

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE
EXPERIENCES OF FACULTY AND STAFF IN A LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM AT A PUBLIC, FOUR-YEAR RESEARCH INSTITUTION

by

HOLLY MORRIS LUTHER

KARRI HOLLEY, COMMITTEE CHAIR

JASON GARVEY

MICHAEL HARRIS

MARGARET KING

CLAIRE H. MAJOR

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy, and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2014

Copyright Holly Morris Luther 2014

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

During a time when effective leadership at institutions of higher education is more critical than ever, the decline in the number of individuals who identify themselves as *leaders* and the decline in numbers of those who are interested in pursuing formal positions of leadership--or assuming the roles of emergent leaders--is concerning. This dissertation explores how institutions of higher education are cultivating their leaders. Using the *Leadership Institute* program at Southwest State University as a case study, the purpose of the dissertation is to 1) explore the personal experiences of faculty and staff at a four-year institution participating in a campus-based leadership development program and 2) examine the ways in which a four-year institution increases leadership capacity of its employees. The study also seeks to understand the influence of industrial and postindustrial leadership paradigms on a contemporary campus-based leadership development program.

Through one-on-one interviews, observation and document review, the descriptive case study design provided a unique opportunity to examine in detail the institutional and individual benefits of a campus-based leadership program as well as allowed for assessment of the stated outcomes of the program. The conceptual framework for the study centers on the Rost and Smith (1992) postindustrial and industrial model, exploring in detail the trait, behavioral, situational and change-oriented theories of leadership. The following are the questions that guided the study:

- (1) What leadership philosophies underscore the *Leadership I* curriculum?
- (2) How do the *Leadership I* participants conceptualize leadership?

(3) What individual policies, practices or behaviors have changed as a result of *Leadership I* participation?

Results of the study, as well as the implications from practice that emerged from the findings, suggest that to successfully navigate as a formal or informal leader in the realm of higher education individuals must be able to understand leadership from a process-oriented perspective as well as from a management perspective. There is evidence that using multiple frameworks allows for *leader* development as well as *leadership* development—both of which are necessary to effectively address the complex issues with which higher education is faced in the twenty-first century.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Michael Luther; to my children, Annabelle and Avery Luther; to my sister, Heather Morris; to my daddy, Hillard Morris; to my mother, Barbara Dell Morris; and in remembrance of my cousin, Morrison Avery Thigpen (Mo) and of my grandparents Grace and Avery Thigpen.

I dedicate this work to my husband, Michael, who supported me in the daily affairs of this journey--who made it possible for me to complete my degree by shifting work schedules, providing childcare and acting as my primary editor. I dedicate this to my son, Avery, who spent the first three years of his life living out of suitcases and playing in an office floor as I collected data and wrote my manuscript. It was “good job” that I heard out of the mouth of a two-year-old that provided me my most powerful encouragement. I dedicate this to my daughter, Annabelle, whose smile inspires me daily. I have an abundance of love and gratitude for my husband and children--more than can be expressed by the written word.

I dedicate my work to my sister, Heather, who instilled in me the love of writing—and reading. I dedicate this dissertation to my daddy--Hillard--a man of character, of kindness and of great work ethic and leadership. I dedicate this to my Nanny and Pop--Grace and Avery--who shared with multiple generations of our family the value of education. I dedicate this in the remembrance of my cousin Mo, who always believed in me.

Finally, I dedicate this to my greatest role model—my mother, Barbara Dell. Due to life circumstances involving job transfers and young children, she was unable to complete her

dissertation 30 years ago. She gave up that dream to serve our family. She was my first teacher, my first editor and my biggest cheerleader. She is a woman of integrity, kindness, love and humility. This is for her.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who had a profound impact on my journey and to whom I will always be grateful for their support and encouragement. Foremost, I wish to acknowledge my deep appreciation for my committee--Dr. Claire Major, Dr. Jason Garvey, Dr. Michael Harris, Dr. Margaret King and Dr. Karri Holley. Throughout my masters and doctoral program, Dr. Major has inspired me to reach heights of which I did not think I was capable. Dr. King, who I admired first in the realm of student affairs and then later as a professor in the classroom, always believed in me even when I doubted myself. I met Dr. Garvey late in my process, but I immediately appreciated his encouragement and his genuine interest in the future of his students.

It was Dr. Harris who introduced me to higher education as a master's student and who was my academic advisor for nearly six years. I am grateful for all that he taught me about the field of higher education, for his support of my family, and for the professional and academic opportunities he helped me secure. Finally, I am indebted to Dr. Holley--my chair--who has been a constant source of support and encouragement. I believe it is Dr. Holley's high standards that allowed me to grow and stretch as a student, as a researcher and as a practitioner. I will always be grateful that her compassion matches her expectation--I know few people who are able to hold others accountable to achieving their best while simultaneously caring for their personal and professional well-being. She is one-of-a-kind and I am a better professional and better person because of her guidance and wisdom.

In addition to my committee, I am thankful to my former supervisor and friend, Elle Shaaban-Magaña. Elle is a role model for me of what it means to be a professional in higher

education, a mother, and a woman of integrity. Likewise, I wish to acknowledge Kateri Broussard, who represents true selflessness in friendship. I am also thankful for my third grade teacher, Mrs. Lynnae Jarrell, who made learning an exciting adventure. Finally, I want to recognize all the individuals from the Women's Resource Center at The University of Alabama, Kappa Alpha Theta Fraternity, Calvary Baptist Church of Tuscaloosa, First Baptist Church of Albertville and from the Thigpen/Morris/Luther/Black families who prayed for me, loved me and encouraged me during this process.

I wish to extend special thanks to my mother-in-law and father-in-law, Janice and Ross Luther, for taking care of my son Avery while I worked on chapter two of the dissertation. I will be forever grateful for the love and devotion they showed to him during the dissertation process. I also appreciate the encouragement my niece Bentley and nephew Bryce gave to me throughout the process. They are two of the most loving children I know. I respect their parents, Ben and Bambi Luther, for the strength of their convictions. I am equally grateful for Heidi Armock who always has taken a genuine interest in what I am studying and who has an empathetic soul. I am thankful for Hypatia, whose sweet voice on a long-distance call cannot help but make me smile. It was the countless trips my mother and daddy made across country to help with my children that allowed me the opportunity to write and the many notes and calls of encouragement from my sister Heather that kept me going. Likewise, I am grateful for my uncle Rudy and aunt Alice, who for many years provided me a home-away-from-home.

A special thanks goes to the individual participants and administrators of the *Leadership I* program who took time to candidly share their experiences with me, without whom, the study would not exist. Words cannot do justice to acknowledge all the ways in which my husband, Michael, and children, Avery and Annabelle, have supported this endeavor—I am so thankful.

Recognizing the power of words, I am also grateful to all those who spoke words of encouragement into my heart. Mother Teresa once said, “Kind words can be short and easy to speak but their echoes are truly endless.” What a better world in which we would live if people practiced kindness on a daily basis and put the needs of others ahead of their own desires. Surpassing all others, I am grateful to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. I pray He will guide me to use the knowledge I gained through this experience to serve Him and His kingdom, for His glory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xvi
CHAPTER ONE: CULTIVATING LEADERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION.....	1
Statement of Purpose.....	2
Research Questions.....	3
Leadership Defined.....	4
Cultivating Leaders in Higher Education.....	5
Leadership Development for Faculty and Staff in the Twenty-First Century.....	6
Barriers to Leadership in Higher Education.....	12
Academic Capitalism and the Competition for Limited Resources.....	13
Increased Demands on Faculty and Staff.....	14
Socialization of Faculty and the Neglect of Staff.....	16
Concluding Remarks and Organization of Dissertation.....	17
A Paradigm Shift.....	17
The Twenty-First Century Approach.....	18
Significance of the Study.....	19
Organization of the Dissertation.....	20
CHAPTER TWO: LEADERSHIP THEORIES OF TWO CONTRASTING PARADIGMS.....	23

Faculty and Staff Leadership Development.....	23
Institutional Challenges to Leadership Development.....	24
Statement of Purpose and Research Questions.....	25
Statement of Purpose.....	26
Research Questions.....	26
Conceptual Framework.....	27
Trait Theory of Leadership.....	28
Overview of Trait Theory.....	29
Literature Review of Trait Theory.....	31
Limitations and Criticisms of Trait Theory.....	38
Concluding Remarks about Trait Theory.....	42
Behavioral Theory of Leadership.....	43
Overview of Behavioral Theory.....	43
Literature Review of Behavioral Theory.....	45
Limitations and Criticisms of Behavioral Theory.....	49
Concluding Remarks about Behavioral Theory.....	51
Situational Theory of Leadership.....	52
Overview of Situational Theory.....	52
Literature Review of Situational Theory.....	54
Limitations and Criticisms of Situational Theory.....	62
Concluding Remarks about Situational Theory.....	67
Change-Oriented Theories of Leadership.....	68
Overview of Change-Oriented Theories.....	68

Literature Review of Change-Oriented Theories.....	71
Limitations and Criticisms of Change-Oriented Theories.....	80
Concluding Remarks about Change-Oriented Theories.....	83
Two Contrasting Paradigms.....	85
Industrial Leadership Paradigm.....	85
Postindustrial Leadership Paradigm.....	87
Leadership Development in a Postindustrial Paradigm.....	90
The Influence of Culture on Leadership.....	95
Concluding Remarks.....	96
Similarities Between the Theoretical Approaches as Related to Leadership Development.....	97
Differences between the Theoretical Approaches as Related to Leadership Development.....	100
The Use of Multiple Frameworks in Leadership Development.....	102
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	104
Prevalence of Campus-Based Leadership Development Programs.....	104
Previous Research on Campus-Based Programs.....	105
Research Design.....	106
Case Study Approach.....	107
Site Selection.....	107
Southwest State University.....	108
The <i>Leadership Institute</i> Program.....	114
Participant Selection.....	118
Data Collection.....	120

Interviews.....	120
Observation.....	121
Document Review.....	121
Data Analysis.....	122
Managing Data.....	122
Trustworthiness.....	124
Transparency, Consistency-Coherence, Communicability and Confidentiality.....	124
Access and Researcher Positionality.....	126
Role as a Former Southwest State University Employee.....	126
Access.....	127
Delimitations of the Study.....	127
Single-Site Study.....	128
Sample Population.....	128
Conclusion.....	128
CHAPTER FOUR: LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT VS. LEADER DEVELOPMENT: THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO DISTINCT PARADIGM APPROACHES.....	131
Themes.....	131
Emphasis on Legitimate Power.....	133
Introduction to the Program.....	134
Leadership Defined as Individual, Positional Authority.....	139
Emphasis on Individual Advancement.....	144
Concluding Remarks about the Findings Associated with the Theme of Legitimate Power.....	150
Emphasis on Traits and Behaviors.....	151

Emphasis on Leadership Traits.....	153
Emphasis on Leadership Behaviors.....	162
Concluding Remarks about the Theme Associated with Traits and Behaviors of Leadership.....	164
Emphasis on the Leader.....	165
Discussion of Vision.....	166
Leader-Centered Language.....	168
Concluding Remarks about the Theme Associated with the Emphasis on the Leader.....	170
Significance of Context and Culture.....	170
Sensitivity to Context as Part of the Program Curriculum.....	171
Sensitivity to Diversity as Part of the Program Curriculum.....	174
Concluding Remarks about the Theme of Situational Context and Culture.....	183
Significance of Relationship and Influence.....	185
Peer Relationship Building, Networking and Support.....	186
Professional Collaboration.....	192
Leadership Defined as Influence.....	197
Concluding Remarks about the Theme of Relationships and Influence.....	198
Leadership as a Process.....	199
Leadership as an Institutional Process.....	200
Informal Leadership Practices.....	201
Leadership as Change.....	203
Leadership as Service.....	207
Concluding Remarks about the Theme of Leadership as a Process.....	208

Concluding Remarks Regarding Analysis of Data.....	209
CHAPTER FIVE: IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS.....	213
Answering the Research Questions.....	214
What Leadership Philosophies Underscore the <i>Leadership I</i> Curriculum?.....	215
How Do the <i>Leadership I</i> Participants Conceptualize Leadership?.....	226
What Individual Policies, Practices or Behaviors have Changed as a Result of <i>Leadership I</i> Participation?.....	233
Concluding Remarks Regarding Research Questions.....	236
Differing Perception of the <i>Leadership Institute</i> Program Based on Self-Identification.....	237
Faculty and Staff.....	237
Gender and Race.....	238
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study.....	239
Single Research Site.....	240
Small Sample Population.....	241
Researcher Lens and Political Influences.....	242
Concluding Remarks about Delimitations/Limitations of the Study.....	243
Recommendations for Future Research.....	243
Recommendations Regarding Sample Population and Timeline.....	244
Recommendations Regarding <i>Leadership Fellows</i> Research.....	245
Recommendations Regarding Benchmarking.....	246
Recommendations Regarding Revolutionary Leadership Development Framework.....	246
Considerations for Practice.....	247
Long-Term Program Impact.....	247

Diversity.....	250
Needs of Faculty/Staff Participants Based on Years in the Field.....	256
Program Marketing.....	259
The Use of Multiple Frameworks in Revolutionary Leadership Development.....	261
A New Definition of Revolutionary Leadership Development.....	261
Concluding Remarks.....	265
A Move Toward Using Multiple Frameworks in Leadership Development.....	267
REFERENCES.....	269
APPENDIX A.....	281
APPENDIX B.....	282
APPENDIX C.....	286

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Rost and Smith *Model of Two Contrasting Paradigms*.....28

CHAPTER ONE

CULTIVATING LEADERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

There exists what many describe as a *crisis* in higher education caused by economic, social and organizational changes that have occurred over a period of several decades (Zusman, 2005; Tierney, 1998; Tierney, 1999; Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Gallant & Getz, 2009). This crisis has threatened the identity of colleges and universities and their ability to thrive in the twenty-first century. Zusman (2005) characterized well the current state of higher education:

The twenty-first century has brought with it profound challenges to the nature, values, and control of higher education in the United States. Societal expectations and public resources for higher education are undergoing fundamental shifts. Changes both within and outside the academy are altering its character – its students, faculty, governance, curriculum, functions, and very place in society (p. 5).

The need for organizational change is evident given the increasing number of challenges that face higher education today. In his discussion of how to build a responsive campus, Tierney (1999) called for “dramatic organizational transformation” (p. 2). Issues dealing with access (Tierney, 1999; Zusman, 2005); accountability and trust (Zusman, 2005; Chaffee, 1998; Schmidlein & Berdahl, 2005); and the rising cost of higher education (Tierney, 1999; Schweber, 2008) plague all institution types and are a constant reminder of the need for effective leadership.

The challenges of the twenty-first century university cannot be resolved through current approaches and thus create “tensions between the existing practices of the organization and demands for new ways...” (Gallant & Getz, 2009, p. 93). The demand for innovation indicated by Gallant and Getz (2009) dictates the need for new and effective leadership practices in higher

education, further raising concerns about the emphasis placed on industrial paradigm approaches to address issues of a postindustrial society (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

To initiate the changes that will address the challenges facing higher education, it is essential that faculty and staff are willing to assume leadership roles within their institutions. It is also critical that faculty and staff are confident in their leadership abilities. Not surprisingly, research has indicated that in order to sustain a strong, effective institution, strong and effective leadership is necessary (Bensimon, Neuman & Birnbaum, 1989). Unfortunately, in addition to the higher education crisis that defines contemporary colleges and universities, there is also an emerging *leadership crisis* (Ekman, 2001; Bensimon, et al., 1989).

An aging faculty (Doyle, 2008), a decrease in the number of faculty in traditional, tenure, career tracks (Doyle, 2008) and the growing number of institutions that are led by individuals who have never held positions as department chairs, deans, provosts or faculty members (Ekman, 2010; Appadurai, 2009) contribute to the shortage of experienced leaders in higher education. Also resulting in fewer faculty and staff willing to assume formal leadership roles is the general disdain for administrative assignments (Ekman, 2010); the rising number of senior student affairs officers suffering from fatigue and burn-out (Romano, Hanish, Phillips & Waggoner, 2010); and the constant stress caused by budget cuts and resource reduction (Romano, et al., 2010). The literature revealed that the general crisis in higher education is in large part due to the lack of faculty and staff engaged in leadership and an overall lack of understanding of leadership. This raises an important question about how twenty-first century institutions are training people in the area of leadership and how the approach is influencing individual campuses and higher education in general.

Statement of Purpose

During a time when effective leadership at institutions of higher education is more critical than ever, the decline in the number of individuals who identify themselves as *leaders* and the decline in numbers of those who are interested in pursuing formal positions of leadership--or assuming the roles of emergent leaders--is concerning. According to Adrianna Kezar (2009), “one of the most important conditions for the health and future of higher education is the development of its leaders” (p. ix). To change the course of how leadership is perceived at institutions, thus changing the desire of faculty and staff to participate in leadership activities, one must first look at how campuses are currently addressing leadership development needs.

This dissertation explores how institutions of higher education are cultivating their leaders. More specifically, the purpose of this dissertation is to (1) explore the personal experiences of faculty and staff at a four-year institution participating in a campus-based leadership development program and (2) examine the ways in which a four-year institution increases leadership capacity of its employees. This dissertation also seeks to understand the influence of industrial and postindustrial leadership paradigms on a contemporary, campus-based leadership development program and seeks to understand how that influence might impact the leadership experiences of faculty and staff participants working within a twenty-first century organization.

Research Questions

I selected the *Leadership Institute (Leadership I)* program at Southwest State University (SWSU) for my case study. A case study approach provided the opportunity to examine in detail the institutional and individual benefits of *Leadership Institute* as well as allowed for assessment of the stated outcomes of the program. The following are the questions that guided the study:

- (1) What leadership philosophies underscore the *Leadership I* curriculum?

- (2) How do the *Leadership I* participants conceptualize leadership?
- (3) What individual policies, practices or behaviors have changed as a result of *Leadership I* participation?

Leadership Defined

In order to sufficiently address the topic of leadership development, an initial discussion about contemporary and traditional leadership perspectives is needed. Although a widely accepted definition of leadership does not exist, there is a strong consensus among modern-day scholars about what leadership is not. Leadership is not defined by one's position (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Kouzes & Posner, 2008; Tierney, 1999; Kezar & Lester, 2011; Astin & Astin, 2000). Leadership is not synonymous with management (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Zaleznik, 2004; Astin & Astin, 2000; Rost, 1993; Kezar & Lester, 2011). Leadership is not inborn (Maxwell, 2007; Northouse, 2004; Astin & Astin, 2000). Although contemporary scholars differ in the way that they describe leadership, most agree that leadership is a *process* of influence that involves a *relationship* (Kouzes & Posner, 2008; Astin & Astin, 2000; Birnbaum, 1992; Kezar & Lester, 2011; Tierney, 1999; Birnbaum, 1993; Northouse, 2004; Rost, 1993; Astin & Astin, 2000). Consequently, leadership has also been described as a phenomenon, meaning two or more people must be involved (Gortner, Nichols & Ball, 2007).

One of the most highly referenced definitions of leadership in contemporary higher education literature describes leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (Rost, 1993, p. 99). Leadership has also been described in modern education literature as a values-based process occurring in a group context that involves influence, goal-attainment and change (Northouse, 2004; Astin & Astin, 2000; Rost, 1993). Underlying these definitions is the assumption that all

people have the capacity to lead, which supports the emergent leader philosophy of Astin and Astin (2000) and Kezar and Lester (2009).

Rost's definition of leadership and the descriptions of Kezar and Lester (2009) and Astin and Astin (2000) reflect a more postindustrial perspective of leadership. Not all contemporary leadership reflects the collaborative, relationship-oriented hallmarks of postindustrial leadership, however. In fact, many contemporary leadership models reflect a more managerial focus that represents industrial leadership, a perspective often embraced by colleges and universities and frequently used as a foundation for their leadership development programs (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

Cultivating Leaders in Higher Education

Prior to discussing how leadership among faculty and staff is cultivated in higher education, it is important to take time to address how a person becomes a leader. A leader is acknowledged either through a formal appointment or informally through status granted by others (Gortner, et al., 2007). A leader is often described in current literature as an agent of change (Astin & Astin, 2000) and as a symbol that helps establish the culture of the organization (Gortner, et al., 2007). When organizations are formally structured the necessity of rational procedures often results in formalized leadership roles (Birnbaum, 1992). Informal leadership and "grassroots" leadership are becoming more pervasive topics within higher education research; however, the majority of colleges and universities continue to operate within traditional, hierarchical structures that give power, authority, reward and recognition to formal leaders who have been selected and appointed (Astin & Astin, 2000; Tierney, 1999; Kezar & Carducci, 2009). This type of leadership perspective supports the industrial leadership view of a

single individual as “the leader” rather than the postindustrial perspective that perceives leadership as a collective process in which all people have the capacity to lead.

Leadership Development for Faculty and Staff in the Twenty-First Century

Leadership development programs have the potential to encourage faculty and staff to engage in both informal and formal leadership. Scholars agree that the future of colleges and universities is largely dependent on the ability of faculty and staff to find creative ways in which to address the complex issues emerging in higher education (Kezar, 2009; Christensen & Eyring, 2011). Hence, it is critical to the future of higher education that faculty and staff see themselves as leaders and engage in productive leadership behaviors. The institutional and individual benefits of leadership development programs are many. Leadership development programs help ensure that employees possess the necessary leadership abilities to guide an organization and create innovative solutions to problems (Fincher, 2003). Programs may also provide a diverse pool of well-educated candidates for future formal leadership positions who are knowledgeable about and committed to the institution’s goals (Davis, n.d.). Employees who participate in leadership development programs are typically more satisfied with their work, have increased job performance and have a larger network and support system of colleagues (Davis, n.d.).

Despite the documented benefits of leadership programming, and the international interest in the topic of leadership in general, colleges and universities rarely commit substantial resources to development or administrative training of their employees in this area (Ekman, 2010; Vaillancourt, 2011; Kezar, 2004). The recruitment and placement of institutional leaders involves exhaustive searches, screening and selection processes that use an institution’s already limited resources. Given the financial strain on institutions, rarely is there an investment made in terms of leadership development after the employee is hired (Fincher, 2003). The lack of

financial ability (and some might suggest the lack of interest) to invest in internal leadership development programming further exacerbates the leadership crisis that currently exists within higher education.

The leadership development programs that do exist are typically targeted at future, senior-level administrators. (Fincher, 2003; Kezar, 2009; Ekman, 2010). This trend is not surprising given the history of leadership development programming in higher education. National and regional leadership programs began to emerge in the 1960s, and were primarily aimed at faculty and mid-level administrators who wanted to pursue senior-level administrative positions and focused almost exclusively on formal leadership training (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Kezar, 2009; Carr, 1999). Such programs were often referred to as a “catalyst for advancement” and did not acknowledge grassroots leadership or emergent leadership practices (Carr, 1999, A37). For the most part, campus-based programs have followed the example set by national programs, focusing on individuals who either are currently in formal roles of leadership or those who are seen as having the potential to assume such roles (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

Key assumptions guiding contemporary leadership development programs. Kezar and Carducci (2009) discussed four assumptions that guide most current leadership development programs for staff and faculty. These assumptions are also discussed by other scholars and are as follows: (1) leadership is conceptualized as an individual, hierarchical leader (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Tierney, 1999; Day, 2001; Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006); (2) universal and predictable skills and traits that transcend context best epitomize the work of leaders (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Fincher, 2003; Wisniewski, 2004); (3) leadership is related to social control, authority and power (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Astin & Astin, 2000) ; and (4) representations of leadership are value-free (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Astin & Astin, 2000; Amey, 2006). A closer

review of these assumptions is necessary because some of their components contradict much of the contemporary research on organizational leadership.

Leadership defined as an individual, hierarchical leader. While corporate and non-profit sector organizations have transitioned to more postindustrial, transformational leadership approaches that emphasize collaboration and deemphasize authority based solely on position, higher education, in large part, continues to adhere to industrial and transactional leadership philosophies that emphasize top-down approaches—even within the unique environment of shared governance (Kezar, et al., 2006). The emphasis on hierarchy and positional authority is evident within higher education literature as well as throughout the organizational operations of colleges and universities. When someone refers to the “leadership of the institution”, he is almost always referring to those in formal positions of administration, not the presence of informal leadership or the general abilities of all employees to exert mutual influence. Seldom is there recognition of the multidirectional aspect of leadership.

In addition to the infrequent acknowledgement of the multidirectional aspect of leadership, there is rarely a demarcation between *leadership* development and *leader* development, although the difference is significant. It is a difference of developing social capital verses human capital (Day, 2001). *Leader* development, or the development of human capital, focuses on the enhancement of individual abilities. *Leadership* development, or the development of social capital, emphasizes interpersonal competence, relationships and mutual trust (Day, 2001). Although most programs at colleges and universities claim to develop “leadership”, what they are actually focused on is developing leaders and enhancing the skills of individuals, with the idea that a few individuals will increase the effectiveness of the organization. This approach is somewhat reminiscent of antiquated trait and “great man” theories that will be discussed in

depth in chapter two, which infer an organization's success is determined by the presence of a few great men (or women) with inborn leadership talent (Northouse, 2004).

Leadership defined in terms of skills and traits that transcend context. Although most scholars no longer believe that traits can predict leadership effectiveness, many have argued that personal characteristics do impact the effectiveness of a leader and thus cannot be excluded from conversations about leadership (Fincher, 2003). For this reason, the development of skills and traits are emphasized in the majority of faculty and staff leadership development programs. Leadership development programs often rely on the leadership competence model which is defined as a categorization of general knowledge, skills, traits or characteristics that occur when leadership is effectively demonstrated (Wisniewski, 2004). "The trend in organizational development is to treat leadership as a series of competencies that can be developed" (Gortner, et al., 2007, p. 367). Fincher (2003) warned that although there are benefits of using categories for evaluation of potential leaders, the limitations are great because human competencies are difficult to observe or measure.

While many scholars have maintained the relevance of personal characteristics and behaviors, they typically also now emphasize their significance within the context of organizational characteristics, situational demands and cultural issues (Fincher, 2003). Contemporary leadership research has emphasized that context is critical in the discussion and enactment of leadership and has rejected the idea that individual leadership traits transcend context (Astin & Astin, 2000; Tierney, 1999). Given this research, it is significant that faculty and staff participants in leadership programs rarely are asked to reflect on their own skills, traits and leadership behaviors in context of the institutional culture (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

Leadership defined as social control, authority and power. In addition to the emphasis on context, contemporary research underscores collaboration as a cornerstone of effective leadership. It is common, however, for leadership development program curricular components to focus on teaching faculty and staff how to harness power, authority and control rather than how to collaborate. Often, power is addressed in terms of how to equip positional leaders with skills that will help them influence followers, communicate effectively, create a vision and allocate rewards and resources (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

Ideas about power, authority and control are commonly represented through leadership development programming within a framework that promotes the use of legitimate or reward power. Power in higher education institutions is derived either from one's position in the administrative hierarchy or from professional status and scholarly recognition. "Professional status" refers to the status earned by faculty and reflects an individualistic model that represents the uniqueness of higher education (Astin & Astin, 2000). "Administrative power" reflects higher education's adherence to hierarchy and formal, transactional leadership approaches. The five commonly recognized types of power—reward, coercive, legitimate, referent and expert—all exist within the walls of institutions; however the types of power aligned with positional, formal leadership (legitimate, coercive and reward) are more prevalent when discussing administrative aspects of higher education (Gortner, et al., 2007).

Leadership as a value-free endeavor. There is a striking difference between the recommendations for effective leadership found in contemporary literature and the assumptions that guide the practices of most higher education leadership programming. This difference is much more evident within the discussion of the first three assumptions presented because there are members of the higher education community who still believe institutions should be value-

free. The reality, however, is that higher education is not values-neutral (Astin & Astin, 2000). Values are involved in almost every decision regarding education (Astin & Astin, 2000). Decisions regarding curriculum and pedagogy approaches, admission and access, assessment, serving the community, resource allocation, personnel policies, governance procedures and making change in the context of a global society are all value laden (Amey, 2006; Astin & Astin, 2000).

It is not a question of whether values are involved in the decision-making process but rather *what values* should govern the process (Astin & Astin, 2000). It is significant, then, that faculty and staff leadership training and development programs rarely focus on the values and ethics involved in administrative decision-making (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). Contemporary leadership theories, especially those centering on transformational and postindustrial leadership, depict leadership as a values-based process (Amey, 2006; Astin & Astin, 2000). In addition to the organization having its own values, the leader or leaders have personal values that they contribute to the process (Amey, 2006). It is significant that the paradigm that describes leadership as a values-neutral entity also describes leadership in terms of traits, behaviors and influence strategies (Kezar, et al., 2006).

An outdated approach? Many scholars have argued that the focus of higher education institutions on the training of formal leaders, and in turn the emphasis on hierarchical authority, is too exclusive an approach and one that is not aligned with current leadership research and literature (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Tierney, 1999; Astin & Astin, 2000). Likewise, the dependence of colleges and universities on short-term leadership development programs to cultivate leaders, with little to no follow-up, is concerning. According to Sadler (1997) programs alone cannot develop leaders; they are only useful in the context of a culture that encourages

creativity and vision, provides challenging opportunities for employees, deemphasizes positional power, offers self-development and encourages leadership in subordinates.

According to the literature, the majority of leadership development programs in higher education represent what some refer to as antiquated ideas of leadership, failing to recognize that the concept of leadership is now identified more with process-oriented, collaborative behaviors, rather than with an emphasis on formal, positional power and hierarchical structures (Kezar, 2009).

Most of the leadership development programs in higher education reflect outdated perspectives and approaches to leadership development. The programs bring together hierarchical, positional leaders; focus on skill and trait development; and reinforce the importance of social control and persuasion, and teaching competencies that transcend context (Kezar, 2009, p. xi).

Current leadership development programming is too often geared toward management training and skill building rather than true leadership development (Sadler, 1997). The competencies and skills that can be developed through training should only be the focus of short-term workshops, which should account for only a fraction of the leadership development programming (Fincher, 2003). What is problematic is that the focus on enhancement of competencies and skills has been the emphasis of professional development, under the guise of leadership development—acting as the basis of leadership development programming at institutions across the country. The lack of quality leadership development programming is one barrier to increased faculty and staff engagement in leadership activities; however, availability of training and development opportunities only account for a portion of the barriers to leadership engagement that exist.

Barriers to Leadership in Higher Education

Even with the implementation of successful, innovative leadership development programming for faculty and staff, it is difficult to find individuals interested in taking on

leadership roles within an institution. Assuming a formal or informal leadership position in higher education is less attractive today than in previous decades because of the current educational environment. As stated previously, multiple barriers to leadership exist within the realm of higher education. Among the greatest barriers to faculty and staff leadership are academic capitalism and the competition for limited resources (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Ylijoki, 2003; Tierney, 1999; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Romano, et al., 2010). Contributing to a decrease of faculty and staff in leadership activities are the growing demands and expectations of a faculty workforce that is undergoing constant change in composition (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997; Mead-Fox, 2010) along with faculty socialization and the neglect of attention to staff needs within research and practice (Kezar & Lester, 2009).

Academic Capitalism and the Competition for Limited Resources

The competition for limited resources, which has resulted in an environment of academic capitalism, is perhaps the largest barrier to leadership engagement and is an underlying cause of many of the other barriers that are discussed. With the decline in federal and state funding for higher education, colleges and universities and their employees are prompted to look for new revenue sources (Ylijoki, 2003; Tierney, 1999). The market-like pressures on institutions lead to the market-oriented behaviors of faculty, especially, but also of staff (Anderson, 2001). One of the implications of these market-like behaviors is the restructuring of higher education, which includes the reduction or expansion of departments, shifts in internal resource allocation, changes in the division of academic labor, establishment of new organizational forms, and the redesign of administrative offices (Slaughter & Leslie, 2001). The relationship between the academy and industry has resulted in an increase of time spent by faculty applying for external funding and a loss of time for administrative duties and leadership activities (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Along with faculty, student affairs and academic affairs staff members have also been impacted by the reduction of available resources. The past several years of budget-cuts have placed a demand on many departments to “do more with less”. The call to maintain quality programming for a larger number of students with fewer staff members and less financial resources has resulted in higher levels of anxiety and stress among staff members and low morale within departments (Romano, et al., 2010). Consequently, many individuals have become discouraged with their career field (Romano, et al., 2010). An excerpt from the Romano, et al. (2010) study describes well the impact of limited resources for staff members serving in student services.

The vice president of student affairs at a medium-sized university in the Northeast said, "It is only human nature to feel diminished, devalued, marginalized, isolated, and so on. I don't like to use the word depression, but more a real sense of a gloom and doom kind of milieu, and then moments of optimism. And then almost I can recall everyone feeling as though they were numb from it all, from the intensity, university wide and within the division” (p. 66).

It can be difficult to convince someone who is struggling to meet the excessive demands of his or her current position to consider assuming even more responsibility, either formally or informally.

Increased Demands on Faculty and Staff

Increasing emphasis on research and publication. In addition to the reduction of resources placing demands on faculty, competition has led to increased standards in research. By the turn of the twentieth century the importance of publication was already understood by faculty members wanting to advance their careers, or even just maintain their positions, and since then the focus on publication has only grown.

University rivalry required that each university be certain that its professors were better than its rivals, and one way of making that clear was by coming in ahead in the somewhat informal annual page count in which universities indulged (Rudolph, 1990, 403-404).

Most institutions directly or indirectly encourage the “publish-or-perish” attitude of faculty, which greatly limits the time and ability that tenure-track faculty may dedicate to leadership endeavors. The rising publication standard emerged as a barrier to faculty participation in leadership and has contributed to a diminished emphasis on teaching and service (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

The expanded role of the faculty and staff. The emphasis on publication and the tenure process in general may emphasize research over teaching and service, but the requirements of the latter have increased at many institutions (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Altbach & Finkelstein, 1997). With the rise of part-time and clinical faculty hires, there are fewer tenure-track faculty members at institutions today than in the past. Non-tenure track faculty members are rarely invited to participate in governance and are not compensated for service or leadership activities. Consequently, those who do have tenure or are tenure-track are often expected to provide the service work in the department or program areas and are often responsible for managing part-time faculty schedules and coordinating student paperwork (Kezar & Lester, 2009). The additional administrative duties of tenure-track faculty may add to the disillusionment of some toward academic leadership. Their additional duties also limit the time they have to actively participate in formal leadership roles. Adding to the shortage of those able to serve in formal leadership capacities is the greater service role maintained by women and faculty of color (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Because female faculty members and faculty of color have to work in multiple service capacities they are also less available for formal leadership positions.

In addition to the expanded role of faculty, student services staff members have had additional demands and responsibilities within their jobs because of an increase in enrollment at institutions across the U.S. and a decrease in the number of staff hired (Fain, 2009). In general,

one of the greatest barriers to leadership is the changing nature of the job of a formal leader at institutions of higher education, especially the role of senior administrative leadership. Members of staff, as well as members of faculty, are particularly hesitant to assume formal positions of leadership because of the increased risk and liability associated with such positions (Mead-Fox, 2010). Those in senior-level administrative leadership positions are confronted with matters “removed from the core educational and research enterprise, including fund raising, outside constituency obligations, and legal and regulatory issues” (Mead-Fox, 2010, D25). The managerial nature of higher education administrative posts today makes them far less attractive to many.

Socialization of Faculty and the Neglect of Staff

Faculty socialization. Although the nature of contemporary higher education administrative positions may make them less attractive, leadership positions have traditionally been less enticing to faculty because of the way in which they are socialized. Faculty perspective about academic leadership is impacted by their graduate school experiences as well as their experiences as junior faculty (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Kezar & Lester, 2009; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Graduate school trains future faculty to work independently on their research and does not train students to work collaboratively or participate in activities that would be defined as formal or informal leadership (Kezar and Lester, 2009).

The first years as a faculty member are generally marked by loneliness and isolation (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). It is during this time that the organizational socialization process occurs. Rather than fostering an environment that encourages participation in leadership activities, junior faculty members are socialized to stay silent about departmental or institutional issues (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Once tenure is achieved a faculty member has worked in

solitude for over a decade and often finds it difficult to engage in leadership that would necessitate collaboration. There are also those who support the idea that faculty should not seek to serve in administrative roles (Fathe, 2008).

Absence of staff in the literature and overlooked in practice. Whereas there is a plethora of information and research about faculty leadership, there exists very little literature regarding the engagement in leadership of staff. What is evident, though, is that administrative staff members are also more reluctant to assume either formal or informal leadership roles. The lack of attention to staff is not confined to higher education literature, but rather indicative of what occurs on campuses across the country. Staff is often overlooked in the discussion about leadership when the issue is broached on a campus. The lack of research and inattention to staff members create a barrier and contribute to the leadership dilemma. The lack of information readily available with which to try to resolve the leadership crisis also results in a dwindling pool of candidates willing to serve in any leadership capacity.

Concluding Remarks and Organization of Dissertation

Modern higher education is defined by change and marked by complexities, which makes the decline of leaders a particular concern. Barriers including the reduction of resources, rising cost of higher education and increased demands on the time of faculty and staff have resulted in fewer individuals expressing interest in assuming formal leadership positions. As a response to the need for increased leadership, many campus-based leadership development programs have emerged in the past several decades. For the most part, however, the programs have proven to be uninspiring and inadequate if examined through a lens of contemporary leadership development theory.

A Paradigm Shift

The paradigm shift from industrial to postindustrial leadership is happening slowly at institutions of higher education. In many instances very little change is being made within the traditional administrative leadership structures to reflect the knowledge-based, collaborative, global perspective of the twenty-first century. Superficially, colleges and universities acknowledge the shift away from formal, top-down management; however their every day practices rarely reflect this recognition. The organizational structures of institutions and the deeply embedded philosophy that guides most colleges and universities continue to represent an exclusive rather than inclusive approach to leadership. It is apparent that for many colleges and universities *leadership* is synonymous with *management* and there is very little distinction between *leadership* development and *leader* development (Rost, 1991; Day 2001).

