understand group dynamics, they probably would like to be sure of what it is and why it can be helpful. Simply defined, group dynamics are “the interactions that influence the attitudes and behavior of people when they are grouped with others through either choice or accidental circumstances” (Group dynamics, 2021). With this simple definition, instructors can see how this plays out in a college classroom. Students often are grouped randomly, or maybe put together due to major, interest in a topic, or even their writing abilities (e.g., stronger with weaker students). Coers et al.’s (2010) study showed it is important for students to understand there is a process of team development, and this can change their perception of group work in and outside of the classroom. Many instructors often do not take the time for the class to get to know much about one another or allow class time for or require groups to do so and just dive into trying to tackle the project. However, students’ personalities and habits associated with their personality types can lead to friction, and because no time has been spent considering or even exploring this, a lackluster experience (or worse) often results. And this is where the reaction of rolled eyes, heavy sighs, or even groans come from students when they discover that a class requires group work—a lack of understanding of
group dynamics. Coers et al. (2009) conducted a qualitative case study on student’s perceptions of group work and determined that students needed a foundational basis of group dynamics to help them fully understand the necessity of group work. Therefore, time and foundational work are required as part of the scaffolding activities in developing team assignments and activities with a mind toward the experience being most satisfying and successful.

In the literature, Tuckman and Jenson (1977) are well noted for their theory of group dynamics. The theory of group dynamics is comprised of five key areas: forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning (Tuckman & Jenson). The most notable area was the internal development amongst group members in the forming stage (Tuckman & Jenson). Three additional articles share why it is a good idea to take time to explore group dynamics as part of the forming stage. Omatsu (n.d.) discussed that instructors are trained as subject-matter experts, but in general, disciplinary training and education rarely includes how to teach let alone how to leverage the group dynamics of students. Omatsu suggested that instructors start with simply having a first-day discussion of what group dynamics are with students and then continuing from there to “emphasize classroom culture and community building in each succeeding session and each assignment” (p. 2). He also shared that when he is successful, there are no issues with attendance and students perform better (Omatsu).

Supporting this idea are Rusticus and Justus’s (2019) findings that a basic understanding of a group’s dynamics are key to successful group work. They cited team-based learning literature that was against student-formed teams more than teacher-formed teams, they studied both to see what differences existed and if this was a justified bias. They reported more successful groups formed by the students when students already knew each other a bit or had worked with one another previously. One participant voiced that it was a “shot in the dark” if you knew no one, emphasizing the importance of getting to know something about potential team members prior to forming groups (Rusticus & Justus, p. 450). In their discussion, the authors discussed that overall, student-formed teams rated slightly higher on group dynamics, satisfaction, and performance (Rusticus & Justus, p. 453). This aligns with Omatsu’s (n.d.) statement that when students have a chance to know one another a bit, it can lead to better outcomes.

A final study from Theobald et al. (2017) discussed how students’ comfort in groups led to greater success (by nearly 30%), and students reported feeling 5.25 times more comfortable if working with at least one friend (p. 7). On the other hand, if someone dominated a group, this lowered success rates (Theobald et al.). For this reason, our roundtable will focus discussion on how to allow students to get to know one another, including exploration of personality-type tendencies, through a variety of activities from day one to enhance group work experiences, both formative and summative.

Description

I. Introductions
II. Define Group Dynamics and quick review of literature
III. Discuss use of assessments and activities to build Group Dynamics
   A. Jung Typology
   B. DISC
C. Compass Points Activity
D. Class Debriefs
   1. In Person/Remote
   2. Asynchronous

IV. Examine other methods used by participants to enhance Group Dynamics
V. Answer questions

**Foreseeable Implications**
In the near-term, sharing these ideas with students to help them make group work better will serve not just to improve a single class experience, but all future class experiences. Instructors can encourage students to carry these new skills in building basic group dynamics to other courses both within their leadership programs and beyond to enhance all of their group work experiences throughout their education.

There also are long term implications for the ideas discussed in this session. In leadership programs, we are developing not just leaders but followers, as well. The activities we will endorse help people not just come to an understanding of themselves and their own tendencies, but also of the people they are leading or following. Nearly every leadership theory and approach emphasizes how the relationship between leaders and followers is vital to creating not only organizational but also personal growth and success. Activities which develop group dynamics early in a course or working relationship can help educators to encourage our students to include these tools in their personal leadership toolkits within the workplace and lives to lead to better outcomes.
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Breaking Down the White Savior Complex in Higher Education’s Leadership & Service Programming

Julie LeBlanc (she/her), Florida State University
Kelli Dowd (she/hers), Oakland University
Heather Polonsky (she/they), Penn State University

Abstract
Much of higher education’s leadership development and community engagement work centers on whiteness and the experiences of white people (Cann & McCloskey, 2017; Mitchell et al., 2012). How do we develop experiences that are inclusive, educate our students, provide meaningful learning opportunities, while also not perpetuating harm against communities we serve? How do we reconstruct our programs and root this work in equity and social justice to empower leaders who disrupt systems of oppression to create systemic change? This roundtable is an opportunity for leadership and service educators to come together to discuss breaking down the white savior Complex within our programs for college students. As facilitators we will lead discussion on how we see these patterns perpetuating harm in our work, such as by re-traumatizing our students and approaching leadership and service programs from deficit and elitist perspectives. Yet, there is a lack of research on the practice of leadership and service programs upholding whiteness. We will discuss how higher education perpetuates the white savior complex in our programming and leadership training as well as how institutions tout these experiences ultimately reinforcing white supremacy. Additionally, we will conclude with recommendations on how we can begin to dismantle saviorism in our practice.

Introduction
Butin (2006) asserts “there is a distinct possibility that service-learning may ultimately come to be viewed as the ‘Whitest of the White’ enclave of postsecondary education” (p. 482). Service-learning is one type of practice within the broader realm of community engagement, so similar assumptions can be made about the existence of whiteness within all community engagement programs. As higher education continues to diversify in terms of its student demographics and imperative to prepare students as leaders in the global society, this tension cannot be ignored. This roundtable discussion will conceptualize whiteness in the context of campus-based leadership and service programs and will detail how white savior complex permeates such programs. The facilitators will problematize whiteness and will equip participants with considerations for how they can transform their programs from those that perpetuate whiteness to those that uphold and advance equity and inclusion.

By participating in this roundtable discussion:

- Participants will be able to define the white savior complex and how it shows up in their leadership and service programming.
- Participants will reflect on the university's role in perpetuating harm within communities.
- Participants will brainstorm possible actions steps to decentering whiteness in leadership and community engagement work.
- Participants will discuss ways to deconstruct leadership theory to create more inclusive learning opportunities for students.
- Participants will be able to make connections with others doing this work in the field to create accountability to breaking down the white savior complex.

**Background**

“Issues of power and privilege undergird civic engagement partnerships, which can lead to several problematic tendencies if unchecked, especially when partnering with low-income communities of color” (Lopez & Romero, 2017, p. 296). As coordinators and advisors of leadership and community engagement programs, we have a responsibility to our communities and those we serve to better prepare students for these experiences prior to volunteering. When there is no education about the community we are serving or the social justice topics at hand, the best intentions can create a harmful impact. This can easily lead to the presence of problematic practices in community engagement programs, like deficit framings of community members and savior mentalities among undergraduates and faculty (Becker & Paul, 2015; Lopez & Romero, 2017). Programs can easily become a burden on the organizations and people we aim to be serving. Potentially more seriously, we can perpetuate colonialism and white supremacy if we are not intentional about educating students prior to participating in service.

Service programs can easily “offer the opportunity for a white savior project to take root. And it is in the white savior project that white egos are satiated and whiteness re-centered” (Cann & McCloskey, 2017, p. 82). One possible way to begin decolonizing and decentering whiteness in service programs is by how we train student leaders to facilitate these experiences with other students. Training student leaders in reflection and humility, in creating space and listening to BIPOC is imperative to this work. “By centering program philosophies and activities in the experiences of marginalized students, such programs create rare and precious opportunities at PWIs for the production of new knowledge and healthy civic exchange.” (Lopez & Romero, 2017, p. 302).

Steps need to be taken early on in these programs to better train, educate, and support student leaders before engaging in community partnerships to ensure community voices are centered and uplifted. Recommendations discussed in this roundtable will include concepts like trauma-informed care and how to implement such practices into leadership trainings and service experiences (Messemore, 2020). We will also discuss taking a macro view of leadership and service programs to self interrogate where inequity is taking place, leading to rebuilding stronger programs through an equity lens. A program audit is an important tool to think critically about how white supremacy is showing up in our programs (Williams, 2020).
Evolving research and scholarship within leadership education prioritizes the unification of social justice education and leadership education. Chunoo et al. (2019) affirm leadership educators’ role in disrupting systems of oppression; this perfectly mirrors educators’ roles in dismantling whiteness and racial inequity in their programs.

**Description**

By participating in this roundtable discussion:

- Participants will be able to define the White Savior Complex and how it shows up in their leadership and service programming.
- Participants will reflect on the university’s role in perpetuating harm within communities.
- Participants will brainstorm possible actions steps to decentering whiteness in leadership and community engagement work.
- Participants will discuss ways to deconstruct leadership theory to create more inclusive learning opportunities for students.
- Participants will be able to make connections with others doing this work in the field to create accountability to breaking down the white savior complex.

Assuming sessions are 90 minutes:

1. **15 minutes** - Introductions, Land Acknowledgement, Creating an open space for discussion, our positionality in the work
2. **15 minutes** - How do you define the white savior complex? Where does it show up in your programming?
   a. Pair and Share in breakout rooms (or share in the chat if no breakouts), and have a larger discussion and share research.
3. **15 minutes** - How do we decenter whiteness in leadership and service work? How do we develop mutually-beneficial partnerships that hold universities responsible for the burden placed on organizations to educate students for free? How do we adapt and deconstruct leadership theories to be more inclusive?
   a. Share research and allow space for discussion, either in the larger group or in a group of 3 and then come back to the larger group for discussion and shared research
4. **30 minutes** - How are we perpetuating harm in communities, with our partners, and in our students? What role do we have as leadership educators in breaking down white supremacy culture within our offerings? Suggestions for how we do this?
a. Create larger groups and utilizing Jamboard, allow groups to brainstorm and add ideas to the digital board
b. With 5 minutes left - ask folx to look at the gallery of other jamboards and see if there are any suggestions another group came up with that you might be able to utilize, or connect with someone about

5. 15 minutes - Share tips and suggestion highlights from the Jamboard as well as research, address final questions, comments, make connections for accountability

Foreseeable Implications

As leadership educators who facilitate students’ engagement with their local, national, and global communities, we have a distinct responsibility to design programs that center equity and inclusion rather than whiteness. This topic is of timely importance as our campuses continue to grapple with racial injustice’s ubiquitous presence in our educational system. By facilitating this roundtable discussion, we hope to engage in robust discussion with colleagues and fellow leadership educators who have direct oversight and impact on campus-based leadership and community engagement programs; equipping them with considerations to break down whiteness will have a significant impact on the evolution of our campus-based programs and initiatives.
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Exploring Barriers to Effectively Teaching Cross-Cultural Leadership Theory and Praxis

Michael Linville, Indiana Wesleyan University
Artem Kliuchnikov, The Analytical Center for Leadership Research & Development

Abstract

Expansive changes in global communications and the rapidly emerging and integrated global economy have led to the widespread emergence of cross cultural teams. These developments are consequential with respect to the cross-cultural understanding of leadership theories and practices, as the latter has become both urgent and important. Teaching leadership effectively should be heavily influenced by the extent to which similarities exist within and between the respective cultures, though this is not always the case. Simply adopting Western cultural bound theories and practices in the classroom requires considerable caution, as the constraints and assumptions upon which leadership is taught may be faulty (Wee Pin Goh, 2009). This roundtable will focus on a discussion among participants of the barriers or challenges faced in teaching leadership across various cultural contexts. Obstacles to effectively teaching culturally relevant leadership principles and practices include, but are not limited to, several issues: language, research methods, cultural dimensions, societal norms, and conflicting worldviews and value systems. To date, the leadership literature has addressed few of these well.