What is also clear is the lack of leadership in higher education is exacerbating the crisis in higher education, preventing the emergence of innovative solutions that could amend some of the challenges that plague higher education. If leadership is not innate and thus requires development and cultivation, many institutions are missing their greatest opportunity to enact change by neglecting the leadership development of their faculty and staff. Given the current conditions of higher education and the leadership crisis that contributes to these conditions, it is understandable why the number of campus-based programs that focus on internal leadership development is rising. What is in question is the impact of these programs. Is current campus leadership development programming making a difference from an individual and institutional perspective and to what end?

The Twenty-First Century Approach

Many of the common approaches to cultivating leaders in higher education are in opposition to the literature and research regarding twenty-first century leadership. The focus on

hierarchy, traits and individual development without consideration of the relational process that is occurring represents an industrial perspective of leadership that disregards situational context and values (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). Specifically, the idea of developing traits and skills of individuals at the “top” of an organizational hierarchy to increase overall organizational productivity is reminiscent of out-dated leadership philosophies that many say are no longer practical in a society focused on collaboration and team work (Northouse, 2004). The emphasis on skill enhancement without discussion of context or culture in leadership development programming has been referred to as one of the greatest failures of current leadership programming in higher education (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Rost, 1991).

It is somewhat ironic that during a time when contemporary leadership approaches are widely discussed and researched across fields in the academic, corporate and non-profit sectors, most institutions of higher education often rely on industrial paradigm theories as a foundation for their leadership development programming. There has been a call by some in higher education to make dramatic changes so that programming will be more aligned with postindustrial ideas about leadership (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Tierney, 1999). In the absence of leadership development programming that includes contemporary leadership research and that is widely accessible to faculty and staff, the organizational transformation for which Tierney (1999) called is unlikely.

Significance of the Study

The barriers described in this chapter clearly demonstrated the need for campus-based faculty and staff leadership development initiatives; however, such initiatives have not been widespread. The lack of research addressing leadership development among faculty and staff and the inattention by institutions to the development of its faculty and staff provides the impetus for

the research topic of this dissertation (Astin & Astin, 2000). The research that does exist on the topic of faculty and staff leadership development indicates that the key components of most campus-based programs are drawn from the industrial leadership framework (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Astin & Astin, 2000). Some have suggested that long-term, meaningful change is created by programs that focus on postindustrial leadership initiatives, and that reject the principles of the industrial leadership paradigm (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). Others have argued that it is important to have a curriculum with a foundation that draws from both industrial and postindustrial paradigms (focusing on *leadership as management* as well as *leadership as a process*) to best develop the individual leader as well as grow leadership within an organization as a whole (Ensley, Hmieleski and Pearce, 2006; Kezar, et al., 2006). The president of Pacific University advocated for leadership programming that incorporates the “interpersonal relationships and lifestyle elements of leading” along with the skill-based instructions that are more commonly found (Carr, 1999).

In examining how colleges and universities develop their leaders, it is critical to explore whether leadership programs teach leadership practices that are effective and practical for today’s higher education professional and whether these practices result in organizational change. Is leadership development programming resulting in widespread leadership activities and meaningful institutional change or is it used as a way to establish status within the field and as a catalyst for advancement for those selected to participate? Perhaps a more thoughtful inquiry is whether a program can accomplish both of these purposes and to what extent do postindustrial and industrial leadership practices play a role?

Organization of the Dissertation

In this chapter I have discussed factors that are contributing to the current crisis in higher education. In addition to a general crisis in higher education marked by the changing character, values and control of higher education, colleges and universities are experiencing a leadership crisis (Zusman, 2005). The barriers to leadership compound this crisis and make leadership development programming for faculty and staff of particular importance. The limited amount of research that exists on the topic indicates that institutions overwhelmingly take an industrial leadership approach to leadership development. This raises some questions given that twenty-first century higher education outwardly promotes values that are more postindustrial in nature. In the remainder of this dissertation I will examine the way in which higher education fosters leadership capacity in its faculty and staff through a case study format that will allow me to explore in-depth the experiences of faculty and staff in a leadership development program at a public, four-year research institution.

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one included the purpose of the dissertation, the research questions and presented evidence for the significance of the study. Chapter two will provide a literature review of theories that commonly guide the curriculum development of leadership programs in higher education. The review will provide an overview of each theory; discuss the research of various models of each, discuss practical applications of each and discuss the limitations and criticisms of each. Chapter two will also discuss the conceptual framework for the study, which centers on the Rost and Smith (1992) postindustrial and industrial model. Chapter three will outline the methodology for the study. I will argue that a qualitative case study format is appropriate because it allows for understanding the process of leadership development as well as ideal for inclusion of multiple sources of information (Kezar

& Lester, 2009; Kezar, 2012). Chapter four and five will include the research findings, discussion, recommendations and conclusions drawn from study.

CHAPTER TWO

LEADERSHIP THEORIES OF TWO CONTRASTING PARADIGMS

As discussed in chapter one, the leadership that is necessary within the current context of higher education is remarkably different than the leadership required thirty years ago. Higher education in the twenty-first century is significantly influenced by globalization, changes in demographics, technology advancements and a call for greater accountability (Kezar, et al., 2006). For these reasons, as well as others, colleges and universities are facing unique challenges that have not been encountered previously in the same manner and thus require innovative leadership from members of their faculty and staff.

There is significant evidence to suggest that the issues that confront higher education institutions today require inventive, adaptive approaches to leadership; however, according to scholars, many colleges and universities utilize more traditional and industrial approaches (rather than postindustrial approaches) to prepare their faculty and staff for leadership responsibilities (Kezar, et al., 2006). This dissertation seeks in part to understand a contemporary campus-based leadership development program through the lens of postindustrial and industrial frameworks. The dissertation also seeks to understand whether an institution's leadership programming more strongly aligns with a postindustrial or industrial leadership paradigm and how that identification impacts the leadership experiences of faculty and staff as they respond as leaders in a twenty-first century organization.

Faculty and Staff Leadership Development

As stated in chapter one, contemporary leadership development programs often characterize leadership as an individual, hierarchical leader; focus on skill-based training; define leadership in relationship to authority and social control; and regard leadership as a values-neutral phenomenon (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Tierney, 1999; Day, 2001; Kezar, et al., 2006; Fincher, 2003; Wisniewski, 2004; Astin & Astin, 2000; Amey, 2006). Davis (n.d.) described eleven campus-based programs that serve as concrete examples of contemporary approaches to faculty and staff leadership development. These eleven programs include some of the aforementioned characteristics. Davis (n.d.) specifically focused on three common elements that he stated exist in the eleven examples he described, as well as exist in other contemporary leadership programs. The three elements highlight skills development, mentoring and fellowship opportunities.

The programmatic elements that Davis (n.d.) illustrated overlap with the characterization of leadership described by Kezar, et al. (2006), most notably in that the elements of the programs focus on trait and skill-based training, formal leadership, hierarchy and power. The mentoring aspect of the programs Davis discussed adopts a more postindustrial position on leadership development. According to Day (2001), however, all of the programs that Davis (n.d.) described focus on *leader* development rather than *leadership* development. This slight difference may appear unimportant, but is actually quite representative of the difference between an industrial versus a postindustrial approach to development.

Institutional Challenges to Leadership Development

In addition to the barriers to leadership discussed in chapter one, there are several specific challenges that institutions are faced with once they begin developing leadership initiatives for faculty and staff. Institutions must determine the purpose of the program along with what

population the program will target; how the program will be funded; and the theoretical basis of the curriculum. According to scholars, when there is an emphasis on specific leadership traits and management skills without attention to context, culture or to the process-oriented, collaborative nature of twenty-first century leadership, institutions may fail to prepare their employees adequately (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

An additional consequence of the trait-based leadership development approach geared toward training future senior-level administrators is that it may exclude already marginalized populations. Many institutions target those faculty and staff members already in upper-level positions for leadership development programs, rather than offering broad-based leadership development (Kezar & Carducci, 2006). Upper-level positions in higher education continue to be dominated, largely, by White men (Lafreniere & Longman, 2008). In addition, the industrial approach defined by an emphasis on positional power and command models is more typical of men's leadership. According to Lafreniere & Longman (2008) "...traditionally masculine qualities such as confidence and dominance are equated with leadership, giving men a clear advantage over women to obtain leadership roles" (p. 389). Within the context of leadership development programming, transactional approaches and masculine traits continue to be promoted. This quietly suggests that a more transformational, collaborative, relational approach, which is more typical of women's leadership styles, is not as acceptable or desired for senior-level administration. In the twenty-first century, institutions are faced with the challenge to broaden their definitions of effective leadership.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

In addition to determining the purpose, selecting the population and establishing the funding, institutions must establish a theoretical foundation for their leadership programs, which

has become increasingly difficult with the abundance of literature on leadership that is available. The most common theories that have been utilized in structuring leadership development programs over time fall into four main theoretical categories. These are (1) trait; (2) behavioral; (3) situational; and (4) change-oriented.

To create a framework that will help increase the understanding of the approaches used in leadership development for faculty and staff at institutions of higher education, I discuss the aforementioned categories of leadership theories (trait, behavioral, situational and change-oriented) in this chapter. These four theories represent a historical progression of the way in which society views leadership, which also represents a slow movement from an industrial to postindustrial approach to leadership. A review of these theories also provides significant insight into the practicality of each theory and the challenges and limitations that accompany it.

Statement of Purpose

This dissertation explores how institutions of higher education are cultivating their leaders. More specifically, the purpose of this dissertation is to (1) explore the personal experiences of faculty and staff at a four-year institution participating in a campus-based leadership development program and (2) examine the ways in which a four-year institution increases leadership capacity of its employees. This dissertation also seeks to understand the influence of industrial and postindustrial leadership paradigms on a contemporary, campus-based leadership development program and seeks to understand how that influence might impact the leadership experiences of faculty and staff participants working within a twenty-first century organization.

Research Questions

A case study approach provided the opportunity to examine in detail the institutional and individual benefits of the *Leadership I* program at Southwest State University as well as allowed for assessment of the stated outcomes of the program. The following are the questions that guided the study:

- (1) What leadership philosophies underscore the *Leadership I* curriculum?
- (2) How do the *Leadership I* participants conceptualize leadership?
- (3) What individual policies, practices or behaviors have changed as a result of *Leadership I* participation?

Conceptual Framework

Postindustrial leadership is most often characterized as a relational, interactive, collaborative process of influence that is values-centered, chaotic and focused on creating change (Rost, 1993; Kezar, et al., 2006). Conversely, industrial leadership is described as a leader-centered perspective that emphasizes traits, positional authority and “good management” of the status quo (Rost, 1993, p.100). Although institutions of higher education are typically perceived as advocates for innovation and change, colleges and universities have been slow to adopt postindustrial leadership practices. As a result of this slow movement, characteristics of the industrial paradigm such as formal, hierarchical structures and top-down management styles abound within higher education. Also as a result of industrial leadership influences, leadership development programs at colleges and universities are less likely to emphasize cultural and situational context and more likely to focus attention on individuals leaders, universal skills, authority and power (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

Following the examples of Bensimon, et al. (1989) and Kezar, et al. (2006), I specifically focus on leadership theory in this literature review in recognition that in order to gain a better

understanding of the state of leadership development in higher education, I must first explore the theories that have shaped it over time. I selected the four theoretical perspectives of trait, behavioral, situational and change-oriented leadership because the literature suggests that each perspective has been widely used in the realm of higher education or specifically in the training and development aspect of organizations, or both (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Northouse, 2004). I also selected these theories because their foundational elements reflect components of industrial or postindustrial leadership as defined by Rost and Smith's (1992) framework, *two contrasting paradigms of leadership*. It is the description of these competing paradigms, as outlined by the Rost and Smith (1992) model, which I use to frame this study on contemporary leadership development programming for faculty and staff [See Figure 1].

INDUSTRIAL PARADIGM	POSTINDUSTRIAL PARADIGM
Good management	Process distinct from management, good or bad
Leader behaviors/traits	Leaders and collaborators interacting in a relationship
Do the leader's wishes	Do what both leaders and collaborators wish
Pursue any and all organizational goals	Pursue purposes that intend real changes
Use any legitimate behaviors only	Use influence behaviors only

Figure 1. Two contrasting paradigms.
From Rost and Smith, 1992, p.195, but revised.

[Figure 1]

The following descriptions of trait, behavioral, situational and change-oriented leadership theories further depict the pronounced differences between the industrial and postindustrial leadership concepts as outlined by Rost and Smith. At the conclusion of the chapter I discuss further in-depth the idea of industrial and postindustrial leadership and the significance of these differences in terms of leadership development for faculty and staff in higher education.

Trait Theory of Leadership

Overview of Trait Theory

Great Man approach. In 1869, Francis Dalton outlined two points regarding leadership that continue to shape the way people think about the concept today. The first point indicated leadership as a “unique property of extraordinary individuals whose decisions are capable of sometimes radically changing the streams of history” and the second point attributed the effectiveness of great leaders to the possession of inherent, inborn traits (Zaccaro, 2007, p. 6). In these two points, Dalton encapsulated the premise of the “great man” model of leadership, which is the predecessor to the trait approach or what some suggest is an early form of trait theory (Hoffman, Woehr, Maldagen-Youngjohn & Lyons, 2010). At the turn of the nineteenth century it was widely accepted that only a select number of people possessed the characteristics, qualities and *traits* needed to be successful and effective leaders (Northouse, 2004). According to the popular belief during that time, these “great men” were exceptional leaders due to their genetic make-up. There was very little recognition of the impact of situational context, training or collaborative practices.

Trait approach. Growing out of the “great man” model of leadership in the early twentieth century, the trait theory approach dominated the field until the mid-1950s and maintains a strong influence in the way scholars, as well as society at large, conceptualize leadership today. Trait theory is a leader-centered theory that attributes the effectiveness of individual leaders to specific, personal characteristics that differentiate them from their followers (Bensimon, et al., 1989; Northouse, 2004; Kezar, Carducci & Contreras-McGavin, 2006).

Bensimon, et al. (1989) provided an excellent overview of the premise of this theory:

We define *leader traits* as relatively stable and coherent integrations of personal characteristics that foster a consistent pattern of leadership performance across a variety of group and organizational situations. This approach proposes that leaders are persons endowed with specific traits related to their effectiveness that differentiate them from

followers. Traits may include physical characteristics (height, appearance, age, energy level), personality (self-esteem, dominance, emotional stability, initiative, persistence), social background (education, socioeconomic status) and ability (general intelligence, verbal fluency, knowledge, originality, social insight, cognitive complexity) (p.8).

Traditionally, the trait approach has several identifying features that set it apart from other leadership models. Foremost, trait theory does not acknowledge the follower or the situation as important factors in establishing successful leadership (Northouse, 2004; Ott, Parkes & Simpson, 2008). Instead, the emphasis is on the leader and his or her personality and characteristics (Northouse, 2004). Secondarily, traditional trait theory highlights personality traits that are considered to be inborn characteristics that cannot be taught (Hoffman, et al., 2010). During the past century, as the trait approach has risen and fallen in popularity, scholars have revisited the assumptions associated with the theory. For example, more modern trait approaches acknowledge that although some traits may be inherited, many qualities related to effective leadership are actually learned behaviors (Northouse, 2004; Zaccaro, 2007; Hoffman, et al., 2010). Recent research has distinguished between “trait-like” and “state-like” individual differences, presuming that state-like differences (such as knowledge and skills) are not stable throughout one’s life (Hoffman, et al., 2010).

Skills approach. As trait theory leadership evolved and moved away from the “great man” philosophy, theorists began to embrace the inclusion of proximal characteristics. Researchers established that the qualities that correlate with effective leadership are not necessarily innate, but can be learned.

In contrast to prior leadership–individual difference research focusing primarily on dispositional antecedents of effective leadership, recent conceptual models have expanded their treatment beyond traditional, trait-like individual differences to include proximal, malleable individual differences (Hoffman, et al., 2010, p.3).

With the onset of War II people became more interested in researching the traits required of a “good leader” so that these qualities could be identified in military personnel, cultivated and used to help achieve victory overseas (Rost, 1991). It was during this time that a transition occurred in the discussion about leadership from inborn characteristics and traits to skills and abilities that can be developed. This shift represents the introduction of the skills approach to leadership theory.

In 1955 Robert Katz laid the foundation for the skills model that emerged in the mid-1990s, suggesting that effective administration depends on technical, human and conceptual skills (Northouse, 2004). The skills model is described as the “capability model” and explores the relationship between a person’s knowledge, skills and performance as a leader (Northouse, 2004). Katz (1955) was careful to differentiate between skills and traits, explaining that *skills* suggest what people can accomplish and *traits* imply who leaders *are* (i.e., their innate characteristics). The skills approach is discussed under the umbrella of trait theory because it still focuses on individual differences and is acknowledged separate from the behavioral studies discussed later in the chapter (Northouse, 2004). For simplicity, the “great man”, trait and skills approach are discussed in this dissertation under the heading of “trait theory” because of their leader-centric perspective and common focus on individual difference in relationship to leadership effectiveness.

Literature Review of Trait Theory

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) stated, “it is unequivocally clear that leaders are not like other people” (p. 59). The study of trait leadership can be simplified as the study of the traits, characteristics and abilities that differentiate leaders from non-leaders. This definition seems quite clear and simple; however, few theories within the realm of leadership studies are more

widely discussed and few are more divisive. Scholars have referred to the history of trait-based leadership approaches as “controversial” (Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), “inconsistent” (Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002) and “checkered” (Zaccaro, 2007). In fact, the trait approach is so contentious that within the literature on the theory scholars spend a great deal of time discussing the multiple challenges to the theory and the historical representations and misrepresentations of it.

Early challenges to trait theory. In the late 1940s and 1950s, Stogdill and Mann, respectively, were two of the first scholars to challenge the trait approach, finding that there existed no consistent set of traits that differentiated leaders from non-leaders and that situational factors were more predictive of leadership success (Northouse, 2004; Zaccaro, Kemp & Bader, 2004; Stogdill, 1948; Mann, 1959). In 1974, however, Stogdill reported findings from a second survey that upheld the idea that an individual’s characteristics *are* a significant part of leadership *along with* situational factors (Northouse, 2004). Both Stogdill and Mann expressed that the results of their original studies had been interpreted too pessimistically in terms of trait theory application (Northouse, 2004; Lord, De Vader & Alliger, 1986).

Leader emergence and leader effectiveness. Overgeneralization and the misinterpretation of the early work of Mann and Stogdill have resulted in much of the negativity about the study of traits in relationship to leadership (Lord, et al., 1986; Zaccaro, et al., 1991). The majority of research regarding trait theory today has focused on either leadership emergence and perception (Lord, et al., 1986; Zaccaro, Foti and Kenny, 1991; Stogdill, 1948; Zaccaro, et al., 2004; Judge, et, al, 2002) or leadership effectiveness (Zaccaro, et al., 2004; Judge, et, al, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Emergent leadership research refers to research about the factors related to someone being “perceived as leaderlike” (Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994, p. 496)

whereas leadership effectiveness refers to the performance of an individual that results in the achievement of an organization or group's goals (Judge, et al., 2002).

The findings of Lord, et al. (1986), Judge, et al. (2002), Northouse (2004) and Zaccaro, et al. (1991) support the association between traits and leadership emergence. The research of Judge, et al. (2002), Derue, Nehrgang, Wellman and Humphrey (2011) and Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) provide evidence for the relationship between individual difference and leadership effectiveness. Although these two categorizations represent distinct ideas, there exists a relationship between the two areas of research. According to Lord, et al. (1986) "there is a close parallel between trait approaches to leadership perceptions and work on the general topic of using traits to predict behavior" (p. 408). The closeness of the relationship between these two concepts can at times blur their distinction (Judge, et al., 2002). For example, the work of Mann and Stogdill focused on leadership emergence, however many contemporary scholars discuss their conclusions in relationship to leadership effectiveness. This also evokes some of the questions surrounding the validity of trait theory (Lord, et al., 1986).

Trait-like versus. state-like attributes. The conversation about distal versus proximal attributes in relationship to leadership effectiveness and emergence has existed in some version since the introduction of the trait approach, but has been a focus of the discussion in the last two decades (Kilpatrick & Locke, 1991). Distal characteristics or "trait-like" attributes are defined as those characteristics that are more stable throughout one's lifespan and thus less malleable (Hoffman, et al., 2010). Proximal characteristics or "state-like" attributes are defined as less stable throughout one's lifespan and thus more malleable and able to be developed (Hoffman, et al., 2010; Zaccaro, et al., 2004). Cognitive abilities, personality, motives and values are examples of trait-like/distal attributes whereas social appraisal skills, problem solving skills, expertise and

tacit knowledge are examples of state-like/proximal attributes (Zaccaro, et al., 2004; Hoffman, et al., 2010).

I have separated the distal and proximal attributes that recent, prominent studies have demonstrated are linked to leadership emergence and/or leadership effectiveness and included them in two lists. Scholars have found correlation with the following “trait-like” attributes to leadership performance and perception: (1) extraversion (Judge, et al., 2002; Derue, et al., 2011; Northouse, 2004); (2) agreeableness (Derue, et al., 2011); (3) conscientiousness (Judge, et al., 2002; Derue, et al., 2011); (4) openness (Judge, et al., 2002); (5) integrity (Hoffman, et al., 2010; Northouse, 2004; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991); (6) charisma (Hoffman, et al., 2011); (7) intelligence/cognitive ability (Judge, et al., 2002; Northouse, 2004; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991); (8) creativity (Hoffman, et al., 2011); (9) achievement (Judge, et al., 2002); (10) dominance (Judge, et al., 2002; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Judge, et al., 1986); and (11) masculinity (Judge, et al., 1986).

Researchers have also linked the following “state-like” attributes to leadership outcomes: (1) oral and written communication skills (Hoffman, et al., 2011); (2) interpersonal skills (Hoffman, et al., 2011; Zaccaro, et al., 1991; Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs & Fleishman, 2000); (3) problem solving ability (Hoffman, et al., 2011; Mumford, et al., 2000); (4) decision-making ability (Hoffman, et al., 2011); (5) technical/business knowledge (Bass, 1990; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Mumford, et al., 2000); (6) management skills; (Hoffman, et al., 2011); (7) self-confidence (Northouse, 2004; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991); and (8) determination/drive (Northouse, 2004; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). The previous lists of state-like and trait-like attributes are comprehensive, yet not at all exhaustive of the research on individual-difference in relationship to leadership studies.

Categorization of traits. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the aforementioned research is that each study revealed a different list of traits associated with leadership emergence or effectiveness and each study categorized these traits differently. The inability of the trait approach to produce a universal list of traits associated with leadership is one of the criticisms of the approach that I will address when discussing the limitations of trait theory. Another criticism is that historically there has been no consistent method of categorizing traits. Recently, however, two systems have emerged that are gaining popularity in the literature.

The first categorization system that was recently introduced is the system by Derue, et al. (2011), which organizes traits that are correlated to effective leadership behavior into three categories: (1) demographics; (2) traits related to task competence; and (3) interpersonal attributes. The second system gaining prominence and seemingly more utilized than the Derue, et al. (2011) system is one that categorizes attributes into proximal and distal characteristics. This method is utilized by Hoffman, et al. (2011) as well as Zaccaro, et al. (2004). Other frameworks for categorizing traits that are seen in contemporary individual-difference literature are the five factor model and the work of Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991). The “Big Five” has emerged as a common way in which to think about the connection between personality and leadership (Goldberg, 1990; Judge, et al., 2002). The “Big Five” personality traits are neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Goldberg, 1990; Judge, et al., 2002). Similarly, in their research, Kirkpatrick and Locke have discussed six overarching traits that differentiate leaders from non-leaders, which they then have broken down into multiple, descriptive characteristics.

Skills approach. The current research on the trait approach overlaps with what scholars call the “skills approach.” The skills approach does not focus on *what leaders do*, but rather

looks at leadership as “the capabilities, knowledge and skills that make effective leadership possible” (Mumford, et al., 2000, p. 12). The three-skill approach introduced by Katz in the 1950s led to the skills model, which has been studied extensively since the early 1990s (Northouse, 2004). The skills model has five components that mirror the categories discussed in relationship to various trait approach models: (1) individual attributes (general cognitive ability, crystallized cognitive ability, motivation, personality); (2) competencies (problem-solving skills, social judgment skills, knowledge); (3) leadership outcomes (effective problem solving, performance); (4) career experiences; and (5) environmental influences.

Whereas research on the trait approach to leadership has often led to findings that predict emergence of leadership, the skills model is called a “capability model” because it looks at the relationship between skills and performance (Northouse, 2004; Mumford, et al., 2000). It is not a predictive model; rather it provides a framework for understanding effective leadership practices (Northouse, 2004). Mumford, et al. (2000) emphasize that the three competencies of problem-solving skills, social judgment and knowledge are key to leadership outcomes. In their model, individual traits influence a person’s competencies and the environment impacts a leader’s performance (i.e. situation).

Situation and behavior. Although the focus of trait theorists is the individual difference that correlates with leadership effectiveness and perception, many of the contemporary scholars also recognize that behavior and context play a role. Derue, et al. (2011) asserted that it is a combination of traits and behaviors that predict leadership effectiveness. Likewise, in their work, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) claimed that the traits are only a precondition to successful leadership and an individual who possesses these characteristics must also take certain actions in order to achieve success as a leader (1991). Kirkpatrick and Locke stated that the traits that they

describe in their model enable individuals to acquire skills necessary to become an effective leader and successfully plan and implement a vision for an organization. Almost all contemporary scholars also now address situational context and environmental influences within their studies, although this remains secondary in importance to individual difference.

Practical application of trait theory. Trait theory may be one of the most controversial approaches to leadership but it is one of the most utilized paradigms in the development of leaders (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). The trait and skill approaches are related to *leader* development more so than *leadership* development because they focus on the capacity of individuals to be effective in leadership roles and processes (Day, 2001). Skill-based training, specifically, is one of the more popular leadership development approaches of education and business. Through skill-based training, individuals work on honing existing skills and developing new skills to increase their effectiveness (Popper, Micha, Lipshitz & Raanan, 1993). Skill-based programs focus on the competencies that are considered “developable” such as the ability to interact socially, think systematically, make critical evaluations, think creatively and empower others (McCauley, et al., 2000). To be effective, these broad categories must be broken down and the underlying skills must be examined separately (McCauley, et al., 2000).

In addition to job training, trait and skill assessments are also utilized in evaluating job candidates (Burns, 2003). Burns (2003) called it “common sense” that when applying for a job a candidate would be asked about her background, experience and skills and simultaneously be evaluated on traits such as empathy, initiative, fortitude, and ambition (p. 10). What Burns called “uncommon sense” is that many of these traits may not seemingly be associated with the job for which a person is applying but because research indicates that possession of certain traits is predictive of performance, the assessment of such traits is significant (p. 10). The belief that

when searching for a candidate for a leadership position in higher education, hiring parties should look for certain characteristics and qualities persists, which demonstrates the practical influence of trait theory in the realm of higher education (Bensimon, et al., 1989).

Higher education application. Trait theory is widely utilized within higher education in leadership development programming for students, faculty and staff. The skill-based model may be the most implemented version of trait theory in higher education. Many leadership development programs use a competency model based on the skills model (Davis, n.d.; Advanced Leadership, 2012; Fisher, 2012). The University of Wisconsin system's *Extension Leadership Development Program* is an example of higher education using a leadership competency model that emphasizes development of key abilities (Wisniewski, 2004).

Among the drawbacks of development programs in higher education that focus solely on traits and skills is the resulting lack of emphasis on context and culture that scholars suggest is imperative in the settings of colleges and universities (Kezar, et al., 2006). Also considered a downside to the trait theory focus in higher education is the incompatibility it often has with change-oriented models, which include many elements that colleges and universities promote--at least outwardly-- in the twenty-first century (ideas such as collaboration, multidirectional influence and horizontal power structures). Even with the stark criticism of trait theory, however, it maintains a stronghold in leadership development curriculum at institutions of higher education.

Limitations and Criticisms of Trait Theory

There are many scholars who argue that the weaknesses of the trait and skills approaches to leadership far outweigh their strengths (Northouse, 2004; Kezar & Carducci, 2009). The controversial nature of trait theory has made it the target of sharp criticism. The limitations and

criticisms of this theory include the following: (1) scholars have failed to produce a definite, objective list of traits or skills that are associated with effective leader behavior; (2) there is little discussion of situational context; (3) the predictive value of these theories is weak; and (4) the practical application of these theories to leadership development and training is marginal.

Failure to identify universal traits. From the literature, it is evident that one of the greatest limitations to trait theory is that there exists no defined set of traits or skills that a person must possess to be perceived as a leader or to exhibit effective leadership practices (Northouse, 2004; Ott, et al., 2008). Rarely is the complexity of leadership considered when discussing attributes of leaders and there is seldom recognition that the *combination* of an individual leader's characteristics may affect leadership performance (Zaccaro, 2007). The methodology used to determine which traits are the "most important" to leadership is weak and the interpretation of data has been highly subjective (Northouse, 2004).

With a lack of reliable research in which the lengthy list of traits is grounded, it is understandable why controversy surrounds trait theory. The lack of definition also hurts the credibility and practicality of the skills approach to leadership. With the skills approach, it is a problem of boundaries—scholars argue that the skills approach addresses much more than leadership outcomes (Northouse, 2004). Interestingly, the skills model is also criticized for claiming that it is not a trait model. It includes "individual attribute" components; however, making it "trait-driven" and thus it suffers from many of the same limiting factors relating to the lack of a universal list of attributes.

Absence of context. Along with the absence of a universal set of traits, trait theory lacks in its discussion of situational context. The idea that leaders possess a certain set of attributes and skills that transcend context is a downfall of both the trait and skill approaches to leadership

(Northouse, 2004; Kezar, et al., 2006). Most contemporary scholars agree that the situational context is significant in the conversation about variance in leadership (Zaccaro, 2007). The trait and skill approach to leadership, however, focuses almost entirely on the leader while neglecting other cultural and environmental factors, including the behavior of the followers.

Scholars criticize the trait approach for ignoring how traits of a leader impact the group and its work (Northouse, 2004). Contemporary trait and skill researchers are more likely to take into account situational factors; however, the approach is still leader-centric. Interestingly, Stogdill's original criticism of trait theory was that the theory did not address the significance of context. More than half a century later this continues to be one of the greatest criticisms and most limiting factors of the trait theory of leadership.

Weak predictive value and overgeneralization. Evident by the inconsistency of traits identified and the absence of situational context, the trait approach is very subjective (Northouse, 2004). Both trait and skill approaches are weak in predictive value, with many studies failing to adequately explain how the possession of certain traits or skills leads to effective performance (Northouse, 2004). Those scholars who do provide evidence cite traits as preconditions or precursors to the behavior that results in leadership outcomes (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). As discussed previously, overgeneralization is also a problem in the literature about trait theory. Although there is considerable overlap in concepts, there is a distinction between leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness that is often overlooked (Lord, et al., 1986). Traits that are positively correlated with leadership emergence have inappropriately been generalized as those that predict leadership effectiveness.

Marginal success of practical application. Perhaps the most significant limitation in terms of this dissertation is that the trait model is not found to be useful for training or

development of leaders and the skills model is only marginally useful (Northouse, 2004). This criticism is somewhat ironic given that trait theory—specifically the skills approach-- is highly utilized as a framework for leadership development programs (Burns, 2003). Skill development should not be the “essence” of leadership development warns Popper, et al., 1993, but rather only one component of the overall process.

Trait-based and skill-based leadership development programs are leader-centered and ignore the culture of the organization. Some would argue that these programs are actually *leader* development programs because they focus on the individual rather than the group and ignore contemporary leadership approaches (Day, 2000). In business as well as in higher education, the trait-based and skill-based models of leadership development are typically designed to cater to those who are already in administrative roles or those aspiring to be in formal leadership positions and often reflect a hierarchical (and at times patriarchal) environment. In such an environment leadership is defined by certain traits or skills (often described as masculine) and a person must acquire these in order to progress through the formal leadership hierarchy.

Of the four assumptions about faculty and staff leadership development programs that were discussed in chapter one, the following two directly relate to the trait theory paradigm: (1) leadership is conceptualized as an individual, hierarchical leader (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Tierney, 1999; Day, 2001; Kezar, et al., 2006); and (2) universal and predictable skills and traits that transcend context best epitomize the work of leaders (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Fincher, 2003; Wisniewski, 2004). The focus on trait and skill development has received sharp criticism from higher education scholars who say that the leader-centric perspective of these models do not align with the contemporary leadership approaches that are geared toward collaboration and teamwork (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

Concluding Remarks about Trait Theory

With the emergence in popularity of change-oriented leadership models, many agree that trait theory represents an out-dated approach to leadership because of the lack of discussion of cultural context (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). There are still many scholars, however, who defend the notion that traits can be used to differentiate between leaders and non-leaders and that such characteristics are predictive of leadership perceptions or leadership effectiveness (Northouse, 2004; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Lord, et al., 1986).

There are several strengths of the trait and skills approach to leadership. With over a century of research about the trait approach to leadership and over half a century of research on the skills approach, there is a great knowledge base about these models (Northouse, 2004). These approaches are also very attractive because they align with the way in which leadership or leaders are commonly depicted in society—as something or someone extremely unique and special (Northouse, 2004). The skills approach is especially appealing because it is the first model that makes leadership accessible to everyone. Practically, the trait and skills approach are appealing because if traits or skills can be identified that differentiate leaders from non-leaders then this information can serve as a foundation for leader selection, training, development and assessment (Zaccaro, 2007).

Since its emergence, trait theory has heavily influenced the field of leadership studies and continues to be a part of conversations about the most contemporary leadership theories (Bensimon, et al., 1989). According to Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), traits do matter and there is a clear difference between the characteristics of leaders and those of non-leaders. Due to its longevity in the field, trait theory has been studied extensively and has changed with the emergence of new research. In the beginning, trait theory focused on identifying the innate

qualities of great men (Northouse, 2004). The approach then shifted to recognize that proximal characteristics also played a role in predicting leadership effectiveness and emergence (Rost, 1991). From this the skills approach materialized.

The initial approach of trait theory as a leader-centered theory that focused on identifying certain traits that indicated and predicted who would be effective leaders continues to dominate the discussion and despite controversy, continues to have appeal (Kezar, et al., 2006). Eventually, trait theorists began to acknowledge that context and behavior play a role in trait perspectives, which was the beginning of the move toward situational and behavioral studies of leadership.

Behavioral Theory of Leadership

Overview of Behavioral Theory

Although there is great variation in the way scholars define leadership, historically it has been most frequently described as a *behavior of influence* (Rost, 1991, p. 53). Whereas trait and skill theories typically concentrate on a person's innate characteristics or honed abilities, behavioral theories focus on the actions and style of the individual. Quite simply, behavioral theories examine the *behaviors* of effective leaders (Kezar, et al., 2006).

Fundamentally, evaluating leadership in organizations is not about the attributes the leader has, but about what the leader is perceived to do (and actually does) in the social context of his or her unit (Rosser, Johnsrud & Heck, 2003, p. 17).

Like trait theories, behavioral theories are leader-centered. In contrast to the perspective of early trait theory, however, behavioral theory presents leadership as something that can be learned. Behavioral theories outline specific skills in which leaders can be trained (Kezar, et al., 2006). It is important to note that although there are some commonalities, behavioral theory differs from the skills approach. The skills approach focuses on capabilities whereas the

behavioral approach focuses on a leader's actions-- "what they [leaders] do and how they do it" (Northouse, 2004, p. 65).

Landmark behavioral theory research. As trait theory declined in popularity in the 1940s and 1950s, behavioral theory emerged with prominence (Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio & Johnson, 2011). The behavioral approach to leadership is historically significant because it indicates a shift in thinking about leadership solely from a perspective of individual characteristics to examining leadership more broadly in terms of style and action. Occasionally, the behavioral approach also places emphasis on situational factors.

In some of the earliest behavioral studies, during a time when trait theory was still widely accepted, Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) defined leadership in terms of authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire characteristics. From their observations, they concluded that the democratic leader who demonstrated inclusive, participatory behavior was the most ideal (Lewin, et al., 1939). The conclusions drawn by Lewin, et al. were progressive for the 1930s and foreshadowed discussions that would occur decades later regarding leadership behavior within the context of horizontal and process-oriented leadership--both distinctions of postindustrial leadership models.

The Ohio State studies and the University of Michigan studies are known as landmark studies in the advancement of behavioral leadership theory (Northouse, 2004; Bennis, et al., 1989; Hernandez, et al., 2011). In these studies, researchers examined how individuals acted when leading an organization or group of people (Northouse, 2004). The Ohio and Michigan studies introduced the relationship/task dichotomy that has, at least to a degree, influenced all subsequent behavior and style studies (Northouse, 2004; Bennis, et al., 1989; Hernandez, et al., 2011; Ott, et al., 2008). According to Kegan, et al. (2006), many behavioral theorists assume

leadership effectiveness is “the product of the leader’s ability to balance task and relational behaviors” (p. 9). Research indicates that behavioral theorists also work to distinguish which actions are most appropriate for particular situations (Kezar, et al., 2006). This reveals that although situational factors do not play a large part in behavioral theory, they are not completely absent from the discussion.

Literature Review of Behavioral Theory

Early research about leadership styles. In the Lewin, Lippitt, and White study (1939), researchers studied four groups of 10 year-old boys. Each group experienced rotating leaders who personified characteristics of either an authoritarian, democratic or laissez-faire leadership style. Authoritarian leaders in the study dictated the way in which the tasks were organized and completed and were personal in both their criticism and praise. Authoritarian leaders were not participatory with the group; in fact, the group members perceived them as aloof. The democratic leaders engaged the group members in discussion and involved them in the planning and decision-making process. Democratic leaders were objective in their criticism and praise and strived to appropriately participate within group activities. The laissez-faire leaders in the study were non-participants in the group, who gave the group members complete freedom and made few comments unless questioned.