Introduction

Warren Bennis (1989) long ago predicted that “given the nature and constancy of change and the transnational challenges facing American business leadership, the key to making the right choices will come from understanding and embodying the leadership qualities necessary to succeed in the volatile and mercurial global economy (p. 47). A review of the leadership literature suggests that much leadership theory has arisen from Western-based researchers and thought leaders. Hino (2019) observed that “researchers who have grown up or been educated in the West have tended to focus on the measurement of, and suggestions for, the effective behavior of leaders (p. 138). Hino goes on to assert that emphasizing behavior may well reflect cognitive differences between Western and Eastern researchers and thought leaders, and that Westerners tend to consider individual characteristics rather than context and relationships. In fact, the limited comparative leadership research that has been conducted to date suggests that, from one culture to the next, leaders often differ in their understanding and practice of many of the underlying principles on which leadership theory is based. Several examples include regard for authority, dependence vs. independence, perspective on rules and systems, and many interpersonal dynamics (Walumbwa et al, 2005). While international research into many of these themes have been conducted over the past few decades, including the managerial thinking study by Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1966) and the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) study of 62 countries (House, et. al., 2004), barriers remain to accurate and meaningful understandings of leadership theory, leader/follower interactions, and the actual practice of leadership. This roundtable proposes to engage in dialogue that explores those barriers, as well as to exchange ideas about addressing them for the effective teaching of culturally-relevant leadership theory and practices.
Background

The subset of the leadership literature dealing with cultural variances in the practice of leadership generally is referred to as comparative leadership studies. While considering ways of leading that are practiced in Western countries may or may not offer valuable insights into leadership practices in non-Western countries, distinguishing principles that are considered universal or transferrable have yet to produce generalizable guidelines for teaching leadership studies from culture to culture. “There is theoretical evidence to support the idea that people within different cultures see the world differently” (Hino, 2018, p. 140. The nuances that exist in societies of peoples across geographic regions of the world (such as national borders) do not reflect homogeneity. Moreover, sub-cultures exist widely even within most cultures that are defined by manmade borders. To date, little leadership research has effectively addressed the implications of these nuances on how leadership is understood and practiced. In other words, contextualizing leadership within subcultures remains a largely undeveloped and little researched area within the leadership academy. Among reasons for this are the barriers to good research and pedagogy that this roundtable seeks to explore.

The roundtable presenters have devoted considerable time and effort over the past few years conducting pilot studies and research into the phenomenon of leadership in the countries of Ukraine and Russia. Those experiences have led to some insights as well as many more questions about particular social dimensions concerning leadership across cultures, and how those might serve as guides to further investigating and understanding leadership practices in this complex and culturally interconnected world.

Description

This proposed roundtable topic will focus on an exploration and discussion among participants of the barriers or challenges faced in teaching leadership across various cultural contexts. Examples of these barriers and challenges include:

- **Language/translation** – Despite sound research methods that incorporate back translation into the process, language barriers exist when the meaning of a word in one language does not exist or translate at all into another language; an example of this is the English word “challenge” that does not exist in the Russian language. The closest possible translation is the word “problem,” hardly an equitable exchange that results in comparable meaning.

- **Research issues like interviewee transparency** – In some societies, particularly those where there are restrictive cultural norms related to self-expression, obtaining research subjects who will participate or who will answer honestly often is difficult and, sometimes, nearly impossible.

- **Varying cultural dimensions** – An example of this is that paternalistic leadership is considered a valued characteristic in collectivistic cultures, an attribute that is not likely valued in individualistic cultures (Hino, 2018; Kim et al, 2006).

- **Dysfunctional societal norms (such as widespread corruption)** – The pervasiveness of corruption in many cultures of the world serve to hamper or thwart efforts to teach authenticity, integrity, and trust, to students of leadership.

- **Widely disparate worldviews and values systems** – An individualistic culture, such as is fairly common in the U.S., places high value of fairness, especially with respect to
leaders who are found to be taking advantage of their position to personally enrich themselves in some way. By contrast, some collectivistic cultures generally accept that their leaders unequally benefit from their roles (one aspect of the power distance cultural dimension) so long as the leader also is seen as looking out for the people.

The facilitators of this proposed roundtable have experienced each of the above examples of challenges that have served as impediments to better understanding leadership in Ukraine. In fact, the concept of leadership typically carries with it a negative connotation as a holdover from the Soviet era when “leaders” were Communist Party members who exploited others. That leaves the educator with the question of how to teach desperately needed leadership in a culture where it is not valued or understood. Ukraine certainly is not the only country where similar dynamics exist.

**Foreseeable Implications**

In attempting to assess the perceptions of leadership as they exist across cultures, along with recommendations on how to teach culturally relevant leadership practices, the facilitators of this roundtable discussion hope to exchange ideas that would lend useful pedagogical insights. As one example based on the facilitators’ experiences in Ukraine, indigenous leaders and expatriates who desire to contribute to the development of successful organizations and a prosperous society would greatly benefit from engaging in the process of learning leader best practices. This is particularly relevant to the current global political environment, as many societies move toward populism. People who perceive that they hold little power but are subject to poor leadership stand to benefit from the emergence of high-quality leaders who have acquired the necessary skills and competencies to lead with excellence.

Participants of this roundtable discussion, especially those who may be involved in cross-cultural or global leadership education, will benefit from a rich exchange of ideas around the challenges that exist in quantifying discernable and applicable leadership theories and practices at both cultural and sub-cultural levels. An example of the value of such discussion may easily be illustrated by the example of an educator who desires to teach leadership in a country (or perhaps in a different cultural context within their own country) where little leadership research has been conducted, resulting in an incomplete understanding of leadership practices. Where would such an educator begin? Certainly, using resources that originate in the West often is the course of action, but the more that is understood about comparative leadership, the more ill-advised this approach seems to be. Long-term solutions likely begin with foundational research that explores in greater depth the cultural nuances that exist across and within various countries. As the U.S. population becomes increasingly diverse, barriers to understanding leadership within this country also must be addressed through additional, in-depth research in ways that foster greater relevance for teaching methodologies and delivery mechanisms, as well as leadership educators’ perceived values about culturally diverse students (Russette et al, 2008). The roundtable facilitators assert that before researchers are able to pursue effective methodologies to conduct such studies, many heretofore unexplored, uninvestigated and/or unidentified variables must be better defined and better understood.
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Leader Identity Development Through Personal Leadership Philosophies

L.J. McElravy, University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Amardeep Kaur, University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Abstract

Leader identity plays an important role in shaping an individual’s willingness and readiness to engage in leadership. To help promote leader identity development, we propose the use of a personal leadership philosophy assignment. A personal leadership philosophy is a short statement expressing one’s views and expectations for themselves as leaders. Reflecting on and clarifying one’s leadership beliefs may be helpful in promoting leadership identity development. The goal of roundtable discussion is to engage in dialogue exploring the relationship of leadership identity and personal leadership philosophies to promote college student learning and leadership development.
Let’s get to Work(spaces): Developing Leadership Scholar Identities through Graduate Education

Michaela Saunders, Kansas State University
Kerry L. Priest, Kansas State University

Abstract
Emerging and experienced scholars involved in leadership education can strengthen their scholar identities, leader identities, and leadership educator professional identities through practice. This virtual roundtable will explore and discuss scholar identity, notions of doctorateness, and the importance of building identity development and growth into leadership learning and development graduate programs along with leadership development processes and practices. By sharing experiences, identifying future questions for research and practice, and setting the stage for continued collaborative engagement, participants can gain understanding and identify opportunities for building into graduate programs more identity-enhancing experiences that can help interdisciplinary students traverse the learning curve, and even how graduate programs can incorporate the practices of identity workspaces in their physical and virtual environments. This session will be of particular interest to graduate students, graduate advisors, and program developers as we consider together the processes and implications for developing and strengthening scholar identities.

Introduction
A recent report on academic leadership programs in the United States identified 651 masters, 329 doctoral, and 170 graduate certificates within the International Leadership Association (ILA) program database (Guthrie et al., 2018). While not specified, it is assumed that these programs have varied purposes, ranging from developing leadership skills applied to professional roles (e.g., executive education) to developing people for related professions within the field of leadership studies/leadership education (e.g., student affairs professional, higher education faculty, community organizer, leadership coach, organizational consultant). Regardless of format or objectives, scholars suggest that leadership programs should attend to the development of not only knowledge and practices (capacity) but also efficacy and identity (Bertrand Jones et al., 2016; Carroll, 2015).

A discussion on the intersections of leadership identity development and leadership educator professional identity development is beginning to emerge (Pierre et al., 2020; Seemiller & Crosby, 2019; Seemiller & Priest, 2015; Chung & Personnette, 2019). We extend the conversation with a focus on graduate programs, and the intersecting development of a scholar identity.

In their framework for leadership educator professional development, Priest and Jenkins (2019) highlight scholarship and creative inquiry as an integral dimension of professional practice. Boyd et al. (2019) describe how graduate programs can prepare leadership educators as scholars, and...
the vital role of faculty in teaching, advising, and mentoring graduate students in the development of their scholarly perspectives, skills, and products.

We (authors) hold the identity of an emerging scholar (graduate student) and experienced scholar (graduate faculty member). Yet, we both see ourselves as scholars-in-development. In this idea incubator roundtable we invite graduate students, as well graduate advisors, and program developers, to consider the process and implications for developing scholar identities. Our conversation will be an opportunity to explore how the interdisciplinary nature of leadership education can create a learning curve for students no matter their scholarly background. That learning curve necessitates the creation or strengthening of a scholar identity. We will consider what has been called “doctorateness,” and the attributes necessary to achieve it; the role of spaces of learning - and what gaps may be created in the digital-only learning environment; the tenants of leadership development; and how the processes and practices of identity workspaces can support teachers, learners, and the academic institutions at which they develop. How can these ideas help faculty best support their students’ growth? How can students best help themselves and their peers in developing as scholars and as leaders?

While our focus will be on doctoral preparation, the conversation will be valuable for anyone engaged in graduate-level contexts. Specifically, participants will:

1. Explore and discuss development of a scholar identity within leadership learning and development graduate programs;
2. Share examples of experience; and
3. Identify future questions for research and practice.

**Background**

**Scholar Identity**

In the chapter, “Academic Research,” within *The Full-Time Faculty Handbook*, Ahern Fechter (1999) advises,

> A crucial first step in establishing a research agenda is to clearly define your purposes for researching and for publishing that research. These will undoubtedly change as you progress through your career or even as you move from institution to institution. (p. 97 )

The chapter encourages flexibility, prioritizing research, and aligning scholarship with personal passions as much as possible.

Yazdani and Shokooh (2018) identified five defining attributes of doctorateness: (1) independent scholar, (2) developmental and transformative apprenticeship process, (3) original conceptual contribution/scholarship, (4) stewardship of the discipline, (5) highest academic degree (p. 40). Further, they suggest that doctorateness is:

> a personal quality, that following a development and transformative apprenticeship process, results in the formation of an independent scholar with a certain identity and level of competence and creation of an original contribution, which extend knowledge through scholarship and receipt of the highest academic degree and culminates stewardship of the discipline. (2018, p. 42)
It seems intentional that “independent scholar with a certain identity and level of competence” shows up in that order. Research on leadership identity adoption (Kwok et al. 2018; Miscenko et al. 2017) suggests that identity development strengthens over time and is reinforced by social contexts and feedback. Also, the doctoral education process is a process on purpose. The research agenda is a map drawn along the way to guide the scholar. As we grow as scholars, the sophistication of the agenda is likely to grow as well.

**Leader Identity**

“We cannot know who we are until we see what we do” (Miscenko, 2017, p. 606). Leader identity can be described through four dimensions: (a) meaning, (b) strength, (c) integration, and (d) level (Miscenko, 2017). In an exploration of leader identity development over time, Miscenko (2017) found that “leader development involves changes in leadership skills, behaviors, and identity in a mutually reinforcing manner” (p. 617).

Let’s consider scholar identity development in parallel: as scholars grow skills and adopt behaviors, reinforced through the “doctorateness” process and leading to new and more challenging opportunities, scholar identity gets stronger. That means as graduate students develop independence (strength), and release contributing scholarship (meaning), while experiencing apprenticeship or mentorship, students become scholars.

The difference made by Zoom rather than in-person collaboration, and the inability to be on campus due to COVID-19 mitigation precautions seem ripe for an entire conversation about scholar development given the connections of place to process and practices of meaning-making and development explored by Ropo et al. (2013) and Ropo and Salovaar (2019).

Material places are powerful in leading people, and spaces and places can thus function as substitutes of individual leaders. However, this does not take place objectively, but rather through subjective personal experience. In other words, the experience of material places cannot be reduced to managerial or architectural plans and intentions to construct certain kinds of leadership. The performative nature of material place occurs through subjective embodied experience. (Ropo et al., 2013 p. 379)

**Practicing Scholar Behavior**

Several studies (i.e., Rockinson-Szapkiw et al. 2018; Rogers-Shaw et al., 2018) point out the need for support outside of research as an indicator of persistence through the doctoral journey, particularly for those juggling family responsibilities. That support system can assist with stress management, time-management, goal setting, and much more. As Reedy and Murty (2009) advise, managing stress and time will only enhance the research agenda’s function as an opportunity:

- To focus on what classes will be most helpful.
- To determine what subsets of your field are most interesting or relevant to your goals (or in the immediate, what to read today and what to save for a break between semesters.).
● To motivate you toward making connections with faculty and seeking out collaboration opportunities with fellow students.
● To choose how to tackle coursework projects with an eye toward your end goal.

Building Professional Identity Workspaces

“An identity workspace is a holding environment for identity work—an institution entrusted to facilitate the process of consolidating existing identities or crafting new ones” (Petriglieri, 2012, p. 298). Priest and Middleton (2018) proposed that leadership education or training contexts can serve as leader identity workspaces. Similarly, we propose that leadership education graduate programs serve as “workspaces” for the development of scholar identities. According to Petriglieri (2012), identity workspaces offer a combination of three features:

● Provide conceptual frameworks and routines that help members make sense of themselves and their environment, as well as feel comfortable and act competently in it;
● Create communities they identify with and that provide a mixture of belonging, support, and challenge;
● Support rites of passage that facilitate and integrate identity development and role transitions. (p. 298)

Specific design considerations include a focus on groups, progression through developmental stages (preparation, orientation, experimentation, and integration), as well as creating a culture of confidentiality (Petriglieri, 2012).

Description: Means for Discussion/Interaction

In this virtual roundtable, we will utilize a slide deck presentation to share purpose and key points. We will spend most of our time in dialogue within the “room” and encourage participants to also share using the chat function. We will capture notes via a Google Doc or similar that all participants will have access to after the event, to continue to connect, foster collaboration, and share resources.

1. Participant introductions: What brings you to this roundtable?
2. Brief overview of topic & objectives: Intentionally developing scholar identities within leadership education, learning and development graduate programs, with an emphasis on the doctoral experience.
3. Invitation to storytelling:
   a. What have been our experiences, or critical moments in our development of a scholarly identity?
   b. Where are we on our journeys?
4. Reflection and discussion:
   a. What are questions, tensions, or needs you have at this stage of your journey? What should we be considering? Examples:
      i. How do one situate themselves in an interdisciplinary program; what is the role of liminality in scholar identity?
      ii. How do we build community in online/digital environments?
      iii. What are opportunities for mentoring/apprentice roles?
      iv. How do we develop a research agenda?
v. How do we support unique/diverse interests?

5. Advancing research and practice:
   a. How can programs and professional associations better support emerging scholars?
   b. Now what is one thing you will individually do to make progress?
   c. What might we collectively like to engage in next?
   d. Now what are some ideas we have for future collaboration (research or practice)?

Implications of this Session

This session aligns with the National Leadership Education Research Agenda Priority 4 (Pierre et al., 2020) by critically exploring leadership educator preparation and the development of intentional, diverse, and culturally relevant approaches to leadership learning and development at the graduate level. This conversation is timely as shifting societal, cultural, political, and economic contexts are challenging university leaders to reimagine graduate education as a whole, and the development of graduates for leadership specifically.

The ideas generated during this session could be valuable to the ALE graduate education focus area network (FAN) as well as the student FAN as they seek to provide professional experiences that support scholar identity development. Recognizing that identity development is a critical component of professional development, we hope that participants will leave with a new lens to reflect on their own scholar identities, and to consider how their programs do or do not yet serve as “identity workspaces.” Developing a better understanding of the scholar identity processes through collaborative research can also advance inclusive design of professional development experiences and expanded forms of scholarship.
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The Cs of Change, a Framework for Leaders. A Componentized Approach to the Implementation of Change

Ian H. MacLeod, CD-Birch Hollow Consulting

Abstract

Change is becoming increasingly complex and its impact on organizational culture and success can be profound. Leaders need tools and strategies to implement change while understanding their organization’s culture and the implications of change. This discussion introduces a conceptual framework – the 4Cs of change – context, culture, clarity, and communication that gives leaders a structure in which to look at component parts of change and to use these parts to lead change in their organization.

This roundtable discussion will introduce the framework and stimulate discussion on what it can do to help leaders with change and if it is a tool that would help them lead complex change and organizational cultures.

Introduction

Leaders face issues of change in their organizations daily. Change is a constant and is becoming more and more complex in the organizations we lead. Looking at change as a monolithic challenge that must be met for organizational success can be a daunting task. It has been my experience that change and organizational culture go together – without understanding the change that is to occur, the culture of the organization and the impact that change will have on it, successful change can be difficult. It is because of these complexities that the Iceberg model of Change (Krueger, 1996) and the Lilypad model of organizational culture (Schein, 2017) resonate with me as they remind me of the complexities of change and culture and that the unseen is as important as what can be seen. With that in mind I have developed a conceptual framework that I have called the 4Cs of change. This framework allows for change to be broken into smaller component parts that can be addressed individually to form a detailed plan for successful change. The 4Cs of change as defined in this framework are Context, Culture, Clarity and Communication. By breaking change into these component parts, a better understanding of the problem of change can occur, allowing leaders to create a better change plan.

Kezar (2018) states that “research demonstrates that change strategies are successful if they are culturally coherent or aligned with the culture. Institutions that violate their institutional culture during the change process have often experienced difficulty” (p. 57). I believe that this can best be done by clearly understanding the issues involved, addressing the impact on the culture, engaging with stakeholders, and communicating with all involved. This can be done using the conceptual model shown in Figure 1, the 4 C’s of Change.
Figure 1. The conceptual model of the 4 C’s of Change.

This conceptual model looks first at the context of the change that is being made. It helps to answer the question, “Why change?” In developing this conceptual model, theories and frameworks were examined that supported it and related research, including research by Cameron and Quinn (2011), Manning (2018), and Schein (2017). Combining the work of these theorists, along with the research conducted and my experience and practice, has allowed me to determine the focus and theoretical background to develop my model, particularly with culture. Their work has provided me with the understanding of organizational culture and the impact of change on it. The second C, culture, highlights that a clear understanding of an organization’s present and future culture (because of having implemented change) is essential for successful change. The other C’s, clarity and communication, illustrate the need for clarity when examining change and the need for clear and detailed communication to ensure that all stakeholders understand and participate in the change. Together, these four components increase the likelihood of successful change. They come together to form a framework that allowed for the development of a detailed

Background

The 4 C’s model. With any change come a series of how questions. How will the culture of the organization be impacted and changed? What parts of the organization will need to change? What will be the impact of this cultural change on relationships between stakeholders both internal and external to the organization? How will this change best occur? As a change agent, the best way to answer the “how” questions is through applying the conceptual model of the 4 C’s to leading the change process. The 4 C’s model and its implementation is further explained here.

Context. Context involves understanding where the institution is situated, how it works, and which stakeholders influence its functioning. Context is understanding the change that is to happen, where the end state of that change lies, and how one might get there. Without a clear understanding of the context of the change one is about to lead, chances for success are lessened.
The context phase correlates to the discovery stage of the Appreciative Inquiry cycle (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005), and it continues throughout the change process.

Context is not static. It includes not just having a good understanding of one’s starting position and the anticipated impact of change, but also continuing to have that understanding throughout the implementation of change. Sensemaking and organizational learning are two tools that can maximize the opportunity for everyone impacted to know the context of the change (Kezar, 2014). Sensemaking is about changing mindsets, which in turn will alter behaviours, priorities, values, and commitments (Eckel & Kezar, 2003). By understanding sensemaking and its effect on where my institution is now, I can have a clear context of what the change is about and how it will impact the College.

With a clear understanding of the context, it is easier to engage stakeholders in becoming a positive part of the change. Engaging people can be difficult, but it is critical for successful change. Redmond, Abawi, Brown, and Henderson (2018) have developed a framework for engaging online students in higher education. Although its focus is on online students, this framework can be used to look at engaging people regardless of where they are. Redmond et al.’s framework has five types of engagement: social, cognitive, behavioral, collaborative, and emotional (2018, pp. 189–190).

Each of these types of engagement plays a role in different aspects of an organization and the people engaged in change. This engagement is strengthened by developing an environment in which the context of change is understood and people are engaged in the process. By engaging stakeholders in change, both leaders and followers understand the context of the organization into which the change will happen.

**Culture.** Culture is a powerful element when looking at change and how to lead it. A complete understanding of the culture of an organization, as it is now and how it will be after change, is a first principle that must be one of the lenses through which is change examined. If culture is not well understood, the chance for a successful change is limited. Change in an organization could result in profound cultural changes impacting leaders, employees, services, and the economy. The solution to change at any organization needs to ensure that whatever is done and whatever the cultural changes are, the primary mission of the institution is improved, not degraded.

Using Schein (2017) and Morgan’s (2006) definitions to fully understand the seen and unseen elements of an organization’s culture has allowed the development of a clear understanding of the culture impacted by any change plan.

**Clarity.** Clarity, the third C, is the understanding of the change that is to be undertaken and all aspects of it. What are the social, cultural, financial, economic, and technological impacts of the change? Which stakeholders need to be engaged early and often in the change process for it to be successful? What is the order and sequence within which the change happens? What change processes and theories are to be used to implement the change? What is the timeline for the change, and will it be rolled out all at once or in manageable stages? These questions have one purpose: to provide clarity for the leader of change and for stakeholders impacted by the change. They frame the “how” of change.
As part of the change process, stakeholders need to look at how to best to implement organizational change. The change process must be able to show to everyone the benefits of the change, the impacts of the change on stakeholders and the organization, and the timeline in which it will occur. This level of clarity is essential for successful change, and without it the chances for successful change are greatly reduced.

**Communication.** The fourth and final C of the 4 C’s model is communication. Change cannot be hidden away; it must be seen and embraced by all. This can best be done through strong, effective communication that clearly lets stakeholders know what change is happening, what the end state of the change will be, and what their role will be in implementing the change. Communication is essential for effective engagement, which leads to effective change. A clear understanding of the communication practices used in an organization is key to understanding how to best engage stakeholders.

Lewis (2019, pp. 54–56) described formal and informal communication, and both are important for stakeholder engagement. Understanding formal and informal communication methods will greatly assist in the development of a successful communication plan. Formal communications are organizational communication tools, methods, and channels already in place, such as a company newsletter, internal memos, blogs, and videos. They are seen by stakeholders as the way the organization communicates with them. Informal communications include “spontaneous interactions of stakeholders with each other, with implementers, and with non-stakeholders” (Lewis, 2019, p. 55).

There is a strong connection between culture, communication, and the need to socialize change. This connection can be fostered through social accounts. Social accounts are “the explanations one gives another for the decisions and actions he or she has made” (Cobb & Wooten, 1998, p. 148). Teams, committees, and subcommittees are common methods of bolstering these social accounts and leveraging the socialization of change to generate engagement. As such, shared leadership is vital, inviting everyone across the organization to bring their knowledge and experience to the implementation of the change. Clear communication increases the understanding and engagement of those impacted by change. Change should never be a secret or implemented without an understanding of why it is happening amongst those impacted by it.