The authoritarian groups’ interactions were characterized by aggressive behavior, low satisfaction and high productivity (Lewin, et al., 1939; Ott, et al., 2008). The group members led by the laissez-faire leaders also demonstrated aggressive behavior and low satisfaction, but also had low productivity (Lewin, et al., 1939; Ott, et al., 2008). The groups led by democratic leaders were friendlier in their interactions and had the most satisfied and productive members as compared to other groups (Lewin, et al., 1939; Ott, et al., 2008). Lewin, et al. (1939) concluded

that the democratic leader was better received than the authoritarian leader, who was perceived as strict and removed, or the laissez-faire leader, who was seen as a non-participant and aloof (Lewin, et al., 1939; Ott, et al., 2008). The democratic leader was viewed as a participant in the process, as objective and as inclusive (Lewin, et al., 1939). The Lewin, Lippitt and White study is significant because it is the seminal work in the realm of behavioral leadership theory and has had enormous influence not only on behavioral theory, but also on situational/contingency theories and change-oriented theories (Goleman, 2000; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958).

Task /relationship dichotomy. The Ohio State and Michigan studies also were instrumental to the behavioral movement. The Ohio State studies utilized an instrument named the *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)* that was given to a large sample of people in the educational, military and industrial realms (Northouse, 2004). The responses from this questionnaire indicated two types of leader behavior: *initiating structure* and *consideration* (Northouse, 2004, p. 66). The *initiating structure* behaviors, also known as *task-oriented* behaviors, were defined as behaviors that involve activities like directing, coordinating, planning, problem solving, defining role responsibilities, evaluating progress and setting standards (Ott, et al., 2008; Bensimon, et al., 1989; Northouse, 2004). The *consideration* behaviors, also known as *relationship-oriented* behaviors, were characterized as actions that are friendly, considerate, supportive, consultative and open in nature and behaviors that foster a sense of mutual trust, respect, and warmth (Ott, et al., 2008; Bensimon, et al., 1989).

The University of Michigan studies classified task behaviors as *product-oriented* and the relationship behaviors as *employee-oriented*, but described the behaviors of each similarly to how the Ohio State study described them (Ott, et al., 2008). The Michigan studies found that product-oriented leaders are confronted more often than employee-oriented leaders and their

subordinates have lower job satisfaction, higher turnover rates and higher absenteeism (Ott, et al., 2008). Conversely, the Ohio State studies found that when leaders exhibit initiating structure behaviors the productivity of individual subordinates, as well as the productivity of the overall organization or group, is higher (Ott, et al., 2008). One of the most significant conceptual differences between the Ohio State and Michigan studies is that the Michigan studies viewed task and relationship orientations as opposing ends of the same continuum whereas the Ohio State studies viewed them as two independent orientations of leadership (Northouse, 2004). Although the Ohio State and Michigan studies differed in their findings, together they laid important groundwork for the behavioral and style models that would emerge in the following five decades.

Blake and Mouton's Managerial/Leadership Grid. The most prevailing model of behavioral leadership is Blake and Mouton's *Managerial Grid* (later name the *Leadership Grid*). I will refer to it as the "*Leadership Grid*" for the purposes of this discussion. The *Leadership Grid* is frequently used in training and development of managers to demonstrate how individuals can use behaviors that are relationship-oriented (labeled in the *Leadership Grid* as *concern for people*) and task-oriented (labeled in the *Leadership Grid* as *concern for production*) to achieve organizational goals (Northouse, 2004, p.69).

The *Leadership Grid* is visually represented by a model with two axes. The horizontal, x-axis represents the leader's concern for production/results (task) and the vertical, y-axis represents the leader's concern for people (relationship). Each axis includes a nine-point scale in which "1" represents low concern for either task or people and "9" represents high concern for either task or people (Blake & Mouton, 1967; Northouse, 2004). Although rarely discussed, there

is a third dimension of the grid that is referred to as the “thickness” and represents the depth of the style or how long the style is maintained (Blake & Mouton, 1967).

Within the *Leadership Grid* there are five leadership styles depicted: (1) authority-compliance (9,1); (2) country club management (1,9); (3) impoverished management (1,1); (4) middle-of-the-road management (5,5) and (5) team management (9, 9). Blake and Mouton argued that leaders have a dominant style of leadership that they will use in the majority of situations as well as a “backup style” (Northouse, 2004, p.72). According to the original theory, those leaders who are low on both axes or high on one axis and low on the other are ineffective because they are ignoring either the task or relationship aspect of leadership (or both if 0,0) (Bensimon, et al., 1989). Those leaders who are a (5,5) are striking a compromise that encourages satisfactory performance by the group (Bensimon, et al., 1989). Blake and Mouton (1967) suggested that the most effective leadership style is a (9,9), representing a high task and a high relationship orientation. Although the work of Blake and Mouton has been significant in the area of behavioral, management and leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Northouse, 2004; Bensimon, et al., 1989), the *Leadership Grid* has also received harsh criticism:

The grid has often been criticized for asserting that one “best way” exists of providing leadership without concern for the particular task, the nature of the environment, or the qualities of the participants (Bensimon, et al., 1989, p. 13).

Practical application of behavioral theory. The behavioral approach is important from a conceptual level because of its focus on task and relationship behaviors (Northouse, 2004; Ott, et al., 2008). Northouse (2004) referred to behavioral theories as a “conceptual map” that allows people to better understand themselves as leaders. As with the trait approach, behavioral approaches provide people with the ability to engage in assessment of their own actions pertaining to leadership (Northouse, 2004).

Behavioral and style approaches are used as a framework to structure training and development programs for employees across multiple fields (Northouse, 2004). It is suggested that by using the task/relationship dichotomy, individuals can assess their own leadership orientation and research ways to become a more effective leader. As with the trait approach, questionnaires that are geared toward self-assessment and subordinate assessment are frequent means for evaluating one's behavior or style (Northouse, 2004; Kezar, et al., 2006). The style approach is practical because it "provides a mirror for managers that is helpful in answering the frequently asked question, "how am I doing as a leader?" (Northouse, 2004, p. 76).

Higher education application. The behaviors that were at one time linked to leadership effectiveness or to the perception of leadership effectiveness in higher education have changed. For example, there has been a shift from the task-oriented behaviors of goal-setting, vision planning, directing and an overall focus of "getting things done" of college presidents to include more relationship-oriented behaviors of listening, being open to influence and collaboration (Kezar, et al., 2006). There are several current studies that now reveal the importance of striking a balance between task and relationship-oriented behaviors for administrators at institutions of higher education (Kezar, et al., 2006; Neumann & Neumann, 1999). This represents a shift away from the work of Bensimon, et al. in the late 1980s that supported a more transactional, task-oriented perspective of leadership for higher education.

Limitations and Criticisms of Behavioral Theory

Although the idea behind defining an individual's style in terms of task-oriented or relationship-oriented behavior has been significant in the training and development of leaders across fields, there has been significant criticism of the behavioral theory (Northouse, 2004). There exist three main criticisms of the behavioral theory. They are as follows: (1) behavioral

theories have failed to adequately explain a relationship between the leader's behavior and leadership outcomes; (2) researchers have been unable to establish a universal style of leadership; and (3) behavioral theories do not aptly address the impact of situational context (Kezar, et al., 2006; Northouse, 2004).

Weak predictive value. Similar to trait theory, behavioral theory research has not sufficiently or consistently demonstrated how leader behavior or style is associated with performance outcomes (Northouse, 2004). The Ohio State studies, the Michigan studies and the *Leadership Grid* are attitudinal theories of leadership (Gortner, et al., 2007). Given that these theories are descriptive of attitudes, their predictive value is low.

Attitudinal theories, like trait theories, contain a gap in explanation: attitudes do not necessarily correlate with effectiveness. Some unidentified action needs to take place between attitudes and effectiveness. To find a comprehensive theory we need to return to situational theories (Gortner, et al., 2007, p. 358).

The usefulness of behavioral theories is not always substantial because scholars do not agree on categories or classification systems (Northouse, 2004; Bensimon, et al., 1989).

Failure to identify universal behaviors and the absence of context. Also similar to trait theory is the criticism surrounding the lack of attention to context in the discussion of behavioral theory. It is true that the situational factors are more prevalent within the conversations about behavioral theory as compared to trait theory; however, they are still not widely discussed. The inability of behavioral theorists to identify a universal style of leadership that is effective across situations indicates that context is indeed significant and thus the treatment of it as an afterthought within behavioral approaches is problematic (Northouse, 2004; Rost 1991). In addition to the absence of context, the implication that the high relationship/high task leadership style is more effective than other styles regardless of the situational context is questionable (Northouse, 2004).

Some situational leadership theorists argue that models like the *Leadership Grid* deal with attitudinal dimensions and thus are not truly behavioral models (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Renowned situational leadership theorists Hersey and Blanchard (1982) suggested that situational models of leadership describe how people behave whereas the Blake and Mouton model describes “attitudes and predispositions toward production and people” (p. 50). Furthermore, situational theorists have argued that “attitudinal models”, like the *Leadership Grid*, lead to behavioral assumptions and from those assumptions inappropriate conclusions are drawn (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). In general, situational theorists disagree with those who advocate “one best way” to leadership, saying that this perception is problematic because the circumstances of a situation, including the needs of those an individual is leading, largely dictates what behaviors would be most effective (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Hersey and Blanchard’s life cycle theory, which in many ways acts as a situational theorist’s response to the original *Managerial Grid* is discussed in greater detail in the following section of the chapter. Hersey and Blanchard rejected the idea that the “team approach”, which indicates an orientation high in task and high in relationship, is the best approach regardless of the situation. Although Blake and McCauley later recognized the importance of context in the theory, the primary focus remained on the behavior—or what Hersey and Blanchard would call the “attitude” (Northouse, 2004).

Concluding Remarks about Behavioral Theory

The widespread research on behavioral and style models gives credibility and validity to the approach (Northouse, 2004). From a historical perspective, behavioral theory helped leadership studies progress away from the trait-centered approaches and even foreshadowed elements of contemporary leadership theory. Behavioral theory is a widely utilized approach to

leadership, especially in the realm of leadership development. It is also, however, a difficult approach to explain. According to Northouse (2004), the behavioral approach is “not a refined theory that provides a neatly organized set of prescriptions for effective leadership behavior” (p. 73). Instead, it provides a “framework for assessing leadership in a broad way, as behavior with a task and relationship dimension” (Northouse, 2004, p. 73).

It is clear that behavioral theory has had a tremendous impact on the progression of the field of leadership studies and continues to play a significant role in leadership development programming. Behavioral leadership scholars typically agree that in some situations task-oriented behavior is more appropriate whereas in other situations relationship-oriented behaviors are more useful (Northouse, 2004; Kezar, et al., 2006). Although behavioral theory has not traditionally focused a great deal on situational context, one cannot discuss behavioral approaches without recognition of situational factors. The acknowledgement of situational context by behavioral theorists eventually led to the rise of situational and contingency theories.

Situational Theory of Leadership

Overview of Situational Theory

As early as the 1950s, there was greater recognition by trait and behavioral leadership theorists that situational factors play a role in leadership effectiveness and emergence (Zaccaro, 2007; Northouse, 2004; Kezar, et al., 2006). The primary focus, however, remained on what were considered innate characteristics of individuals in positions of authority and the actions of those acknowledged as leaders. As the situational and contingency theories of leadership gained momentum, the widely accepted trait and behavioral theories declined in popularity, suffering sharp criticism for their lack of attention to situational factors and context. It was not until the 1960s that it became common for scholars to explore situational factors in relationship to

leadership effectiveness, however (Northouse, 2004). Through the work of now well-known leadership scholars, Fiedler, Hersey, Blanchard and Vroom, situational leadership theory grew in popularity and became a part of mainstream leadership theory (Northouse, 2004; Gortner, et al., 2007; Ott, et al., 2008).

Situational leadership theorists propose that situational approaches vary from behavioral approaches because they include dimensions of observed behavior, describing *how* people behave (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Those who ascribe to situational models typically contend that behavioral approaches to leadership are actually describing a leader's attitudes toward people and production, rather than their behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). According to many situational leadership models, a successful leader is one who is able to adapt his or her behavior to meet the needs of group members within the context of various situations (Northouse, 2004; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; House, 1996; Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Situational theories purport that different types of situations require different types of leadership (Northouse, 2004; Gortner, et al., 2007; Bensimon, et al., 1989). Gortner, et al. (2007) described well the premise of situational theory. They said that the skills, behaviors and traits a leader needs depend on the context of a situation, which includes the leader's peers, ability of followers, nature of the task and external environment. An example of the Gortner, et al. description is the situational leadership approach, in which ability of the leader to assess the followers' needs, including their level of commitment and competency, is critical (Northouse, 2004). The leader's assessment allows him to "match" his behavior to the needs of the followers in both the directive and supportive dimensions (Northouse, 2004; Kezar, et al., 2006).

It is critical to note that not all situational leadership theorists believe that an individual should or can adjust his or her style in order to create a good match between the leader and the

situation (Fiedler, 1970). Fred Fiedler, who created the most well-known contingency theory model, said that the situation should be altered to fit the leader (Fiedler, 1970; Ott, et al., 2008). Fiedler disagreed that it is possible to genuinely change a person's leadership style because leadership behavior is related to an individual's personality, which he says is unlikely to change (Ott, et al., 2008). In general, contingency theories focus on examining the variables or situational factors that shape a leader's behavior to help determine under what circumstances a leader is most likely to achieve success (Gortner, et al., 2007; Bensimon, et al., 1989). Contingency theory accounts for factors within the organization as well as external to the organization and suggests that even factors such as a person's position within a hierarchy or the perception of the environment and size of the organizational unit can be meaningful in terms of leadership behavior (Bensimon, et al., 1989).

In the literature about leadership theory, there is not a consistent way in which situational and contingency models are introduced. Some scholars present these two approaches separately (Northouse, 2004), whereas others include the contingency model of leadership underneath the umbrella of situational theory (Gortner, et al., 2007; Ott, et al., 2008). In the following discussion, I will address the contingency approach as a unique approach, but within the broader scope of situational theory. Although distinct, the concepts behind traditional situational approaches and contingency models are very similar. Both models acknowledge that there is no "one best way" to approach leadership because situational factors influence leadership outcomes (Bensimon, et al., 1989).

Literature Review of Situational Theory

The premise of situational theory is that there are forces and factors beyond personality and behavior that impact leadership emergence and effectiveness (Kezar, et al., 2006). Scholars

agree that three of the main factors leaders should take into account when deciding how to approach a group or scenario are (1) forces in the manager; (2) forces in the subordinate; and (3) forces in the situation (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Northouse, 2004). Forces in the manager include a leader's personal value system and expectations, confidence in her subordinates, natural leadership inclinations and feelings of security within her role (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Ott, et al., 2008). Forces in the subordinate include employee or group-member personality, expectations, and level of competence and commitment (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Northouse, 2004; Ott, et al., 2008). Forces in the situation include characteristics such as the type of organization and environment in which the organization functions; group effectiveness; the nature of the task or problem; and the pressure of time (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Ott, et al., 2008).

There exist numerous prominent situational leadership theories. For the purpose of this literature review, I will focus on five models to which scholars have attributed great significance in the larger study of leadership theory or that have been frequently applied to higher education. I briefly review the following theories: (1) Tannenbaum and Schmidt's continuum theory; (2) Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership approach; (3) Fiedler's contingency theory; (4) House's path-goal theory; and (5) Vroom-Yetton-Jago decision-making model.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt continuum theory. One of the earliest studies that addressed the importance of situational factors in determining a leadership style was the work of Tannenbaum and Schmidt in the late 1950s (Ott, et al., 2008). In their work, Tannenbaum and Schmidt introduced a continuum of leadership behavior that includes seven categories of decision-making (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958). Each category indicates a different degree of group participation in the decision-making process, ranging from group members having no

control to almost complete decision-making freedom (Ott, et al., 2008). The three factors previously discussed (forces of the leader, subordinate and situation) influence where on the continuum the decision is made (Ott, et al., 2008).

As a leader faces day-to-day challenges of an organization, the three forces are paramount in how he or she approaches situations and the decision-making process (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958). Within the context of a long-term strategy (such as in higher education) some of these forces are less important and leaders look more toward issues of group motivation, teamwork, morale, development, quality improvement and the group's attitude toward change (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958). According to Tannenbaum and Schmidt's research, long-term goals are associated with greater subordinate-centered behavior, in which groups have greater freedom and more participation in the decision-making process.

Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership approach. Like Tannenbaum and Schmidt, Hersey and Blanchard addressed the forces of the manager, subordinate and situation in their model. Finding the *Managerial/Leadership Grid* inadequate, Hersey and Blanchard created the tridimensional leaders effectiveness model, which added a third dimension of "environment/situation" to the "task" and "relationship" dimensions of the original grid (Gortner, et al., 2007). Under the Hersey and Blanchard model, leadership effectiveness occurs when the right combination of task and relationship is reached for a particular situation (Gortner, et al., 2007).

The Hersey and Blanchard matrix reflects the four leader styles that are used to meet the needs of followers: telling, selling, participating and delegating (Ott, et al., 2008). The leader's style is chosen based on the maturity of those that she is leading (Gortner, et al., 2007). For example, task-oriented behaviors (i.e. "telling") are reduced as the maturity of subordinates

increase (Gortner, et al., 2007). Likewise, leaders increase supportive, relational behaviors as the group moves from immature to mature levels in their behavior (Gortner, et al., 2007). When the subordinates achieve a high level of maturity, the need for directive and supportive behavior decreases and the leader begins using a “delegating” style. The Hersey and Blanchard model has been replicated extended and refined several times since its introduction in 1969 (Blanchard, Zigarmi & Nelson, 1993; Northouse, 2004).

Fiedler’s contingency theory. (Gortner, et al., 2007, p. 359). Recognized as the “father of contingency theory”, Fiedler suggested that Hersey and Blanchard’s *model of situational leadership* is overly simplified (Fiedler, 1970; Gortner, et al., 2007). Fiedler claimed that there exist multiple variables that moderate a leader’s effectiveness (Gortner, et al., 2007). Fiedler asserted that the quality of the match between the leader’s personality or style and the situation is pertinent to whether a leader will be successful. (Gortner, et al., 2007). He rejected the idea, however, that a leader is able to easily change his or her style to meet the group’s needs, a premise of most prior situational models (Ott, et al., 2008).

To test his hypothesis, Fiedler created the *Least Preferred Coworker* (LPC) scale and conducted a survey that asked participants to describe their most preferred coworker and least preferred coworker (Fiedler, 1970). Individuals who score high on the LPC scale are relationship motivated and those who score low are task motivated (Northouse, 2004). Based on the survey results, Fiedler established three areas of influence on a leader’s roles: (1) leader-member relations; (2) task structure; and (3) position power (Fiedler, 1970).

If a leader has positive leader-member relations, he is generally well respected and evokes loyalty, which increases compliance by his subordinates (Fiedler, 1970; Gortner, et al., 2007). Compliance is also commanded when a leader has high positional power, because he can

reward or punish subordinates more easily than those who do not have positional power and must use other avenues to gain compliance (Fiedler, 1970; Gortner, et al., 2007). Task structure influences a leader's role because when there is a high level of structure, operations are clearly defined and assessment of the quality of the work is easier, thus making supervision somewhat more manageable (Gortner, et al., 2007). If the structure of the task is not well defined, the leader typically has less control, making compliance more difficult to achieve (Fiedler, 1970; Gortner, 2007).

The three factors defined by Fiedler predict the "favorableness" of a situation (Northouse, 2004, p. 111). The situations that are most favorable are those that have positive member-leader relations, structured tasks and a leader with strong positional power (Northouse, 2004). Leaders with a low LPC score ("task-oriented" leaders) are most effective when situations are very favorable (i.e. when situational control is very high) or when situations are unfavorable (i.e. when situational control is very low) (Ott, et al., 2008). Leaders with high LPC scores ("relationship-oriented" leaders) are most effective in situations with moderate levels of favorableness and control (Ott, et al., 2008).

According to contingency theory, task-oriented leaders perform best when organizational operations are strong and smooth or when there is a complete loss of control (Northouse, 2004). Conversely, relationship-oriented leaders excel when there is some semblance of control but uncertainty is ever-present (Northouse, 2004). When a leader's LPC style does not match the situation in which he is working, this can produce anxiety, immature behavior and poor decision-making, which ultimately result in negative outcomes for the organization (Northouse, 2004). Hersey and Blanchard suggested that if the leader's style is inappropriate for a given situation, the leader should adapt his style, whereas Fiedler doubted the ability of individuals to change

their personal style (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Gortner, et al., 2007). Fiedler described a leader's motivation as an "enduring characteristic that is not subject to change or adaptation" and thus more aligned with a trait description, rather than a behavioral one. (Vroom & Jago, 2007, p. 20)

House's path-goal theory. Following Fiedler's work, another prominent contingency theory emerged in the 1970s that attempted to fill some of the gaps left by the Ohio State and Michigan Studies (Vroom & Jago, 2007; House, 1996). Path-goal theory states that the leader's role is to direct group-member paths toward individual and group goals, to define expectations and to ensure appropriate motivation exists (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Northouse, 2004; House, 1996). Path-goal theory examines task and relationship behaviors, as well as achievement-oriented and participatory leadership behaviors (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Northouse, 2004).

According to path goal-theory, the ability of a leader to be effective is dependent upon characteristics of subordinates and the environment (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

... Individuals in positions of authority... will be effective to the extent that they complement the environment in which their subordinates work by providing the necessary cognitive clarifications to ensure that subordinates expect that they can attain work goals and that they will experience intrinsic satisfaction and receive valiant rewards as a result of work goal attainment (House, 1996, p. 326).

Path-goal theory suggests that an effective leader will use a style that best meets the motivational needs of group members (Northouse, 2004). When the path to the goal is clearly defined and when the payoffs received by group members are worthwhile, motivation increases (Northouse, 2004). When there exists a good match between behaviors and the situation, then job satisfaction, leader acceptance and expectations are elevated (Vroom & Jago, 2007). According to path-goal theory, directive behaviors are most effective in situations with a low degree of task structure and ineffective in highly structured situations (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Bensimon, et al., 1989).

Vroom-Yetton-Jago decision-making model. The decision-making model of leadership is similar to path-goal theory in its perspective of behavioral contingencies (Vroom & Jago, 2007). The Vroom and Yetton research, as well as associated studies on decision-making leadership, focused specifically on the degree to which a leader includes group members in the decision-making process (Bensimon, et al., 1989). In the initial study, Vroom and Yetton examined five decision-making processes, ranging from highly autocratic to highly participatory (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

The decision-making model identifies situational variables that change contingent upon the decision (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Studies have shown that leaders use a complex set of decision rules, which respond to situational factors (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Bensimon, et al., 1989). Bensimon, et al. (1989) suggested that effective leadership involves assessing the appropriate level of involvement for followers in each decision. They also suggested that the level of involvement should depend on the characteristics of the followers as well as on the decision-making process itself. The conclusions of Vroom and Yetton and subsequent studies led to an understanding that variance in behavior is specific to a situation. Furthermore, their research also demonstrates that situation accounts for approximately three times as much variance as individual difference (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Practical application and implications of situational theory. If Vroom and Jago's assessment of the amount of variance attributed to situational context is correct, then it is logical that one of the limiting elements of both trait and behavioral leadership theories is their lack of attention to situational factors (Northouse, 2004; Rost 1991). Likewise, one of the biggest criticisms of leadership development programming in higher education is that it does not emphasize the importance of culture and context (Kezar, 2009). Given that there are gaps that

exist within leadership development programming and given the widely discussed limitations of behavioral and trait theories, it is understandable why situational and contingency theories have some very practical implications. Specifically, when situational and contingency theories are utilized in the placement and training of employees for organizations the outcomes have been positive (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Training. Many larger corporations view situational theory as a credible way in which to train leaders, in part because it is a prescriptive theory (Northouse, 2004). For example, the straight-forward nature of Hersey and Blanchard's situational approach is easy to access and thus more practical than some other leadership approaches (Northouse, 2004).

The fluid nature of situational leadership makes it ideal for applying to subordinates as they move forward or backwards (regress) on various projects. Because situational leadership stresses adapting to followers, it is ideal for use with followers whose commitment and competence changes over the course of a project (Northouse, 2004, p. 97).

According to Northouse (2004) the situational approach is applicable in “virtually any type of organization, at any level, for nearly all types of tasks” (p. 97).

Path-goal theory can also be utilized to help leaders better understand their followers, and in turn, better understand themselves as leaders. As one of the first situational leadership theories to examine the effect of leader behavior on followers, path-goal theory provides a useful framework that allows leaders to understand the behavior and satisfaction of group-members (Northouse, 2004). In practice, path-goal theory provides managers with recommendations of how to accurately diagnose situations given the characteristics of the group members and of the task so they can respond appropriately (Northouse, 2004; Vroom & Jago, 2007). The “road map” that path-goal theory provides leaders to help them understand subordinate performance and

satisfaction is not unlike the guidance that Tannenbaum and Schmidt provide to managers regarding meeting the needs of their employees.

The successful manager of men can be primarily characterized neither as a strong leader nor as a permissive one. Rather he is one who maintains a high batting average in accurately assessing the forces that determine what his most appropriate behavior at any given time should be and in actually being able to behave accordingly (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958, p. 101).

The work of Mischel, Vroom, Jago and Yetton has produced some of the best empirical evidence of the success of situational/contingency theory in the context of leadership training (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Following a four-day training course using their normative model managers became more participatory in their style (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Placement. Contingency theory is also practical because it has high predictive value and thus provides some of the most useful information about what type of leadership will be most effective in a situation. Contingency theory is often seen as one of the most practical leadership theories because it acknowledges that not every person will be effective in every situation (Northouse, 2004; Ott, et al., 2008). For this reason, Northouse (2004) suggested that utilizing the LPC scores may be helpful in distinguishing how an individual may best be able to serve an organization. Contingency theory can be utilized to explain why one individual may possess traits typically associated with strong leaders but be ineffective in a particular situation (Northouse, 2004). Contingency theory can also predict whether a person in one position will be equally effective if moved to another position within an organization (Northouse, 2004). Contingency theory also may help supervisors understand the need to change the context of lower-level positions to create a better fit for a current manager (Northouse, 2004).

Limitations and Criticisms of Situational Theory

Situational and contingency approaches to leadership aptly address context and have been shown to have positive outcomes when used in coordination with leadership development, training and placement; however, situational theory is not without limitations. There are two main criticisms of contingency theory, which greatly limit its usefulness: (1) there exists a lack of validity and clarity demonstrated by associated theoretical models; and (2) the feasibility for practical application is low, especially regarding application in the higher education arena (Northouse, 2004; Bensimon, et al., 1989; Vroom, 1983; Bess & Goldman, 2001).

Issues of instrument validity and clarity of theory. The Hersey and Blanchard situational approach does not have an extensive body of empirical research and thus questions have emerged about the way in which they conceptualized certain aspects of leadership (Northouse, 2004). Some scholars doubt that the Hersey and Blanchard approach improves performance (Northouse, 2004). The situational approach model does not make it clear how group members move from low development levels to high development levels or how group member commitment changes over time (Northouse, 2004; Graeff, 1997). Northouse (2004) stated, “without the basic research findings, validity of the basic prescriptions for matching leader styles to subordinates’ development levels must be questioned” (p. 107). According to Graeff (1997), all versions of the Hersey and Blanchard situational approach lack a solid theoretical foundation of variable relationships in the model.

A substantially greater volume of research supports contingency theory as compared to the situational approach; however, it is not without criticism, either. Scholars have found fault with the commonly used LPC scale for its lack of surface and construct validity (Northouse, 2004; Ayman, Chemers & Fiedler, 1995). Fiedler made no attempt to directly measure the concept of situational favorableness (Rice & Katzenbaum, 1981). Rice and Katzenbaum stated that

the evidential validity of contingency theory would continue to be questioned unless “more direct and precise measures of situational favorableness are developed” (p. 384). Aymen, Chemers and Fielder (1995) further clarified some of the advantages and limitations of the LPC scale in the following statement:

The LPC scale is a measure whose history and approach creates unique advantages and disadvantages. As an indirect measure of values and/ or motivational orientation, it is less susceptible to demand characteristics or social desirability effects. On the other hand, the lack of a clear theoretic-deductive explanation makes the LPC construct appear mysterious and unscientific (p. 154).

Although Fiedler has provided evidence that supports the reliability of the instrument, scholars remain skeptical (Northouse, 2004). Similar to Fiedler’s contingency theory, path-goal theory has also been studied extensively; however, it has also only received moderate support concerning its validity (Northouse, 2004). There is contradictory evidence regarding the assertions of path-goal theory in terms of the relationship of leader directiveness, group member satisfaction and task difficulty (Northouse, 2004).

Lack of clarity created by gaps in explanations. The vague concepts associated with contingency theory and the situational approach makes empirical research more difficult and makes understanding and application of the model more challenging (Kezar, et al., 2006). In the Hersey and Blanchard *situational leadership model* the descriptions of subordinate development levels and of commitment are vague (Northouse, 2004). Hersey and Blanchard are criticized for not explaining well the theoretical basis for descriptions of changes within subordinate development levels and not expounding on how confidence and motivation combine to define commitment (Northouse, 2004). Likewise, Fiedler’s contingency theory has been criticized for failing to explain why some leadership styles are more effective than others in certain situations (Northouse, 2004).

Low feasibility for practical application. According to Kezar, et al. (2006), contingency theory is “difficult to translate into practice, given the numerous variables that must be assessed before determining a leader’s effectiveness” (p. 10). Some scholars have suggested that situational and contingency theories may not be as clearly applicable to higher education given the unique organization of institutions (Vroom, 1983; Bensimon, et al., 1989). In his review of Fiedler’s contingency model, House’s path-goal theory, Hersey and Blanchard’s life cycle theory and the Vroom and Yetton decision process theory, Vroom (1983) discovered contradictory recommendations regarding leadership for academic departments. For example, the models of Fielder and House recommend that institutions choose a task-oriented leader for the position of department chair, whereas, Hersey and Blanchard and Vroom-Yetton models indicate a delegating, participatory style is a better match for this role (Vroom 1983; Bensimon, et al., 1989).

Contradictory nature of situational leadership theoretical application in higher education. Northouse (2004) along with Bess and Goldman (2001) demonstrated further the contradictory nature of the application of situational theory in higher education in their assessments, which are inconsistent with Vroom’s (1983) recommendations. In opposition to Vroom’s aforementioned assessment, Northouse asserted House’s path-goal theory indicates the need for relationship-oriented behaviors on the part of an academic chair. Also in contradiction to Vroom’s collegial/participatory perspective, Bess and Goldman (2001) stated that the situational leadership approach indicates the need for a department chair with a task-oriented leadership style. Bess and Goldman suggested that department chairs who are appointed by higher-level administrators are more likely to examine the maturity of faculty in their department from a hierarchical perspective than those chairs who are elected by their peers (Bess &

Goldman, 2001). Consequently, the appointed chairs may see faculty as less mature and assume a style that is representative of one-way communication depicted by the “telling” style of the situational leadership model (Bess & Goldman, 2001).

Unlike the situational leadership approach that focuses on the department chair’s leadership behavior, Fiedler’s contingency theory suggests a department chair should change the job to meet his or her style by varying aspects of his or her position power, task structure, and leader–member relations (Bess & Goldman, 2001). Following this model, department chairs would likely focus on positional power given the movement toward the managerial approach in academia (Bess & Goldman, 2001). Under this model it is likely that chairs would increase task structure and less likely that they would emphasize increased member-relations (Bess & Goldman, 2001). The resulting situation is one of moderate control, which would mean that a person with a high LPC would be the best “match” for this scenario (Bess & Goldman, 2001). Given the move toward managerial approaches in higher education, it is likely that a person with a low LPC score would be hired for a chair position, however, resulting in a “mismatch” between the leader and the situation and less effective departmental leadership (Bess & Goldman, 2001).

As with the previous models discussed, path-goal theory is limited in its ability to identify or predict effective leaders within higher education (Bess & Goldman, 2001). The faculty structure does not adhere to Weberian forms of hierarchy, thus path-goal theory as utilized by department chairs is more likely to have an effect on job satisfaction than on motivation (Bess & Goldman, 2001)

. . . Chairs who seek to “clarify the path” leading to desired faculty goals will be hard-pressed to convince faculty that hard work on low status assignments will be worthwhile (Bess & Goldman, 2001, p. 437).

It is possible that chairs may have greater influence on the levels of expectancy of junior faculty than of senior faculty (Bess & Goldman, 2001). The role of department chair is most often temporary, which raises the question as to whether these leaders would have the ability to articulate goals that connect with group member values, a cornerstone of path-goal theory (Bess & Goldman, 2001). According to Bensimon, et al. (1989), the Vroom-Yetton decision process theory may be the theory best able to be utilized in higher education scenarios because it “uses multiple criteria to determine participative or autocratic decision-making” (p. 45).

Concluding Remarks about Situational Theory

Situational variables impact an organization’s effectiveness and influence a leader’s behavior (Vroom & Jago, 2007). For ensured leadership success, Fiedler (1970) suggested placing a leader in a situation that matches his or her style. If this is not possible, Fiedler suggested altering situational variables until a better match can be made (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Ott, et al., 2008). Other situational theorists have focused on leaders adapting their own styles to meet the needs of the situation (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

In general, situational approaches began to lose favor when leaders realized that “they would have to consult decision trees and wheel charts to find out how to behave” (Rost, 1991, p. 22). Furthermore, the list of situations that researchers have not studied is exhaustive. In addition to the two major limiting factors discussed in the prior section, there are other criticisms of situational leadership, especially as it is applied to higher education. The fact that organizational culture is not discussed as a variable in most of the prominent models is problematic given the significance of culture in terms of higher education. It is also concerning that situational leadership theories generally frame leadership in a hierarchical manner and seem to identify leaders as individuals with positional power. Situational theories do not embrace a definition of

leadership that is reflective of the collaborative nature of leadership in the twenty-first century, evident by the language of “subordinate” and “manager” that is utilized in both initial and updated theories. As scholars began to note the complexity of situational theories and their lack of emphasis on organizational change, a new paradigm of leadership began to emerge.

Change-Oriented Theories of Leadership

Overview of Change-Oriented Theories

Twenty-first century organizations are faced with constant demands to adjust to meet the needs of a rapidly changing environment. Given the increasing globalization of society, scholars began placing a greater emphasis on a new paradigm of leadership that focuses on transformation and change (Northouse, 2004). This new paradigm of leadership encompasses multiple leadership models; however, two of the most well known theories are transformational leadership theory and charismatic leadership theory (Northouse, 2004; Gil, Rico, Alcover & Barrasa, 2005; Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991). Some scholars have described charismatic leadership as an element of transformational leadership, rather than as a theory in its own right (Bass, 1998; Bass & Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2004; Kezar, et al., 2006), whereas others have asserted that charismatic and transformational leadership are synonymous or at least converging (Conger, 1999). Still others view the two theories as overlapping but distinct (Yukl, 1999). I address the two theories as distinct leadership approaches, but with similar models and influence dynamics.

Transformational leadership theory. Postindustrial leadership is characterized by relationships, transformation and change (Komives, et al., 2006; Dugan, 2006). The relationship aspect of postindustrial leadership is similar to the “democratic leader” defined in the Lewin, et al. (1939) study. One prominent postindustrial leadership style is characterized by transformational leadership theory (Dugan, 2006; Northouse, 2004). Introduced originally by

Burns in the late 1970s, transformational leadership involves a two-step process of influence (Levine, Muenchen & Brooks, 2010). In the first step, the leader raises the morals, values and ideals of his followers and in the second step, the leader influences change in individuals, groups and organizations (Levine, et al., 2010). At the time of its emergence, transformational leadership theory was viewed as innovative because it represented striking differences from transactional leadership, which was the premise of most leadership studies prior to the 1980s.

The primary difference in transactional and transformational leadership is that transactional leadership results in expected outcomes and transformational leadership results in exceeded expectations (Northouse, 2004).

Whereas the transactional theories of leadership apply primarily to leadership roles, functions and behavior within an existing organizational culture, transformative leadership is about leadership to change a culture. Transactional leadership focuses on incremental change; transformative leadership is about radical change (Ott, et al., 2008, p. 39).

Transformational leadership is a relational process of influence (Ott, et al., 2008; Levine, et al., 2010; Northouse, 2004). Transformational leaders view leadership as an opportunity to encourage others to commit to the goals of the group through sharing information and providing knowledge about the importance of the bigger picture (Rosener, 1990; Bolman & Deal, 2003). Transformational leadership is also a process concerned with change. According to Tierney (1993), change takes place through interaction of the individual with the organization or structure. Thus, those practicing transformational leadership acknowledge the impact and importance of emotions, values, ethics, standards, long-term goals, and followers' motives (Northouse, 2004). What is being done and who is doing it are equally significant to the overall outcome for the organization (Tierney, 2008; Schein, 1991).

Charismatic leadership theory. Charismatic leadership shares many similar elements with transformational leadership. Some scholars have defined charismatic leadership as an attribution based on followers' perception of a leader's behavior (Conger, 1999). Other scholars have described charismatic leadership as a process of moving organizational members forward by means of well-articulated strategic visions (Conger, 1999). Regardless of which model is used, most scholars agree that charisma focuses on emotion—in fact, charisma is sometimes defined as the emotions which result because of the interaction between leaders and followers (Kezar, et al., 2006).

Although charismatic leadership theory is relatively new, the idea emerged within the work of Max Weber in the early twentieth century (Eatwell, 2006). In his classification system, Weber identified three types of legitimacy and power. He named the first type “traditional”, which was associated with monarchies. He referred to the second type as “bureaucratic”, which was associated with political parties and democratic nations. Weber named the third type of power “charismatic.” He used this term to describe the “emergence of exceptional, radical leaders in times of crisis” (Eatwell, 2006, p. 141). In Weber's assessment, charismatic leaders provide inspiration for the creation of organizations—organizations that are then managed in either a traditional or bureaucratic manner (Bass & Bass, 2008). It is relevant that Weber's definition of charisma was taken from the theological concept of divine grace and thus reminiscent of the “great man” theories (Bass & Bass, 2008).

Rather than describing charisma as extraordinary individual characteristics, most scholars have identified certain attributes that charismatic leaders often embody (Levine, et al., 2010). Levine, et al. identified the following four attributes as those of a charismatic leader: (1) extraordinary gifts; (2) presence in a crisis; (3) ability to present radical solutions; and (4)

transcendent powers. Fisher (1984) suggested that the three conditions for charisma are distance, style and perceived self-confidence. Additionally, charismatic leaders typically articulate an organizational vision and mission, hold high performance expectations and demonstrate a high level of determination (Levine, et al., 2010). Given the description of individuals who possess charismatic leadership traits, it is not surprising that charismatic leaders often promote radical change within an organization (Conger, 1999).

Literature Review of Change-Oriented Theories

Even when narrowing the focus of change-oriented leadership to only encompass transformational and charismatic theories, there remains a plethora of models from which to choose. I have selected literature on three predominant models of transformational and charismatic leadership to represent the spectrum of models that exist. I chose these three models because of their historical significance within the field and because of their prevalence within the literature (Conger, 1999). In the following discussion, I focus on the House and Shamir integrative theory of charismatic leadership, the Conger and Kanungo behavioral model of charismatic leadership and the Bass and Avolio model of transformational leadership.

House and Shamir integrative theory of charismatic leadership. Robert House is recognized as publishing some of the initial research on charismatic leadership (Northouse, 2004). Although much of his work has been criticized for its theoretical shortcomings, it remains significant for two main reasons. First, it provides a framework and foundation for future scholarly works in the area and second, the model incorporates leader behaviors as well as dispositional attributes, follower effects, and situational variables. (Conger, 1999). According to House and Baetz (1979) to meet the qualifications of a “leadership behavior” the action must be

perceived as an influence effort and subsequently the influence effort must be judged as acceptable (House & Baetz, 1979, p. 345).

House's original model included the components of idealized influence, inspirational leadership and intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1998). House labeled a leader "charismatic" if that person inspires trust from his followers, leader identification and unquestioned obedience as well as provokes acceptance, emotional involvement with the organization's mission, elevated goals, self-efficacy and collective efficacy (Bass & Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2004). House also described several personal characteristics held by charismatic leaders including self-confidence, a desire to influence others, a dominant nature and a strong sense of one's moral beliefs (Northouse, 2004).

As House's original model has been revised through the years, some significant new research has emerged. In 1993 Shamir, House and Arthur found that charismatic leaders have a transformative effect on followers' self-concepts and their identity in relationship to the shared identity of the organization (Northouse, 2004). Charismatic leaders therefore achieve success by emphasizing intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards (Northouse, 2004) and by focusing on connecting followers' self-concept to the mission and values of the organization (Bass & Bass, 2008).

The Shamir, et al. expansion of the original House model demonstrates that there is a shift occurring from viewing charismatic leadership as a dyadic process to one that is perceived as a collective process (Conger, 1999). Compared to non-charismatic leaders, charismatic leaders make more references to values, distal goals and history and tend to make more positive comments about their followers, as well as hold higher expectations for themselves and their followers (Bass & Bass, 2008). The Shamir, et al. model also highlights the shared nature of the

influence process in which the leader chooses a vision that is aligned with the followers' beliefs and similarly, followers select a leader who represents their core values (Conger, 1999).

Conger and Kanungo behavioral model of charismatic leadership. The Conger and Kanungo model of charismatic leadership states that charismatic leadership is an acknowledgement based on followers' perceptions of a leader's behavior (Conger, Kanungo & Menon, 2000). Conger & Kanungo (1987) called charismatic leadership an "attributional phenomenon" and emphasized that it is a process that can be explained within the context of a behavioral framework (p. 639). Charismatic leadership is not an acknowledgement made because of formal position; rather it is due to the behavior a person exhibits (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Conger, et al., 2000).

In the Conger & Kanungo model, there are three primary stages. Stage one is the *environmental assessment stage* in which charismatic leaders are distinguished from other leaders along the following two dimensions: (1) the followers believe the leader has a desire to change the status quo and (2) the leader has an understanding of environmental opportunities, constraints and the needs of the followers (Conger & Kanungo, 2000). In stage two, the *vision formulation stage*, the charismatic leader articulates a vision for the future that meets the needs of the followers and provides inspiration for the group. Stage three is the *implementation stage* during which leaders participate in extraordinary acts that are perceived by followers to be both selfless and risky in nature.

In addition to the three stages, there are five behavioral dimensions included in this model of charismatic leadership. They are: (1) sensitivity to environmental context; (2) strategic vision and articulation; (3) sensitivity to member needs; (4) personal risk and (5) unconventional behavior (Nandal & Krishnan, 2000). Similar to Shamir and associates, Bass and Bass (2008)

stated that one of the most critical elements of charismatic leadership is the desire by followers to identify with the leader. The “emotionally-driven” relationship of charismatic leadership must concede to a rationally driven one in order for it to endure (Bass & Bass, 2008).

Conger and Kanungo (2000) identified three follower effects to which charismatic leadership is positively related: (1) leader reverence; (2) follower collective identity and (3) follower perceptions of group performance. In contrast to Shamir, House, Bass and Avolio, the Conger and Kanungo model supports a scenario in which the vision of the charismatic leader may be created based on opportunities in the external environment and followers’ needs may be considered only in the aftermath of the vision formulation (Conger, 1999). The Conger and Kanungo model is the most widely used model of charismatic leadership today.

Bass and Avolio model of transformational leadership. James McGregor Burns’ book *Leadership*, published in the late 1970s, is the seminal work in regard to transformational leadership across disciplines, although his work focused primarily on political leadership (Northouse, 2004). Burns categorized leadership as either transactional or transformational, articulating that a leader’s success relied in large part on his understanding of the relationship dynamics with his followers (Northouse, 2004). Burns (1978) defined leadership in the following manner:

I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations...of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers’ values and motivations” (p. 100).

Further explaining this perspective, Northouse (2004) called transformational leadership a process that works to “raise the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (p. 170).

In the mid-1980s, Bass-- and then later in the 1990s Bass and Avolio-- built upon the foundation that Burns had laid with his concept of transformational leadership (Conger, 1999). Their model is considered to be conceptually better than the model Burns described (Conger, 1999). The most notable difference between the two models is that Burns conceptualized transformational and transactional leadership as two ends of the same spectrum, whereas Bass and Avolio categorized them separately (Conger, 1999). This is a significant distinction because in the Bass and Avolio model a leader can demonstrate both transformational and transactional behaviors (Conger, 1999).

Similar to Burns, Bass believed that transformational leadership was about raising the motivation level of followers. According to Bass, the following three leadership processes result in followers doing more than expected: (1) leaders raise followers' understanding about the significance of goals and values behind them; (2) leaders encourage followers to look beyond their own self-interest and toward the collective good of the organization or team; and (3) leaders meet followers' higher-order needs (Northouse, 2004; Conger, 1999). The Bass/Avolio model of transformational leadership includes seven different factors (Northouse, 2004). The four transformational factors identified by the model are charisma/idealized influence, inspirational influence, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Northouse, 2004).

Whereas transformational leadership focuses on the personal development of followers and their individualized needs, transactional leadership involves leaders making exchanges to achieve mutual satisfaction (Northouse, 2004). In the Bass and Avolio model, the factors relating to transactional leadership are contingent award and management-by-exception, which include negative reinforcement and criticism (Northouse, 2004). Bass and Avolio also acknowledged a seventh and final factor that falls neither under the umbrella of transformational or transactional

leadership. They gave the name “laissez-faire leadership” to those actions of people in positions of power that reflect an absence of leadership (Northouse, 2004).

Similarities between transformational and charismatic leadership. There is considerable overlap in concepts of the three dominant models of transformational and charismatic leadership (House and Shamir, Conger and Kanungo, Bass and Avolio) (Conger, 1999). According to Conger and Kanungo (1999) the following nine components are shared among the theories: (1) vision; (2) inspiration; (3) role modeling; (4) intellectual stimulation; (5) meaning-making; (6) appeals to higher-order needs; (7) empowerment; (8) setting high expectations; and (9) fostering collective identity. A common theme of transformational and charismatic leadership models is empowerment. Both theories are represented as empowerment processes, driven by vision creation that focuses on motivating and inspiring followers to exceed expectations.

Differences between transformational and charismatic leadership. Even within the context of such similarities, there do exist differences between transformational and charismatic leadership. In the Conger and Kanungo model, followers are influenced by their perceptions of a leader’s extraordinary qualities (Conger, 1999). The research of Bass, Avolio, Shamir, House, and associates focused greater attention on actual leader behavior as the primary influence of follower perception. The work of Bass and Avolio focused on a leader’s ability to articulate and make appealing the organizational mission and vision to followers and how the leader’s communication meets followers’ higher-order needs. Similarly, the research conclusions of Shamir and associates asserted that it is how a leader frames a mission in the context of the organization’s values and the established, collective identity that matters and not one’s extraordinary qualities (Conger, 1999). The models also differ in the level of discussion of

followers' attitudes and effects; environmental assessment and stage definition; leadership strategy; and impression management and image building.

There are also other areas in which transformational and charismatic leadership theories diverge. Transformational leaders are most often associated with a servant leadership style, whereas charismatic leaders are often associated with heroic leadership, and even sometimes compared to the "great man" theories (Conger, 1999; Bass & Steindlmeier, 1999). Subsequently, a transformational leadership paradigm is more likely to emphasize shared, reciprocal power whereas a charismatic leadership paradigm stresses individual control, positional power and the vision of leaders in hierarchical positions of power.

Practical application of transformational and charismatic leadership theory. New paradigm, change-oriented leadership theories differ from earlier theories in that they do not detail a specific set of assumptions about how a leader should behave in order to be successful (Northouse, 2004). Instead, change-oriented leadership theories provide a "general way of thinking about leadership that emphasizes ideals, inspiration, innovations and individual concerns" (Northouse, 2004, p. 188). The change-oriented models are a shift from traditional, twentieth-century leadership and begin a movement toward collective/shared leadership that focuses on transforming organizations and that distinctly separates leadership from management.

Training and development. The influence of transformational leadership and charismatic leadership is beginning to emerge in training and development programs for employees across many fields. An emphasis on organizational and individual goals that are a result of vision-building exercises and that manifest themselves in organizational and personal vision statements reflect change-oriented leadership development methods (Northouse, 2004). The transformational leadership tenets of individual consideration and intellectual consideration

toward followers are also common topics of discussion during training programs today. (Northouse, 2004). Change-oriented theories are also starting to be discussed and taught more in training programs for senior-level and mid-level managers because research shows that transformational leadership improves measures of motivation, morality and empowerment among direct followers and also positively impacts performance of indirect followers (Dvir, Eden, Avolio & Shamir, 2002). Additionally, the positive impact of transformational leadership works to reduce or eliminate followers' feelings of demoralization (Dvir, et al., 2002). According to Northouse (2004), in addition to training and development, transformational and charismatic leadership theories are highly utilized by companies in recruitment, selection and promotion.

Organizational change. Along with capacity for individual influence, change-oriented leadership models are popular because of their potential to create substantial organizational outcomes (Eisenbach, Watson & Pillai, 1999). Change-oriented leadership theories are significant because they can be effectively utilized to make changes to the status quo. There is evidence that charismatic and transformational leaders can be successful at making meaningful, substantial change in their organizations by accurately assessing the state of the organization and knowing when to exhibit appropriate behaviors within the transformation process (Eisenbach, et al., 1999). Whereas the previously discussed leadership models and theories have emphasized individual performance and satisfaction, as well as meeting expectations and maintenance of the status quo, change-oriented leadership is more about long-lasting, cultural and social changes made deep within the organization. Conger (1999) described charismatic leaders as “reformers” and “entrepreneurs”.

Higher education context. Given the structure, ambiguity of goals, tenure process and award system of higher education it is understandable why many scholars argue that colleges and

universities embrace leadership styles that are more transactional than transformational in nature (Bensimon, et al., 1989; Kezar, et al., 2006). Bensimon, et al. (1989) suggested that it is difficult for colleges to successfully engage in transformational leadership practices except (1) during an institutional crisis; (2) in the setting of a small institution where one leader can have a substantial influence or (3) when an institution is seeking to become comparable with institutions in a higher tier. The descriptions, however, of successful leaders in higher education often have multiple transformational or charismatic components (Bensimon, et al., 1989).

It is evident that there is still not a clear consensus about the use and effectiveness of transformational and charismatic leadership in the context of higher education. Bensimon, et al. (1989) asserted that transaction theory is more widely utilized by college presidents. They concurred that presidents maintain power by controlling access to information, controlling finances and resource allocation and staying involved with faculty and administrative appointments. Research also shows that deans may more commonly gravitate toward transactional styles of leadership in large part because the hierarchical structure, reward system and tenure process more readily lend them to this style of leadership (Gmlech & Wolverton, 2002). Conversely, Fisher (1984) suggested that in the case of college and university presidents, charismatic leadership may be critical for success because the goals and vision of a president may be as significant as what he actually achieves. Fisher (1984) wrote about the importance of articulating vision, mission and cause in describing the charismatic presidency. In Fisher's assessment, the charismatic and transformational aspects of leadership that focuses on inspiration are essential for the success of most presidencies. Fisher (1984) called charisma the "single most effective form of influence" and relayed that those who can learn to use charismatic leadership ethically and effectively can win followers who are loyal and supportive (p. 39).

The current perspective is that both transformational and transactional leadership have a place in higher education. Although transactional leadership may be utilized more than transformational forms of leadership in many areas of higher education, there is evidence that suggests that a combination of transactional and transformational styles might be most effective, whether in the academic or student services realm (Kezar, et al., 2006). It seems clear that the type of institution and other situational factors significantly influence the success of transformational and charismatic leadership (Gmelch & Wolverson, 2002). Transformational leadership seems most effective in situations that center on issues of equity, diversity, assessment and technology (Kezar, et al., 2006). According to Kezar, et al. (2006), transformational leadership results in higher morale and satisfaction of faculty and staff whereas transactional leadership builds organizational infrastructure, capacity and resources. Both are necessary for an organization to function.

Limitations and Criticisms of Change-Oriented Theories

As part of the new paradigm of leadership, transformational and charismatic leadership are two of the most frequently discussed leadership theories in the twenty-first century. Although these theories come as a response to a changing society and are in many ways cutting-edge in their frameworks, there are also limitations to these theories. There are three main criticisms of transformational and charismatic theories, which greatly limit their usefulness: (1) there is a lack of validity and conceptual clarity demonstrated by associated theoretical models; (2) each theory has heroic, trait-based tendencies and elements of elitism, focusing primarily on formal leadership; and (3) each theory has great potential for abuse.

Lack of validity and conceptual clarity. It is difficult to define parameters of either transformational leadership or charismatic leadership because these theories encompass such a

broad range of behaviors (Northouse, 2004). Some question the construct validity of the transformational leadership behaviors (i.e. individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation and idealized influence) because of the diverse components of each and the overlapping content that make definitions ambiguous at best (Yukl, 1999). In a similar fashion, there is elusiveness centering on behaviors associated with charismatic leadership; however, this stems primarily from the disagreement of essential behaviors between dominant theories (Yukl, 1999). In addition, criticism exists because transformational leadership and charismatic leadership are often treated synonymously, although they are represented as distinct theories as well (Northouse, 2004).

A great deal of ambiguity exists regarding the influence processes and behaviors associated with transformational and charismatic leadership (Yukl, 1999; Kezar, et al., 2006). The ambiguity stems in part from vague descriptions of the influence processes and could be strengthened if theorists explained the effect of said processes on leader behavior and how that behavior affects the mediating variables, especially as defined in transformational theory (Yukl, 1999). As discussed previously, in regard to charismatic leadership theory, there is much disagreement as to which influence process is most significant in terms of leadership success (Yukl, 1999). According to Yukl, both transformational and charismatic leadership theories suffer from an overemphasis on dyadic processes, ignoring the significant and relevant issues of leader influence on organizations and collective group mentality.

The validity of transformational leadership, as well as charismatic leadership, has been questioned (Northouse, 2004; Kezar, et al., 2006). Specifically, scholars have discussed the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ), which is the instrument that has been primarily used for decades to measure transformational leadership (or more specifically the leadership

style of the respondent) (Northouse, 2004; Levine, et al., 2010). Researchers have found that the factors of transformational leadership described by this tool correlate with each other and with factors of transactional and laissez-faire leaders, thus raising questions about the validity of the MLQ (Northouse, 2004). In a similar fashion, the Conger and Kanungo scale to measure charisma has been called “ambiguous” and “redundant” (Levine, et al., 2010, p. 581).

Transformational and charismatic leadership as heroic, trait-based and elitist. Some models of transformational and charismatic leadership focus more on leader behavior, whereas other models focus more on follower behavior and perception. Regardless of the emphasis; however, transformational and charismatic leadership models typically discuss leaders as individuals who exhibit certain qualities that enable them to motivate followers to achieve extraordinary results (Northouse, 2004). The focus on the leader and his or her traits as determining factors of the outcomes of a situation is aligned with heroic and trait-based leadership and fails to acknowledge the concept of collective or shared leadership (Northouse, 2004; Yukl, 1999). Yukl described well the heroic premise in terms of transformational leadership:

In most versions of transformational leadership theory, it is a basic postulate that an effective leader will influence followers to make self-sacrifices and exert exceptional effort. Influence is unidirectional, and it flows from the leader to the follower. When a correlation is found between transformational leadership and subordinate commitment or performance, the results are interpreted as showing that the leader influenced subordinates to perform better. (p. 292).

The identification of new paradigm leadership theories with trait-based and heroic approaches is potentially problematic because it does not incorporate the shared-leadership philosophy that has grown in popularity over the last several decades (Yukl, 1999; Northouse, 2004). According to Kezar, et al. (2006) transformational leadership “perpetuates directive and hierarchical views of leadership” (p. 10). Transformational and charismatic leadership when

resembling heroic leadership returns to the idea that one person is responsible for the success of an organization, rather than making the responsibility collective and shared. Framing the new paradigm of leadership in this way also suggests that the formal leader is putting his needs above the needs of his followers and of the organization, meaning that the self-sacrifice of the leader in order to make change is not genuine, but rather a façade created to achieve self-serving outcomes (Northouse, 2004). Some scholars have argued that transformational leadership is elitist in nature because it is non-democratic, although leading researchers on the topic have stated that transformational leaders can be directive and participative, as well as democratic and authoritarian (Northouse, 2004).

Potential for abuse. A final limitation of transformational and charismatic leadership is their potential for abuse. Both theories center on creating change and moving people toward a vision, but how an organization's values are determined, whose values are used to dictate change and who is responsible for creating the vision say a lot about the nature of the leadership (Northouse, 2004). Northouse (2004) states "history is full of examples of charismatic individuals who used coercive power to lead people to evil ends" (p. 187). The question of abuse seems to center on whether or not the transformational or charismatic leader's approach is ethical and motivation is genuinely in the best interest of the organization.

Concluding Remarks about Change-Oriented Theories

According to recent research, transformational and charismatic leadership positively influence follower motivation, performance and satisfaction (Kark, Shamir & Chen, 2003; Dvir, et al., 2002; Kezar, et al., 2006). Prior to the last two decades, researchers have studied leadership almost exclusively in terms of "task-oriented" and "relationship-oriented" behaviors and traits, with the focus on organizational outcomes. As scholars began to look at how leaders

initiated and implemented change, it became evident that “change-oriented” leadership was its own distinct behavior and support for a three-metacategory model emerged (Yukl, Gordon & Taber, 2002). Yukl, Gordon and Taber (2002) suggested that three independent dimensions (task, relationship and change-oriented), rather than mutually exclusive categories of behavior, are more appropriate when discussing leadership behaviors. This expanded model became relevant because twenty-first century leadership made a shift from focusing strictly on organizational outcomes to focusing on leadership as a process, showing concern for all members and defining success as achieving socially desirable ends (Kezar, et al., 2006).

As indicated previously, scholars still investigate how change-oriented theories of leadership impact organizational outcomes, but the goals of leadership are broader in a twenty-first century perspective. Earlier leadership theories focused on outcomes but almost exclusively on the outcomes of organizational effectiveness and performance. Although effectiveness may be socially desirable, in transformational leadership moral ends (such as equity) often take prominence over purely functional objectives (Kezar, et al., 2006, p. 35).

Change-oriented leadership research is credited with bringing to the forefront multiple new concepts to the field of leadership studies that have altered the way in which leadership is considered, discussed and practiced (Kezar, et al., 2006). Charismatic and transformational leadership theories are two of the theories that have been recognized as having benefits and outcomes that are cross-cultural in nature (Judge, Woolf, Hurst & Livingston, 2006). Certainly, the perspective that change-oriented leadership is to be revered as the quintessential leadership approach is not universal. Bensimon, et al. (1989) included this description of charisma from a commentary in the *Wall Street Journal*: “...charisma becomes the undoing of leaders. It makes them inflexible, convinced of their own infallibility, unable to change” (p. 38).

In many ways change-oriented leadership is progressive, focusing on ethics, social change and empowerment; however, transformational and charismatic leadership theories still place emphasis on leader behavior and makes clear differentiation between “leaders” and “followers” (Kezar, et al., 2006). Although charismatic and transformational leadership definitions reflect leadership as a “process”, as theories they continue to be based upon hierarchical and trait-based concepts (Kezar, et al., 2006). It is the focus on hierarchy and power that led Rost (1991) to criticize transformational and charismatic leadership scholars of the 1980s saying that they were “trivializing” the concept. He called change-oriented theories that emerged during this time “one-fourth (if that much) of what transformational leadership is all about” and essentially disregarded the concept of charismatic leadership as a change-oriented style of leadership in its own right (p. 88).

Two Contrasting Paradigms

In the review of trait, behavioral, situational and change-oriented theoretical approaches, certain characteristics of industrial and postindustrial paradigms have emerged. Most scholars associate change-oriented theories with postindustrial characteristics, but as evident from Rost’s remarks, not all scholars agree that change-oriented theories reflect the postindustrial paradigm. Conversely, if looking closely at the characteristics of industrial and postindustrial paradigms, one can see elements of both in each of the four theoretical approaches described. In the following sections, I outline the two paradigms and the influence of each on leadership development.

Industrial Leadership Paradigm

The industrial paradigm is what has guided society’s view of leadership for most of the twentieth century. Industrial leadership places an emphasis on power and authority, individual

behavior and traits, and a focus on the leader as manager (Rost, 1991). Within the realm of the industrial paradigm, the term *leadership* is synonymous with “good management” (Rost, 1993, p. 97). The term “good” in this context means “effective” (Rost, 1993, p. 97). Rost suggested that in the industrial paradigm there is no such thing as “bad leadership”—rather, leadership is always good (i.e. effective). Rost (1991) explained the traditional perspective of industrial leadership in the following manner:

Leadership is great men and women with certain preferred traits influencing followers to do what the leaders wish in order to achieve group/organizational goals that reflect excellence defined as some kind of higher-level effectiveness (p. 180)

As depicted in Rost’s definition, the industrial paradigm conceptualizes leadership as a set of characteristics or properties that a person possesses (Northouse, 2004). This idea is tied to trait leadership theory. As discussed earlier in the chapter, the original trait leadership model emerged from the “heroic” leadership models of the early twentieth century and promotes the idea that leadership “resides in select people” and “restricts leadership to only those who are believed to have special, usually inborn, talents” (Northouse, 2004, p. 4). The core industrial leadership principles are easily found within the foundational elements of trait and skill approaches.

Industrial leadership also focuses on an individual’s attributes as they relate to effective, top-down management and the achievement of organizational goals. In addition to only certain people possessing the traits necessary for effective leadership in the industrial paradigm, the “leader” of an organization is almost always associated with a formal position with accompanying title and power. The trait, behavioral, situational and change-oriented leadership theories discussed in this chapter, which are also the theories often utilized as a framework for leadership development programming, reflect a leader-centered philosophy. Each of these

theories use terms such as “followers,” and “subordinates” in a way that suggests that leadership belongs to those who are in a formal position within a hierarchy and to no one else.

The theories discussed in this chapter refer to leadership in terms of behaviors, traits and skills. Even the theories that are included under the umbrella of change-oriented leadership reference leadership in terms of traits and positional power. Coercive behaviors have also been identified as a part of trait, behavioral and situational leadership strategies, especially. With the exception of transformational leadership and some aspects of charismatic leadership models, the theories discussed also focus on the leader’s wishes without regard to the desires of the “followers”. Given all of the aforementioned facts, it is evident that the theories as outlined in this chapter align with the industrial paradigm of leadership more so than the postindustrial paradigm of leadership, although each theory contains elements of the postindustrial paradigm or a foreshadowing of its characteristics.

Postindustrial Leadership Paradigm

Representing a distinct contrast to the industrial leadership paradigm, the postindustrial leadership paradigm emphasizes a twenty-first century model of leadership that is collaborative, is relational, is multidirectional in influence, and seeks meaningful change while recognizing the importance of context (Rost, 1993; Astin & Astin, 2000). The premise of leadership as an inclusive process is a relatively new concept. Defining leadership as a “process” focuses on learned behavior exhibited within the context of a situation or a relationship and, as a result, makes leadership accessible to everyone—a very different approach than that of the trait philosophies of the industrial paradigm that emphasize specific leader characteristics in the context of top-down hierarchies (Northouse, 2004; Rost, 1993). Rost (1993) suggested the following definition to describe twenty-first century leadership:

Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes (p. 99).

In the following discussion, I examine each of the four elements of this definition.

Relationship based on influence. Rost (1993) stated that if leadership is a process based on influence then it must be multidirectional and noncoercive. Both of these assumptions are significant because they demonstrate a shift from the industrial perspective that limits influence to the very few at the top of an organization's hierarchy to a more horizontal or "flat" view of leadership. The postindustrial perspective also champions shared power, seeing the industrial paradigm's focus on authority and power as oppressive (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). In fact, postindustrial leadership scholars have often claimed that, historically, leadership has been a "tool of social control" (Kezar & Carducci, 2009, p. 7).

Relationship among leaders and their collaborators. The postindustrial perspective acknowledges that anyone in an organization can be a leader and thus the influence flows in many different directions. There is significance in the language that has been used by industrial versus postindustrial leadership scholars. In a majority of this chapter, research has been discussed that uses the language of "followers", "managers", and "subordinates". Twenty-first century leadership theorists have argued that the aforementioned words reflect the negative aspects of the industrial paradigm and thus choose to use more inclusive terms such as "collaborators", that dictate the values of the new paradigm of leadership (Rost, 1993; Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

I use the word collaborators when I write about leadership in the postindustrial paradigm...The reason for the change is the unanimous feedback I received from numerous professionals throughout the nation...that followers as a concept is unacceptable in the new paradigm and no amount of reconstruction is going to salvage the word (p.109).

Rost concluded that there is no such thing as followership and that all people within an organization should be participating in the leadership process. This is not to say; however, that everyone will be equal with their influence, but that is to be expected because not all leadership relationships look the same (Rost, 1993).

Relationships are fostered that intend real change. Kezar and Carducci (2009) stated that the “emphasis of revolutionary leadership is learning, empowerment and change” (p. 6). Likewise, Rost (1991, 1993) focused on change as a central element of postindustrial leadership. Rost (1993) was careful to emphasize the word “intend” in his definition. He said the change that leaders and collaborators work toward should be purposeful, but the outcome of leadership revolves around the intention of substantive change, not whether or not the change occurs (1993). Postindustrial leadership is messy and differs from industrial leadership descriptions of good management in which “good” means effective. Leadership in the postindustrial paradigm is not always effective. “...Leadership does happen when leaders and collaborators attempt change but fail” (Rost, 1993, p. 100).

The intended changes reflect the mutual purposes of the relationship. The change that leaders and collaborators attempt to make must be agreed upon mutually and not a result of coercion by a person in a position of authority (Rost, 1993). This part of Rost’s definition of twenty-first century leadership also points to the assumption that leadership involves values, which conflicts with the value-neutral frame of the industrial perspective of leadership (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). The collaborative nature of decision-making and the emphasis on change indicates that personal values, as well as organizational values, will have to be considered in the leadership process (Kezar & Carducci, 2009).

The four distinct elements emphasized in Rost's definition of twenty-first century leadership represent well the thoughts of postindustrial leadership scholars regarding the fundamentals of the leadership process. Kezar & Carducci (2009) also laid out a comparison between "then" and "now" in the revolution of leadership research, which mirror the industrial and postindustrial elements emphasized by Rost and Smith. The revolution in leadership research and the shift from an industrial leadership perspective to a postindustrial leadership perspective has great implications for higher education, especially in the realm of leadership development.

Leadership Development in a Postindustrial Paradigm

Key principles for effective leadership. Although most scholars would agree that leadership is no longer defined solely by specific traits or skills a person possesses, there are some organizational principles and individual qualities that are linked to successful leadership practices and outcomes (although what "success" means is highly debatable). Leadership practices are often discussed from either an organizational perspective or an individual perspective. Key *organizational* principles for effective leadership include ideas that reflect collaboration and a multidirectional perspective of power as well as communication, respect and a common purpose (Astin & Astin, 2000; Tierney, 1999; Kezar & Lester, 2009; Kezar & Carducci, 2009). *Individual* qualities and values that contribute to effective leadership practices include self-awareness, integrity, competence, commitment and the ability to empathize (Astin & Astin, 2000, Fincher, 2003; Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Bryman, 2007). From an individual as well as an organizational perspective, the significance of sensitivity to culture and context, commitment to social change, and the acceptance of complexity and chaos has also been cited as contributing to successful leadership outcomes (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Tierney, 1999).

It is important to note that the discussion of “qualities” in the context of effective leadership practices is remarkably different than the ideas put forth by trait leadership theories. Not all individuals practicing effective leadership exhibit the aforementioned qualities, and not all people who exhibit these qualities are leaders. Research has shown, however, that these are qualities that are often demonstrated by individuals in situations in which effective leadership is occurring (Astin & Astin, 2000). It is perplexing that the previously discussed principles and qualities are those recognized by many higher education scholars as favorably impacting leadership practices in the twenty-first century; however, they are not the practices that are traditionally emphasized by colleges and universities in their leadership development initiatives, nor are they those that are represented by the organizational design of institutions.

An industrial leadership approach in postindustrial organizations. In chapter one, I discussed the traditional leadership assumptions that are frequently used by organizations to train their leaders, including institutions of higher education. These assumptions, as outlined by Kezar and Carducci (2009), reflect what Rost defines as the industrial perspective of leadership. If leadership development programs are largely based on the industrial leadership paradigm, yet leadership is viewed as a relational process of influence and change, there are inconsistencies that would seemingly cause tension if not reconciled (Rost, 1993). Kezar and Carducci (2009) put forward the following suggestion regarding the inconsistent nature of using industrial leadership training programs in the twenty-first century:

Rather than continuing to sponsor programs that target positional leaders who operate from a values-neutral, top-down, and context-free leadership paradigm, revolutionary leadership educators should expand their target audience and engage individuals from across the organization as a means of fostering leadership environments that value and enact collaboration, empowerment, learning and social responsibility (Kezar & Carducci, 2009, p. 8).

Likewise, Rost (1993) called for a reconstruction of leadership development programming that currently uses models focused on specific traits, skills and behaviors without elements of postindustrial leadership approaches.

Leader development versus leadership development. The leadership development programming that exists is rarely sufficient to develop leaders for the twenty-first century (Rost, 1993). In chapter one, I discussed the difference between *leader* development *leadership* development. This difference is especially significant when looking at the dissimilarity of the industrial and postindustrial paradigms. It is a difference of developing social capital verses human capital (Day, 2001). *Leader* development focuses on the enhancement of individual abilities. *Leadership* development emphasizes interpersonal competence, relationships and mutual trust (Day, 2001).

According to Rost (1993) *leader* development can be associated with the “Lone Ranger” or “John Wayne” view of leadership that gives the authority, power and privileges to one great man or woman who, because of inborn traits and extraordinary skills, produces unimaginable feats (p. 102). Rost (1991, 993), Day (2001) and Kezar and Carducci (2009) have called for *leadership* development because they believe that in the twenty-first century leadership is not about the actions of one leader but rather what leaders and collaborators do together to create meaningful change. Given this fact, Rost (1993) called the approach that focuses on the development of leaders “inadequate” and “counterproductive” (p. 101).

We have to develop people who want to engage in leadership as collaborators or leaders or both (since leaders and collaborators will change places frequently in the new paradigm); people who want to work collaboratively with other people to change organizations, communities, and our society; people who want to work in teams to institute change that reflects the mutual purposes of the team members (Rost, 1993, p. 101-102).

Leader development grounded in theory. Of the four broad theories discussed in this chapter, change-oriented leadership is most often described as having postindustrial leadership characteristics; however, the theories that fit under this umbrella often have equally as many industrial leadership characteristics as do the other three theories. Transformational and charismatic leadership, for example, continue to use very trait and behavior-centered philosophies that focus on the positional leader as the person of influence. It is evident that although scholars have suggested that leadership in the twenty-first century should be a process-oriented phenomenon, grounded in context and organizationally specific, leadership development programs in higher education continue to emphasize traits, skills, behaviors and formal authority (Kezar, et al., 2006). If the postindustrial paradigm frames leadership as a socially constructed phenomenon--which means that it includes the influence of perceptions, interpretations, context, culture, subjective experiences and the process of meaning-making on leadership practices--then approaching the idea of leadership as something that can be taught as a universal truth or as a possession of an individual seems flawed (Kezar & Carducci, 2009, p. 6). It is this type of industrial approach to *leader* development that is often seen in contemporary organizations—including institutions of higher education.

Kezar and Carducci (2009) stated that leadership should be seen as a “highly complex and ambiguous process shaped by interpersonal interactions and the cultural and social norms of particular contexts” (p. 6). When viewed in this manner, research has demonstrated that the leadership process is successful at empowering marginalized groups of people, transforming organizations and making strides in endeavors for social justice and change (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). The question becomes, then, how do organizations change their training and development processes to include postindustrial paradigm ideas?

Revolutionary leadership development and principles for program implementation.

Kezar, et al. (2006), Kezar & Carducci (2009) and Rost (1993) laid out some suggestions in response to the previously posed question. Kezar and Carducci (2009) summarized well the main tenets of revolutionary leadership development concepts, which are: (1) promote individual and organizational learning; (2) embrace complexity and chaos; (3) recognize leadership as a collaborative process that often occurs in team environment; (4) demonstrate sensitivity to culture and context; (5) foster an appreciation for the role emotions play in leadership; (6) empower historically marginalized individuals and foster social change; and (7) acknowledge the impact of globalization. Leadership scholars have suggested that trainers at colleges and universities develop curricula that reflect these revolutionary concepts to most effectively prepare people to respond to the ever-changing nature of twenty-first century organizations.

Several scholars have outlined practical ways in which to design leadership development while taking into account the aforementioned assumptions. The following are suggestions of principles to be utilized when developing postindustrial leadership programming: (1) expand program time frames (Kezar & Carducci, 2009); (2) balance reflection with action (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Kezar, et al., 2006); (3) promote interdependence, collaboration and develop people to work in noncoercive relationships (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Rost, 1993; Kezar, et al., 2006); (4) situate leadership in context (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Rost, 1993; Kezar, et al., 2006); (5) emphasize values (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Kezar, et al., 2006); (6) stop concentrating on the leader (Rost, 1993; Kezar, et al., 2006); (7) frame leadership as an episodic affair (Rost, 1993); (8) train people to use influence (Rost, 1993); and (9) create understanding about what entails transformational change (Rost, 1993). These nine suggestions are certainly not exclusive, but this is a comprehensive list based on literature of ways in which organizations can

begin changing their leadership development processes to be more aligned with postindustrial leadership perspectives.

The Influence of Culture on Leadership

When discussing industrial and postindustrial leadership approaches in terms of leadership development in higher education, it is necessary to acknowledge the role of institutional culture. According to Tierney (1988),

An organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it. It concerns decisions, actions, and communication both on an instrumental and symbolic level (p. 3).

Furthermore, culture is reflected in the shared assumptions of members of an organization (Tierney, 1988).

There are certain aspects of higher education culture, in general, that influences leadership development programming, as discussed previously in this chapter; however, the specific campus culture is also significant. A campus-based leadership development program is often developed at least in part by administrators from that campus and thus the curriculum will reflect the cultural perspective of leadership at that institution (whether is it hierarchical, collaborative, etc.). When looking at whether institutions and their administrators promote revolutionary leadership development in practice, one must examine closely whether the culture of the institution will easily allow for this type of leadership development.

Some studies have demonstrated that there is a relationship between institutional culture and change (Kezar, 2002). This finding is significant when discussing leadership development using a postindustrial and industrial framework because one of the core elements of the postindustrial paradigm is change. Using the findings from three case studies, Kezar (2002) argued that it is problematic to promote change strategies as universal principles without

considering the relationship of culture to change. Kezar also suggested that there is a relationship between institutional cultural archetypes and distinct campus culture and the way the change process occurs. She concluded her study stating that change strategies are “most successful if they are culturally coherent or aligned with the culture” (p. 457). This conclusion may indicate why some institutions use leadership approaches more aligned with an industrial or postindustrial paradigm. Kezar (2002) asserted, however, that there are certain times that it is appropriate to challenge institutional culture as well.

Concluding Remarks

Numerous scholars have set forth suggestions for practical ways in which institutions of higher education could include postindustrial leadership development principles into their programming for the future (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Rost, 1993; Kezar, et al., 2006). With a lack of research on campus-based leadership development programs for faculty and staff, however, the remaining question is about how institutions are *currently* approaching leadership development. Are the traditional theoretical frameworks employed by institutions in their leadership development *actually* reflecting either a postindustrial or industrial leadership paradigm? If so, what is the broader impact of this influence?

I have outlined the multiple differences of the four main theoretical approaches to leadership discussed in this chapter. Included in Appendix A is a table depicting the industrial and postindustrial characteristics of each of the four theoretical approaches. It is clear that if four different leadership development programs were created using frameworks based on each of the four theoretical approaches discussed, they would look remarkably different. Given that most leadership development programs currently utilize more than one theory in their curriculum design, however, it is significant to look at where these theories intersect (Davis, n.d.). For their

many differences, the four theoretical approaches actually share a considerable number of similarities in the context of leadership development.