**Description**

The 4Cs is one way to look at change by dividing it into smaller component parts. The aim of this roundtable discussion is to introduce this framework and see if it resonates with the participants. Is it a tool that can assist leaders in creating successful change? Are there elements of this framework that make sense and others that do not? Like change itself, this is a fluid framework, does it have the right Cs in it, or are there others that make more sense? The aim of this discussion is to get participants to answer these questions and thinking about how they lead change and are the 4Cs an approach that could help?

The session is planned as follows:
• Introduction – 10 minutes – background and intro to 4Cs
• Context – 15 minutes
  o Why is context important?
  o How as a leader do you develop clear context of change?
• Culture – 15 minutes
  o How do you define culture in your organization?
  o How does change affect culture?
  o How does culture affect change?
• Clarity – 15 minutes
  o How can clarity help with change?
• Communication – 15 minutes
  o How does communication impact change?
  o How does communication impact change you have been involved with?
• Discussion – 15 minutes
• Conclusion/wrap-up – 5 minutes

Foreseeable Implications

One implication coming from this discussion is that it may provide leaders with a different perspective in leading change and how it may impact their organizations. By looking at change in smaller parts they may develop ideas and tools that will lead to a greater understanding of change and how it impacts their organization. This will allow them to become better at leading change and becoming the change champions leaders should be.
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What is Her Story? Discussing Female Leader Identity, Imposter Phenomenon and Self-Efficacy

Kate D. McCain, Arizona State University
Paula Veach, Arizona State University

Abstract

Attention to the study of leader identity development has increased in the last decade. While gender roles and identity continue to be a source of discussion, fewer studies have examined the social and contextual factors influencing leadership identity emergence particularly among female leaders in academic environments. There are things that women learn from a lifetime of functioning in male dominated spaces such as leadership. The result of this learning may offer alternative perspectives about leadership, distinctive priorities and ways of interacting. This round table will engage female leaders within higher education in narrating their experiences with leader identity, imposter phenomenon, and self-efficacy.
Creating Student Belonging in Online Courses

Ada Cenkci, Northern Kentucky University
Megan Downing, Northern Kentucky University

Abstract

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and related social distancing measures, many college classrooms moved online. The sudden shift in learning modality brought some challenges to leadership educators, including how to create a sense of belonging in their classrooms. Sense of belonging is a basic human need and research indicates significant benefits of belonging in the classroom such as academic self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, engagement, and course achievement. Considering such student benefits, this roundtable will explore fostering a sense of belonging in the leadership education classroom, especially in virtual learning environments. The participants will share their personal experiences and best practices for creating belonging in the classroom.
Best Practices in Undergraduate Mentoring – Findings & an Invitation

Carol Clyde Gallagher, Cottey College
Yolanda Caldwell, The College of Saint Rose

Abstract

There are many and varied opportunities to undergraduate mentoring programs. This roundtable session will review relevant information from the literature, followed by a discussion of possible best practices to consider in the development of a multi-campus mentoring program. Participants interested in developing and implementing a multi-campus program will be invited to participate in a project that addresses one of the more significant findings of previous research – the need to evaluate with consistent criteria, format, functions, and definitions.

Introduction

Many leadership education programs, both within and beyond the formal classroom environment, are utilizing or considering the possibilities inherent in mentoring as an opportunity for growth and learning. While the concept is aspirational, the research has consistently suggested that there is less structure and focus on theoretical and functional elements that lead to both effectiveness and what will be discussed as “best practices.” Participants of this session will achieve the following learning outcomes:

1. Consider findings for current and potential programs regarding program design and best practices.
2. Share with and learn from colleagues regarding personal experiences with mentoring best practices.
3. Offer recommendations and consider participation in a pilot program that will occur on multiple campuses with varied participant groups.

Background

Mentoring initiatives and programs have long been studied in higher education, often with foci that vary from peer-based programs to faculty or alumni mentoring initiatives. Research focused on mentoring and mentoring programs lags in comparison to the prominence that the approach is seen in higher education (Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Gershenfeld, 2014; Crisp et al., 2017). Such programs grow out of an interest in retention, academic performance, relationship building, student engagement, and career preparation (Gershenfeld, 2014).

Jacobi (1991) offered the first comprehensive review of the literature and identified three key shortcomings: a lack of consensus on a clear and concise definition of mentoring, a variety of methodological weaknesses, and theoretical deficiencies. The research identified four higher education theories that allowed for clear mentoring opportunities which included connection to learning, development support, academic and social integration, and social support.

Jacobi’s (1991) recommendations that developed through her research into undergraduate mentoring programs included a need to include easy to understand descriptive information, the nature of mentoring partnerships, and those characteristics most often found in both mentees and
mentors. Jacobi (1991) also recommended effectiveness of formal mentoring programs be evaluated using more rigorous research designs that provide primary theoretical analysis.

Crisp and Cruz (2009) reviewed the mentoring literature as it focused on both undergraduate and graduate programs both at a student’s home institution and abroad by focusing on 47 studies completed between 1990-2007. With the integration of theoretical perspectives of mentoring from education, business, and psychology literature. Growth was seen in the number of mentoring studies that were published focusing on student identity (i.e. gender and gender identity, race, class, and first-generation). Similar to findings from Jacobi (1991), a continuing theme was around regarding methodological limitations, potentially impacting internal validity and that ability to generalize findings.

Crisp and Cruz’s (2009) recommendations included an expansion of theory to include underpinnings of feminist and critical race theories in addition to theories from other fields. The authors also reiterated a need for a clear mentoring definition, as their work uncovered more than 50 definitions in total. Further recommendations focused on issues of internal validity (i.e. standard instruments and utilizing longitudinal designs) and issues of external validity (i.e. researching more comprehensive mentoring programs in a variety of settings). Additionally, they emphasized the need for a more clear understanding of mentoring programs, including participant characteristics.

Gershenfeld (2014) evaluated 20 studies completed between 2008 to 2012 that focused on mentoring programs where undergraduate students served as mentors or mentees. Focusing on limitations identified in previous reviews (Jacobi, 1991; Crisp and Cruz, 2009), continuing challenges related to definition, theory and methods were identified, in addition to consideration of social validity and the inclusion of fundamental program components. The addition of Jackson’s (2009) classification system to assess evidence-based interventions (to review methodological rigor), and assessment of the purpose or function of the mentor was evaluated using Nora and Crisp’s (2007) categories. These categories also allowed for a shift from vague definitions and terminology toward the emphasis of the categories that emphasized four functional aspects (academic support, psychosocial or emotional support, role modeling, and goal setting/career planning).

Eamon’s (2008) four-part social validity operationalization was also incorporated in the study, which included “[a] the establishment of socially relevant goals; [b] demonstration of meaningful change; [c] use of acceptable, appropriate, and feasible interventions; and [d] maintenance and generalization of intervention gains” (p. 328). This operationalization may involve both objective and subjective measures, which considers outcomes including and beyond reported satisfaction.

Determining a theoretical base should be a high priority for any program, and Tinto’s social integration theory is most often cited. Tinto’s work emphasizes student integration into both the classroom and extracurricular environment are more likely to persist and graduate from an institution (Gershenfeld, 2014). Retention is not the only impetus for programs. Spence and Hyams-Ssekasi (2015) suggest that institutions of higher education are becoming more attentive to employability outcomes, while Priest and Donley (2014) address the efficacy of both formal and informal mentoring as an effective leadership education strategy for student development.

Hall and Jaugietis (2011) offer five mentoring program components to consider, including ratio of mentees to mentors, mandatory or voluntary participation, compensation, frequency or duration of the program, and programmatic support for the program and it’s participants.
Implications from previous meta-analysis efforts indicate that an emphasis must be placed on adequate rigor in research design of future studies (Jacobi, 1991; Crisp and Cruz, 2009; Gershenfeld, 2014), with particular attention to external and internal validity through a use of comparison and/or control groups, pretests–posttests, multiple research sites, valid instruments, and similarly rigorous research methods. Additional recommendations include clear details on definitions, functions, and features of the program in light of social validity (Gershenfeld, 2014).

Best practices offer a particular challenge due to the variety and complexity of programs and opportunities (Brondyk and Searby, 2013). Determining what constitutes a “best practice” may differ from disciplines to career field to community or organization, with variety in conceptualization, expectations, rigor, commitment, and outcomes. The most consistent and significant challenge for many programs is the lack of empirically substantiated best practices within the academic environment.

Brondyk and Searby (2013) introduce criteria that must all be met for a practice to be considered a “best practice.” These include 1) being practically effective (i.e. affordable, attainable, and accessible), 2) empirically based (validated through research-based literature), and 3) achievement of stated purpose (effectiveness in reaching goals).

**Description**

Discussion will occur in a group setting, with opportunities for active engagement or pure learning from others. Each iteration will adhere following format:

- 3 minutes welcome & introduction (why they’re present)
- 3 minute review of handout on best practices (capturing concepts from the above literature review)
- 7 minute discussion of best practices that have been observed or implemented
- 2 minute invitation to multi-campus pilot program in development

**Foreseeable Implications**

Mentoring continues to be a significant area of interest for leadership, and within both academic and co-curricular programs there is a need to capture and analyze metrics that contribute to best practices. The implications of this session are to develop a multi-campus program that is grounded in the literature for analysis as discussed through previous research.

**References**


Exploring Leadership Legitimacy as a Property of Whiteness: Implications for College Student Leadership Scholarship and Practice

Lauren Irwin, University of Iowa

Abstract

I argue that whiteness as property offers a valuable conceptual tool for college student leadership education scholarship and practice. Whiteness remains underexplored in college student leadership education scholarship, despite the increasing use of critical frameworks. Accordingly, this idea incubator roundtable places research about student affairs leadership education alongside literature on racialization in leadership prototypes to highlight how leadership legitimacy functions as a property of whiteness. Implications for research and practice, using whiteness as property, will be explored.

Introduction

In this roundtable, I will trace theorizing at the intersection of leadership legitimacy, racialization, and whiteness as property. In connecting these bodies of scholarship, attendees will critically examine the racialized nature of leadership education work. Further, I will solicit feedback and discussion about how to further this work in theory and practice, inviting attendees to consider potential implications. Collectively, this idea incubator will share critical perspectives on racialization and whiteness in leadership education and facilitate dialogue around implications for research and practice.

The United States is a racialized society, structured by white supremacy (Bonilla-Silva, 1997; Jung, 2015). U.S. history and the development of dominant institutions, like higher education, are deeply intertwined. Further, scholars have detailed how genocide, slavery, settler colonialism, and whiteness facilitated the creation, expansion, and modern functioning of higher education (Patton, 2016; Wilder, 2014). Whiteness is a relational category, occupying a standpoint of privilege (Frankenberg, 1993), because of its construction in opposition to Blackness and People of Color (Harris, 1993; Leonardo, 2009). Yet, whiteness exists beyond white people, operating through ideological and discursive practices (Leonardo, 2013). Thus, whiteness also refers to practices, beliefs, and patterns of communication that preserve white domination (Gusa, 2010; Leonardo, 2002).

Higher education institutions aspire to serve numerous functions, with leadership development as a central goal (Astin & Astin, 2000; Dugan & Turman, 2018). Leadership is a coveted outcome, as those deemed legitimate in their leadership may attain visible and influential positions in society. While at times, universities legitimate leaders committed to justice, like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Alicia Garza, unfortunately, universities also continue to legitimate white supremacist leaders, like Donald Trump and Richard Spencer, contributing to continued violence and domination. Given the racialized nature of both U.S. society and higher education, leadership development research and practice must deeply interrogate structures of power and domination, including racism and whiteness (Author, 2019).
Notably, a growing body of college student leadership scholarship centers considerations of power, social location, and justice (Barnes et al., 2018; Dugan, 2017; Guthrie & Chunoo, 2018; Museus et al., 2017). Yet, research has not fully examined the ways student affairs leadership educators and leadership programs protect and reproduce whiteness. This roundtable seeks to address that gap and asserts that student affairs leadership education protects leadership legitimacy as a property of whiteness. If higher education broadly, and leadership education particularly, are invested in racial justice, there is an urgent need to interrogate and disrupt practices that continue to reify leadership as a property of whiteness. I believe this roundtable is an important step in centering racial justice in theory and practice.

**Background**

Whiteness as property, formally coined by Harris (1993), a critical legal scholar, asserts that the U.S. history of genocide and slavery was foundational to the formation of property rights and racial identity. Whiteness was legitimated as foundational to both citizenship and property rights by the courts (Harris, 1993). Importantly, property encompasses both physical objects and anything of apparent value—like whiteness (Annamma, 2015). Further, whiteness and property are intertwined within education as whiteness and white property ownership provide the basis for funding public education and have assured continued access to quality education (Aggarwal, 2016; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). One of the most important aspects of whiteness as property is the right to exclude, or the ability to protect the benefits of property by deeming others not white (Harris, 1993). Whiteness’ value is maintained through its exclusivity, much like leadership. Here, I argue that leadership legitimacy is a property of whiteness, a reality that is protected by leadership education’s whiteness. Thus, whiteness as property is a valuable analytical tool, as it provides one way to understand whiteness’ function as more than identity, but as an active entity, exercising power and securing rights (Annamma, 2015; Harris, 1993). Next, I describe literature about student affairs leadership educators and leadership programs, before detailing how leadership legitimacy functions as a property of whiteness.

I use the term leadership educator to refer to student affairs professionals and para-professionals whose role(s) center around a “commitment to the development of leadership capacity of individuals, groups, organizations, and society” (Seemiller & Priest, 2017, p. 1). Here, I focus on leadership educators in student affairs leadership education settings. Leadership educators create environments and opportunities for students to engage in leadership development through retreats, workshops, classes, certificate programs, and other offerings (Owen, 2012). While students build leadership skills and knowledge through diverse experiences in college and beyond, these programs are significant points for student engagement and success, relationship building, and leadership skill development (Dugan et al., 2013; Dugan & Komives, 2007). In short, these programs are important areas of leadership legitimation. However, what constitutes valuable leadership skills or knowledge varies based on the theories used, assumptions about leaders and leadership, and constructions of the intended student participants (Dugan, 2017). Leadership educators largely control these processes.

A contemporary body of work provides the foundation for knowledge about leadership educators, focusing on demographics (Dugan et al., 2013; Jenkins & Owen, 2016; Owen, 2012), pedagogical strategies (Jenkins, 2012, 2013), and leadership educator identity development (GuramatunhuCooper & Lyons, 2017; Priest & Seemiller, 2018; Seemiller & Priest, 2015, 2017).
Leadership educators, especially those in student affairs, are overwhelmingly white (Jenkins & Owen, 2016). Most leadership educators do not have a degree in leadership, but many have some post-baccalaureate leadership coursework (Jenkins & Owen, 2016). Thus, many leadership educators are self-taught (Jenkins & Owen, 2016) and draw on their lived experiences, past leadership roles, and professional skills to construct and facilitate leadership education (Priest & Seemiller, 2018).

Commonalities exist across leadership education program structures and pedagogies as leadership education practices are influenced by shared standards, best practices from professional organizations, and large-scale surveys (Dugan et al., 2013; Owen, 2012). Several leadership models are commonly employed: The Social Change Model, the Relational Leadership Model, and the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership (Owen, 2012; Rosch & Anthony, 2012). These models share some epistemological congruence, as they conceptualize leadership as relational and process oriented. Predominantly, white scholars authored these models. Finally, Jenkins (2012, 2013) detailed the prevalence of discussion-based pedagogy, followed by reflection, presentations, and self-assessments within leadership programs. Next, I argue that the demographics, tools, and practices of leadership educators and programs reify whiteness as a prerequisite for leadership.

Leadership Legitimacy as a Property of Whiteness

The interplay of leadership educator demographics, dominant leadership tools, and research about leadership legitimacy demonstrates how leadership operates as a property of whiteness. Student affairs leadership educators are overwhelmingly white (Jenkins & Owen, 2016). Further, most leadership educators lack formal academic training or credentials in leadership. The importance of self-teaching and learning through participation in leadership education spaces (i.e., conferences, professional experiences), reinforces the exclusionary nature of leadership education (Rocco & Pelletier, 2019). In short, current leadership educators hold immense power in validating students’ emerging leader identities and colleagues’ leadership educator identities (Komives, 2011; Seemiller & Priest, 2015). In many ways, leadership education reflects white institutional presence (Gusa, 2010), given the domination of whiteness in knowledge, discourse, and demographics. Thus, whiteness, as identity and discourse, functions as a powerful credential for leadership educator legitimacy.

Not only is whiteness an important credential for accessing leadership educator roles and resources, but it undergirds the construction of leadership education. If leadership education is predominantly constructed by white leadership educators and they facilitate leadership education based on their own values, experiences, and ways of knowing (Priest & Seemiller, 2018), they likely design leadership in their own, white, reflections. Thus, whiteness is a prerequisite for leadership legitimacy at multiple levels – as leadership educators and for students in leadership programs. This reality is further reinforced by the leadership tools that inform leadership education practice.

The majority of leadership theories and tools used by leadership educators were crafted by mostly white scholars (Dugan, 2017). In many ways, whiteness is also an essential qualification for legitimation as an expert or authority on leadership. While it is possible for white people to act against whiteness (Giroux, 1997), commonly used leadership tools largely neglect critical considerations of power broadly, or whiteness in particular (Author, 2019;
Dugan, 2017). Thus, dominant discourses and practices of student leadership development are rooted in whiteness, further reinforcing the performance of whiteness as essential for leadership legitimacy.

Finally, leadership experiences differ across racial identities. Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips (2008) demonstrated whiteness as central to leadership prototypes, where being white is seen as an important part of being a leader, regardless of the industry’s or organization’s racial diversity. Further, in their review of leadership literature related to race and ethnicity, Ospina and Foldy (2009) illustrated that non-white racial identity is a constraint for leaders of Color, as being a Person of Color threatens perceived leader legitimacy. Thus, leadership legitimacy is not just about mere participation in a leadership program or attainment of a leadership role, as organizations still reproduce racialized structures and practices, that reward whiteness, even in the presence of People of Color (Ray, 2019; Ray & Purifoy, 2019). Racism structures leadership legitimation. In many ways, successful leadership requires “doing whiteness” (Liu & Baker, 2016, p. 420), or a recognition that white discourses, practices, and habits of leading – and often white identity – are what secure leadership legitimacy.

Thus, while many leadership programs, educators, and models desire to serve all students (Komives, 2011), the reality is that leadership education is designed to legitimate a narrow portion of students as leaders. Leadership is exclusive and leadership education is highly racialized in a way that protects leadership legitimacy as a property of whiteness. Predominantly white leadership educators utilize existing leadership tools, rooted in whiteness, to inform their gatekeeping practices. Thus, white-washed tools, are used in race-evasive ways to exercise the right to exclude, resulting in college student leadership development and legitimacy as a property of whiteness. These practices are both informed by and reinforce notions of whiteness as essential for leadership.

**Description**

This idea incubator roundtable places research about student affairs leadership education alongside literature on racialization in leadership prototypes to highlight how leadership legitimacy functions as a property of whiteness. In the first half, I will summarize salient features of whiteness as property and racialization in leadership education. I will share slides to highlight salient points. Then, in the second half, I will facilitate reflection and discussion about implications for research and practice. Discussion questions will be shared in the chat, verbally, and on slides. I will encourage attendees to unmute and share, utilize the chat function, and/or follow-up via email. Some of discussion questions I will pose are: 1) Are there scholars/practitioners that come to mind who are invested in similar work and thinking?; 2) What methodologies or research designs could inform the empirical exploration of whiteness as property in leadership education?; 3) How does your leadership program/curriculum resist discourses, norms, or practices that preserve leadership legitimacy as a property of whiteness?; and 4) What additional scholarship could help inform theorizing around the racialized nature of leadership legitimacy?

**Foreseeable Implications**

Leadership development persists as a central goal of higher education. Thus, leadership educators have a central role in guiding student leadership development (Komives, 2011). While
many students develop leadership skills and lead outside of formal leadership programs, leadership programs, and leadership educators are important leadership gatekeepers. Much like the courts have legitimated whiteness as both the basis for property and as property (Harris, 1993), leadership educators explicitly and implicitly legitimize both whiteness and white students as leaders. This roundtable will directly inform the pursuit, design, and future of critical scholarship, including considerations of how whiteness manifests in leadership education efforts. Such scholarship is important in pursuing equity and racial justice in higher education and leadership education. Further, attendees will be prompted to critically examine their practices through discussion and reflection – during the roundtable and beyond. Finally, this dialogue can facilitate relationship building – strengthening networks of and connections among leadership educators invested in disrupting whiteness in leadership education.
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Exploring Growth Mindset and Design Thinking in Undergraduate Leadership Education
Academic Advising

Addison Sellon, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Hannah Sunderman, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln
L.J. McElravy, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Abstract

Academic advising has the potential to play a critical role in leadership education students’ undergraduate experience (Mann, 2020; Spratley, 2020). The utilization of growth mindset and design thinking can enable student development and provide advisors with specific material to work on with their students. During this roundtable discussion, three leadership educators, two of whom are faculty members and one of whom is a graduate student, will share their own advising experiences along with materials formulated to incorporate growth mindset and design thinking into leadership education advising practices. The discussion will allow participants to share their own perspectives on advising, experiences with growth mindset and/or design thinking, provide feedback on the proposed manual, and collaborate on using the proposed manual in their own advising practices. All of the discussion points work towards the overall goal of enhancing the undergraduate advising experience in leadership education.
Gender and Problem Solving: Implications for Leadership in Higher Education

Sarah Bush, University of Idaho
Megan Seibel, Virginia Tech
Jera Niewoehner-Green, The Ohio State University
Mary Rodriguez, The Ohio State University

Abstract

Leading and managing change through complex problem solving is an integral part of higher education. Yet, appropriately assessing and understanding one another through this work is difficult. Kirton’s Adaption-Innovation (A-I) theory explains problem-solving preferences; namely how people generate ideas, perceive and engage with structures in order to implement ideas, and respond to rules and group norms differently. While there is a dearth of literature related specifically to gender and problem-solving style preference, the environment assuredly influences behavior. Gendered expectations may warrant a behavioral response that is the result of coping to fit, rather than an exhibition of true preference. It is conjectured that gender-influenced workforce behavior, if at a gap from preferred method of implementing change, can result in poor person-organization (P-O) fit and may adversely impact the success and retention of women in higher education. In this round table, we will explore how problem-solving style impacts the perceptions of women and how those perceptions impact their experiences in higher education.

Understanding differences in preferred problem-solving styles can lead to an environment where problem-solving diversity is appreciated (Kirton, 2011). Further, as leadership educators, we can better understand methods for providing training and workshops that fully embrace preferred problem-solving styles and cognitive diversity in breaking down barriers of women’s success in higher education.

Introduction

We are all influenced by the contexts and environments in which we work and solve problems to manage change. Previous research has been conducted that has examined the relationship and influences of gender, race, and ethnicity in higher education (Hart, 2016; Kelly, 2019; National Academies, 2007; Turner & González, 2011). According to Kirton (2011), preferred problem-solving style is another factor that influences our behavior. In Kirton’s (2011) Adaption-Innovation (A-I) theory, social, environmental, and cognitive factors impact our likelihood to behave in accordance with our preferred problem-solving style or as an outward manifestation of coping behavior.

“Coping is defined as a process, switched on by motive, which offers the individual, at a price, an added range of resource when problem solving” (Kirton, 2011, p. 256-257). Research has been conducted on gender influences on behavior in the workforce and person-organization (P-O) fit and previous research supports extensive coping can result in a high amount of stress, where cognitive misfits tend to have higher turnover regardless of job performance (Bloodgood & Chilton, 2012; Brigham et al., 2007; Chan, 1996). But little has been done to examine how preferred problem-solving style and gender interact to influence behavior and P-O fit.
Considering the context in which they work, there may be higher expectations for women to cope to uphold expectations for gendered norms. This raises the question, could women be cognitive misfits based on coping to fit gendered expectations and not preferred problem-solving style? Exploring how problem-solving style impacts the perceptions of women and how those perceptions impact their experiences in higher education could provide new insight for training and retention in higher education.