Similarities between the Theoretical Approaches as Related to Leadership Development

Using the table in Appendix A, I have identified five main areas of intersection in how the four theoretical perspectives might be used in application in relating to leadership development programming. Each theoretical perspective, to some degree, supports the following elements in the development of leaders: (1) emphasis on the leader; (2) emphasis on behaviors and traits; (3) emphasis on legitimate powers; (4) acknowledgement of the significance of context; (5) acknowledgement that leadership involves influence and relationships. I discuss each of the aforementioned elements in detail in the subsequent paragraphs. The elements represent industrial as well as postindustrial perspectives (although, there is a stronger industrial influence) and a focus on *leader* development as well as a foreshadowing of *leadership* development, as defined by Day (2001). The five elements also reflect a more accurate picture of what leadership programming for faculty and staff looks like at institutions today.

Emphasis on the leader. At their foundation, each has a fairly strong leader-centered perspective, reflective of an industrial leadership approach. This is especially evident in the trait and behavioral theories, which focus almost solely on the actions and attributes of positional leaders, but is also demonstrated in context of the situational and change-oriented theories. Situational theories focus on the behavior of “followers” to a greater degree than trait and behavioral theories, but the crux of the discussion is about the situational appropriateness of the behavior and approach of an organization’s formal leaders. Perhaps most surprising is that those theories that are identified as change-oriented in nature also can be largely leader-dominated. I advocate using the term “leader-dominated” rather than “leader-centered” for the change-

oriented theories, because most of these theories do emphasize some type of collaboration as well.

Emphasis on traits and behaviors. One of the hallmarks of industrial leadership is its emphasis on traits and behaviors. Although change-oriented leadership champions multidirectional influence, these models also highlight traits and behaviors of leaders—especially those in formal positions-- that allow them to create transformation and enact change. Charismatic leadership may be the best example of this in that the focus of its models is on a formal leader's attributes and abilities that allow him or her to accomplish extraordinary feats. Bass & Bass (2008) related charismatic theories to the “heroic” and “great man” theories of earlier in the century. Trait, behavioral and situational theories discuss behavior, style, skill and attributes in a more straightforward manner either as *the* factors or *as corresponding factors* in leadership effectiveness and emergence.

Emphasis on legitimate power. In addition to the four theoretical approaches sharing a rather leader-centered philosophy, they also rely heavily on a formal, hierarchical approach to leadership, which is also reflective of the industrial leadership paradigm. Change-oriented leadership veers somewhat from this description, but still largely employs this framework. The top-down approach suggests that leadership is defined as a position and restricted to a limited number of people in senior-level positions, rather than as a concept that can be applied by anyone.

The hierarchical nature of industrial organizations lends itself to the use of legitimate power, which is described as the “authority based on one's right by virtue of a leadership position” (Gortner, et al., 2007, p. 337). Legitimate power is utilized within models of all four theoretical approaches and dominates trait, behavioral and situational theories. Legitimate,

coercive and reward power are most prevalent when discussing administrative aspects of higher education (Gortner, et al., 2007). Although legitimate power does not use physical or punitive force in the way coercive power does, it sometimes utilizes the “implied threat of such force” (Gortner, et al., 2008, p. 337). Ideas about power, authority and control are commonly represented through leadership development programming within a framework that promotes the use of legitimate or reward power.

Acknowledging the significance of context. The last two areas of overlap of the five theoretical approaches when thinking about leadership development application involve more ambiguity than the first three and would most likely spark greater controversy. Contemporary leadership research indicates that context is critical in the discussion and enactment of leadership and rejects the notion that individual leadership traits transcend context (Astin & Astin, 2000; Tierney, 1999). The idea of situational context is more of a postindustrial leadership concept. The significance of context and culture in situational and change-oriented theories is clearly asserted in almost every model; however, when looking at the original description of trait and behavioral theory, there is virtually no mention of situational context.

The absence of situational factors in the discussion was included as a criticism of both trait and behavioral theory earlier in the chapter. It is, however, also true that most behavioralists and contemporary trait theorists have addressed situational context and environmental influences, even though it was often as an afterthought. Almost every model of trait and behavioral theory discussed in modern literature acknowledges that situational factors play a role in leadership effectiveness. I carefully selected the word “acknowledge” to define this element because each of the four theoretical approaches acknowledge situational influences, but how central these influences are to the theory differs greatly.

Acknowledging the influence and relational aspects of leadership. The final area in which the four theoretical approaches converge in terms of application also represents a great deal of variance. Each of the four theoretical approaches acknowledges, if not embraces, the relational and influential aspects of leadership. Change-oriented leadership models, such as transformational leadership and charismatic leadership, come closest to viewing leadership in terms of it being a process that includes multidirectional spheres of influence. Models of situational, behavioral and trait theories also acknowledge that leadership is relational and involves influence, however. For example, such relational and influential elements are clear from the early research of Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), Lewin, et al. (1939), Tannenbaum & Schmidt (1958) and Hersey and Blanchard (1982). There are major differences between all four theoretical approaches in how the idea of relationships and influence are understood—whether through a postindustrial lens of shared power in which the leader and collaborators are all “doing the leadership” or through an industrial lens as simply a means-to-an-end to elevate the position, status and effectiveness of the formal leader (Rost, 1993, p. 99).

The five areas of intersection between trait, behavioral, situational and change-oriented theories when considering application in the context of development represent both industrial and postindustrial elements as described by Rost (1991). Even within each of the five areas, the way in which a concept is applied by one theoretical approach may make it more industrial or postindustrial in nature—which may differ from the perspective or application of another approach. The concepts of influence and relationship are the best examples of this, in which change-oriented models have the most postindustrial descriptions, with the other three theories holding more industrial views of them.

Differences between the Theoretical Approaches as Related to Leadership Development.

The differences between the four theoretical approaches can be simplified into the difference between *leadership as a process* vs. *leadership as an individual person*. Leadership, when defined as an individual, focuses on power derived from legitimate behaviors; top-down management; formal positions and the goals of the leader. Leadership when defined as an individual or position reflects an industrial perspective of leadership and is most often represented in trait, behavioral and situational theories, although the ideas can also be seen within change-oriented models. Leadership as a person or position manifests itself as *leader* development.

When defined as a process, leadership represents a more postindustrial perspective. With the definition of *leadership as a process* comes an emphasis on the collaborative, relational, multidirectional, influential nature of leadership; an emphasis on change; and a recognition that leadership does not only happen at the top of a hierarchy. This non-positional or informal approach to leadership is unique but does not have to be used as an approach that excludes or replaces entirely traditional, hierarchical models. Transformational and charismatic leadership models are two examples of change-oriented models that have tried to combine both formal and informal leadership approaches, which is one reason Rost (1991) suggested that although change-oriented leadership models are more representative of the postindustrial paradigm than trait, behavioral and situational theories, they also do not fully represent postindustrial ideology. *Leadership as a process* typically manifests itself as *leadership* development.

The Use of Multiple Frameworks in Leadership Development

The concepts of revolutionary leadership development and the tenets of the postindustrial paradigm, which include an emphasis on social justice, have historically been concepts not only thought of as desirable but ones that colleges and universities have embraced. There have been

those in higher education who have called on colleges and universities to make dramatic changes in their approaches to faculty and staff leadership development, so that their programming will be more aligned with contemporary ideas about leadership (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Tierney, 1999). These same scholars have said that it is contradictory that institutions of higher education generally promote ideas of postindustrial leadership yet their administrative structures and leadership development processes still generally reflect an industrial paradigm approach. Other scholars have argued that theoretical models, such as transformational leadership and charismatic leadership, that champion more postindustrial perspectives do not work as well within higher education because of its unique organizational context (Bensimon, et al., 1989; Kezar, et al., 2006).

Most of the literature discusses postindustrial and industrial leadership practices as mutually exclusive. The outline of the five overlapping elements of the four theoretical approaches discussed in this chapter indicate that it may be plausible to adopt new leadership perspectives and programming that can address the current issues with which higher education is faced in the twenty-first century, while still including some traditional aspects of training and development that have been practical and have historically produced positive outcomes. According to Kezar, et al. (2006) literature indicates that leaders, and in turn their organizations, will be best served if they use “as many frameworks as they can to address complex problems” (p. 160). Ensley, Hmieleski and Pearce (2006) further supported the idea of using multiple frameworks in leadership development, saying “future thinking about leadership must encompass both vertical and shared facets in order to capture a fuller view of leadership processes and outcomes” (p. 218).

There is a lack of literature about leadership development programming for faculty and staff at institutions of higher education and very few studies that address leadership development programming using a postindustrial and industrial paradigm as a framework for investigation (Rost, 1993; Kezar & Carducci, 2009). This study is significant because it examines leadership development programming for faculty and staff through an industrial and postindustrial lens. The literature reviewed in chapter two has summarized research of popular leadership theories used in leadership development and training programs in higher education and represents the benefits and limitations of each, which helps provide a frame of reference for the study. Given the literature reviewed and the quotes from Kezar, et al. (2006) and Ensley, et al. (2006) regarding the necessity of multiple frameworks, a question is raised as to whether leadership development programs for faculty and staff at institutions of higher education may require the influence of both the industrial and postindustrial paradigms to produce the most desired outcomes. It is apparent that the competing paradigms may each have something meaningful to offer in terms of developing leadership within faculty and staff ranks in higher education in the twenty-first century.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Leadership development is critical to the future of higher education; in fact, Kezar (2009) called the development of leaders “one of the most important conditions” to sustain the vitality of higher education (p. ix). This dissertation explores how institutions of higher education are cultivating their leaders. More specifically, the purpose of this dissertation is to 1) explore the personal experiences of faculty and staff at a public, four-year institution participating in a campus-based leadership development program and 2) examine the ways in which a four-year institution increases leadership capacity of its employees. I selected the *Leadership Institute* program at Southwest State University for my case study. The following are the questions that guided the study:

- (1) What leadership philosophies underscore the *Leadership I* curriculum?
- (2) How do the *Leadership I* participants conceptualize leadership?
- (3) What individual policies, practices or behaviors have changed as a result of *Leadership I* participation?

Prevalence of Campus-Based Leadership Development Programs

Although there are only a scant number of studies that address campus-based leadership development programs for faculty and staff, multiple programs exist. According to the American Council on Education, there are three primary models of campus-based leadership development programs that have emerged in North America (Davis, n.d.). *Skills development programs* focus on attributes and skill development of faculty and administrators (institutional

examples of this model include Kennesaw State University and the University of California). *Mentoring practices and programs* are the second type of campus-based leadership program and focus on mentoring relationships (institutional examples of this model include Arizona State University and the University of Washington). Mentoring is often a component of other leadership programming, but can also stand alone as an approach to leadership development (Davis, n.d.). The final model of leadership development that campuses typically adopt is what Davis (n.d.) refers to as the *fellowship as exposure to administration*, which involves job shadowing opportunities, mentoring, career coaching and planning, and self-assessment opportunities (institutional examples of this model include Pennsylvania State University and Illinois State University) (Davis, n.d.).

Two examples of programs in the Southeast similar to *Leadership I* in format are at the University of Florida and the University of Georgia. Both institutions have faculty and staff leadership development programs that are competency-based and use a workshop format (Advanced Leadership, 2012; Vivian H. Fisher, 2012). Reflected in the curriculum of the Georgia and Florida programs are also an emphasis on *skills development* with elements of *mentoring* and *fellowship as exposure to administration*. Based on its curriculum, the *Leadership I* program also appears to have components of all three types of programs that Davis described, with mentoring being approached through informal practices.

Previous Research on Campus-Based Programs

The number of institutions that offer leadership development opportunities for faculty and staff may be increasing; however, there is very little research that exists about these programs and thus few examples of methodology from which to draw. Adrianna Kezar is one of the few scholars who have focused ample attention on faculty and staff leadership development.

She has done so largely from a grassroots perspective and has consistently selected a case study approach as her methodology, stating that the approach is ideal for understanding the process of leadership development as well as ideal for inclusion of multiple sources of data (Kezar & Lester, 2009; Kezar, 2012). Likewise, I chose case study methodology for my research because it provides the opportunity to examine in detail an institutional approach to leadership development and the individual experiences of those enrolled in the *Leadership I* program. In addition, a case study format allowed for assessment of the stated outcomes of the program through experiences revealed by participants.

Research Design

Qualitative research is a term under which numerous forms of inquiry fall, all of which help members of society engage with a deeper level of understanding about the meaning of social phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). According to Merriam (1998), qualitative research is based upon the idea that “reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds” (p. 6). To that end, Merriam presented five over-arching characteristics of qualitative leadership. Merriam described the five characteristics in the following manner: (1) the qualitative researcher is interested in how people make sense of the world around them; (2) the qualitative researcher collects and analyzes the data; (3) qualitative research involves field work; (4) qualitative research generally involves inductive research; and (5) qualitative research results in a descriptive picture of the phenomenon.

The research questions of this study focus on the lived experiences of the *Leadership I* participants and the administrators who created the program curriculum. The purpose of the study reveals that it is inductive; thus, rather than having a hypothesis to guide the study, the themes and concepts were derived from the data. In addition to the goals of the investigation

reflecting qualitative inquiry characteristics, the research questions suggest that the design needed to be flexible, emergent and use the researcher as the primary instrument for data collection to provoke findings that are rich in description. The aforementioned elements indicate that a qualitative study was appropriate for the research questions that I have presented and, more specifically, a case study strategy was needed.

Case Study Approach

A case study approach is the strategy that scholars have traditionally relied upon when the focus of the research is on the culture of a program or organization (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Case studies are popular in education because the examination of processes, programs and problems that they evoke has brought about change in common practices and can result in overall improvement of organizational function (Merriam, 1998). There are several types of case studies (e.g. descriptive studies, interpretive studies evaluative studies) (Merriam, 1998).

Merriam (1998) defined a *descriptive case study* in education as a detailed account of a phenomenon, generally related to “innovated programs and practices” (p. 38). Joint, campus-based leadership programs for faculty and staff are relatively new in higher education and are seen as progressive development techniques and thus the *Leadership I* program meets the criteria Merriam suggested for a descriptive case study. Merriam (1998) also indicated that the most important characteristic of case study research is the ability to determine boundaries around the object of the study. Delimiting the *Leadership I* program was a fairly easy task because there are a specific number of participants, instructors and committee members, as well as a structured curriculum that is followed. Given the aforementioned facts, a descriptive case study approach that includes multiple methods of data collection seemed most appropriate.

Site selection

The primary purpose of the study is to understand the experiences of faculty and staff participating in a leadership development program. For this reason, I proposed a single-site study, which allowed me as the researcher to focus greater attention on details of the lived experiences of participants within the context of the culture of the organization. A single-site study also allowed me to seek broader understanding of the approach to the curriculum of the program, also within the context of the institution's culture.

Southwest State University

For this study, I selected Southwest State University, a student-centered, public, four-year research institution in the Southern United States. Southwest State University is a strong example of an institution that has undergone dramatic shifts in the past decade in response to social and economic factors. An aggressive recruitment plan laid out by the newly hired university president in 2003 was the impetus for the many changes that the institution would undergo in the following decade (Hutt & Andreen, 2003). The 33 percent increase of students from 2006 to 2012 is evidence of the tremendous enrollment growth that has been experienced over the last decade (Editorial, 2012). It was not only a commitment to growth in numbers that the new president made in 2003, but also a commitment to increasing the quality of the student population (Hutt & Andreen, 2003).

In the fall 2012 incoming freshman class there were 239 National Merit Scholars, 42 National Achievement Finalists, and one in four students enrolled in the Honors College (Quickfacts, 2012). These numbers compare to 34 National Merit Scholars and 6 National Achievement Finalists in 2003, a time during which an "honors program" existed but no Honors College (Bonner, 2011). In 2003, 24 percent of incoming freshmen placed in the top ten of their high school graduating class; whereas in 2012, 26 percent of incoming freshmen achieved a 4.0

or greater in high school (SWSU enrollment, 2012; Bonner, 2011). The undergraduate student population is not alone in its growth and increased selectivity. In terms of the graduate school, enrolment has increased more than 20 percent and doctoral student enrollment, specifically, has increased by more than 29 percent in the last 6 years (Cannon, 2010). The number of applications has also increased for the Graduate School. Among other reasons, expansion of distance education programs is cited as resulting in a larger graduate student population (Cannon, 2010).

Southwest State University has had an impressive decade on paper; however, the institution's recruitment efforts have not gone without criticism. Although Southwest State University publically confirms that diversity is of paramount concern, the new recruitment strategies may tell another story. Southwest State University conveys its desire to recruit a diverse student population and for many years has promoted the increase in students who identify as Black/African American/non-Hispanic; however, this increase has not kept up with the overall increase in the student population during the emphasis on growth in the past decade. As an example, it is accurate that the number of African American students has increased during this time; however, as a percent of the overall student population at Southwest State University this number has decreased. In 1999, African American students made up approximately 12.6 percent of the campus populations. In 2004, this decreased to 11.89 percent. In 2009 this number decreased again to 11.72 percent. In the 2011-2012 academic year, there was an increase in the percent of African American students, reaching 12 percent of the population; however, this is still lower than the percentage over a decade prior. During the same time period, the percentage of White students increased on the SWSU campus (SWSU system data summary, 2011; SWSU minority report, 2007; SWSU minority report 2009)

The numbers represented in the previous paragraph raise questions about the recruitment efforts. The most prevalent question is whether students from the state—especially minority students and those from lower socio-economic backgrounds—are being focused on less in the recruitment process than out-of-state students from potentially higher-income areas? The data over the last decade may suggest that the institution has redirected its main focus to out-of-state recruitment, rather than recruitment of minority and marginalized students from within the state.

Despite questions about the recruitment efforts of minority and marginalized student populations, SWSU has received favorable reviews nationally in the past decade, increasing from 48th place in 2003 in the *US News and World Report's* annual rankings to 31st place its 2012 rankings among all public colleges and universities (SWSU ranked, 2012). The success of the institution and the targeted, national recruitment plan has led to an increase of applications, which has resulted in a much lower acceptance rate (from 85% to 53% in undergraduate admissions over the past ten years) and resulted in a much higher percentage of the student population coming from out-of-state (38% of graduate and undergraduate students, up from 20% in 2002) (Smith, 2012; Quickfacts, 2012).

The aforementioned statistics offer only a small picture of the enormous changes that have taken place at Southwest State University during the past decade. The unprecedented growth in the student population has made changes in the infrastructure a necessity. Since 2003, 40 new facilities have been constructed on the SWSU campus to accommodate the additional students (Quickfacts, 2012). Also to address rising student demand, faculty and staff positions have been added (Faculty Senate Meeting, 2008). There are those who argue, however, that the supply has not kept pace with the demand in terms of facilities or new hires (Jones, 2005;). Beginning in 2006, it was mandatory for all first year students to live on campus. With the large

increase in number of incoming students each year, the freshman residency requirement resulted in less space for upperclass students desiring to live on campus, even with the additional construction (Evans, 2011). Whereas ten years ago the university offered programs to entice upperclass students to live on campus, now returning students are not guaranteed a spot in campus housing and have faced waitlists in the last several years (Evans, 2011).

Housing concerns stretch beyond campus. Students looking for housing complain that finding adequate, affordable housing close to campus is difficult (Brown, 2012). In 2012, when a SWSU housing and residential community representative was asked about whether she believed there would be adequate off-campus housing to meet the needs of SWSU students, she declined to comment, indicating her uncertainty about what the future might hold (Brown, 2012). In addition to housing struggles, students also have expressed concern about the ability to find seating at campus food courts and the access to other campus activities and facilities that were designed with a much smaller student body in mind. The limited number of athletic tickets and inability of Greek organizations to house the increased number of students the university encourages them to pledge has also not gone without complaint.

A growing need for leadership. Multiple scholars have cited the increasing need for adept leadership at colleges and universities because of the crisis with which institutions of higher education are faced (Zusman, 2005; Tierney, 1998; Tierney, 1999; Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Gallant & Getz, 2009). Evidence of the change taking place in higher education is reflected in who is now attending colleges and universities; what they are learning and how the material is taught; how education is funded on a macro and micro level; and the role of higher education in the broader community. The changes Southwest State University has undergone in

the past decade as well as the economy and other external factors, which in part have been the impetus for the institution's changes, indicate the demand for new approaches.

In chapter one I referenced a quote by Zusman (2005), who spoke about the challenges the twenty-first century has brought for higher education in terms of its nature, values and control as well societal expectations and resources (p. 5). Zusman stated, "Changes both within and outside the academy are altering its character – its students, faculty, governance, curriculum, functions, and very place in society" (p. 5). I choose Southwest State University for the site of my case study largely because of the enormous change that has occurred at this institution in the last decade. According to Kezar (2009) in the face of great change and challenges in twenty-first century higher education, leadership is more of a necessity than ever.

A potential leadership shortage. In chapter one, I discussed several factors that contribute to the shortage of experienced leaders in higher education. A majority of the factors discussed seem applicable to Southwest State University, including an aging faculty (Doyle, 2008); a decrease in the number of faculty in traditional, tenure, career tracks (Doyle, 2008); stress caused by budget cuts and resource reduction (Romano, et al., 2010); and the high rate of fatigue and burn-out coupled with a loss of interest in administrative assignments (Romano, et al., 2010; Ekman, 2010). I will offer a brief explanation of each factor in relation to Southwest State University.

Economic conditions. Certainly one of the greatest challenges that face an institution of higher education in 2012 is financial, given the economic conditions. Colleges and universities are being asked to do more with less, across the board. For example, in the early 1970s appropriations to SWSU from the state were 44 percent of total SWSU revenues and by 2011 they were only 20 percent of total revenues (Faculty Senate, 2003). The decrease in funding for

higher education nationally has resulted in a reduction of resources for divisions across colleges and universities.

With its strategic enrollment plan and good financial management, Southwest State University escaped the severe cuts to programs, staff and instructors that other institutions of higher education have experienced; however, academic affairs and student affairs departments still saw budget tightening. SWSU administrators have frequently addressed the fact that departmental budgets have not faced severe cuts during the last several years; however, little can be found about substantial increases in departmental budgets, despite the fact that the student population has more than doubled since 2003. There is no doubt that individual departments have seen increases in their budgets, but to what extent seems unclear from the reporting.

Aging faculty. Southwest State University also has what Doyle (2008) refers to as an aging faculty, with 25 percent of the faculty over the age of 60 (Grayson, 2012). According to Grayson (2012), faculty at institutions across the state, including SWSU, are opting to continue working past traditional retirement age. For some, this is out of financial necessity given the economic conditions and for others it is out of personal desire. In Grayson's article, one SWSU faculty member expressed fear that the extended careers of professors may be hurting the natural life cycle of the institution, preventing younger faculty members from joining the ranks and thus limiting new ideas that could be generated for the academy (Grayson, 2012). Of course, others have disagreed vehemently with this perspective.

Non-tenured and part time faculty. Statements made by the president and senior-level administrators over the past decade have emphasized that the university has increased the number of faculty and staff to respond to the enrollment growth. What is not said, however, is that new positions and replacement hires often come in the form of part-time instructors. In

2004, 65 percent of faculty members at SWSU were tenured compared to only 52 percent in 2010 (Southwest State University System Data Summary, 2012; Wolfson, 2010). As tenured faculty is on the decline nationally, part-time faculty numbers are rising. Twenty-six percent of SWSU's faculty is part-time (Hicks, 2011). As more students place a higher demand on departments to maintain more course offerings the need for faculty who can dedicate their time to teaching has increased. Wolfson (2010) also reported that fewer tenure positions are a result of budget cuts and a way to “keep flexibility in their faculty.”

In addition to the aforementioned factors leading to the leadership shortage in higher education, the growing number of institutions that are led by individuals who have never held positions as department chairs, deans, provosts or faculty members is listed as a cause (Ekman, 2010; Appadurai, 2009). In the case of Southwest State University, this does not apply as the president that presided over the period of enrollment growth and expansion had prior experience as a faculty member, dean and president of another institution. Also cited as a reason for the leadership shortage is the lack of leadership development and training programs. The *Leadership I program* is actively working to reduce the effect of that factor for SWSU.

The *Leadership Institute Program*

Beginning in 2009, *Leadership I* grew out of a partnership between the *Leadership Fellows*, the Department of Human Resources and the College of Continuing Studies (CCS) (Inaugural *Leadership I* Class, 2010). *Leadership I* is a two-year leadership development program for up to 15 faculty and staff members each year. Since its inception, there have been two cohorts of *Leadership I*. A third cohort began its curriculum in January 2013.

Leadership Institute program purpose. According to the program's description, *Leadership I* is designed to “prepare aspiring faculty and professional staff to assume positions

of higher responsibility within the university and other higher education arenas” (*Leadership Institute* home, 2012). During its two-year program, the curriculum for *Leadership I* focuses on developing the participants in the areas of leadership and management (Inaugural *Leadership I* Class, 2010). The *Leadership I* website states the following as specific purposes of its curriculum:

- (1) To develop and enhance participants’ abilities for higher-level management/leadership responsibilities;
- (2) To provide practical skills that may be used to enhance participants’ immediate effectiveness as an administrator;
- (3) To update participants on critical issues affecting the university and its mission;
- (4) To enhance participants' abilities to think critically about higher education in a dynamic environment.

There is some controversy over the aforementioned elements of the stated purpose, as they were not voted upon. Some of the original creators of the *Leadership I* program maintain that career development is paramount to its purpose (personal communication, November 28, 2012).

The *Leadership Fellows* program. As noted at the beginning of this section, *Leadership I* grew out of, in part, a program at the university called the *Leadership Fellows*. This part of the *Leadership I* history is significant and thus needs further exploration. The mission of Southwest State University *Leadership Fellows* was “to identify, develop, prepare, and advance faculty and staff for senior leadership positions at SWSU and other flagship universities” (*Leadership Fellows*, n.d.). Each year the *Leadership Fellows* would select no more than 10 fellows, who would include faculty and staff “poised for advancement to senior leadership positions such as

provost, dean or vice president” (*Leadership Fellows*, n.d.). The curriculum consisted of monthly meetings on topics pertinent to higher education; workshops; and the development of a formal mentoring relationship (*Leadership Fellows*, n.d.). In addition, three to five faculty fellows were expected to participate each year in the SEC Academic Leadership Development Program.

The specific purpose of the curriculum of the *Leadership Fellows* program is not completely dissimilar to the goals of *Leadership I*. There are several differences between the two leadership programs, although most of them are slight. There was an initial difference between the numbers of participants selected each year for each program. The initial target number for the *Leadership I* program was 15, although this number has since been revised to be 10 to 12. The new target number is similar to the 10 faculty and staff selected each year for the *Leadership Fellows* program. Another slight difference between the programs involves the descriptions of who is eligible for each program. The *Leadership Fellows* program was much more specific in calling for candidates poised for advancement to positions such as a dean or vice president, whereas *Leadership I* calls for candidates who are ready to assume “higher responsibility within the university and higher education” (*Leadership Institute* home, 2012; *Leadership Fellows*, n.d.). Originally *Leadership I* was open only to staff. Faculty has been included in the second and third cohorts.

The curricular components of the two programs differ. The *Leadership Fellows* program had more consistent, bimonthly meetings along with additional workshops. *Leadership I* has less frequent course offerings but each course is longer in duration and participants have some option in topic area. The final, significant difference is that the *Leadership Fellows* had a formal mentoring component that *Leadership I* does not currently maintain (personal communication, April 10, 2012).

Leadership Institute requirements. Participants in the *Leadership I* program are current faculty and staff who are “poised for advancement into leadership positions on campus” (*Leadership Institute requirements, 2012*). Staff candidates for the program should be currently in the role of a manager at either the director or assistant/associate director level and have demonstrated ability in demanding positions and a desire for additional responsibility (*Leadership Institute requirements, 2012*). To apply, candidates must complete the online application process, which includes a statement of purpose, an essay about how the candidate has made a difference within a specific task or initiative benefiting the institution and submission of a vita (*Leadership Institute application, 2012*). The application process also requires submission of a letter of support from the candidate’s supervisor, as well as an interview and a commitment to completing the courses as scheduled (*Leadership Institute application, 2012*). When reviewing applications, the following criteria are used: (1) overall fit of personal goals with the objectives of *Leadership I*; (2) readiness for personal growth; (3) capacity for positive influence; and (4) support of the supervisor.

Participants in the program complete four SWSU-specific courses designed by *Leadership I* advisors and four management courses offered by the CCS from a list of options provided (*Leadership Institute resources, 2012*). Although the term “courses” is used in the *Leadership Institute* literature, the term “workshop” may be a more accurate portrayal. The SWSU-specific workshops have traditionally each been two days in length and begin with an orientation (*Leadership Institute curriculum, 2012*). The CCS workshops are typically three days in length. For the 2013 academic year, the SWSU-specific workshops sessions are: (1) The Changing Learning Community; (2) Building and Supporting the Learning Community; (3) The Members of the Learning Community; and (4) Thriving in the Learning Community. All four

workshops, along with the three-hour orientation for participants and their supervisors, are requirements of the program. In addition to the SWSU-specific workshops, there has been a list of approximately eight choices of three-day CCS workshops from which participants choose three topics that are of interest to them. The current CCS offerings include the following titles: (1) Increasing Your Managerial Productivity; (2) Understanding, Motivating and Communicating With People; (3) Dealing Successfully With Tough People Issues; (4) Developing Critical Management Skills; (5) Enhancing Your Communication and Leadership Effectiveness; (6) Leadership; (7) Negotiating, Mediating and Building Consensus; and (8) Improving Your Competitive Edge. The SWSU-specific workshops focus more on current issues in higher education specific to SWSU whereas the CCS workshops are more management oriented.

Participant Selection

The faculty and staff participating in this dissertation were selected based on their status as active members or graduates of the *Leadership I* program or because of their involvement with the program as administrators, advisory committee members or instructors. Each of the first two cohorts includes 15 members. All members from the first two cohorts should have completed the requirements for the program by December 2012. Currently, there are nine members of the advisory committee.

The faculty and staff involved in the *Leadership I* program hail from multiple departments and divisions within the institution. By virtue of their status as members of the *Leadership I* program, it is presumed that they share a common goal to serve their campus and higher education in innovative ways, in addition to a desire to assume more responsibilities either on campus or in the higher education arena (*Leadership Institute* home, 2012). The two

cohorts include 15 men and 15 women. Approximately 10 percent of *Leadership I* members represent a racial minority. There are fewer faculty members than staff members who have participated in the program. Over 75 percent of the members of *Leadership I* are in positions classified as professional staff.

I sent initial inquiries to members of each of the first two cohorts to ensure that I would have a representation of faculty and staff, as well as gender and race. I requested individual, semi-structured interviews, approximately one-hour each in length, focusing on their involvement in the *Leadership I* program and its impact on the way in which they understand leadership. In January 2013 a third cohort of *Leadership I* began; however, the members of this cohort are only in the initial stages of their coursework. For this reason, I did not invite members of cohort three to participate in individual interviews and instead observed this cohort as it actively engaged in the curriculum.

Acknowledging that *Leadership I* grew out of a partnership between the *Leadership Fellows*, the Department of Human Resources and the College of Continuing Studies, I pursued interviewing the advisory committee members that represent these three areas, specifically, along with additional advisory committee members. The advisory committee members who represent the areas that developed the *Leadership I* programming were able to provide a historical perspective on the program as well provide insight into the current operations of it. I selected the additional advisory committee members who I interviewed based on their knowledge of the program, active participation on the committee and willingness to participate.

In addition to blind e-mail requests I sent to individuals asking for participation, I also requested recommendations from those who helped create the program of whom I should interview. I have used pseudonyms for the program and advisory committee members to protect

their identities. Prior to contacting the program members, I contacted the advisory committee outlining my study and requested permission to correspond with members of cohort one and two.

Data Collection

Merriam (1998) stated that data are “ordinary bits and pieces of information found in the environment...that can be concrete and measurable...or invisible and difficult to measure. (p. 69). Merriam also suggested that it is the perspective of the investigator that determines which elements of the collected information translates into research data (p. 69). Marshall and Rossman (2006) showed that qualitative researchers utilize the following four primary methods for data collection: (1) participating in the setting; (2) direct observation; (3) personal interviews; and (4) document analysis. In this study, I relied on three of the aforementioned methods, with the exception of “participating in the setting.” Through personal interviews with program participants, program creators and advisory board members; through observations of the *Leadership I* courses; and through review of curriculum documents I worked to create a comprehensive picture of the experiences of faculty and staff in the *Leadership I* program. In addition, I learned the larger organizational implications of the program and the justification of the curriculum design.

Interviews

Interviews are used when researchers cannot observe behavior, feelings or how others interpret their surroundings (Merriam, 1998). The interviews for this study were in a semi-structured, person-to-person format that included a protocol of questions to guide the conversation (Merriam, 1998). The interview protocol is listed in Appendix C. Sixty minutes were designated for each interview. I recorded the audio from interviews, with permission of the participants, and then transcribed the recordings following the meetings. During each interview, I

took additional notes as the researcher, recording any observations that could not be captured by audio. One interview was conducted by phone. I did not record this interview.

Observation

Observation is an important tool of research when it serves a purpose, is planned in advance, is recorded systematically and is subject to checks (Merriam, 1998). A person may choose to collect data through means of observation because as an outsider, the researcher may notice things that members of the organization or group may not and because sometimes people are more reserved in individual interviews (Merriam, 1998). Merriam also suggested that these types of observations may lead to greater understanding of the context and culture of a group.

The third cohort of *Leadership I* began coursework in the 2013 spring semester. I requested permission to observe two university specific sessions of the *Leadership Institute*. Following the checklist of situational elements laid out by Merriam (1998) I recorded observations in the following categories: (1) the physical setting; (2) the participants; (3) the activities and interactions; (4) the conversations; (5) the subtle factors; and (6) my own behavior as the researcher. My goal for these observations was to understand better the culture of the group, the curriculum of the program and the interactions of the participants. I began my observations by becoming familiar with the setting and then began writing field notes. I was mindful to stay as unobtrusive as possible, although technically I was an “observer as participant” given that the group was aware of my presence and that I engaged with participants (Merriam, 1998).

Document Review

Merriam stated that documents are “a ready-made source of data easily accessible to the imagination and resourceful investigators” (p. 112). For the document review portion of data

collection, I reviewed items in association with the coursework requirements as well as documents related to the application process. I requested permission to review these materials from the advisory committee. In the process of research I gained access to other relevant documents that also helped me have a better understanding of the program's practices and history. A document analysis often reveals data that a researcher would otherwise not uncover or would take the researcher a great amount of time to learn, thus making it valuable –as it was to me in this study (Merriam, 1998).

Data Analysis

Merriam (1998) called data collection and analysis a “simultaneous activity” in the realm of qualitative research (p. 151). The process is an interactive one that if done appropriately allows for trustworthy findings through emerging insights that direct subsequent phases of data collection (Merriam, 1998). In addition to being an interactive process, data analysis for qualitative case studies is a very intuitive process (Merriam, 1996). I used constant comparative data analysis, as suggested by Marshall and Rossman (2006) and originally developed by Glaser and Strauss.

Managing Data

I adhered to the following procedural phases of analyzing data as described by Marshall and Rossman (2006, p. 156-157): (1) organizing data; (2) immersion in the data; (3) creating categories and themes; (4) coding the data; (5) offering interpretations through analytical memos; (6) searching for alternative understandings; and (7) recording the findings. To organize the data, I initially utilized the *comparative leadership theory table* discussed in chapter two and provided as a reference in Appendix A. This table depicts the postindustrial and industrial characteristics of each of the leadership theories discussed in chapter two, displays examples in practice of each,

and demonstrate where the theories converge and diverge. During the phase of immersion, I followed the guidance of Marshall and Rossman (2006) and read the data multiple times.

Phases four and five include creating themes and coding the data. For both, I began with the framework taken from chapter two. Although inductive analysis is involved and thus I looked for emergent patterns from settings and participant communication that can dictate themes within the findings, I primarily used analyst–constructed typologies in my management of data (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The researcher creates analyst-constructed typologies. These types of classifications are “grounded in the data but not necessarily used explicitly by participants” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 159). The danger of this type of analysis is that the researcher can feel pressure to force data into the already existing categories even when there is not a good fit. To address this issue, I utilized the matrix in chapter two to define the initial categories that I used in the coding process. I use the framework as a guide to begin the coding procedure, but was not limited by it. During the coding process, I used a color-coding system to mark passages of transcripts and document themes. I coded faculty and staff participants separately so that I was able to compare the two groups.

Following the coding process, I recorded my thoughts in the form of notes. Reflection is part of the process of making sense of the findings and establishing their significance. Another necessary component of data management is exploring alternative explanations. Alternate explanations always exist and must be addressed so that I may offer why my explanation is the most relevant (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The final phase of data management that Marshall and Rossman (2006) discussed is “writing the report,” which they said cannot be separate from the analytical phase. Marshall and Rossman (2006) wrote the following about case study reports:

A rich tradition of community studies, organizational research and program evaluations documents the illustrative power of research that focuses in depth and in detail on

specific instances of a phenomenon. Case studies take the reader into the setting with vividness and detail not typically present in more analytic reporting formats. (p. 164)

Trustworthiness

To ensure trustworthiness of the study, I have provided rich detail in chapter four that will support the appropriateness of the conclusions I draw (Merriam, 1998). The assumption in qualitative research that reality is “holistic, multidimensional and ever-changing” makes measuring validity somewhat different than in a quantitative study (Merriam, 1998, p. 202). In qualitative studies human beings are the primary instruments by which data is collected allowing researchers close access to the phenomenon being studied (Merriam, 1998). Given this, Merriam (1998) asserted that the internal validity of qualitative studies is generally strong. To ensure that my study had strong internal validity, I employed the use of triangulation, member checks and stated personal biases that could impact the lens through which I analyzed the data. More specifically, I used multiple sources of data and methods (one-on-one interviews, document analysis and observation) to confirm the findings and I have sent completed transcripts back to participants for verification.

Transparency, Consistency-Coherence, Communicability and Confidentiality

Rubin and Rubin (1995) suggested examining the credibility of qualitative research by its transparency, consistency-coherence and communicability. With my research I have strived to attain credibility through these measures. Rubin and Rubin (1995) used the aforementioned three indicators because “most indicators of validity and reliability do not fit qualitative research” (p. 85). Rubin and Rubin (1995) stated that transparency allows people a window into the processes of data collection. They concluded, “A transparent report allows the reader to assess the intellectual strengths and weaknesses, the biases and the conscientiousness of the interviewer”

(p.85). To ensure transparency, I kept careful records during the data collection and management phase (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

In addition to transparency, consistency and coherence are important to establishing trustworthiness in a qualitative study. To ensure both of these, I worked to understand why inconsistencies emerged within individual interviews and between interviews when discussing specific circumstances. Likewise, I offer explanations when there is inconsistency within themes and have followed Rubin and Rubin's (1995) advice to probe further to uncover the reason and meaning behind what appears as incoherence of themes.

Finally, I have strived for communicability within the research, meaning that what I present should feel "real" to the participants as well as the audience (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). I made efforts to attain this by asking questions to allow participants opportunities to talk about their personal experiences, by recording the details as vividly as they describe them and by representing a wealth of evidence through quotations from participants (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). As Rubin and Rubin (1995) concluded, the goal is "research that is designed to garner lots of evidence; that is vivid, detailed and transparent; that is careful and well documented; that is coherent and consistent is going to be convincing" (p. 91).

In addition to the aforementioned ways in which I worked toward establishing trustworthiness of my research, I implemented strict guidelines for confidentiality in the study. Confidentiality is critical to establishing a valid, reliable, transparent, consistent and coherent study in which participants feel able to freely communicate. As with most institutions of higher education, there are multiple relationships between and amongst individuals in all divisions that have been fostered and grown over time. I recognized that participants must trust that their identification will be protected and believe that they can speak freely without fear of retribution.

To provide this level of anonymity and comfort, I explained to each participant the process I used to record and transcribe the information, the purpose of my collecting the information and the way in which I will protect their identity.

Access and Researcher Positionality

It is impossible in the context of qualitative research and interviewing to remain neutral or emotionally uninvolved (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). According to Rubin and Rubin (1995), “the researcher’s empathy, sensitivity, humor and sincerity are important tools for the research” (p. 12). In qualitative research participants are asked to be open with information, trusting the researcher with personal and sensitive information. It is not as likely that a researcher will garner much information if she is perceived as impersonal and uncaring (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Likewise, the researcher’s bias, experiences and personality will have an impact on the study (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Overall, the goal is to balance the empathy toward individuals and sensitivity to a situation in a way that enables the researcher to discover the personal narratives, but not become overly involved to the extent that it alters how she sees the bigger picture of a situation (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Role as a Former Southwest State University Employee

I was employed by Southwest State University for five years. I served as a graduate assistant for three years, two of which I worked in the division of student affairs and during the third year I worked in academic affairs. For two additional years, I was a full time staff member, serving as an assistant director in the division of student affairs. During the time I worked as a professional staff at SWSU, I also served as a representative for my department on several committees that involved academic and student affairs professionals. Through my work on these committees I have been a part of numerous discussions regarding the need for additional training

and development of staff and faculty on campus. It was my experiences as a full time staff member and my experiences on campus-wide committees that initially inspired my interest in the topic of faculty and staff leadership development.

As a researcher I am influenced by my experience as a professional staff member and graduate assistant, but I am also impacted by the type of work that I have done. Within the context of higher education, my work has been focused on women and persons in marginalized populations. As a practitioner I have worked extensively with leadership programming, particularly programming geared toward college-aged women. Given that my experiences with leadership programming are with women and members of other marginalized populations, I have approached my work within higher education from a feminist perspective and through a feminist lens, which has some impact on the way in which I perceive information as researcher.

Access

As a staff member at Southwest State University I established relationships that helped me as I began seeking to gain access to participants for the study. Prior to contacting the *Leadership I* members for individual interviews, I submitted an executive summary of the topic to the *Leadership I* advisory committee explaining the intention and goals of the study. I requested specific access through approval from the *Leadership I* advisory committee to interview individual members of cohorts one and two and I asked permission to observe courses and review documents associated with the *Leadership I* program. It should be noted that I interfaced with several of the *Leadership I* program members and committee members in a professional capacity when I was a staff member at SWSU. This familiarity also helped me gain access and establish trust among potential participants.

Delimitations of the Study

There are two main delimitations of this study, each of which are discussed in detail in the following section. The first delimitation I discuss addresses the ability to generalize the findings. The second delimitation I discuss applies to the sample population.

Single-Site Study

This study is a single-site case study, which means that some findings may not be able to be generalized to other institutions. The information will hopefully be useful, however, to those institutions with similar leadership development programming for faculty and staff or those seeking to initiate similar programming. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006): “Although no qualitative studies are generalizable in the probabilistic sense, their findings may be transferable” (p. 42). For research that involves large samples the problem is often depth, whereas the issue for case study research is one of breadth (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

Sample Population

The study is delimited by the fact that it is confined to the interviewing and observing of the *Leadership I* program at Southwest State University, a program that has only been in existence for three years and has three cohorts of faculty and staff with which to engage. Further limiting the study is the fact that I did not interview all participants, nor did I observe all courses in which they participate. The small percentage of persons of color involved in the program is also a limiting factor, given that I was restricted in how I was able to understand the lived experiences of faculty and staff of color in the context of this leadership development program.

Conclusion

Although limitations exist in this study, the process-oriented nature of leadership development as well as the programmatic elements of it in a formal setting provides a strong argument for the case study approach. In general, qualitative research is appealing in this

scenario because the personal, in-depth, lived experiences of those involved with the *Leadership I* program are about what I hope to gain insight. For this reason the benefits of qualitative research, and specifically the case study approach, outweigh the limiting factors outlined in this chapter. As recognized previously, a single-site study does not allow for generalization of findings, but can lead to findings that are transferable to other institutions and situations—as I believe the findings of this study demonstrate (Marshall and Rossman, 2006).

Data collection and analysis were dictated by traditional qualitative practices, as outlined in this chapter. Access was gained through support of the institution's administration and from relationships that I have made previously. Being aware of possible bias and actively taking steps to improve trustworthiness mitigated researcher bias.

The emergence of campus-based programs is a trend that reflects the acknowledgement by institutions that effective leadership practices can to some degree, subvert the challenges faced in twenty-first century higher education. The growing trend of leadership development programs also indicates that institutions realize the desire to assume formal leadership positions is on the decline. The need for faculty and staff who are well-trained and well-versed in leadership has never been greater (Gallant & Getz, 2009; Latchem & Hanna, 2001). There is a lack of research, however, about the approach campus-based programs are using in leadership development and the institutional and individual impact of such programs.

Southwest State University provided a setting that is representative of the multiple changes that are happening in higher education and thus also demonstrated the growing need for leadership at twenty-first century institutions. Using a postindustrial and industrial framework, my desire was to understand the experiences of individuals in the *Leadership I* program and to understand how SWSU is increasing the leadership capacity of its faculty and staff. For many

years scholars have discussed the crisis in higher education, marked by challenges of a changing world. What has become abundantly clear is that there is a crisis in leadership that is occurring simultaneously, both within and outside the walls of the academy. If institutions are going to effectively address the challenges facing higher education in the future, they must first address the leadership crisis occurring today.

CHAPTER FOUR

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT VS. LEADER DEVELOPMENT: THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO DISTINCT PARADIGM APPROACHES

The future of higher education is partially dependent on the development of its leaders (Kezar, 2009). This chapter explores how institutions of higher education are cultivating their leaders. More specifically, the chapter explores findings from the data that 1) explore the personal experiences of faculty and staff participating in *Leadership Institute*, a campus-based leadership development program at Southwest State University and 2) examine the ways in which a four-year institution increases leadership capacity of its employees.

The *Leadership I* program is a two-year leadership development program for 10 to 15 faculty and staff members each year. Since its inception, there have been three cohorts of *Leadership I*. The *Leadership I* program is designed to “prepare aspiring faculty and professional staff to assume positions of higher responsibility within the university and other higher education arenas” (*Leadership Institute* home, 2012). During its two-year curriculum, *Leadership I* focuses on developing the participants in the areas of leadership and management and lists the following as its critical competencies: (1) student and customer centered; (2) ethics and diversity; (3) self-development; (4) adaptability/flexibility; (5) collaboration/building relationships; (6) decision-making; and (7) communication (Inaugural *Leadership I* Class, 2010). The stated purpose and critical competencies reflect both industrial and postindustrial paradigm elements.

Themes

I used the table found in Appendix A as a framework to begin the coding process. Using the industrial and postindustrial characteristics for each of the four theories, I determined codes for multiple subthemes. I then placed those subthemes into groups based on similarities. From those groupings emerged six overarching themes. These six overarching themes closely align with the areas of *intersection and difference* [See Appendix A] of the four theoretical perspectives in terms of leadership development, as discussed in chapter two. The following are the six themes that emerged from the data:

- (1) Emphasis on legitimate power;
- (2) Emphasis on traits and behaviors;
- (3) Emphasis on the leader;
- (4) Significance of context and culture;
- (5) Significance of relationships and influence;
- (6) Leadership as a process

The six themes and the related subthemes represent elements of both industrial and postindustrial paradigms. They also reflect an emphasis on *leader* development as well as *leadership* development. As I explore each of the themes in detail in this chapter, a pattern emerges that indicates the *Leadership I* program includes elements of individual development as well as institutional development. When asked if *Leadership I* is about individual development and a catalyst for advancement, or if its focus is more on institutional change, Laura Jones, a director in the division of university advancement who has been at the institution eight years, said:

I think it's some of both. I think you go into it thinking it's about individual development and basically what it can do for me. I should not speak for the class, because I don't know that, but I think you do go into it with that mindset, that I'm going to improve, I may move up – some people may go into it thinking they're going to get that skill set then

leave. I don't know how many people have done that, but I'm sure we all came into it with our own perceptions and probably left slightly different because I think it does help the university. It's investing in its employees. It's possibly training its next round of top-level leaders because we've been through the training and we're familiar with how things work at the university. We have that network now. It's probably very smart on the university's part that it does this kind of program; it's kind of like growing your own leadership.

Ms. Jones' sentiments are significant because they represent a leadership philosophy that is focused on individuals, is trait-based and advocates the use of legitimate power, yet also reveals the importance of situational context, relationships, and *leadership as a process*. Ms. Jones' comments reflect well the overall findings of the dissertation, which do not show the *Leadership I* curriculum exclusively adopting either an industrial or postindustrial leadership approach. I include discussions in this chapter about each of the six themes. I provide examples of leadership characteristics and philosophies supported by the *Leadership I* curriculum. These characteristics and philosophies can be attributed to both industrial and postindustrial paradigms, as well as to both *leader* and *leadership* development. In this chapter, I refer to those individuals who participated in one of the three cohorts of *Leadership I* as *participants* and those who served on the advisory committee as *advisory committee members*.

Emphasis on Legitimate Power

Legitimate power refers to a person's ability to influence others because of his or her positional authority in an organization (Lunenburg, 2012). "That is, the organization has given to an individual occupying a particular position the right to influence—direct—certain other individuals" (Lunenburg, 2012, p. 2). Similarly, Gortner et al. (2007) described legitimate power as the "authority based on one's right by virtue of a leadership position" (p. 337). As discussed in chapter two, when leadership is defined as an individual, it focuses on power derived from legitimate behaviors, top-down management, formal positions, and the goals of the leader.

Legitimate power is more evident in trait, behavioral and situational theories, although the use of legitimate power is also seen within change-oriented models.

According to Gortner et al. (2007), legitimate power is prevalent within administrative aspects of higher education. In fact, two of the four assumptions that typically guide faculty and staff leadership development philosophies center on the idea of legitimate behavior (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). The first of these assumptions is that *leadership is conceptualized as an individual, hierarchical leader*. The second assumption is that *effective leadership is related to social control, authority, and power* (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). Both of the aforementioned assumptions are reflective of a formal, leader-centered philosophy that derives power from position and both assumptions represent an industrial paradigm perspective of leadership.

Through my interviews with participants and advisory committee members, as well as from observation of courses and document review, I found that the *Leadership Institute* program underscores the use of legitimate power in both a direct and indirect manner. In this section, I will discuss how *Leadership I* places emphasis on legitimate power in the following ways: (1) through the introduction to the program; (2) through the definition of leadership as an individual, positional authority; and (3) through the emphasis on individual advancement.

Introduction to the Program

Learning about the *Leadership Institute*. Prior to the first word spoken at an orientation or in a workshop setting, individuals begin to form opinions about a program. For example, how a person learns about a program, the application process and the admission process contribute to that participant's perception of the program as he or she moves forward. In the case of *Leadership Institute*, of the 17 program participants interviewed, 12 first learned of the program through their supervisor or from the dean of their academic department. More than half of the

participants indicated that the endorsement from a supervisor was critical to their decision to apply. This kind of endorsement was especially significant to Andrea Cassidy, an executive director in student affairs and new professional in the field of higher education, who stated, “I don’t know if I would have applied if she [my boss] didn’t kind of tag me as being someone she thought would be good for it.” Likewise, Martha Stone, who has been at the institution eight years working in the realm of student and academic affairs in mid-management positions, said, “My boss at the time sent me an e-mail and said ‘I think you should consider this.’ And I don’t know that I would have without his endorsement.”

Some participants said that without the encouragement of their supervisor or their dean, they would not have considered themselves a qualified applicant. Others said that although they were interested in the program, they felt like they were too busy to invest in leadership development for themselves and would not have pursued it without prodding from their supervisor. Still others described the application process as more of a mandate—something they were required to do by virtue of their position. This was the case for Richard Rollings, a director of a department in the division of student affairs. Mr. Rollings has been at the institution for less than five years and said he did not know about the *Leadership I* program until his manager said, “Hey, I’ve just put you up for this--go do it.” Michael Anderson, an assistant vice president in the area of advancement who has been on campus nine years had a similar experience. He said the following about his introduction to the program:

It was determined that I would be—should participate. They were aware of it, what was coming down the pike and they were like, “This would be a great opportunity for you to get some more leadership experience and more exposure to other areas on campus.”

Introduction to the program from an authority figure. Within the context of the conversation about legitimate power, it is important to acknowledge that the majority of

participants were initially introduced to the program by an authority figure and most frequently by their direct supervisor. The way in which most participants learned about the program was through the top-down structure of the institution. Whether through encouragement or direct mandate, supervisors and deans used their influence derived by their position to ensure participation. According to advisory committee members, including the supervisor is an intentional part of the recruitment process for *Leadership I*. The supervisor is also included in the admission and orientation process to ensure that he or she understands the commitment necessary for the program.

There are very few instances that the legitimate power utilized was described as coercive in nature, in which faculty or staff feared punitive actions if they did not participate. These examples were infrequent and such coercion resulted in varied outcomes (for example, one participant who said his participation was required became one of the program's biggest advocates and the other individual who said he was required to participate by his supervisor was one of the program's greatest critics). Overall, the involvement of the supervisors in the admission and recommendation process and the use of legitimate power have had multiple positive outcomes. One such outcome is the prevalence of individuals participating in the application and interview process who might otherwise not have applied. According to participants, the inclusion of the supervisors also created a more formal tone to the process and made them not only take the process more seriously, but gave the program greater credibility. Overall the participants responded favorably to the inclusion of their supervisors and found that supervisor engagement was important to make the time commitment necessary for the program more manageable. Participant Martha Stone commented about the positive experience of having supervisors involved in the process:

The supervisor also had to sign off on the application form. You know there was a buy in there. But for them to include the supervisors in the luncheon that we had... and Dr. Johnson talked to the supervisors, that "this is a commitment on your part too. And we have expectations for you too and you cannot burnout your employee because you don't give them a little slack to participate in *Leadership I*."

Application and selection process. In addition to the legitimate power utilized in the initial introduction to the *Leadership I* program, there is also evidence of it in the application process. In the application documents for 2013 an "ideal faculty candidate" is described as an "individual poised for advancement into leadership positions on campus." Similarly, "ideal staff candidates" are described as "managers at the director or assistant/associate director level with a track record for consistent excellence in progressively more demanding positions." Included in both of these descriptions is the idea of professional advancement and an emphasis on language that depicts leadership in terms of individual development.

Many of the participants who commented on the application process said that the formal nature of the process was impressive to them and made them take more seriously the program and its goals. Participants also commented that they were honored to be selected after completing the *Leadership I* application process, which they said was more elaborate as compared to other campus programs of which they had been a part. Denise Price, a staff member who has been working in the same area of student affairs at the institution for 20 years and currently serves as an associate director, described the application process as "exciting." She said that the application and statement of purpose challenged her to reflect on the way in which she impacts the institution and helped her to think about her professional development goals. Samantha Simon, a director in the area of advancement, also stated that the formality of the application and interview process made her and other participants feel as if this is an important program to the institution and the institution is investing in developing those who are selected.

The formality of the application and interview process was noted by most participants, but several also mentioned the language used on the website and on the application. According to participants, the language used indicates that advancement opportunities are related to participation in the program. In regard to the application materials, Andrea Cassidy stated:

Well, I felt like it was kind of focused on position sometimes. I think something in the – I'm big on language, and I think...I think something in the application or on the website or something...I just remember it saying something about "your position and advancing." And I remember seeing "advancing" and knowing it was attributed to a position. I mean, to me, I just wondered if that changed the motives of some people in there.

Dr. Madeline Foster, the chair of the *Leadership I* advisory committee, shared her thoughts about the selection process, which are related to legitimate power. When asked how she thought other faculty and staff who are not a part of *Leadership I* perceive the program, she said,

I think that sometimes some people want it to be about identifying someone who has potential and that causes some hurt feeling sometimes. I've had conversations on a couple of occasions where somebody is like "why didn't so and so get chosen for interview?" And we'll say "their job isn't big enough compared to where we're aiming at." Right or wrong, where we're shooting at is at bigger jobs and the notion is that there are other kinds of opportunities for people within those other positions and that sooner or later, they'll be successful; they'll thrive; they'll be in this job that fits better. So that's probably caused some frustration and we need to do a better job of communicating about that.

This comment is significant because in the course of my research I have heard both from those who I interviewed, as well as from others on campus, that *Leadership I* is perceived as somewhat elitist in its selection process--that there are several marginalized areas on campus that are considered too "small" or "insignificant" to be represented by membership within the program. Dr. Foster argued that qualified individuals from such areas will eventually move into other, larger positions, and will then have an opportunity to participate in the program. Others argued that some of the areas that are overlooked represent the most marginalized populations and include staff members who have expertise in those areas, gaining both campus and national

recognition, but have no desire to move to another position and thus will never have the opportunity to participate in *Leadership I*. According to participants and community members, these faculty and staff members' legitimate power is low at the institution, but their impact may be great, especially when looking at retention of small but critical populations.

Leadership Defined as Individual, Positional Authority

One of the hallmarks of industrial leadership is an emphasis on legitimate behaviors in leadership activities. Legitimate behavior encompasses the idea that leadership is defined in terms of an individual or a position (Gortner, et al., 2007). This perspective on leadership is especially evident in the data collected through individual interviews, but also present in program documents and through classroom observation.

Interacting with senior leaders as an outcome. When asked to identify the most significant part of the curriculum for increasing their leadership capacity, almost every participant identified *time spent with senior-level administrators* as most significant. Likewise, when asked to identify their three main outcomes of the program, a majority of participants included *getting the opportunity to know and interact with senior-level administrators on a more personal level* as one of the most significant programmatic outcomes. Dr. Heather Smith, an associate dean and member of the faculty who has worked at the university for more than 20 years, said that the opportunity to hear from campus leaders with whom an employee would typically not have the chance to interact was extremely valuable. She specifically noted the significance of the inclusion of presidents, vice presidents, and deans in the program's panels. Similarly, Samantha Simon said the program "brought in the highest level of leadership on campus." Ms. Simon stated that she found value in having senior-level administrators share the challenges and successes of their careers in a candid manner.

As one of the newest higher education professionals involved in the program, Andrea Cassidy also stated how impressive it was to hear from the vice presidents and other senior-level administrators. Like Ms. Simon and many of the other participants, she found the stories of their individual leadership journeys inspiring. She also felt like the interaction the group had with the senior-level administrators made them more relatable--more of individuals rather than positions. Of her experience with senior-level administrators during her time in the program, Ms. Cassidy stated,

I mean, I loved hearing from all the VPs. Just being able to sit there and hear their whole leadership journey and what they really care about because that was promising to me. Sometimes, you just get this idea of the administration making decisions, and maybe they're not in touch with things, but being able to hear from each person individually made me realize that they're all human, and they are in touch, and they care about this place. So, as a new professional, that made me more committed to Southwest State University.

In addition to finding time with the senior-level administrators inspiring and having the opportunity to relate to them on a more personal basis, several participants also indicated that an outcome of interaction with senior-level administrators is increased confidence and a feeling of reassurance. Phillip Forrester, who has worked at a director level in academic affairs at the institution for more than 15 years, said the following in terms of his interaction with institution and system-wide administrators:

That was – for me what was pleasing was meeting with trustees, meeting with people from the SWSU system, meeting with the president and senior members of staff who I’ve dealt with to a certain extent on a day-to-day basis...and being reassured that they were seeing things the same way.

Other participants concurred that the confidence in knowing that they are on the same page as senior-level administrators, or that they are doing what is desired of them, has been a benefit of the interactions. More staff members than faculty members addressed the issue of confidence and professional reassurance as a result of relationships forged with individual speakers.

Equating a position of authority to enhanced leadership knowledge. The majority of participants reported that the ability to interact and ask questions of senior-level administrators were among some of the most valuable aspects of the program. There are some participants, however, who did not appreciate the interactive component and would have preferred a more lecture style format. Michael Anderson said the following regarding the interactive forum with senior-level administrators:

Actually, there were times on the interaction where I wish some people in my group would have been quiet and let me soak up more of what the person had to say. I did like hearing from the – you know, if we have the vice president of student affairs, and he's sharing with us. To me, if you get people like that, and you get their time, I want to hear more from them, as opposed to somebody else that's sitting in the room with me.

A few other participants shared Mr. Anderson's perspective that hearing the speakers was more valuable than interacting with them, although no one else was as critical of their peers as he.

Courtney Matthews, a director in financial affairs and an employee of the university for 13 years had a different, but related, thought regarding the interaction with the senior-level administrators. She commented that it seemed to be through "osmosis" that senior-level leadership taught them effective leadership practices.

Both Ms. Matthews and Mr. Anderson represent a way of thinking that reflects the industrial perspective, which equates leadership with position. Mr. Anderson was interested only in hearing the senior-level administrators speak about leadership because he equates their *position* with *expertise*. He did not hold as much value, if any, for the perspectives of his peers, most of who hold "lower" positions than himself. Ms. Matthews' comment poignantly represents what I heard from most of the participants regarding their experiences with senior-level administrators. Although participants appreciated the interaction and question and answer component of the panels, they seemed to most enjoy hearing the speakers talk. They believe the

senior-level administrators represent “best leadership practices” by virtue of the position that they hold. By simply being in their presence, the participants reported feeling as if they were gaining knowledge about effective leadership approaches.

Legitimate power represented by heroic leadership of “great men” and “great women”. The concept of leadership-by-osmosis that Courtney Matthews described is similar to the approaches of those who promote the ideas of heroic leadership. It reflects the notion that only a few “great men” or “great women” are leaders and it is from those individuals, exclusively, that people should seek knowledge. One of the more striking findings in regard to position is the frequency of times the university president and vice presidents were mentioned by the program participants. *All* of the program participants commented about the involvement of the president and/or the vice presidents, while only a few mentioned any of the other individuals from campus or from the system who served as speakers, facilitators or panelists. Ms. Matthews said, “We had the president come. It was a big deal.” The sentiments of the other program participants were similar. They expressed awe at the inclusion of the president and vice presidents. Faculty and staff alike asserted that it made the program more legitimate and “important.” For many of the participants these “great men” and “great women” gave the program prestige.

The word most commonly associated with the inclusion of the president and vice presidents was “impressive.” Dr. Grace Johnson, one of the advisory committee members and creators of the *Leadership I* program, said that the advisory committee has made an intentional effort to ensure that the program is not about impressive titles or “great men” but, rather, meaningful change. Dr. Johnson made the following comments:

That was one of the things Victoria and I kept pushing, "We want application."

We did not want people to come away from this saying, "Wow, I got to meet the president today and it was so impressive to be with the president. He just made me feel so good about the university and this is just such a great program." Well, how is that going to change what you do? "Oh, it's not going to change anything that I do, but it was just great. I would recommend this to anyone." We didn't want that satisfaction. We wanted it to be something that was application based that really made a difference in the way they approached their job. So we sort of kept pushing on that. On the other hand, we did not want it to be...this is how you fill out a form or... this is how you do this. It needed to be sort of a very rich understanding still of how the university operates.

By virtue of being a vice president or president, the participants recognized the individual as a leader and thus as someone after whom leadership behaviors should be modeled. This view is one that carries significant insight into institutional culture as well as the intentions of the *Leadership I* program in the development of faculty and staff. The comments and discussion of the participants illustrate a formal culture that has respect for position and hierarchy. When I asked program participants if the curriculum reflects a more formal or informal approach to leadership, the majority responded that it reflects elements of both informal and formal leadership, but that it emphasizes formal leadership that includes a top-down approach and focuses on the individual as a leader and positional authority. Of the 17 program participants, ten said that the curriculum has elements of both formal and informal leadership whereas seven participants asserted that the curriculum focuses only on formal structures and approaches. Of the ten who said that there are elements of both formal and informal leadership included, most asserted that formal approaches are more prevalent and visible.

David Self, an executive director in the division of financial affairs who has been at the university for six years, called some parts of the *Leadership I* curriculum "title-driven." Martha Stone said the institution sees leadership as a "level" and that such a perspective is reflected in the *Leadership I* curriculum. Laura Jones represented the sentiment of many of the participants regarding the program's focus on formal, positional leadership. She said:

I don't think one was more emphasized than the other. I think intrinsically the expectation was more top down; you're in a leadership program because of the position you hold. I think you had to be at director level or higher, so I think there was that expectation from us as participants as well as from the steering committee who's doing the work and guiding us that at that level you are a leader. You're not just a manager. You're not making sure somebody just fills up their time and things are being handled.

Ms. Jones' perspective reinforces Ms. Cassidy's comments regarding the language used in the application process. From the onset, most participants viewed the program as a small, elite group of people who were selected because of their current position and potential for growth.

Emphasis on Individual Advancement

The idea of potential advancement is one that was discussed frequently during the one-on-one interview phase of the data collection. One of the questions that I asked participants to reflect upon is whether they feel like *Leadership Institute* is meant to be a catalyst for advancement and individual growth or whether it is geared more toward widespread leadership development. The responses I received were varied, but almost all participants shared that they received either a direct or indirect message about advancement opportunities.

A perception of advancement based on program participation. Participants held varying perspectives about the presentation of the message regarding professional advancement. Some, like Andrea Cassidy, said that the initial interview and application process used language that implied the program was a stepping-stone for advancement opportunities. Phillip Forrester agreed with Ms. Cassidy regarding the application process. Mr. Forrester also stated that the implication that *Leadership I* is tied to promotion was evident through conversations had during the university specific sessions. Mr. Forrester made the following comments regarding this subject:

One of the things that I think I would criticize – that's too strong a word. No it's not. No It's too strong a word. One of the things that I would say they oversold perhaps going in was they create the impression that it's --whilst they would deny this--they create the

impression that it's very much a promotional thing. That you complete this course and you're guaranteed a promotion. Now they didn't actually use those words, but that was very implied. And now being an older person and sensitive to their knowledge about these things I knew that wasn't necessarily the case. What they should have been saying was that these are skills, these are tools that you need to acquire if you wish to – if you are ambitious and wish to move forward, but there's no guarantee. I think they were guilty a little bit of implying that it was guaranteed and I think there were some people who were a little bit upset when they realized that wasn't going to be the case necessarily.

David Self, an individual who holds great value in the servant leadership model also discussed participant expectation in terms of promotion. He said that he believes many of his colleagues saw the program as something good for their résumés and a way for them to “move up to the next step.” Mr. Self said that he thinks most people in his cohort share his belief that there is individual benefit as well as institutional benefit to be gained from the program. In reference to this, he commented:

If I'm applying for a job at the university that's above me, they're gonna see this *Leadership I* credential and that's gonna stand out and mean something...that hopefully there is a next step for those who went through the program or at least that you've kinda got a differentiator, if you will, on your résumé when those positions come open. I think everyone in there would be somewhat disappointed if they felt like someone with the same amount of experience and the same skills and abilities...if they were applying for the same job, there would be some disappointment to think that *Leadership I* doesn't mean anything. And the fact that I think you go into it hoping that on the back end of this there's something to be gained and so – for the university as a whole, because hopefully they've got better leaders, but also from the perspective of hey, I went through this, now I'm going to try to use this.

The idea that both the institution and the individual will have notable gains as an outcome of the program mirrors somewhat the position that participants took when asked about the formal and informal leadership emphasis of the curriculum. Many participants said that the curriculum represents both vertical and horizontal leadership approaches, and likewise, many also said they believe that the program's intent is for both individual advancement and widespread leadership development. The underlying message from a majority of the participants, however, included an expectation that they would graduate from the program with an elevated status that might lead to

later advancement. No one said they would be disappointed if the institution did not improve as a result of the program but several, like Mr. Self, said that they would be disheartened if they saw no personal benefit.

Overall, most participants agreed that advancement was discussed as a possible outcome of the program, but there was no stated guarantee. Laura Jones said that the advisory committee members were clear that *Leadership I* does not guarantee any type of promotion, but it does “enable you to do a better job and it may open other opportunities.”

Andrea Cassidy stated that the topic came up several times in discussions when the cohort got together formally and informally. Once, she said, several participants posed the question about program participation leading to advancement during one of the *Leadership I* sessions. Ms. Cassidy said it was presented in a joking manner, but she thought the individuals asking were quite serious. In response to the question as to whether participation in *Leadership I* is linked to advancement at the university, Dr. Johnson explained that there are no guarantees. Ms. Cassidy said she did not go into the program looking for advancement, but as one of the few people who have been promoted since the cohort graduated, she recognizes that *Leadership I* may have been a catalyst for her in some way. Several other participants referenced open conversations, both within and outside of *Leadership I* sessions, regarding the link between advancement and the program participation.

Advancement as a result of the caliber of participants rather than as a function of the curriculum. Two of the faculty shared the perspective that the conversation about advancement may have emerged as much because of the caliber of the individuals involved in the program as it did because of any programmatic element. Dr. Samuel Faulkner said the leadership development provided in the program made him ask himself, “What do I need to do to

develop into the next level of leadership?” He continued by saying, “I want to set milestones now for what I want to accomplish in this role before I move to my next role.” Likewise, Dr. Heather Smith said the following regarding how she believes people in her cohort looked at the aspect of promotion:

Not everybody was, I don't think everybody's there to say, “I'm going to go to a promotion.” I think we were all there to strengthen our leadership, even in what we were currently doing. So I think that, just by, I don't know if anybody emphasized that as a topic, but I think that people were just wanting to be better and be leaders in what we were doing at the time, and if people received something new then that was great too, but if not that was okay.

Dr. Smith's comments certainly reflect Martha Stone's feelings. Ms. Stone said that conversations did naturally turn to the idea of advancement because of the discussions that unfolded over the two years of meetings. She said that as her peers listened to guest speakers and began discussing their desires to move into higher levels of administration, she realized that she did not want to give up her daily contact with students to pursue higher positions. She said a focus on advancement emerged given the drive of the individuals in the program, but for her it brought the realization that she does not want to seek a promotion in that manner. From the advisory committee perspective, Dr. Madeline Foster said she does not think about the program as providing any guarantees for promotion. She added, however, “people who've thought more about what they're trying to do are going to be the more attractive candidates to be advanced,” which again echoes this idea that it is the caliber of the participants in the program that leads to individual advancement, rather than a result of the program's curriculum itself.

Advancement as a stated or perceived purpose of the program. The connection between legitimate power and advancement opportunities for participants involved in the *Leadership I* program is revealed in the way many participants talk about the purpose of *Leadership I*. I asked participants to tell me in their own words what they consider to be the

purpose of the *Leadership I* program. The most common response I received was that the purpose of *Leadership I* is to grow and develop future leaders from within the university. When asked to explain what they mean by the term “leaders,” participants responded that they mean senior-level administrators or people in higher-level positions.

I have included some brief comments from several participants because I believe it is significant how strikingly similar each one’s response is to the other. Michael Anderson said, “I think kind of the way it was put to me was it was to grow leaders from within at the university.” Martha Stone said the purpose was to “develop the university’s future leadership-- administration.” Samantha Simon said she thought the purpose was to “develop future leaders for the university and to give them the skills that they need and the skills that the university finds desirable.” Laura Jones said she believes the purpose of the program is to “help employees at the director level or higher to not only become better at what they do, but to also train future leaders for the university.” To the question regarding purpose, Dr. Peter Battle said, “I do think that the purpose of it is to try to develop leadership skills among people that are in or going to be in leadership positions at the university,” adding that the university has a “long history of trying to develop leaders from within the ranks.” Andrea Cassidy said, “I just think they see potential in this group of people, so that if an opportunity comes up...if you advance into a high-level position, some relationships will already exist; a knowledge base is formed; skill sets are refined, that type of thing.” Dr. Samuel Faulkner noted, “I think the purpose of the program is to grow the next generation of university leaders.” Finally, Robert Lamb summarized his perspective on the purpose of *Leadership I* in the following manner:

I think it’s trying to replicate not really just our current leaders, but trying to have the vision of the university cast to junior leaders who can permeate that through the organization and hopefully they [university administrators] are identifying talent that can move into higher levels of leadership.

The *Leadership I* website provides the following comments as to the design of the program: “*Leadership I* is designed to prepare aspiring faculty and professional staff to assume positions of higher responsibility within the university and other higher education arenas.” The website also poses the question “What is the best way for the university to prepare for the future?” The response listed is, “We believe it comes from investing in leaders. During this two-year program, *Leadership I* will strengthen the capacity for leadership for up to 10 select members within the university community.” These statements can easily be interpreted as promoting ideas of widespread leadership, as well as individual leadership development and advancement. The phrase “higher responsibility” can be identified as positional in meaning or as increased responsibility—such as in John F Kennedy’s quote referencing biblical scripture, “to those whom much is given much is expected”.

Purpose of the program perceived as widespread leadership development. A small minority of participants said they did not think that advancement opportunities were a focus of the program. Richard Rollings said,

I think there's a degree of advancement in it, but I gotta be honest, I don't see it that way, and I don't think a lot of folks saw it that way. I know that I've been asked by people – I think it'd be better to put it this way: I've been asked by people about my experience in *Leadership I* and to recommend them. And when I ask why they want to do it, there are folks who are like, "Yeah. I want this so that it goes on my CV"...I see it as me getting that giant chunk of Lucite that's sitting right there that I don't really care about at all. I think that if you go into it thinking that suddenly you're magically ready for some next step or level – yeah, there's development there that happens, absolutely, but it's not a name thing.

Interestingly, even within Mr. Rollings’ statement when he said most people do not see *Leadership I* as a catalyst for advancement, he acknowledged that people wanted to get involved in the program for the purpose of advancement. Whatever the personal feelings and motivations

of participants, the findings indicate that there is a strong underlying theme of advancement, whether direct or indirect, intentionally or unintentionally implied.

Dr. Samuel Faulkner offered a faculty perspective on advancement as it relates to the *Leadership I* program. Although Dr. Faulkner said he feels the program is related to individual advancement, he also feels like it is about more than that. From the faculty perspective he said he sees the potential for widespread leadership development via professors and instructors taking what they have learned from *Leadership I*, and the networks they have built, to further advance the mission of the university within their academic areas. When I asked Dr. Grace Johnson of the advisory committee whether she believes the program is more about individual development or widespread leadership and change, she stated that she believes both, further saying, “I don't know that we've got the curriculum ironed out well enough that we could make a blanket statement.” When asked the same question, advisory committee member Dr. Madeline Foster said, “I really personally look at it more as an institutional strategy. Now, I know that's probably not why people apply.” Victoria Thompson, another advisory committee member who, along with Dr. Foster and Dr. Johnson, was integral in the creation of the curriculum also indicated that the purpose is two-fold--to develop individuals as well as act as an institutional strategy. Interestingly, Dr. Mary Louise Hightower and Dr. Albert Dugan, the two advisory committee members I interviewed who were not integral in creating the curriculum, stated that their perception is that the program focuses mostly on individual development and advancement.

Concluding Remarks about the Findings Associated with the Theme of Legitimate Power

Legitimate power refers to a person's ability to influence others because of his or her positional authority in an organization (Lunenburg, 2012). The findings from the personal interviews and document review, especially, indicate that the *Leadership I* program emphasizes

the use of legitimate power through (1) the way in which participants are introduced to the program; (2) the definition of leadership as an individual, position of authority; and (3) the emphasis on individual advancement. Participants indicated that the program emphasizes the importance of advancement through the language used in the application process and demonstrates the institution's hierarchical culture with the involvement of supervisors in the admission process. Participants also commented on the emphasis placed on senior-level administrators during the university specific sessions, which indicated to many that the institution sees leadership as more of a position rather than a philosophy. Participants stated that their engagement with senior-level administrators was one of their most significant outcomes. Almost unanimously, the participants shared that they believe future advancement is linked to participation in the program and believe the purpose of the program is to groom positional leaders for the institution. Statements on the website and in other *Leadership I* documents support this idea, as well, although key advisory committee members said that this is not the main goal of the program.

Overall, participant comments and *Leadership I* documents indicated that there is a strong message regarding the use of legitimate power that is embedded in the program's curriculum that emerges from the culture of the institution itself. In the following sections, I will discuss the findings regarding the emphasis on traits and behaviors and the emphasis on leader-centered behavior, both of which are closely linked to the message of and use of legitimate power and all of which represent an industrial perspective of leadership.