Through an interactive discussion, we aim to accomplish the following two learning objectives. Participants will be able to:

1. Define problem-solving style and identify characteristics of more adaptive and innovative stylistic preferences.
2. Assess their own personal experiences and the experiences of colleagues in relation to perceptions of women in academia based on gendered expectations and preferred problem-solving style.

Background

Problem solving is the key to life (Kirton, 2009). When making decisions, individuals never operate in the same way twice; instead, decisions are impacted by contexts, environments, demands, and additive experiences. Kirton’s (2011) A-I theory focuses on cognitive or problem-solving style, which is defined as, “the strategic, stable characteristic-the preferred way in which people respond to and seek to bring about change” (p. 43). Problem-solving style is resistant to change. In A-I theory, problem-solving style places all individuals on a continuum ranging from highly adaptive to highly innovative based on their score on Kirton’s (2011) Adaption-Innovation Inventory (KAI).

Problem-solving style is a stable trait that does not change over time and the value placed on style is non-pejorative; a particular style may be deemed more or less appropriate only related to the problem at hand, with more complex problems demanding and benefitting from a wide range of stylistic preferences (Kirton, 2011). Problem-solving style influences the types of ideas and amount of structure required by someone for idea generation (Jablokow et al., 2015). Kirton (2009) describes “understanding more about yourself and others – and the inter-relationships – when problem solving” (p. 61) as the number one usage of A-I theory.

There is a slight difference between males’ and females’ mean scores that is stable over large groups (Kirton, 2011). A distinction of why these differences exist has yet to be explored or published. However, an anthropological and sociological view dating back to the hunter-gatherer time period suggests that it may be based on the evolution of the species and the learnt specializations and division of tasks for survival (Kirton, 2011). Additionally, several characteristics often associated with the more adaptive tend to coincide with traditional female social norms, while the more innovative relate to masculine norms.

Structure, such as a paradigm, may include as examples: policies and procedures, organizational culture, hierarchies, or other processes (Kirton, 2009). Individuals with adaptive preferences value structure and agreed upon consensus. They are often described by others as sound, conforming, safe, predictable, inflexible, committed to the system, and intolerant of
ambiguity (Kirton, 2009). Conversely, the more innovative prefer a looser or non-existent structure and are less concerned with agreed upon consensus. They are often viewed by others as glamorous, exciting, unsound, impractical, risky, abrasive, threatening to the system, and causing disagreement (Kirton, 2009). Each position on the continuum has valuable strengths and weaknesses. However, most individuals have a shared weakness of being unable to manage differences and see one another’s point of view (Kirton, 1980). Management of problem-solving style differences, as demanded by the problem, is essential for successful outcomes and can be done in a way that values and leverages aspects of cognition that increase a team’s effectiveness as a result of an individual's unique differences.

Chan (1996) provided evidence that problem-solving style is unrelated to job performance with individuals who are cognitive misfits in relation to their P-O fit. Conversely, they revealed that cognitive misfits tended to have a higher level of turnover regardless of similar job performance (Chan, 1996). Brigham et al. (2007) supported this notion and indicated that a cognitive misfit to P-O or their superior may impact job satisfaction and likelihood to exit the organization. Bloodgood and Chilton (2012) recommended that organizations consider the type of preferred knowledge resources, for use in building cognitive resource, as impacted by problem-solving style. Namely, the more adaptive prefer explicit knowledge resources while the more innovative tend to prefer tacit knowledge (Bloodgood & Chilton, 2012).

Problem-solving style is just one component of the individual’s complex picture. Women and men engage in the world through a gendered frame influenced by culture, tradition, policy, and more. This frame can be especially present in institutions and organizations. Gender as a primary frame by which people organize their interactions and relationships can influence roles and identities, including those that are institutional (Ridgeway, 2014). How does this manifest in organizations? Institutional level discrimination has been documented in lower average pay for predominantly female occupations; this has been attributed to employers seeing the worth of these jobs through biased lenses (England, 2010). In recent years, there has been a reduction in gender gaps of occupations as women have moved into male dominated fields (England & Folbre, 2005), yet women continue to face challenges with their successes wherein they may be unfairly seen as unsociable and difficult to work with (Fuchs et al., 2004).

Perhaps some of this discrimination can be attributed to the gendered nature of organizations themselves. Positing this, Acker (1990) identified processes that reproduce gender in organizations: division of labor, cultural symbols, workplace interactions, individual identities, and organizational logic. These processes that include maintaining primarily men in the highest positions of organizational power, creating images of the ideal manager free of familial obligations to distract from work, and dictating appropriate dress, language and presentation create and maintain gendered inequalities in the workplace (Acker, 1990). Although workplace demographics and culture have changed since Acker’s work, somethings have not changed: engaging in self-promotion to be successful in teamwork can still be challenging for women in male dominated fields, gender bias can play a role in the allocation of rewards, and networking culture may disadvantage women in advancing their careers (Williams et al., 2012). Women may also still perform, or be expected to perform, emotional, supportive, and organizational roles that align with broader societal gender norms (Lester, 2008). How then does problem-solving style and gender play a role in institutions like higher education? Are women able to problem solve in
their preferred style in these gendered organizations? Do they have to cope outside of their preference and what long term effects does that have on women’s careers, productivity, and longevity in higher education? We hope to explore this together in this roundtable session.

Description

This interactive discussion will aim to engage participants in dialogue around the ways problem-solving behaviors are perceived by others in the context of higher education. We will begin the sessions by posing the question “What are the differences in how men and women’s behaviors are perceived while problem solving in the context of higher education?” We will utilize Google Jamboard to capture individuals’ thoughts and engage in dialogue. Next, we will use three additional Google Jamboards to ask participants to specifically discuss how men and women are perceived in relation to the structure they provide or require, their likelihood to conform to the group or follow agreed upon rules, and their role in idea generation and the brainstorming process.

After dialoguing around these topics, we will provide a Google Folder with access to a handout and short overview on preferred problem-solving styles according to the A-I theory (Kirton, 2011). After this overview, we will establish connections between the responses on the Google Jamboards in relation to the overall context of preferred problem-solving style, structure, rule/group conformity, and idea generation. These connections will serve as a starting point for introducing how perceptions of behaviors in men and women may influence their likelihood to engage in problem solving according to their preferred style or amount of coping in higher education.

Implications

Navigating change and engaging in the problem-solving process to provide solutions for wicked, 21st century problems is essential in leadership today. Diversity on teams, including cognitive diversity, is essential to providing sustainable solutions to these issues. Understanding how one’s gender, race/ethnicity, and work environment influence their likelihood to behave in their preferred problem-solving style could provide powerful implications for teams in higher education and the ability for individuals to embrace cognitive diversity.

All individuals use coping behaviors and, at times, function outside of their preferred problem-solving style. However, coping over long durations for extended periods of time can cause added stress (Kirton, 2011). When this added stress influences one’s ability to be successful in higher education, it may reduce retention in female faculty and staff members and ultimately impact the success of individuals in higher education. By examining the relationship between gender, race/ethnicity, and problem-solving style in higher education, we can unpack the pressures to cope and stress caused by sustained coping. Understanding one’s own preferred problem-solving style and how it is similar and different from those around them can lead to an environment where problem-solving diversity is appreciated (Kirton, 2011). Further, as leadership educators, we can better understand methods for providing training and workshops on fully embracing preferred problem-solving styles and cognitive diversity to break down further barriers for women’s success in higher education.
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Student Leadership Development Framework: Creating a Common Language Across the University

Taylor Stokes, University of Florida
Jack Causseaux, University of Florida

Abstract

Ambiguity around leadership education across higher education institutions stems from lack of clarity around an institution’s language, vision, and goals for leadership education. Departments enacting leadership development programming at institutions are expected to make leadership development a priority, but are not given clear guidelines or a consistent message to the goals, common outcomes, or expectations around leadership development for students. This causes individual areas to create programming that may not be congruent with other departments or the overall mission, vision, and values of a framework already being used by the institution. Discussing and ideating strategies to unify efforts across a division of student affairs, or an entire campus, will aid leadership educators in providing clarity to leadership educators, ensuring consistent messaging around leadership is being shared with students, and fulfilling the mission of the university.

Introduction

Higher education has long been a place of development and learning for students. Ingrained in the roots of the American higher education culture, there is an expectation that institutions are helping shape the character and development of students in addition to providing a rigorous education. Institutions are called to create leaders for our society (Komives & Woodard, 2003) however, in recent times, many do not believe that outcome is being met. Leadership scholars have identified the country as being in a leadership crisis (Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977), and in that light, many solutions and theories have been put forth calling for leaders who utilize many skills sets. Leadership educators have highlighted many different strategies including the use of adaptive techniques to solve complex problems (Heifetz, 1994), focus on morale and motivation (Burns, 1978), or that a leader should understand him/herself as a servant first (Greenleaf, 1977). While definitions and expectations of leadership continue to evolve, higher education institutions are held accountable by both government and society for the skill level and leadership capability of their graduates. By emphasizing leadership development programs at higher education institutions, leadership programs will be able to capitalize on the movement toward prestige and preparing graduates to gain employment while being more effective in the workforce (Fox, 2018).

Leadership educators and practitioners must be proactive in creating formal, standardized, multi-disciplinary and sustainable leadership frameworks across a division or institution. This roundtable will be an opportunity for participants to share ideas, best practices, and next steps around promoting cohesive leadership development and education at their institution.

Learner and Participant Objectives
Participants will:
1. Discuss facilitators’ professional experiences with developing a common goals and outcomes for leadership development within their division of student affairs.
2. Share challenges and successes of creating unified leadership development goals and language within a division or university campus.
3. Identify common university stakeholders across a university campus that are influential in helping direct conversation and implementation of unified strategies for leadership development.

Background

Current State of Leadership Development

Leadership educators at universities have worked with minimal resources and institutional support to create “complex, multi-faceted programs that make a profound difference in students’ lives” (Owen, 2012, p. 20). Undergraduate leadership centers can be found at the majority of top public and private institutions across the country and are often well-funded and well-staffed (Lunsford, 2016). Additionally, most leadership programs identify themselves as being grounded in post-industrial, relational, complex theoretical approaches to leadership, utilizing Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) Student Leadership Programs Standards (Owen, 2012). While leadership development programs are established at many institutions, there is still “incongruity between what is known about effective leadership education and what is enacted in programs” (Owen, 2012, p. 20). In one study (Lunsford, 2016), directors of leadership centers selected multiple guiding theories (six on average) and did not have a clear focus for their center. Additionally, the 2016 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership found that leadership program educators often lack proper leadership education themselves (Owen, 2012). Furthermore, it was noted that leadership centers do not participate in consistent strategic planning; do not utilize campus collaborations effectively; and do not leverage assessment findings to their full potential. These disconnects between scholarship and practice might result in fragmented efforts by leadership programs (Lunsford, 2016) and highlight a need for program improvement.

Much of the ambiguity of leadership development stems from tailoring an experience to the context in which a leadership development program is based. The CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education (2015) state that student leadership programs must be consistent with the mission and goals of the institution and must prepare students for leadership roles and responsibilities. While this places leadership development as a priority, the guidelines do not give clarity as to how programs should be tailored or executed (Peck, 2018). Eich (2008) found that high quality leadership programs participate in the formation of a sustained learning community, offering student-centered experiential learning experiences in addition to having continuous research-grounded program development. Identifying key attributes important to student learning can create increased focus for the leadership programs and aid in the development of new programs (Eich, 2008). Identifying those key attributes can be difficult, as shown in Seemiller’s work with student leadership competencies (2016). To narrow the focus of student leadership goals, Seemiller suggests narrowing the list to 6-10 competencies that reflect a model or theory; that are in alignment with the institutional mission, vision and values; that are part of a framework already being used by the institution; and/or that emphasize strengths or growth areas for specific experiences (Seemiller, 2016). With an increased focus on developing...
leaders within higher education, leadership education must focus on institutional goals and context when developing programs.