Emphasis on Traits and Behaviors

In chapter two I discussed that one of the similarities between trait, behavioral, situational, and change-oriented approaches to leadership is the widespread emphasis placed on

traits and behaviors. The focus on traits and behaviors is also a hallmark of industrial leadership according to Rost (1993). Change-oriented leadership models often champion multidirectional influence; however, these approaches also highlight traits and behaviors of leaders and how those traits and behaviors allow them to create transformation and enact change. As discussed in chapter two, charismatic leadership may be the best example of a change-oriented approach that also focuses on traits. Charismatic leadership emphasizes a formal leader's attributes and abilities that allow him or her to accomplish extraordinary feats. The "great man" and heroic leadership approaches discussed in conjunction to the *legitimate power* theme are often what people initially think about when discussing traits and behaviors—the idea that there is one set of traits, characteristics and behaviors that equate to effective leadership.

Trait, behavioral, and situational theories discuss behavior, style, skill and attributes in a straightforward manner either as *the factors* or as *corresponding factors* in leadership effectiveness and emergence. From the responses of participants, both to the questions posed directly regarding leadership behaviors and characteristics as well as those given in general discussion, the idea of leadership effectiveness in terms of traits and behaviors emerged. One of the four assumptions that guide most contemporary leadership development programming deals with the emphasis on traits and behaviors. Kezar and Carducci (2009) stated the following assumption as an underlying principle in most leadership programming today: *universal and predictable skills and traits that transcend context best epitomize the work of leaders*. Kezar and Carducci (2009) acknowledged the prevalence of this principle in contemporary leadership development programming, but also significantly criticized its influence. In the following section, I will examine the way in which program participants and advisory committee members

discussed leadership traits and behaviors and the way in which they are included in *Leadership I* documents.

Emphasis on Leadership Traits

The way in which leadership traits were most commonly discussed in terms of *Leadership I* and its curriculum mirrors the way in which they are discussed in the literature about leadership. This is especially true in relationship to program participant responses. The program participants frequently spoke about traits in terms of heroic leadership, specific leader characteristics, and skill development.

Heroic leadership. In the late 1800s, Francis Dalton defined leadership as a “unique property of extraordinary individuals whose decisions are capable of sometimes radically changing the streams of history.” His assertion that a leader’s effectiveness is a result of inborn traits continues to impact today’s perspectives about leadership. The idea of leadership as a “unique property” of “extraordinary individuals” emerged through the comments of the participants regarding, especially, the former president and current chancellor of the institution and other senior-level administrators. The participants spoke about the past president with admiration and reverence, and referenced him as a “hero” of the institution.

In the previous section I discussed how the participants indicated the significance of legitimate power by their frequent references to the president and vice presidents of the institution. Such references also included an emphasis on the traits and behaviors that give the individuals the legitimate power that is admired. Courtney Matthews expressed her feelings about the past president with the following sentiments:

We had the president come. It was a big deal...I don’t know about you, but I loved that man when he was—I mean, I guess he’s our chancellor, so he’s still our boss. But he would say something and there was never any cards, never stumbling, always figures. I would just be like, “Okay, I’m good. I’m going. Let me go to work.”

Like Ms. Matthews, others shared their awe of the former president's unique leadership abilities and how he was able to use those abilities to inspire them to work harder and think about things from a bigger picture perspective.

One of the most striking elements of the data collected from the interviews is that almost every person attributed the recent growth and success of the university exclusively to the former president. In these comments, the participants almost always mentioned the idea of the former president's vision and charisma. When asked later to define leadership, almost all of the participants said a leader must have vision. I address this concept of vision further as a finding in a later section, but in talking about heroic leadership it is significant to note that people involved in this study largely attribute the success of the institution to one man's vision. That man's influence can also be seen, repeatedly, in the way in which individuals personally define leadership.

Inborn leadership. Although most participants did not indicate directly that they believe leadership is limited to those who possess certain, inborn characteristics, that opinion is not entirely absent from their comments. Michael Anderson made several comments throughout his interview that mirrored the "great man" philosophy of leadership. When talking about his personal perspective on leadership, Mr. Anderson said:

You know, as far as leadership, to me, if you're really talking strictly about leadership, I mean, I think it's one of those things where either people are leaders...[or] are not leaders. And I don't know necessarily if you can go through a program like that and put somebody in there who's not really an innate [leader] and then they come out and be that type of person. They may actually be a lot better manager. Are they ever going to be a great leader?

Other participants referred to certain traits they feel a leader must possess, many of which are identifiers that are stable throughout one's life, but no one else described leadership as a set of inborn characteristics in quite the same manner as Mr. Anderson described it.

Characteristics of effective leaders. In chapter two, I discussed the two ways in which leadership attributes are most commonly described in literature. Distal characteristics or “trait-like” attributes are defined as those characteristics that are more stable throughout one's lifespan, such as cognitive abilities, personality and values (Hoffman, et al., 2010; Zaccaro, et al., 2004). Proximal characteristics or “state-like” attributes are defined as less stable throughout one's lifespan and thus more malleable and able to be developed (Hoffman, et al., 2010; Zaccaro, et al., 2004). Social appraisal skills, problem solving skills, expertise and tacit knowledge are examples of proximal attributes (Zaccaro, et al., 2004; Hoffman, et al., 2010). Program participants defined their leadership philosophies, as well as described individual university leaders, in terms of both trait-like and state-like characteristics.

Trait-like characteristics. As discussed in the last section, a few participants with a heroic view of leadership defined leaders almost completely in terms of trait-like characteristics; however, this was not the norm. For the majority of program participants, the focus on trait-like characteristics emerged in their discussions of the senior-level administrators at the institution. Trait-like characteristics were evident in the descriptions of the president and vice presidents—especially in relation to creating buy-in to their vision for the institution.

Although few participants used the word “charisma”, they described the attributes expressed by senior-level leadership as charismatic in nature. According to Hoffman, et al. (2011) charisma is a distal or “trait-like” attribute. When later asked to provide their personal definition of leadership, many incorporated the idea of charisma into their definition. An

example of such a description came from Dr. Peter Battle, a tenured professor who is in his 22nd year at the institution. Dr. Battle said that leadership is in part “taking responsibility for a vision for where the organization needs to go and convincing other people that that’s the way things ought to go.” Michael Anderson also included this idea of charisma in his personal definition of leadership: “But leadership, to me, really kind of creates buy-in and gets everybody pointed in the same direction in how we go from point A to point B.”

State-like characteristics. Program participants discussed leadership in terms of proximal or “state-like” attributes more frequently than they discussed leadership in terms of distal or “trait-like” attributes. Specifically, program participants described senior-level administrators as having effective communication skills, effective management skills, problem-solving skills, drive and technical business knowledge, all of which are characterized as proximal attributes. Ability to communicate is the state-like attribute most addressed by participants. Communication was also cited in *Leadership I* documents as a critical competency of the program.

Phillip Forrester said that one of the most striking commonalities between senior-level administrators are their abilities to communicate with various constituencies as well as with the media. Richard Rollings said that communication skills are among the traits emphasized during *Leadership I* as being linked to effective leadership. When asked what qualities *Leadership I* specifically promotes as those resulting in effective leadership, he answered "communication." Mr. Rollings said, “Being able to articulate things in a way that is understandable to your audience is one of them [qualities linked to effective leadership]. Knowing your audience is another one because there are different audiences and different messages for different audiences.” Courtney Matthews replied to the same question by saying, the program “focused a lot on communication; whether it's email, a memo, or just knowing when to pick up the

telephone and call someone.” A majority of participants addressed communication in some fashion and many in a similar manner to Mr. Rollings, Ms. Matthews, and Mr. Forrester.

Traits as linked to a specific leadership philosophy. Although participants addressed several different qualities related to effective leadership, they mostly discussed these traits when describing senior-level administrators. When specifically asked how the *Leadership I* program and curriculum defines successful leadership and whether or not it promotes certain traits or qualities as those which equate to leadership success, the resounding answer was no. Many participants stated that their perception of the program is that the curriculum was designed in a way to give participants multiple perspectives on leadership so that they could have the opportunity to see different personalities, traits, skill-sets and styles that lead to effective leadership. When asked whether there were specific qualities promoted, Robert Lamb said the following:

No, there wasn't a rigid parameter at all and I think what the program tried to accomplish was giving you different leadership perspectives and so they brought in a variety of different leaders who had different leadership philosophies. Some of them were the same...but they brought them from all different levels of leadership as well as all the different senior leaders who had different perspectives. I think it gave you an opportunity to kind of pick and see some different leadership philosophies.

Dr. Heather Smith had a similar sentiment. When asked the same question, she said that she saw it as the program offering participants a variety of experiences and opportunities from which to learn about how various leaders who possess strengths in different areas have been successful. Dr. Smith indicated that the message was not about specific qualities, but rather as if the coordinators were saying “We’re offering you these opportunities and this information, and how can you take it to be a leader?” Laughing, Courtney Matthews agreed that no specific “list” of qualities for effective leaders was given, although she said she had hoped there would be one provided. Ms. Matthews said the following when asked if the program focused on specific

leadership characteristics or traits, “I don't think so. I wanted that. I wanted that. What it did was it gave you a toolbox to carry back out with you into the real world with ideas and resources that you could look up.”

Some participants asserted that although specific inborn qualities were not identified as being the traits one must possess in order to be an effective leader, there were some qualities that were discussed as necessary ones to develop in order to succeed. To the question regarding whether a finite list of leadership qualities was discussed Richard Rollings said no. He did, however, say that there was a “tacit understanding that there are qualities that are required” and that the program brought in institutional leaders who, because of their possession of such traits, were able to affect change on campus. He said this was especially helpful to participants because “you could see yourself through their stories.” Mr. Rollings also said that the exercises during the program allowed individuals to examine closer some of the state-like attributes that were indicated as helpful to success in leadership.

Skills approach. The skills approach to leadership looks at “the capabilities, knowledge and skills that make effective leadership possible” (Mumford, et al., 2000, p. 12). More so than the other two aspects of the trait approach, the skills approach to leadership can be seen in the intentional, formal, programmatic structure and curriculum of *Leadership I*. The emphasis on skill development is also evident in the written statements on the *Leadership I* website regarding the design of the curriculum. In fact, two of the four program design purposes are related to skill development. The website states that the curriculum is designed to: (1) develop and enhance participants’ abilities for higher-level management/leadership responsibilities; and (2) provide practical skills that may be used to enhance participants’ immediate effectiveness as an administrator.

The curriculum documents that I reviewed, along with the agendas and advisory committee member and participant comments, clearly indicated that skill development is primarily focused on within the required College of Continuing Studies courses. Dr. Samuel Faulkner explained well the difference between the CCS courses and the university specific sessions in his comments:

Well, the continuing studies are about skills. Even when it's management, it's about understanding your management style and how you do more collaborative approaches to things and how you manage your time better, those sorts of things. How do you do progressive discipline, if you have to do it? How do you work with people who report to you to give them feedback? That's all skills that you need. The *Leadership I* parts are all about the leadership piece of it, and that's the difference.

Likewise, David Self said that he also views the CCS courses and the university specific sessions as “two different things.” He said that he received practical leadership applications for higher education from the university specific sessions whereas he felt like the CCS courses are “more of a soft skill reinforcement of leadership skills.” Mr. Self also said that there is some skill development involved in the university specific sessions, primarily in relationship to human resources topics. Mr. Self's peers, who also acknowledged skill development as a part of university specific workshops, most frequently cited the human resources sessions, as well.

It was nearly unanimous among participants that skill development is emphasized through the CCS courses; however, the participants had very different feelings about the appropriateness of the inclusion of skill development in the program. Several individuals included skill development as a personal goal for participating in the program. Richard Rollings was among the many who listed skill development as one of his primary goals. He said at the onset of the program that he had looked forward to honing his management skills. He said the program was in part an opportunity to “figure out some other element of management that you haven't actually spent a lot of time focusing on and then focus on it.” He said that the “element”

for him was focusing on how to deal with challenging people and developing skills for navigating other personnel issues. Other participants had similar initial goals. For example, Courtney Matthews had hoped to develop skills in public speaking as an outcome of the program.

Some participants, including Elizabeth Shoals and Dr. Peter Battle, said the skill development portion is more appropriate for those who are newer to the higher education arena. Ms. Shoals, who has worked at the university for more than 22 years in the areas of public relations, communication, and academic affairs, made the following comment, which articulates the attitude of several of the participants who are long-time employees of the university: “I think it is hard to have a *Leadership I* program that spans ages 25 to 50...I think I already knew a lot of stuff that some of the younger peers did not.” Similarly, Dr. Peter Battles remarked that the session on developing leadership skills “were not as helpful.” Part of the reason for this, he said later in the interview, is because he had been at the institution and in his field for over 20 years. Comments made by Andrea Cassidy, one of the newest employees in the first cohort, supported the idea that the skill development portion of the curriculum may be better embraced by those newer to higher education. Ms. Cassidy said, “I'm just guessing that I got a lot more [out of it] than some people because I was so new. I was still forming my whole management philosophy, you know.”

A clear difference emerged between those who had worked in any type of professional position, within or outside of higher education, for 10 years or less and those who had worked professionally for more than 10 years as far as how they perceived the inclusion of skill development. Those who had been at the institution longer typically reported seeing less value in the skill-development portion of the program. There was also some difference between faculty

and staff perceptions, although this was less consistent. Both Dr. Peter Battle and Dr. John Martin, career faculty, asserted that the skill development is more geared toward staff than toward faculty members—even faculty members that have administrative positions.

It is important to note that not all participants follow the pattern described above in their thoughts about skill development. Dr. Heather Smith, who has worked as a faculty member as well as in administrative roles for over 20 years, said that one of the reasons she applied was because she did not believe she had all the skills that she needed to be who she wants to be as a leader. She specifically remarked about the value of the CCS courses and how she gained great insight from the skill development emphasis of the CCS courses. Dr. Samuel Faulkner, whose position is classified as both faculty and staff, has been at the institution approximately six years, but had a long career prior to coming to the institution. Dr. Faulkner also stated that improved leadership and management skills was one of the main outcomes of the program for him and that he found the sessions devoted to skill development extremely valuable.

Some found skill enhancement to be a major outcome of the program for them while others thought that skill development should not have been included in the program. The leading attitude toward the skill development portion, however, was one of indifference. Many participants said the content of the CCS courses served as good reminders of management and leadership skills, but said they were at times repetitive. David Self summarized the aforementioned feeling with his comments,

Admittedly if you go to enough leadership courses and you read enough leadership books, typically in those courses you're gonna hear the same stuff, not that it's not important anymore because it refreshes you and reminds you...I would definitely say I improved as a leader just by getting refreshed and getting recharged. I did pick up some things I thought were important.

Robert Lamb also described the CCS course content as “refresher knowledge,” a common phrase used by participants.

Dr. Madeline Foster, the advisory committee chair, said that by delegating the skill development portions to the CCS courses the board hoped there would be more time to focus on leadership in context of the higher education arena during the university specific sessions. Dr. Foster said the following when asked how the curriculum incorporated skill development:

We program for two-day seminars and the focus of those is on what it means to build a learning community. So what it means to be a leader in this environment uniquely and then let them get the skills and that kind of thing in a certificate program--in their electives, for lack of a better word. This is our core. These are our electives. We really want them to think and talk about what it means to be a leader in an academic environment. So that may be a little different than other programs. We really try to make that contextual and not skill. And not even so much about information but more about what do you think about getting people to rally behind your agenda when it isn't their agenda; or how do you – and we have focused on drawing that, trying to draw that out of people that are here already and are successful.

Victoria Thompson of the advisory committee also agreed that the curriculum is not really about skills—at least not the university specific sessions--and that was intentional in the design. She said the program is on a higher level than that, but also noted that they do not do a good job communicating that intention. She has frequently heard in admission interviews individual goals that are tied closely with skill development outcomes. Dr. Grace Johnson, the other key advisory committee member in the creation of the curriculum, also stated the importance of the balance of skill building with the other, specific, higher education leadership components described.

Emphasis on Leadership Behaviors

Trait and skill theories typically concentrate on a person's innate characteristics or honed abilities, whereas behavioral theories focus on the actions and style of the individual (Kezar, et al., 2006). The program participants had significantly less to say about leadership behaviors in

conjunction with the *Leadership I* program than they did about leadership traits and skill development. They still offered some valuable insight, however, as to how the program approaches the conversation of leadership behaviors. Specifically, the participants discussed leadership behaviors in terms of 1) the guest speakers and 2) the college of continuing studies courses.

Leadership behaviors as discussed by guest speakers. When asked in what way does the *Leadership I* program talk about leadership behaviors, many participants replied that leadership behaviors are spoken largely about during the university specific workshops, emerging during the conversations with guest speakers. Participants indicated that the workshops were not necessarily designed to discuss particular leadership behaviors; however, within conversation the speakers provided insight into leadership styles and approaches that they had used that had been successful or unsuccessful. Andrea Cassidy appreciated this approach, saying,

It was nice to me that nobody really stood up and said, "This is the way you do it, and this is your one path to success." It was more like, "This is my story. These are my values and what I believe in. And you can choose to model this, or there might be a better way for you."

Richard Rollings also stated that through readings and speakers, the participants were encouraged to look at different leadership styles and approaches. He said the speakers, as well as those who provided the training, emphasized that there is "no single formula" when it comes to successful leadership behaviors. Elizabeth Shoals also said that it is her perception that the speakers were asked to discuss their leadership styles and comment on how their personal styles influence how they manage their individual areas. Most other participants either directly or indirectly commented on speaker or panelist discussions of leadership behaviors.

Leadership behaviors as discussed in CCS courses. According to participants, along with speakers bringing forth ideas about various leadership styles and behaviors, specific

leadership styles were discussed within the CCS courses. Participants reported that this was done largely through self-assessment instruments and within large-group facilitation of those instruments. Participants specifically said they spoke about leadership behaviors and styles in relationship to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI).

As an assessment tool used for leadership programming, the MBTI is sometimes linked with trait theory and sometimes linked with behavioral theory. In regard to *Leadership I*, the participants discussed their experiences with the tool from a behavioral frame. Andrea Cassidy attended the CCS course that includes the MBTI assessment. She said that it “literally changed her whole perspective.” She said that particular CCS session was more focused on leadership behaviors than other sessions that she perceived were more skills-based. Courtney Matthews called the MBTI session her “favorite,” stating that it helped her better understand her own behaviors and the behaviors of others based on their preferences emerging from the typology. Of the CCS courses that were specifically mentioned, the one that uses the MBTI is the one on which participants most frequently commented, especially staff participants, and is the only session of either the university specific workshops or CCS courses that participants felt was designed to discuss leadership behaviors and styles. Dr. Grace Johnson said she does not feel like the curriculum has done a good job at intentionally addressing leadership behaviors in the university specific sessions, adding that those are more a part of the CCS courses.

Concluding Remarks about the Theme Associated with Traits and Behaviors of Leaders

The emphasis on traits and behaviors was a strong theme throughout the individual interview process and was also evident in the written materials of *Leadership I*. Program participants most frequently talked about leadership in terms of heroic theories, specific leadership characteristics and skill development. Written material for the *Leadership I* program

addressed leadership, specifically, in terms of skill development. Program participants spoke less frequently about leadership behaviors, but still acknowledged that they were discussed within the program. Dr. Madeline Foster, the advisory committee chair, stated that leadership behaviors are addressed in the CCS courses as well as through the guest speakers, which are the same sentiments that I heard from the participants themselves. The manner in which participants discussed leadership traits and behaviors and their link to effective leadership reflects in part the *Leadership I* curriculum and in part personal leadership philosophies. The emphasis on individual traits and behaviors is often closely related to legitimate power and nearly always linked to a leader-centered philosophy, which is discussed in the next section.

Emphasis on the Leader

The four theoretical models discussed in chapter two of this dissertation share several similarities. In addition to the ones already listed, these similarities include that they are each leader-centered or leader-dominated (in the case of some change-oriented models). The overlap in discussion between emphasis on legitimate power, emphasis on traits and behavior, and emphasis on the leader is also significant. In the sections regarding power and traits/behavior, I have already discussed some of the ways in which the *Leadership I* participants and advisory committee members indicated that the program emphasizes *leader* development rather than *leadership* development. According to Day (2001), trait and skill approaches are related to *leader* development more so than *leadership* development because they focus on the capacity of individuals to be effective in leadership roles and processes. Similarly, the emphasis on legitimate power reflects leader development because it focuses on positional leadership exclusively.

Leader development focuses on the enhancement of individual abilities whereas *leadership* development emphasizes interpersonal competence, relationships, and mutual trust (Day, 2001). The findings that emerged from this research study show that *Leadership I* contains elements of both *leader* development and *leadership* development. Thus far, I have discussed the emphasis of the program on *leader* development, which the findings have strongly indicated exists within the program's curriculum in a meaningful way. Specifically, I have discussed how *Leadership I* emphasizes leader development in terms of individual, positional, authoritative rank, and the development of specific characteristics and behaviors of people poised to move into higher-level administrative positions. In this section, I will discuss the leader-centered behavior in two specific ways that I have not yet addressed in prior sections. First, I will discuss the way in which participants discussed the idea of vision. Second, I will address the language that was used to describe leadership and how it is associated with a leader-centered philosophy.

Discussion of Vision

Many of the *Leadership Institute* participants spoke about the importance of vision, but with the exception of one comment by one individual, the participants discussed it solely in terms of a positional leader's vision for the organization. There was no conversation about vision as a collaborative process and very little acknowledgement of the impact of a leader's vision on "followers" or the influence of "followers" on the leader's vision.

Vision was primarily spoken about through specific examples of how senior-level administrators at the institution implement their desires for the institution and how their wishes are carried out by those who serve in subordinate positions. Laura Jones said that she has had the opportunity to work at two different institutions during the transition period of a new president. She said this opportunity was fascinating because it allowed her to compare the way in which

two presidents implemented their visions for their respective institutions and their success rate with creating buy-in for those visions. Several other participants talked about vision in terms of how a person in a position of authority is able to “create buy-in”. Courtney Matthews and David Self both said it was impressive that the former president of SWSU was able to articulate his vision with such clarity and persuasiveness that every vice president and senior-level administrator panelist expressed the same, uniform message about the institution’s future and path for achieving its goals—without hesitation.

According to participants, how employees responded to the vision presented by the SWSU president, especially, was a mark of how successful he had been at transmitting his ideas and wishes for the institution. It is notable that participants feel that the former president’s success at the university was largely related to his ability to get people to follow his vision. Only Dr. John Martin referenced someone other than the positional leader when discussing vision. He had a unique perspective saying,

So I do believe that change has to be something people agree on in order to get there...they always say all leaders have to have a vision. You can have multiple visions and if your so-called – your colleagues do not agree with you, it won’t go anywhere.

Dr. Martin’s perspective is unique because although the other participants also discussed the idea of “buy-in” they did not indicate that consensus building or collaboration is necessary or even desirable. Rather, they discussed vision as a top-down phenomenon and the success of “buy-in” as dependent upon charismatic traits of the positional leader. Dr. Martin indicated the need for some level of agreement or, at least, consensus building.

In addition to specific examples about senior-level administrators at the institution, the other way in which participants most frequently talked about vision is when asked to define leadership. Many participants said that a leader has to be a person with a vision and ability to get

others to carry out his or her wishes. In a previous section, I discussed Dr. Peter Battle's perspective of vision as one that is created by one leader, not the result of a collaborative effort.

Similarly, Courtney Matthews defined leadership in the following manner:

I define it as having a clear vision or mission or an idea and being able to effectively communicate that to the people that you work with or manage... and maintain momentum or enthusiasm and morale.

Michael Anderson said that a leader is "setting the course and then empowering people beneath you to navigate that course." Robert Lamb took these definitions a step further. He described leadership in a similar fashion as did Ms. Matthews, Mr. Anderson and Dr. Battle, but also said that he believes participants were chosen for *Leadership I* because they too possess these characteristics and are being groomed to "get the university vision spread." The way in which the participants defined leadership as "someone with a vision" and the examples they provided of vision as one person's desires and wishes for an organization has a strong positional, leader-centered, industrial connotation.

Leader-Centered Language

During the interviewing process the *Leadership I* participants and advisory committee members often presented contradictory messages in the way they would describe leadership versus the language that they would use when discussing it. For example, David Self described leadership as a "process of influence", yet also used language that reflects a culture of top-down management. Mr. Self defined his position of authority by describing who was "under" him. Likewise, Dr. John Martin, who described leadership in terms of collaboration and consensus building, also spoke about those "under" him. Michael Anderson talked about those "beneath" him. Richard Rollings, who described himself as an "egalitarian" who thinks about leadership in terms of collaborative models and a "bottom up" philosophy, used the word "leader"

interchangeably with the word “manager” and although he said that leadership can be exhibited by anyone, only referred to those in positions of authority as “leaders.” The contradiction represented by Mr. Rollings definition of leadership compared with his lack of recognition of those outside of senior-level positions as leaders reflects my most common finding surrounding leader-centered language.

In addition to the terminology used by participants during individual interviews that often reflected a leader-centered philosophy, the *Leadership Institute* documents also indicated a leader-centered perspective. In particular, the *Leadership I* website, which provides an overview of the purpose of the program and the design of the curriculum, emphasizes the development of the individual leader. The website states that the curriculum is designed to do the following: (1) develop and enhance participants’ abilities for higher-level management/leadership responsibilities; (2) provide practical skills that may be used to enhance participants’ immediate effectiveness as an administrator; (3) update participants on critical issues affecting the university and its mission; and (4) enhance participants' abilities to think critically about higher education in a dynamic environment. Although a successful outcome of some or all of the stated goals might result in widespread leadership development, the goals in and of themselves are very individually focused and clearly follow, at least in part, a leader-centered philosophy.

The website, as well as other *Leadership I* documents, state that the program is designed to “prepare aspiring faculty and professional staff to assume positions of higher responsibility within the university and other higher education arenas.” Again, this message is very clearly focused on the development of individual leaders. During the observation portion of the data collection I also noted use of leader-centered language by both participants as well as some speakers, who spoke about leadership in terms of titles and positions.

Concluding Remarks about the Theme Associated with the Emphasis on the Leader

Scholars have discussed the leader-centered philosophy that guides much of contemporary leadership development programming as being dependent on ideas of legitimate power as well as focused on individual skill building and trait development. This perspective is congruent to what Day (2001) refers to as *leader development*, or a building of individual capacities to lead, rather than widespread leadership development. In addition to the inclusion of legitimate power and an emphasis on traits and behaviors, leader-centered philosophies generally use management-oriented, industrial language and discuss vision and planning for an organization from one person's perspective rather than as a collaborative process.

The findings from this study indicate that *Leadership I* participants perceive vision as something that emerges from one leader and is provided to the rest of the group to implement. Participants reported that what they learned in *Leadership I* supports this perception. Regarding language, *Leadership I* participants used a great deal of industrial terms as they casually discussed their experiences at the institution, although when asked to define leadership they generally described their personal philosophies in a more postindustrial manner. The next three sections of this chapter represent themes that begin to illustrate elements of a more postindustrial perspective of leadership—context, influence and process.

Significance of Context and Culture

A largely postindustrial concept, contemporary research indicates that context is critical to leadership. Although traditional trait and behavioral theories of leadership do not include an emphasis on situational leadership (or even at times an acknowledgement of it), most current models reject the notion that individual leadership traits transcend context completely (Astin &

Astin, 2000; Tierney, 1999). Contemporary trait and behavioral models, at minimum, acknowledge that situation and context must to some extent be explored.

One of the main tenets of revolutionary leadership development is the demonstration of sensitivity to culture and context through programming (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). In fact, one of the most discussed factors of situational leadership is culture. Kezar and Carducci (2009) suggested that faculty and staff who participate in leadership development programs should be reflecting on their own behaviors and skills in context of the institutional culture. For this reason, I asked participants to reflect on how culture was discussed within the curriculum and then asked them how the issue of diversity was addressed. I posed the question about diversity because it is an issue that is relevant to the culture of Southwest State University and is discussed at length in the literature in relationship to situational theory. I have divided this section into two parts. In the first part of the section, I will discuss how the participants described situational leadership in broad terms, and how it is incorporated into the curriculum of *Leadership I*. In the second portion of the section I will discuss the thoughts of the participants and advisory committee members about the way in which issues of culture and diversity are addressed in the curriculum.

Sensitivity to Context as Part of the Program Curriculum

Although I did not ask any specific questions during the individual interviews regarding situational leadership and only one question regarding the culture of the institution, a majority of the participants introduced this topic on their own. The participants spoke about situational leadership in a variety of ways. Some participants incorporated elements of situational theory into their personal definitions of leadership or when explaining how they thought the institution defines leadership. For example, Dr. Samuel Faulkner made the following comments about how he perceives that leadership was presented to his cohort:

I don't think they were really saying that a successful leader is this. It was rather looking and helping people understand where they are in their leadership style, because certain situations can require different leadership styles.

Dr. Faulkner's comment reflects a very traditional situational perspective in which traits and characteristics do not transcend context.

There were other participants who, similar to Dr. Faulkner, casually referenced the significance of situation and context within their personal definitions of leadership or in how they perceive that the institution's leaders think about leadership; however, the majority of participants spoke about situational leadership in relationship to the messages shared by guest speakers and in regard to the exercises in the CCS courses. Dr. Heather Smith said that having current and past senior-level administrators from the institutions share candidly about how they assessed and dealt with difficult situations was invaluable. Dr. Smith said,

We had, actually, past presidents of the university speak, and one person talked about a really difficult situation and how he navigated that particular situation. That was helpful to hear. When you have – we all have those issues that are difficult, and things you have to consider. I think that those were...that kind of thing was very important.

Michael Anderson felt it was not only significant to hear the guest speakers talk about difficult professional situations in which they had engaged but also to hear about the leadership behaviors they used to respond in those situations. For Mr. Anderson, the ability to personally ask the speakers questions regarding their leadership behaviors and decisions in specific situations was most valuable.

Situational leadership exercises as a part of the CCS courses. Program participants referred frequently to situational leadership as it was discussed through CCS courses. Andrea Cassidy described the differences between the university specific workshops and the CCS courses. She described the university specific courses as being more “knowledge-based” and “values-drive” and the CCS courses being more about “what you would do in a situation” and

“how you would communicate” a particular message. Other participants discussed role-playing and case studies that were included in, especially, the CCS courses. Phillip Forrester recollected several workplace conflict scenarios and role-plays in which the group participated. He said the activities, especially those regarding racial issues, were eye-opening for many participants who may have not previously recognized how their own personal views and bias influence how they approached their work at the institution.

In regard to the CCS exercises, Mr. Forrester said that it was “interesting to see how the textbook indicates how these groups would interact...and then to actually see that’s exactly how it works...when you’re actually presented with a situation.” Mr. Forrester said the case study and role-playing activities were helpful because participants were able to receive immediate feedback. Dr. Heather Smith shared Mr. Forrester’s opinion regarding the role-playing exercises. She found receiving feedback from course instructors or speakers helpful, but also found it beneficial to hear how her peers had dealt with difficult situations and hear about their leadership approaches in various scenarios. Dr. Smith classified the CCS role-playing and case study exercises as one of her “big takeaways” from the program.

Not all participants were satisfied with the way in which the program addressed situational context. Michael Anderson, Dr. Peter Battle, Samantha Simon and Robert Lamb indicated that an area they feel like is a weakness for the program is the way in which it addresses situational leadership. Mr. Lamb said although he recalled engaging in several case studies, he did not feel they were necessarily adequate when thinking about specific situations in higher education. He further explained that he thought it would be helpful for what he called “the midlevel leaders” to be asked to address situations common for “senior-level leaders” (such as a communication exercise or a media exercise) and receive feedback from senior-level leaders or

program administrators. Ms. Simon acknowledged the inclusion of situational exercises in the CCS courses, but had hoped to have that same type of opportunity while interacting with guest speakers and panelists during the university specific workshop sessions. She said,

I mean if there was one thing that I really hoped for...there was this fabulous session where you had a lot of past presidents of the university come in to speak to us. They were talking about the biggest challenges during their time and it was just amazing. But what I wanted most of all, and I kept hoping that they were going to do, is I wanted them to present a problem to us and let us break up into groups and see how we might have solved it. I know you are taking something huge and making it really small but there were so many opportunities to me to do some real examples of, you know, hands-on problem solving of the things that you address. We really didn't do quite as much of that as I had hoped for in the *Leadership I* sessions. We did a lot in continuing studies.

Michael Anderson also said he would have liked to have scenarios that involved more “real world experience” for higher education. Likewise, Dr. Peter Battle said he would have liked more role-playing incorporated. It is significant to note that Mr. Anderson and Mr. Lamb were a part of the first cohort. Advisory committee members discussed in their interviews that one way the program has evolved over time is that it is much more interactive now than it was in the first year of the first cohort. Also significant is that Dr. Battle did not complete his CCS coursework and so for that reason, as well, may not have experienced as much role-playing or scenario-based case study work as other participants.

Sensitivity to Diversity as Part of the Program Curriculum

Institutions of higher education have a history of behaviors, beliefs, and actions that make the issue of diversity--especially in reference to racial diversity-- a strong part of their culture. According to Kezar, et al. (2006), transformational leadership is most effective in situations that center on issues of equity, diversity, assessment and technology. The idea of diversity, as well as organizational culture, is discussed at length when talking about change-oriented leadership and the postindustrial paradigm.

Given the frequency with which diversity is discussed within postindustrial leadership models, I chose to ask participants how the *Leadership I* curriculum addresses issues of diversity. I also asked this question because of the institution's history, which includes rigid racial segregation policies, a difficult period of integration that had both successes and failures, and a continued separation in some student and faculty areas along lines of race. Clearly, race is only one small part of a larger conversation about diversity in relationship to an institution of higher education; however on the campus of this university, the history of racial discrimination has influenced how the campus perceives diversity. The campus culture as it relates to diversity strongly influenced how participants spoke about the issue.

The comments of participants regarding diversity were varied, with some individuals stating that the issue of diversity in terms of organizational culture was addressed at length in the program, while others said it was rarely brought up in conversation. Based on the reflections of the participants, I have divided this section into four parts. The participants fell into three categories, (1) those who felt like the discussions of diversity were intentional, overt and a significant part of the main message; (2) those who perceived conversations about diversity as unintentional, cohort-directed and secondary to the main message; and (3) those who felt like discussions about diversity were absent from the curriculum. In the fourth and final part of this section I will address the diversity of the *Leadership I* program from a recruitment and membership perspective.

Diversity as a main component of the program curriculum. There were only a few participants who indicated that diversity is included in the *Leadership I* curriculum in an intentional manner, but I believe their perspectives should be included because the opinions were so varied by the group as a whole. Those who felt like the discussions about diversity were

intentional said diversity as it relates to organizational culture was emphasized in two main ways: (1) through specific speakers who discussed the topic and (2) through a CCS course that dealt with difference. Richard Rollings stated that there was diversity even within the speakers who were chosen to present and felt as if many guest speakers during the university specific sessions acknowledged the issue of diversity. Mr. Rollings said,

Looking at the awareness of--the importance-- of diversity as something that's being emphasized on this campus, especially given its historical context, it was clearly something that was emphasized at multiple points. We had many speakers that went into the – at least touched on the importance of where we've come from, to acknowledge it as a place...from how far we've gotten.

Courtney Matthews also remembered speakers during the university specific workshops addressing issues surrounding diversity and recalled a CCS course that focused on the topic. Those who perceived that the topic of diversity was discussed said they presumed that it would be discussed because of the context of the institution—specifically because of past and present racial discrimination.

Diversity as a secondary and often unintentional component of the program curriculum. The majority of participants indicated that discussions about diversity in relationship to the institutional culture occurred, but that diversity was not a main topic of focus. In fact, most participants reported that conversations that did emerge happened in a spontaneous, unintentional manner as a result of discussion initiated by cohort-members rather than by program administrators, guest speakers or as a planned part of the curriculum. Others identified an isolated speaker or speakers who addressed the topic, but also did not perceive it to be a focus of the program. For the most part, participants described the message of diversity as something underlying that was touched upon but not a focus of the program.

Martha Stone, who has been involved in a number of programs on campus and in the community that address issues of diversity and organizational culture, said that cultural awareness or “diversity” is not a major component of *Leadership I*. She said, there were “no aha’s for me,” meaning that she did not take anything away regarding diversity issues in relationship to being a leader or a senior-level administrator on campus. Likewise, Andrea Cassidy said that although she recalled a few activities about cultural sensitivity, the issue was not one of focus and thus not one of the “big takeaways” she had from the program. Laura Jones, one of the few participants of color in the program, said the following about how diversity and cultural awareness were addressed in her cohort of *Leadership I*:

I don’t know that it was covered that bluntly or that directly. I think we may have talked about that more in Continuing Studies. Yeah, if I remember correctly, that was a Continuing Studies course. I think it was touched upon here and there but not in depth...

When I posed the question about diversity, I could tell that many of the participants were somewhat puzzled. More than a few times I had participants’ answer that “of course” we talked about diversity, as it is such a critical issue on campus, but then when I asked them to explain how it was discussed, they could not recall a single instance. They instead replied by saying that they did not know how it was discussed, but felt sure it must have been addressed given the campus history and organizational culture. Dr. Heather Smith represented this sentiment in the following comment:

I know we talked about it, but some of that blurs together for me a little bit, but I know we talked about it, because that’s such a huge part of campus as we’re talking about campus life and students.

Likewise, Dr. John Martin, also a person who identifies as a minority, said, “It’s very unusual that we would think about no diversity at all.” Interestingly, despite their comments, neither Dr. Martin nor Dr. Smith identified specific ways in which the program incorporated conversations

about diversity in an intentional way. Overall, participants said that discussions about how diversity relates to leadership were present, but not part of the main message. The question about diversity was perhaps the most challenging for many participants who seemed to want their answer to be different than what it was—or at least thought their answer *should* be different. Participants often apologized, stating that they *should* be able to identify more circumstances in which diversity was discussed given the campus at which the program takes place, but they could not recall any (or very few).

Advisory committee member Dr. Madeline Foster said that although information about some of the racial discrimination of the institution is included in the history seminar, there is not a specific workshop regarding diversity within the university specific sessions. Dr. Foster said,

We have a sense of our history that's about Black/White. That's a strong part of our culture so that would come out in the history. You probably can choose something on the continuing education side that deals with that but we don't have a diversity session necessarily. I think we probably talk about that along, in, you would hear it come from people as they talk about their own work.