**Importance of Leadership Development Programs**

As the value of the college degree consistently becomes more heavily scrutinized (Brown et. al., 2014), higher education is turning to the employer to identify skills sets needed for success after graduation. Employers perceive a skills gap between the competencies students are learning while attending university and the skills needed for their career. A research study conducted by Hart Research Associates found that employers “feel college graduates are falling short in their preparedness in several areas, including the ones employers deem most important for workplace success” (AAC&U, 2015). In recent years, institutions have begun to focus on the top attributes identified by employers as critical to success. These attributes include teamwork, problem-solving skills, written communication skills, strong work ethic, verbal communication skills, leadership, initiative, analytical and quantitative skills, flexibility/adaptability, detail oriented, interpersonal skills, and the ability to apply learning experiences to real-world settings (NACE, 2016, AAC&U, 2015) with leadership being the highest ranked at 80.1% of respondents (NACE, 2016). While it is telling that leadership is clearly identified the most important attribute, many of the other attributes closely align with leadership frameworks (Fox, 2018). Institutions can leverage the need for graduating more effective leaders into support for leadership development programs (Fox, 2018). The need for strong leadership programs is clear, however programs and centers have struggled to adequately position themselves within the university. Although developing leadership within the student body is an espoused goal of most institutions, few programs describe themselves as having achieved sustained institutionalization (Owen, 2012).

**Description**

The facilitators will briefly introduce the topic of creating a common framework for leadership development programming. Next the facilitators will ask questions to promote discussion among the group. The facilitators will also briefly share their own experiences and challenges in creating a common framework for leadership development within student affairs at their institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Session Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td>Facilitators will introduce themselves along with the topic of discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes</td>
<td>Facilitators will share their experiences with creating a common framework for leadership development programming at their institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Facilitators will pose questions to the group to encourage discussion on this topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion questions may include:

1. Can you share your experiences in developing student leaders?
2. What developmental goals or outcomes do you have for student leaders throughout their leadership experience?
3. Based on your professional experience, can you describe your view of the developmental process of becoming a student leader?
4. Are there specific leadership frameworks or models you have utilized in leadership programming? If so, what are they and why were they chosen?
5. How do students, staff, and faculty view leadership development at the institution?
6. How do you perceive a common leadership framework can impact the university?
7. What is your area within the university doing well as it relates to leadership development?
8. What is your area within the university not doing well as it relates to leadership development?
9. What challenges exist around implementing collaborative and sustainable leadership development efforts?

**Foreseeable Implications**

Leadership educators or student affairs practitioners at institutions of higher education may not be operating on clear, common learning outcomes or objectives when it comes to creating leadership education or development programming for students. This session can provide higher education practitioners with ideas, practices, and solutions for creating common frameworks for leadership development at their respective institutions. This program has implications for leadership educators and student affairs practitioners that facilitate leadership development programming. Ideas shared in this session should help to enhance leadership development programming to ensure common outcomes and leadership content based on research.
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Unraveling Toxic Cultures Within Student Organizations

Coleman Simpson, NC State University

Abstract

Student Governments rely on autonomy, procedure, and impassioned students to make their organizations successful. However, what happens when autonomy and procedure lead to toxic and unforgiving processes that create harm? What happens when students start to place too much weight on levels of engagement, and begin alienating students who cannot commit at the same levels? Using the current culture of a Student Government at a large public university to guide a conversation, student affairs professionals can develop reflective questions, ideas, and plans to unravel toxic behaviors and cultures within student organizations.

Background

A Student Government at a large public university has over 100 members, a budget that exceeds $400,000 annually, and is grounded heavily in policy and procedure. The organization is led by four “Student Body Officers” that are elected by the entire student body, and has Senators, multi-tiered leadership positions in the organizational hierarchy, other appointed officials, and some ad hoc memberships. There are three branches: the Executive, the Legislative, and the Treasury. There are two independent bodies: the Board of Elections and the Justice Department that facilitate the semesterly elections and judicial review, respectively. Their governing documents are more than 100 pages, and the structure of the organization is modeled off of the federal system. Because of the strong desire to follow policy and procedure, the organization has a very strict and public punitive process to address attendance issues and other areas of concern for organization members. The organization maintains a strict Code of Ethics, and individuals found violating - or accused of violating - the Code can be brought before one of the various committees, or the public legislative body for a hearing. Because of the nature of this organization being a governance, service, and advocacy-oriented body, most of its deliberative processes are held in public forums, including: punitive trials, confirmation of appointments, and discussions of other personnel issues. In recent years, students have been forced to reveal traumatic or damaging information in these public forums and hearings, which have led to hurt and distrust amongst members of the organization, and concerns from organizational leaders and advisors. There has been a steady increase of tension, dramatic discussions, and exploitation of processes that have hurt other members in recent years, and the organization is at a tipping point.

Will it continue its mission of accountable and ethical service in more restorative and proactive methods, or will its members destroy the organization internally through toxic behaviors and attitudes?

To understand the behavior and motives of the students in this organization, one must also be able to understand their values. Schwartz (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003; Schwartz, 2012) describes values that are important to understanding our behavior and motivation. These values are most applicable in workplace settings, but they are transferable to student organization environments where structures, leadership systems, and organizational cultures are very similar. Values are typically stable across time, environment, and situation, so they are important to understand
when working and leading others. Organizational behavior also posits that personality is a key determinant of organizational effectiveness and individual interactions amongst organization members (Kinicki, 2021). All individuals are all a combination of multiple facets of personality, but different combinations and presence of specific personality traits can lead to either success or disaster. These are not finite or fixed assertions that will always lead to certain successes or failures, but they can help direct action from organizational leaders.

Organizational behavior also details how important norms are to organizations. Norms (Mayo, 1946) provide informal guidance to the behavior of the organization, and ensure the survival of the group, center the core values of the organization, and reduce some conflict by establishing boundaries (Feldman, 1984). In some instances, conflict can actually still arise with new leaders (in formal and informal capacities) in an organization that can either facilitate the development of norms or create disagreements with the existing norms (Taggar and Ellis, 2007). However, norms are central to developing the core values and behavioral expectations of all members and can either mitigate or agitate harmful behaviors in an organization.

Finally, Dugan (2017) expands upon the initial Adaptive Leadership theory developed by Heifetz (1994) and describes how challenges can be overcome through various approaches. Heifetz (1994) initially describes all challenges as being either technical, adaptive, or a combination of both. Technical challenges rely on authoritarian approaches to resolving issues, as the problem and solution are both relatively clear. Technical-adaptive challenges require insight from both leaders and stakeholders to figure out unclear solutions to clear problems. Adaptive challenges require learning of both the problem and solution from leadership and stakeholders to overcome a challenge. As cultural issues are tied up in procedural, policy, personality, structural, and political domains, it requires a fully realized understanding of the problem to begin figuring out a solution.

**Primary Objective of Presentation**

This roundtable discussion is designed to engage student leaders, leadership educators, and student affairs professionals who work with student organizations (for all degrees and levels of involvement). The roundtable will function similarly to a case study design, as it will begin with a short introduction of the culture of the organization in question and the main issues present. Then the focus of the roundtable will turn to a discussion on how to address pervasive cultural issues in student organizations and how to implement strategies for success guided by the following questions:

- What roles do organizational leaders and advisors play in perpetuating or reforming organizational culture and values?
- How do student organizations balance needed procedure and policy with the wellbeing of students?
- How do students mentor and support one another in their student leadership journey, while also holding each other accountable in positive and proactive ways?
- How do organizational leaders and advisors begin tackling continued toxicity in organizations if other members do not acknowledge continued problems?
● How do student leaders establish community and engagement with one another without creating value judgements on the levels of engagement for members?
● How do student leaders and advisors tackle harmful organizational norms without creating perceptions that the organizational culture is being attacked?

Foreseeable Implications
Toxicity in organizational culture cannot be successfully unraveled in one 15-minute session. However, there is value in creating space to begin these conversations and acknowledge that many groups are facing these problems. In increasingly divisive and dramatic environments, student governments are more susceptible to the toxicity of governmental and procedural debates, but that is a growing trend in many types of student organizations and campus climates. This discussion is designed to create three foreseeable outcomes: create space for student leaders, leadership educators, and student affairs professionals to share what successes and challenges they have seen in their organizations, generate strategies to begin undoing toxic cultures in their organizations, and develop proactive strategies to maintaining positive and restorative organizational cultures moving forward.
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A United Front: Exploring the Notion of Campus-Wide Leadership Development Curricula

J. "Clay" Hurdle, University of Florida

Abstract

A review of the literature indicates that there is disagreement among leadership educators and administration over the direction and structure of leadership development curricula in universities. In an effort to address the knowledge gap of what should constitute a campus-wide leadership development curriculum, the present roundtable proposal seeks to facilitate a discussion about the present state of campus-wide leadership development curricula in academia. Various topics will be discussed including potential ideas for addressing the disagreement seemingly apparent in the literature. The present proposal’s author will also pitch his own idea for a mixed methods study to address the research topic in the hopes of finetuning the potential project. It is expected that the potential study’s data analysis and integration will provide answers to questions about how undergraduates expect to learn leadership during their time in college in addition to questions about preferred learning contexts and the value placed therein. It is also possible that the study results provide the framework for the development of a new evaluative method for campus-wide leadership development curricula.

Introduction

As the 21st century approaches the quarter mark, leadership education and scholarship have produced a robust body of research and practice, particularly in formal settings such as the collegiate classroom (Northouse, 2016). Indeed, Brungardt noted that since the early 1980s, the number of leadership programs in American higher education has grown to nearly a thousand strong (2011). This is encouraging for leadership practitioners and for society as it aims for new college graduates to enter the workforce with a refined sense of leadership. However, a review of the literature implies that, while leadership programming is robust at a substantive level for numerous colleges and universities, leadership development curricula at the campus-wide level are often ill-defined or disjointed among the various leadership programs in both formal classroom settings (e.g. a leadership major) or nonformal settings (e.g. student activities and involvement). For example, in a review of 15 agricultural leadership programs, Morgan et al. noted that curricular consensus among the programs had yet to be attained (2013). If such inconsistencies are common in what constitutes a leadership development curriculum at different universities, it would seem that empirical evidence should be obtained to address this gap in programmatic development. Indeed, Mangan affirmed that common standards are needed by any academic disciplines so that universities, scholars, and instructors can have guidance in the work for their field (2002). For leadership specifically, Sowcik has noted that research is required in this area to determine the programmatic needs and direction (2012).
The goal of this proposed roundtable is for participants to engage in a discussion about the present state of campus-wide leadership curricula in academia. Specific objectives for the roundtable are:

1. To consider the exemplary leaders (institutions) who model effective campus-wide leadership development curricula.
2. To explore common barriers to program development and execution.
3. To share perspective on effective participatory methods to engage students in the development of campus-wide leadership development programming.
4. To review the framework for a potential study to explore a public research university’s undergraduates’ expectations for a campus-wide leadership development curriculum.

**Background**

Brungardt et al. conducted research for a seminal project in leadership curricular investigation seeking to find if there exists a common framework for leadership development programs in universities (2006). The scope of their study included colleges and universities that offered leadership majors. They examined the leadership majors of 15 colleges and universities and concluded that, while there were some similarities between the leadership programs examined, there were an abundance of dissimilarities. For example, leadership majors were seldom housed by the same academic unit at the departmental and collegiate levels. In addition, the programs exhibited differing scholastic influence from the field of leadership theory. Furthermore, the curricula diverged in focus in areas such as skill development versus theory as well as leadership for civic duty versus leadership for organizational purposes. With this in mind, other academic disciplines have found inconsistencies in their curricular approach to leadership development as well.

In response to reports calling for the development of leadership abilities in engineering undergraduates, Knight and Novoselich conducted a study “… to understand what precollege characteristics and experiences, university experiences, and undergraduate engineering program contexts relate to undergraduate engineers’ self-reported leadership skills” (2017, p. 44). Their findings indicated that while co-curricular experiences related significantly to student leadership skills, curricular emphases had a stronger relationship. In addition, at the program level, they noted that “… the lack of significant relationships between program-level variables and leadership skills may point to a lack of formal leadership development within the undergraduate engineering curriculum at large” (Knight & Novoselich, 2017, p. 63). Their study affirms that curricular leadership development in the classroom and at a programmatic level are important for undergraduate leadership development. While the study indicated that co-curricular experiences should not be the anchor of a leadership curriculum, the findings do confirm that co-curricular activities are an important consideration for leadership curricula.
Co-curricular experiences might not take precedence in conversations about leadership development curricula, even though student affairs professionals and student clubs/organizations engage undergraduates in leadership development (Posner, 2009; Barnes, 2020). However, it is not justifiable to overlook student affairs professionals and the co-curricular student experiences as a part of university leadership development curricula. Indeed, discounting these contributors to leadership education would be somewhat hypocritical because, for example, Jenkins and Owen indicated that the credentials for what constitutes a leadership educator are unclear (2016). They go on to note that while leadership faculty and student affairs professionals might differ in context and critical challenges, they are both indeed leadership practitioners and educators.

Thinking specifically about co-curricular experiences independent of a classroom or workshop setting, studies have shown that there is a relationship with leadership and student organizational involvement. Indeed, Foreman and Retallick noted that this was the case in their study on the relationship between student involvement and leadership outcomes (2012). Their quantitative approach surveyed undergraduate seniors to elicit data pertaining to their individual values of leadership development. When analyzing their results using the Socially Responsible Leadership Scale as a frame for reference, they found that the number of clubs and officer roles could be associated with higher leadership scores. Indeed, the body of their work confirms that leadership development on college campuses comprises student activities and involvement, and they recommend that such activities be included in action plans for the attainment of campus leadership development outcomes (Foreman & Retallick, 2012).

With all of this information in mind, the apparent wide range of inconsistencies and lack of consensus for campus-wide curricular approaches to leadership development constitute a gap in the literature worthy of empirical investigation. As a result, the present paper proposes that any sort of united effort to revise or develop a campus-wide leadership curriculum that is holistic and effective must first begin with a comprehensive assessment of the leadership education in academic, student affairs, and co-curricular contexts to determine the state of a university’s campus-wide leadership program or the programmatic elements that informally constitute the former.

The Student Leadership Programming Model (Roberts & Ullom, 1989; Engbers, 2006) could serve as an investigation’s theoretical framework. Engbers noted that “one strength of the Student Leadership Program Model is that it provides a prescriptive and interpretive framework for the creation of leadership development programs” (2006, p. 3). In effect, the model provides prescriptive categories for the realization of a robust, well-rounded leadership development program in addition to presenting program planners with an interpretive frame within which they can apply the appropriate contexts and supplementary information (Anthony-Gonzalez & Roberts, 1981; Engbers, 2006). Several decades after its original publication, the model was reexamined and updated to be more inclusive of group leadership orientation (Engbers, 2006). As such, this version of the model (the Student Leadership Development Matrix) could be used to guide the present proposal’s potential research project.
Accordingly, the present proposal’s author is considering a study to elucidate first year undergraduates’ perspectives on leadership education in academic, student affairs, and co-curricular contexts at the university level. The study would attempt to answer the following research question:

What are first year undergraduate students’ expectations of a campus-wide leadership development curriculum?

An exploratory sequential mixed methods design would be carried out. An exploratory sequential design involves the execution of a qualitative phase of data collection from whose analysis leads the development of an instrument (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). As such, the question to be considered for the proposed study’s point of integration would be the following:

Can the expectations of the interviewed first year undergraduate students be generalized to their entire first year cohort?

The study would take place at a large, public research university in the Southeast. This context is relevant in that the university has a leadership major and minor in addition to a robust student experience via formal programming and numerous co-curricular activities (i.e. over 1,000 student organizations). Participants would comprise first year undergraduates newly admitted to the university. Specifically, the qualitative phase would see 11 students purposively sampled from each of the 11 undergraduate-degree-granting colleges at the university. The quantitative phase would consist of a census of the first-year undergraduate cohort (approximately 7,000 students). The qualitative phase would consist of interviews informed by the Student Leadership Development Matrix (Engbers, 2006). The quantitative phase would then consist of an instrument informed by the qualitative phase. Integration would occur during final interpretation as the research team analyzes both sets of data to determine if the qualitative phase’s results align with those of the quantitative phase. It is believed that this would be most effectively accomplished through the use of joint displays (Fetters, Curry, & Creswell, 2013; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

Description

With the fifteen minutes allotted, the discussion will take on a social constructionist approach to facilitating conversation. Namely, the topic and proposed research project will be introduced for approximately 60 seconds. For the remaining time, the attendees will engage in discussion guided by several discussion questions. Each question will relate to one of the participant objectives. There will be four discussion questions (with complementary follow-ups) in total. Ideally, each question should generate roughly three-and-a-half minutes of dialogue. The discussion questions and corresponding objectives are as follows:
1. What are some examples of high functioning, campus-wide leadership development curricula? What makes them so unique and/or effective? What factors contribute to the sustainability of the curricula? (Objective 1)

2. What are common issues or barriers associated with the conception and maintenance of campus-wide leadership development curricula? Are they principally curricular? Are they political? What are ways to allay these barriers? (Objective 2)

3. What are successful strategies to engage students in the development of campus-wide leadership development curricula? What are the appropriate qualitative and quantitative means for engagement? In the planning process, is it appropriate to integrate student participation with that of faculty and staff concurrently or in isolation? (Objective 3)

4. What are some suggestions or comments regarding the research project idea? Is the research idea viable? Are potential findings meritorious? (Objective 4)

**Foreseeable Implications**

It is believed that the seemingly apparent gap in the literature for what constitutes a campus-wide leadership curriculum is worthy of empirical considerations. Nevertheless, if this gap is to be addressed empirically (either substantively at individual institutions or collaboratively across multiple institutions) perspectives must be garnered from all relevant stakeholder groups: faculty, staff, administration, and students. As such, it is hoped that this roundtable will shed light on what present success stories there are for campus-wide leadership development curricula. In addition, it is hoped that more information will be learned about difficulties associated with program development and any of the participatory strategies used to engage students in the process of curricular development. Finally, if the author is to endeavor to address this gap in the literature at a substantive level at his own institution, it is hoped that feedback will be garnered with respect to his proposed research project idea.
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Identifying and Retaining Assets of Hybrid Teaching and Learning

Lori E. Kniffin, Fort Hays State University
Justin Greenleaf, Fort Hays State University

Abstract

Hybrid teaching and learning combines both face-to-face and online course formats. While this type of teaching modality has existed for some time, demand for the format increased dramatically due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The purpose of this roundtable discussion is to define hybrid teaching, explore assets related to the hybrid teaching model, and create opportunities to collaborate on ways to retain the strengths of this approach while reflecting on potential best practices for use in the future. Guided questions will be provided to assist participants in thinking critically about the topic.

Introduction

Many leadership educators have faced changes in their instruction due to the COVID-19 pandemic. While face-to-face, online, and hybrid teaching modalities are not new, the use of these modalities have shifted as colleges and universities work to meet their missions and public safety guidelines (Baker et al., 2020). As many of us wait to “go back to normal” there is also a growing sense that “we”—our society and many of its functions—will not ever return to what we knew before. This sentiment may be stemming from the cultural and technological shifts that have been required of large numbers of people and institutions to adapt to the new environment. While this collective shift causes numerous challenges, it has also provided many opportunities to examine new ways of operating. We propose engaging in intentional meaning-making processes to learn from the current experience before things shift again. One such area for meaning-making is the hybrid learning environment.

In this session, we (the facilitators) will share examples of our hybrid teaching in leadership courses over the last two semesters and engage participants in related discussion and reflections. As a result participants will be able to:

- Define face-to-face, online, and hybrid teaching
- Summarize key literature on hybrid teaching
- Explain assets of hybrid teaching by listening to others and drawing from personal experiences
- Co-construct future inquiry and practice on hybrid learning

The purpose of this roundtable discussion is to convene leadership educators curious about the hybrid modality. This can space can support educators currently teaching in this format, encourage sharing of best practices, identify assets of hybrid teaching, and make connections among practitioner-scholars interested in studying this hybrid format. Due to the session format,
we will not be presenting on our experiences in detail, but resources and contact information will be available to facilitate connections beyond the session.

**Background**

Hybrid teaching and learning can be defined as a combination of “instructional elements from traditional face-to-face formats and online course formats” (Hall & Villareal, 2015, p. 69). Schwarz-McCotter stated back in 2008 that “hybrid classes have become common in the fields of education” (p. 92), and that has increased due to the necessity of the COVID-19 pandemic. Research on this modality has shown that hybrid teaching can be similarly effective and in some cases more effective than traditional classroom instruction (Potter, 2015). Some studies have examined student perceptions of hybrid learning. Thoms (2011) explored benefits and challenges of hybrid learning in three Spanish language courses drawing from student perspectives where a majority of 100 students said they would take another hybrid language course and that they “learned as much or more Spanish in a hybrid course than a traditional Spanish course” (p. 29). Hall and Villareal (2015) describe the motivations and perceptions of graduate students in hybrid courses providing discussion on organizational flexibility, online activities, interactive activities, and balance. This format can benefit students by increasing flexibility in scheduling as well as administrators by increasing revenue and enrollment (Schwarz-McCotter, 2008).

The deployment of a hybrid course is not without challenges. Sellnow-Richmond et al. (2019) reported that, despite positive perceptions of hybrid courses, some students felt their expectations for the course were not met and expressed feeling “short-changed by the lack of interaction with both their peers and with the instructor” (p. 8). From a design perspective, faculty members would want to be thoughtful and intentional in how they create their hybrid course. Additionally providing the support and training necessary for success is critical (Kenny & Newcombe, 2011), yet training for faculty who are new to the hybrid environment can be time-consuming (Linder, 2017).

It is clear there are potential benefits and challenges to hybrid teaching and learning, and it is a topic that has been explored, to some extent, in various settings. Yet there is an opportunity that now presents itself to explore hybrid learning more deeply at this unprecedented moment when more teachers and students are engaging in hybrid learning.

**Description**

The aim of the roundtable is to provide participants unfamiliar with hybrid teaching and learning some key definitions and resources. Secondly, our aim is to engage leadership educators in a discussion about their experiences of hybrid teaching and co-create a list of benefits/assets that could be retained for life after the pandemic. Using the outline below, we will engage participants in discussion using online features such as the chat box to use our time efficiently.
We will be prepared to share our own teaching experiences with those who are interested—balancing our experiences with lifting up the experiences of the participants.

- **Introductions (using chat feature to conserve time for discussion)**
  - Name, affiliation
  - Experience (if any) with hybrid teaching or learning
- **Framing (link to a handout for easy reference post-session)**
  - Define hybrid teaching and learning
  - Share key ideas from literature
- **Discussion Questions**
  - Have you taught a hybrid course before? And did you teach in a hybrid format before the pandemic?
  - What are some of the benefits/assets you experienced in this format?
  - What have you learned from hybrid teaching that you may take back to face-to-face and/or online teaching?
  - What have you learned, if at all, about student experience or perceptions of hybrid learning?

**Foreseeable Implications**

This roundtable discussion will create an opportunity for practitioners to learn about, share, and reflect on the role of hybrid courses in leadership education. The discussion has implications for all educators as they consider the role of hybrid courses in the future of teaching and learning. For those who are new, or who were forced into a hybrid environment due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this discussion could help to draw out and purposefully retain the strengths that emerged from the hybrid learning experience. Additionally, for those who have experience with hybrid courses, this discussion could support them in finding new and innovative ways to enhance and/or improve their courses. Ideally, as participants engage in this discussion, new opportunities would be created to collaborate beyond the discussion in an effort to develop best practices related to hybrid teaching and learning in leadership contexts.
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