Another advisory committee member, Victoria Thompson, said that she felt like respondents had good discussions surrounding issues of diversity, both formally and informally, but in most cases the discussions were a result of informal prompts. Victoria said,

I wished I had the list of titles and who are the speakers because I'm drawing a blank from a lot of it. I will say on a somewhat lesser note that it [diversity] too was interwoven throughout all the sessions. I definitely will [say that] because you can see how it would be, especially when we just reached the 50th year anniversary and so forth of the things that happened in terms of the 1963 and 1964 and desegregation and the schoolhouse door and all that sort of stuff. It was appropriately interwoven and could be brought up. Again, in terms of how it was and how it has changed and is this a good thing? Is this not a good thing? Why is it a good thing? Why is it not a good thing? And are there differences in this room of people who were here during those times and are now here and – are here now. Is it better? Is it worse? Talk.

Victoria's comments also reflect the campus history, especially as it relates to integration and the racial relationships between African American and Caucasian populations.

The absence of diversity from the program curriculum. In addition to those who said that diversity is a present but unintentional part of the curriculum, there are a few participants who reported feeling like issues of diversity are completely absent from the program in general or from specific portions of the curriculum in which they would have expected the topic to be included. When asked about the inclusion of diversity in the curriculum, Dr. Samuel Faulkner struggled to recall conversations surrounding the topic and said, “It probably could have been emphasized more heavily.” Michael Anderson said the topic of diversity “didn’t ring a bell.” Dr. Peter Battle also agreed that diversity was not discussed a lot, if at all, and said that was a disappointing aspect for him.

Phillip Forrester, who self-identifies as a minority, said he did not recall any significant component of the curriculum that deals with issues of diversity. Mr. Forrester has a unique perspective, as his country of origin is not the United States. Mr. Forrester remarked that “as an outsider,” he sees a lot of attitudes and actions occurring on campus, and in the geographic region in general, that he thought had ended 50 years ago. He said that some of these discriminatory attitudes and beliefs came out during role-playing activities and case studies during university specific sessions and CCS courses. His concern was that as these discriminatory attitudes emerged in discussion, they were not addressed. He said that no one facilitated a dialogue about cultural sensitivity or issues of diversity from a contextual perspective. Mr. Forrester also noted that there were opportunities to have meaningful conversations, but they did not occur. In reference to the prejudice and insensitivity that emerged during exercises, he said, “I think that was happening without any attempt to control it or contain it or learn from it or say this is a bad thing, this is a good thing.” Mr. Forrester said that without proper facilitation, it was somewhat dangerous to partially discuss such critical issues. He also

expressed regret about this component of the program because he said cultural sensitivity is something that is seemingly lacking on campus and thus should be incorporated into all leadership development initiatives.

Diversity in terms of the membership of the program. It would be an oversight while talking about diversity in terms of situational leadership components of the *Leadership I* program to ignore the make-up of the program itself. Diversity goes far beyond what is visible to the eye. In using only the photographs of the three cohorts online and the information which was disclosed during the individual interviews, it does seem clear, however, that at least in terms of racial and ethnic diversity, the program is somewhat limited. In the first cohort, there were two persons of color, both women. In the second cohort, there were two persons of color, a man and a woman. In the third cohort, there is one man of color. The number of men and women differ in each cohort with cohort one including more women and cohort two and three including more men. Overall there are a slightly larger number of men who have participated in the program, but the difference is not overwhelming. Two participants also identified themselves as “immigrants”.

There was no difference overall in terms of faculty and staff or men and women and how they reported perceiving diversity in terms of the membership of the program. There was, however, a difference in the way diversity was discussed by those who identify as persons of color or as a member of another minority population compared to those who identify as part of the racial majority. The participants who identify as minorities commented with higher frequency in their interview about the noticeable lack of visible diversity. These individuals also responded that diversity was discussed as a secondary topic, if at all, and is not a main part of the curriculum. Regarding the issue of diversity, Dr. John Martin said,

And I’m also a minority, so – I guess a minority, foreign born, whatever. So I would say that it’s important that we are diversifying programs in terms of whatever. Not

necessarily color or race, it can be ethnicity – I mean can be sexual orientation or religious beliefs and all kinds of things.

Specifically regarding the make-up of the *Leadership I* program, Dr. Martin said the following:

[There were] a good number of woman colleagues. But I don't think that many African Americans. Of course, you can count me as a minority, but I do not see many African Americans. Most of them are Caucasians.

The other participants who most frequently commented on diversity of the program membership were those who had self-identified as being previously involved in diversity initiatives on campus or in the community.

Advisory committee perspective on membership selection. For the most part, the advisory committee members I interviewed had similar perspectives about the diversity of the program in relationship to membership selection. Dr. Albert Dugan, Dr. Grace Johnson and Dr. Madeline Foster all acknowledged the importance of having diverse cohorts, but also said that diversity is an area in which the advisory committee has struggled from the beginning. On the topic of membership selection, Dr. Dugan made the following comment:

We really struggled early on with diversity. I think early on it was mainly a PR and marketing issue and having people reach out to make sure we had the diverse pool to begin with. I think it was just a learning curve.

Dr. Johnson also said that one of the biggest barriers to achieving more diversity within the individual cohorts was the lack of diversity within the applicant pool. Dr. Johnson said that she received negative feedback about the lack of diversity represented, particularly within the first and second cohorts, from people outside of the *Leadership I* program, but also from other members of the advisory committee. Several other advisory committee members I interviewed also indicated dissention that existed within the advisory committee regarding the cohorts' lack of diversity.

Those who were highly involved in the membership selection process shared their frustration that other committee members who did not make an effort to increase the applicant pool or recruit a more diverse group of applicants were among the most critical of the outcome. At a committee meeting that became particularly tense regarding the membership selection issue, Dr. Johnson said she turned to one committee member who was being especially critical and said, “And what did you do to create a better pool?” She said the committee member acknowledged that she had done nothing. Dr. Johnson said most of the people who were at the meeting have more authority and legitimate power at the institution than she has—they have the most influence to increase the applicant pool but have done very little to recruit staff or faculty.

Dr. Johnson summarized her thoughts about the lack of diversity in terms of membership makeup in the following manner,

It was definitely about applicant pool...and it was depending on the emails that went to every faculty and staff to create the pool instead of going to people and saying, “You need to [do this]”... people waited until we got to the end product and didn't like the end product and then came in and stated disapproval, not just disappointment.

Likewise, when I asked Dr. Foster about the lack of diversity in some of the cohorts and the advisory committee’s response to such criticism, she said,

It’s not like we’re screening out – yeah, but why aren’t we nominating people who are diverse? So this time we made a concerted effort...if we’re not diverse, this time we made a concerted effort to make sure there were Black candidates in the pool and...we have Black participants.

Dr. Foster also said that it is frustrating to her that people only see diversity in terms of race—most specifically in terms of Black and White. To that end, she made the following comment:

And sometimes the other kinds of diversity gets over looked...Black and White isn’t even the only visible diversity. Nobody notes that there has been an Asian participant; a handicapped participant...It’s like why are we talking about this when I can clearly see there’s diversity?

In addition to the applicant pool's impact on the program's diversity, the advisory committee's philosophy pertaining to who are desirable candidates for *Leadership I* may also be influencing diversity within the program. The program targets candidates who hold positions within the institution that are described by advisory committee members as "larger roles". Individuals in the positions deemed as such often maintain greater political power and institutional influence than staff and faculty in smaller departments. This stated preference toward faculty and staff in more influential, "bigger" positions may result in the exclusion of faculty and staff in smaller departments—areas that often contain a disproportional number of individuals who identify as women and minorities. Some advisory committee members stated that those individuals will have an opportunity to participate once they move into new positions within roles of greater influence. Staff and faculty in the type of areas described, however, frequently have special expertise, which gains them national prestige but does not correspond with on-campus advancement or political power.

Concluding Remarks about the Theme of Situational Context and Culture

The focus on skill enhancement without discussion of context or culture in leadership development programming has been referred to as one of the greatest failures of current leadership programming in higher education (Kezar & Carducci, 2009; Rost, 1991). It is noteworthy, then, that Kezar and Carducci (2009) stated that attention to traits and skills that transcend context is still one of the main assumptions that is used to guide contemporary leadership development programming and such an assumption is not absent from the *Leadership I* curriculum.

According to participants, situational context and cultural influences were discussed mostly through exercises in CCS courses. Participants expressed regret that there was not more

role-playing or situational exercises as part of university specific workshop sessions. Some participants cited this as one of their greatest disappointments of the curriculum because they wanted more context-specific exercises during which they could receive feedback from, especially, senior-level administrators. Participants indicated that administrators and guest speakers at university specific sessions emphasized that leadership traits do not transcend context, but rather they are situation specific. This perspective itself represents that even when not practiced, there was still a strong situational perspective message delivered by guest speakers at university specific sessions.

When the topic of diversity was brought up with participants, most indicated that the topic was discussed informally, was participant-directed, and was not part of the official curriculum. A few recalled that guest speakers addressed the topic, but overall were unimpressed with the emphasis on diversity within the program and said there were no big “take-aways” regarding this topic. Multiple participants acknowledged the lack of diversity within the make-up of the program. Advisory committee members also noted that diversity was something they have struggled to achieve during the membership selection process, largely because of a lack of diversity in the applicant pool. When I asked Dr. Grace Johnson how diversity is addressed within the program’s curriculum, she said,

It's not addressed real well. I don't think the university addresses it real well. It's addressed as well as the university does. It came up most glaringly in the selection of the second cohort. In the first cohort – remember, it was Victoria, Madeline, and me. It was just the three of us, and we made a real effort to make sure that there was at least some representation of people of color in the group.

In general, the advisory committee members identified the struggles the new program has had with reaching and recruiting a diverse applicant pool, which has led to less diversity, at least visibly, within the program.

As a part of my document review, I studied the seven critical competencies of the *Leadership I* program for its participants. It is significant to note that one of these competencies is about ethics and diversity. The ethics and diversity competency reads:

The University firmly believes there are no short cuts to success. The Candidate will manifest our institutional ideals in daily life and work, and demonstrate personal adherence to the University's needs and values. This means hard work, integrity in all dealings, the honoring of commitments, and total respect for others.

Although this competency is named the “ethics and diversity” competency, the language is seemingly more focused on the *ethics* portion of the competency. The subcategories that emerged through the theme of situational context and culture demonstrate the ways in which *Leadership I* is and is not aligning with the postindustrial leadership paradigm and provide a glimpse into the larger culture of the institution.

Although it was not discussed in terms of the topic of diversity, several participants reported finding the university specific session titled *Defining our Campus Culture and Common Values* meaningful and helpful in how they think about their role within the university. I also had an opportunity to observe this session. As compared to the feelings participants reported about other sessions that promoted similar conversations, participants seemed more open and honest in this session with their discussion and comments about campus culture. Advisory committee members disclosed that they have made some significant changes to the approach of this session from the first to the third cohort to best achieve desired outcomes.

Significance of Relationships and Influence

Similar to situation and context, relational behaviors and influence are postindustrial paradigm concepts. Throughout the dissertation, I reference Rost's definition of leadership, which is one of the most widely recognized definitions of leadership in contemporary, higher education literature. Rost described leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and

their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (1993, p. 99).

Each of the four theoretical approaches that I discussed (trait, behavioral, situational and change oriented) acknowledges, at some level, the relational and influential aspects of leadership.

The idea of leadership as a relational and influential process is a theme that clearly emerged through the individual interview phase of my data collection as well as through observation. Participants and advisory committee members spoke frequently about the relational aspects of the *Leadership I* program. I also personally observed the comradery between participants. In addition, when asked about their personal definitions of leadership, many participants asserted the importance of utilizing influence in order to achieve leadership success. The relationships of influence that Rost described are represented through the comments and discussion of individuals, which I further categorized in the following three subgroups of the broader theme: (1) relationship building and networking; (2) professional collaboration; and (3) personal definitions of leadership based on a relational model.

Peer Relationship Building, Networking and Support

I asked the program participants to discuss what they saw as their three main personal outcomes of the program. All but one participant cited relationships with fellow colleagues in the cohort as one of the most significant benefits of the program for them as well as one of the most surprising. Each individual described the relationships they forged in a different manner, but all of the participants acknowledged that the connections they made in the program in some way contributed to their professional and personal growth. Robert Lamb called the relationships he developed with the colleagues in his cohort his “number one takeaway” from the program. Coming from a participant who reported gaining a tremendous amount of personal and

professional development from other curricular components of the program, this is an especially strong testimony.

There were multiple reasons participants gave for citing the relationship factor of *Leadership I* as significant. According to participants, the program included many important relational aspects. Specifically, the participants most frequently cited the following three ways in which the program promoted relationship building: (1) the program provided opportunities to interact with people from different areas of campus; (2) the program provided individuals with opportunities to increase professional networks and (3) the program provided opportunities for individuals to grow personal support networks.

Opportunities to interact with individuals from across campus. I had the opportunity to observe several of the individual sessions of the first workshop for cohort three. By the time I had an opportunity to observe the group, they had already been through an orientation together and one and one-half days of workshop sessions. I noticed the friendly, collegial atmosphere immediately upon joining the group for lunch. Participants and guest panelists from all areas of campus were talking with one another about professional and personal matters as if they had known one another for years. The structure of the program seemed to foster and nurture the newly formed relationships. It was evident that administrators and guest speakers were intentional about asking people to work in teams with different individuals in each session to achieve that goal.

In addition to what I observed, I heard almost every participant speak about his or her personal experiences regarding relationships with other cohort members in the program. Many participants stated that what makes the relationships they formed during *Leadership I* significant

is that they are with people from across the institution with whom they otherwise would not have had close contact. Phillip Forrester said the following of his experience,

Now I know 20 more people on campus, plus some people from the first cohort as well, that I never would have really got in contact with. So I know more people from around campus. I know more people in the university family and more people who I can call on for input, support, or criticism as needed. That was slightly unexpected I think. I didn't think it would be that because we were meeting so infrequently, I didn't think that would happen, but it did.

Courtney Matthews shared Mr. Forrester's sentiments, remarking, "I think the personal relationships are one of the things I took away [from the program]." During her interview Ms. Matthews spoke fondly about the friendships she has forged with specific individuals from other divisions on campus and the relationships that she has continued since graduating from *Leadership I*. She relayed that the continuation of friendships and ongoing professional support have been among her "favorite" outcomes of the program. Martha Stone shared similar feelings. She spoke about the informal gatherings that occurred following *Leadership I* and her role in coordinating some of these events. Laura Jones also made positive comments about the informal gatherings saying, "It was just a good feeling to share experiences and talk with other individuals who are interested in leadership." Of the members who attended cohort functions in the months following their graduation, all referenced the gatherings with great fondness as well as remarked that they would like to see their cohort again soon. The post-graduation gatherings were spoken about in context of cohort one since at the time of the interviews cohort two had just graduated. Dr. Grace Johnson of the advisory committee said that one of the most challenging aspects of the program is how to sustain the relationships built after graduation.

Dr. Peter Battle and Michael Anderson, two of the participants who were most critical about their experiences in the program, commented positively about the opportunity the program provided them to meet people from across campus and the value of the relationships they were

able to build. Dr. Battle commented, however, that he felt as if the relationships--both personal and professional--were stronger within the *Leadership Fellows* program, which involved fewer individuals at a higher level of service. With as many as 15 members in a *Leadership I* cohort, other participants also commented that they believe fellow cohort members, as well as administrators and guest speakers, may not have felt comfortable being transparent and thus the relationships may not have been as strong as they would have been had it been a smaller group.

The participants stated that the most valuable part about the opportunity to meet people from across campus is that it allowed them to see the “bigger picture” of the institution and allowed them to learn about areas outside of their own departments and divisions. Dr. Albert Dugan of the advisory committee, who also was involved with the *Leadership Fellows* program, agreed that having 15 participants in *Leadership I*-- as compared to the smaller membership of *Leadership Fellows*--made relationships more difficult to build at times. Dr. Dugan said, however, that he believes the relationship aspect is one of the most significant elements of the program. When I asked him what he feels is the element of the program that is most significant to increasing participants’ leadership capacity, he said the following:

They’re not together a lot but they are immersed for two days four times throughout the program. I think just those relationships and bonding...I think it’s relationships at the end of the day. I think everything comes down to relationships.

Opportunities to increase professional networks. The continued relationship building that has occurred between members in cohort one relates to another point of significance of the connections made in the *Leadership I* program: professional network opportunities. Many members commented on how they have utilized the relationships made in *Leadership I* in a professionally advantageous way. Martha Stone recalled reaching out to a colleague from her cohort when a student came to her with an issue that involved a topic outside of her specific

expertise. She said that because of the relationship with the colleague that she had made during the *Leadership I* program, she was better able to serve the student and the student had a better outcome with his dilemma. Likewise, Dr. Samuel Faulkner shared that one of the greatest outcomes of the program for him was “a broader network across campus of people that I can both speak to about issues and draw on when I need things...”

Dr. Heather Smith recently stepped into a higher-level administrative role within her college and for that reason said that she values even more the relationships that she formed in *Leadership I*. She said that the collegial relationships that she formed are not only rewarding to her now, but will be advantageous to her in her new position because she will “know who to call.” Likewise, when I asked David Self what were the three main outcomes of the program for him, he concluded,

And then I guess the third, but not the least important, the third thing I’m thinking of would definitely be the relationships with the other *Leadership I* participants, because I established core relationships and I can’t think of any other way or reason I would have established those had it not been for that [*Leadership I*]. So I still stay in contact with them. We see each other around campus – the ones that are still here. I’m actually working with one of the people that I went to *Leadership I* with, I’m working on kind of a special project for their department with them and a lot of that has to do with our relationship--we knew each other, so yes, I think those relationships were good.

Mr. Self’s comments summarize well the sentiments that many participants shared with me regarding the opportunities the program provided to get to know people from other areas of campus and the opportunities to build a professional support network that have led to positive individual and institutional results.

Opportunities to increase personal support networks. In addition to professional networking and gaining access to people from across campus, the *Leadership I* program also provided some participants with personal support systems. Phillip Forrester shared that he made some friendships through the program that extend now beyond the realm of professional,

collegial relationships and are relationships that offer personal support to he and his family.

Andrea Cassidy said that going through this program with other individuals in similar positions gave her a sense of encouragement. Ms. Cassidy commented:

Sometimes, you think, "I'm the only one who's working late," or, like, "I have so much more responsibility than other people." Everybody's busy, you know. And to be reminded of that and be reminded that not everybody's perfect, and we're all working on our skill sets or learning together, and to kind of get-out-of-the-comfort-zone of student affairs was really great.

Similar to Ms. Cassidy and Mr. Forrester, other participants spoke about the unexpected personal relationships and support networks that they developed throughout the duration of the program.

Although the personal relationship aspect was spoken about less frequently than the professional relationships that were built, it still emerged as an outcome for several of the participants.

Relationship building with senior-level administrators. The participants had volumes to say regarding the professional and personal benefits of the relationships they formed with other cohort members; but several also discussed the significance of relationships formed with senior-level administrators. Although a majority of participants discussed one of their main outcomes of the program as exposure to senior-level administrators, a few also specified relationships that were formed or developed further as a result of the program, leading to positive career and personal growth. The participants who spoke about relationships formed with senior-level administrators talked about gaining personal and professional confidence as a result of interacting with these individuals on a deeper level either during the program or after it was complete.

The other main result of relationships built with senior-level administrators is the perception by participants that they are viewed in a different manner for promotions or that they will be viewed for promotions in a different manner when the opportunity emerges. Laura Jones

specifically spoke about relationships forged with senior-level administrators helping to set her and other members apart from those at the institution who did not participate in *Leadership I*. She said it is not just about being involved with the program, but showing senior-level administrators and other hiring parties that she is engaged and wanting to learn and advance. She said getting to know the people in higher-level positions at the institution and within the system in a more meaningful way has been advantageous to anyone in the program who has shown commitment and a sense of dedication. Several other participants share Ms. Jones' sentiments that it is not just the exposure to senior-level administrators, but the relationships that they have been able to build with these administrators that will ultimately lead to advancement opportunities for them and their peers.

As indicated previously, some participants said they did not think the guest speakers were as candid as they would have been had the group been slightly smaller. Other participants also stated that they had hoped for more meaningful interaction with the guest speakers and panelists. Dr. Grace Johnson said that the advisory committee members--specifically those members who have worked most with the curriculum development--have been intentional about making the *Leadership I* sessions more interactive. She said that one of their goals for cohort three is to design the sessions in a way so they are more geared toward relationship building. Multiple advisory committee members said that initially some of the sessions looked more like an "information dump" or a "dog and pony show" that described various areas of the system. Dr. Johnson said that they have worked hard to change that and to be intentional about providing opportunities for relationship building with senior-level administrators, guest panelists as well as within the peer cohort.

Professional Collaboration

Collaboration is a word that is used incessantly in higher education. Most contemporary leadership theories and models reference the idea of collaboration. It is for this reason that I asked participants how collaboration is discussed within the context of the program. Most everyone had an opinion about the manner in which the program presents the idea of collaboration, although these perceptions vary in some notable ways.

Several participants discussed active collaboration in which they participated with people from other divisions on campus as a result of the program. Other participants discussed collaboration as a skill that was modeled for them through sessions with guest speakers. Still others suggested that collaboration was focused on most in the CCS courses and that it was in that context where they gained valuable insight about the topic. Participants also had widely different opinions about whether they considered collaboration to be an intentional or unintentional focus of the *Leadership I* program. A few said they gained no additional insight about collaboration from the program or thought it should be focused on more than it was.

Active collaboration among participants. In many ways the conversations about the value of collaborative initiatives with individuals across campus mirror the discussions participants had regarding the value of building relationships with others outside of their respective divisions. Most frequently, participants used the term “silo” in describing the way in which higher education professionals can become insulated within specific departments or divisions that work unilaterally to solve problems. Robert Lamb described this sentiment in the following comments:

I understand the importance of collaboration especially in higher education. I think it's applicable in any field but in higher education it's easy to get in your own silo and so I intentionally--we all get busy--but I intentionally will try to have that conversation with student affairs, go over to student affairs or my colleagues from the business school or different colleges, different areas, different administrators and that's one great benefit of the program. You have cohort members who are similar levels of leadership here at the

university and you can always pick up the phone and give them a call or they can call you. And you've got the barriers broken down because you already know them.

Mr. Lamb's emphasis on the importance of collaboration in the arena of higher education was touched on by almost all of the participants and especially noted by others, like himself, who did not begin their careers in higher education.

Richard Rollings also spoke about collaboration in terms of getting outside of one's area. Mr. Rollings described himself as an egalitarian person who believes that--with few exceptions--the most work gets done when it is approached collaboratively. Richard acknowledged that collaboration was already somewhat of a trademark for him as a manager and as a leader prior to beginning *Leadership I*, so perhaps that is why he appreciated even more what he perceived as a strong emphasis on collaboration within the program. Mr. Rollings agreed that *Leadership I* is successful at promoting collaborative learning and working styles. He said,

I think what *Leadership I* does is it gets all those people together so that all the preconceived notions are thrown out. Everybody is starting as a peer in a cohort, which talks about equality and egalitarianism and really gives you this basis for constructing something collaboratively instead of all these silly silos on campus. It's been very effective that way.

Mr. Rollings continued to say that most of the people that he has collaborated with as a result of *Leadership I* he would have never talked to prior to the program, much less worked with on a project. He said that *Leadership I* provided him with the connections and confidence to step outside of his area, meet new people and ask for assistance.

Collaboration as a skill that was modeled for participants. Dr. Heather Smith spoke about collaboration in terms of how the idea was presented by guest speakers at the *Leadership I* workshop sessions. For Dr. Smith, it was not just what the speakers said regarding the subject that was influential, but the way senior-level university and system administrators interacted with one another and the way they spoke about their individual and collective decision-making

processes. Dr. Smith shared, "I think those [sessions] were really helpful--not just somebody telling us--but we got to see it through the people that came to talk to us." For example, Dr. Smith specifically recalled the way in which the administrators from facility services worked together and built consensus. Dr. Smith said it was obvious that collaboration was "big" and needed in order to "make the tough decisions" or "come to positive resolutions" in almost every area of the institution.

Collaboration as discussed through exercises in workshop sessions and courses. In addition to the collaborative work across campus that emerged due to relationships made in *Leadership I* and the thoughts regarding collaboration presented by guest speakers, numerous participants also discussed collaboration in terms of specific exercises done in both the university specific workshops as well as in the CCS courses. Participants reported that several of the CCS courses they took focused primarily on management and, at the very minimum, touched on the idea of collaboration. Participants recalled one specific class in CCS that focused on collaboration. The course received fairly positive remarks from cohort members, overall. Richard Rollings said the CCS class involved multiple exercises, which he called "useful." Within the university specific workshop Mr. Rollings also recollected teamwork exercises facilitated by the vice president of student affairs that he perceived were designed to initiate conversation about collaborative action, consensus building and group work. The result of these types of exercises for him was a better understanding of how to promote collaboration among those who he supervises.

Phillip Forrester and Dr. Samuel Faulkner expressed similar thoughts on the subject of collaboration. Mr. Forrester described the exercises in the workshops and courses as ones that would consistently demonstrate that the collaborative response to a situation is "much better"

than the alternative. He felt that there was an emphasis on activities and exercises that promoted collaboration. He called collaboration a “strong theme” of the *Leadership I* program.

Furthermore he said the “collaborative, consultative, involvement processes were recommended and encouraged and demonstrated as being beneficial.” Dr. Samuel Faulkner said even though he does not feel like the *Leadership I* curriculum prescribes a certain leadership style, he believes that collaboration and consensus building are emphasized and promoted as behaviors of effective leaders.

The perception of participants about how *Leadership I* addresses collaboration in the curriculum was so widely varied that I had to remind myself that participants discussed this topic differently in part because of their own leadership lens, their personal definitions of collaboration, their experiences with collaborative projects and the effort that they put forth during the program and afterward to interact with others on campus. Michael Anderson and Dr. Peter Battle stated that the program did not lead to greater collaborative practices by them, personally. They also did not recall any emphasis on the topic in general. Dr. Battle, who completed the majority of the university specific workshops but did not complete his CCS coursework said that he never worked on a project as a team with other members of the cohort, but thought that would have been helpful to “build some camaraderie...if those teams had been selected so that people were coming at it from different backgrounds.” Mr. Anderson said that the subject of collaboration did not resonate with him when asked about his experience in *Leadership I*.

Whether participants saw the inclusion of conversations regarding collaboration as intentional or as an unintentional result of other activities was also dependent largely on personal experiences. Andrea Cassidy saw the topic of collaboration as significant and well discussed, but

initiated in an informal way and not as a structured part of the curriculum. Others, as indicated previously, saw collaboration as an intentional conversation point and focus of exercises. A few did not know whether the focus was intentional or unintentional but said its significance could not be overlooked. Courtney Matthews represented this feeling well in the following remarks:

I think that everything we did involved collaboration. I think whether it was intentional or it was just the nature of the way they set up the program that was a big component of it, whether it was in our individual classes or the group classes.

Leadership Defined as Influence

Webster's dictionary defines influence as "the capacity to have an effect on the character, development, or behavior of someone or something, or the effect itself." During the individual interviews, I asked participants to give me their personal definitions of leadership. The idea of *leadership as influence* emerged as a common theme within participant descriptions. Some of the participants directly referenced influence in their leadership definitions. For example, David Self who has in the past taught leadership courses through the college of business said the following regarding leadership and influence:

So how do I define leadership? I think leadership – the simplistic answer is just the ability to get others to follow you and your ability to influence others. When I think of leadership, it doesn't mean that I have to be the boss. It doesn't mean that I'm responsible for their salary or their job feature. I'm actually a Sunday school teacher at my church and I consider myself the leader of the class and I have zero influence over them – their salaries, their life, anything, but I do believe that there's influence in being a leader, hopefully to make people want to come to my class and to do things. It's the same way here at work. I really see leadership as just the ability to influence people and to get them to follow you. So it's a pretty simple approach, but that's my approach to leadership.

Like Mr. Self, Robert Lamb said that leadership is about influence, but that influence is not dependent on a person's position or rank. Mr. Lamb said it is about being able to "get people to accomplish a mission or task" regardless of formal authority.

In addition to those who directly used the term “influence” in their definitions of leadership, almost every participant discussed leadership in terms of “having an effect” on someone’s life or behavior. Most commonly, participants talked about affecting the actions and behaviors of others through mentoring, encouraging, empowering, setting an example and through following servant leadership models. The idea of influence was clearly seen as a theme as participants spoke about leadership, whether talked about in a direct or indirect manner.

Concluding Remarks about the Theme of Relationships and Influence

Conversations with participants and advisory committee members revealed a strong emphasis on relationships within the *Leadership I* program. This theme emerged in interviews within the context of conversations relating to the intentional opportunities for individual relationship building and networking, the professional collaboration that was modeled for participants and which ensued following the program as well as in context of the participants’ personal definitions of leadership. I also noted the relationship building aspect of the program during the observation portion of my data collection.

The postindustrial paradigm indicates the importance of relationships and influence in leadership, specifically referencing the idea of multidirectional influence. In the examples noted by *Leadership I* participants, influence was mostly viewed in a hierarchical sense, but within the discussions about collaboration some multidirectional elements were mentioned. Rost’s definition that I cited at the beginning of this section regarding leadership is a widely known and used definition. Rost (1993) not only described leadership as an influence relationship but an influence relationship “among leaders and their collaborators who intend real change”. In the next section, I discuss the theme of *leadership as a process* and address change-oriented

leadership, which is closely linked with the relational aspect of leadership in the postindustrial paradigm as Rost defines it.

Leadership as a Process

A significant way in which the theoretical perspectives discussed in chapter two differ is in the way each one represents leadership as either a *process* or as an *individual* person or *position*. Within the context of this study, the idea of *leadership as a process* emerged as a theme primarily from the data collected from individual interviews. Defining leadership as a *process* focuses on learned behavior exhibited within the context of a situation or a relationship and, as a result, makes leadership accessible to everyone (Northouse, 2004; Rost, 1993).

When defined as a *process*, leadership is most often associated with change and with flat organizational structures whereas leadership defined as an *individual* is associated with positional leadership and hierarchy, often described in terms of *leader* development within stagnant organizations. A process approach to leadership is usually considered informal, but according to some contemporary scholars does not have to entirely replace traditional, hierarchical models. Some scholars have argued that process-oriented leadership can be utilized in leader-centered environments. Ensley, Hmlieleski, and Pearce (2006) suggested that leadership development should include both “vertical and shared facets in order to capture a fuller view of leadership processes and outcomes” (p. 218).

Leadership as a *process* typically manifests itself as *leadership* development. From the data collected from individual interviews I found that many *Leadership I* participants described ways in which the program discussed leadership as a *process*. In this section, I will address these findings in the following four categories: (1) leadership as an institutional process; (2) informal leadership practices; (3) leadership as change; and (4) leadership as service.

Leadership as an Institutional Process

In previous sections I have discussed the intensity with which the participants spoke about leadership in terms of the individual and in concordance to formal positions; however, the participants also discussed leadership from the perspective of a process. Although the references to leadership as a *process* were not as frequent as those about leadership as an *individual*, they were still plentiful and significant to the overall conversation. Multiple participants articulated that one of their main goals of the program was to understand the process of the institution better so that they could emerge as more effective leaders within the organization. This was often described by participants as understanding the “big picture” of the institution and of the system as a whole. Phillip Forrester spoke to this idea when he made the following remarks:

Basically having a broader picture of the university, understanding all aspects of the university, that there were many aspects of the university. Everything that's involved--it's not just the teaching and the students. There's a city to administer and to light and heat. There are business responsibilities. So there's a whole lot of different – we have our own transportation fleet, we have our own police force-- all these different aspects to it. Understanding that there is this broader picture that you have to think of.

Dr. Samuel Faulkner also stated that one of his main goals in the program was to learn more about the processes involved in university leadership. He claimed this as a goal because he said that the higher one goes in administration the more people with whom the person interacts and thus it is critical to understand different areas and how to collaborate with, manage and lead those areas.

When looking at leadership as a *process*, relationships and collaboration become paramount. The idea of leadership as a *process* is reflected in many of the comments about collaboration that were discussed in the section about *leadership as relationship and influence*. When speaking about leadership as a *process* and in context of higher education, many participants referred to interactions between individuals within different divisions at the

institution. Martha Stone said that there was a great emphasis during *Leadership I* on the interconnection of all functions on campus and “how that interconnection is vital to the success of this organization and to the people we educate here and employ here.” She said *Leadership I* focuses on how leadership cannot happen in a silo and it cannot happen in isolation. Ms. Stone also stated how important the discussions about leadership as a *process* were because they helped her see the “big picture” of the institution.

The previous examples in this section reflect the ways in which individuals most directly discussed leadership as a *process* during the interviews; however, there are many other indirect ways in which individuals talked about the process-oriented nature of leadership. Leadership as a relational process, as a collaborative process, and as a process of influence are hallmarks of postindustrial leadership and are all highlighted in previous sections of this chapter. In the following paragraphs I address informal leadership, servant leadership and change, all of which were discussed by participants from a largely process-oriented perspective.

Informal Leadership Practices

Overwhelmingly, the participants described the institution’s approach to leadership as formal and hierarchical; however, more than half of the participants said they believe that the curriculum of the *Leadership I* program includes elements of informal leadership, even if that is not the focus. For example, although Martha Stone stated that the curriculum focuses more on formal leadership practices than informal practices, she recalled speakers who talked about how anyone can be a leader “even without a title”. Ms. Stone said:

I don’t think that the program in any way discounted informal leadership, I don’t think so at all, that wasn’t a sense that I walked away with. But the focus I think was on more the formal leadership.

Ms. Stone also said that she thought the institution recognizes individuals as leaders who are not at what most would consider a “significant level” or position within the university. She personally believes that “people can be leaders in all kinds of different roles” and believes the senior-leaders at the institution agree with that perspective even if leadership is not typically presented that way from an institutional or cultural perspective.

Phillip Forrester agreed with Ms. Stone and said that there are informal leaders at the institution and they are important to the leadership process. Mr. Forrester said that it is not his sense that the *Leadership I* curriculum promotes positional leadership in isolation. He made the following remarks regarding his thoughts on the subject of success in leadership: “So I think it’s not because you’re in that position or because you’re in a senior position that you are by definition a leader. Leadership can come from anywhere.” In addition to Ms. Stone and Mr. Forrester, several other participants described their personal leadership philosophies as informal in approach. Frequently I heard people describe leadership as the “action a person takes on a daily basis to advance the mission of the institution.”

Richard Rollings said he sees that the university making some effort to promote informal leadership practices, but believes the institution can improve. Mr. Rollings said, “I think we could do a better job with the bottom up stuff.” He also stated that he thinks that is part of the purpose of the *Leadership I* program—to help those who are in positions of authority learn how to encourage widespread, non-positional leadership. Mr. Rollings talked about how historically higher education has used a very top-down administrative approach but given the current environment that it is no longer feasible. He said,

You've got to have people – you have to have leadership at all levels starting to make executive decisions and collaborative decisions both at the same time. That's what it takes right now at this point in this university's history. That's what's needed.

Dr. John Martin supported Mr. Rollings thoughts that the institution can no longer afford to operate from a top-down mentality. Dr. Martin said that it is risky to not include elements of informal as well as formal leadership into a campus strategy. Dr. Martin pointed to the scandal at Pennsylvania State University as a reason why a strictly formal leadership approach can be dangerous.

The faculty perspective is unique when it comes to the discussion of informal leadership. Dr. Samuel Faulkner, who identifies as both staff and faculty, agreed that part of the purpose of *Leadership I* is to promote informal leadership. He said that in order to develop this aspect of the program's mission, faculty participation is paramount. Faculty was included starting with the second cohort. Dr. Faulkner said that one of the reasons bringing faculty into the program is so critical is because they will become informal leaders within their specific areas and eventually some might be more likely to become chairs or deans. Dr. Faulkner also referred to the importance of leadership as a *process* for advancing the mission:

So, I think that's important, but if they don't go back and take a higher position of authority, they'll still be using the skills and the networks that they've built through committees and things like that. They'll be advancing the mission of the university.

Dr. Heather Smith, a tenured professor and now associate dean, shared similar sentiments as Dr. Faulkner regarding the importance of informal leadership within the faculty. Even though legitimate power is clearly spoken about and represented in the *Leadership I* written materials, the aforementioned examples demonstrate that some participants also see leadership as a *process* as well as a *position*.

Leadership as Change

When talking about leadership from a process-oriented perspective the idea of change often emerges. Change is a characteristic of postindustrial leadership. According to Rost, one of

the main tenets of the postindustrial paradigm is that people will “pursue a purpose that intends real change”. Influence and change play an important role in process-oriented leadership. Dr. Grace Johnson of the advisory committee defined leadership as “an interaction that involves a group and that results in change – a relationship, not just an interaction; a relationship that occurs in a group context that involves change, that actually causes change.” Interestingly, the participants of *Leadership I* had varying opinions about how change was addressed during the program.

I asked each participant to discuss the way in which change is included in the *Leadership I* curriculum. Some participants stated that the idea of change is an evident component of *Leadership I*, whereas others considered it an after-thought, at best. In addition to change being a characteristic of the postindustrial paradigm, the topic is also pertinent because of the tremendous change that the institution has undergone in the past decade. Dr. Johnson emphasized the importance of creating change through *Leadership I* participants. She said that it was fine if participants walked away from the program with a good feeling about themselves and the institution, but that feeling must also translate into something tangible in order for the program to be a success. Dr. Johnson said, “If the feeling inspires a change in the way they do things...but if they walked away with just a feeling then I would say, 'Oh, dear. We failed.'”

Change as a component of the program curriculum. In many ways, change was addressed in a similar fashion as diversity in that most participants indicated that change was discussed as a secondary thought or in the context of other main points, but was not a focus of the curriculum itself. Participants did not deny that multiple conversations about change occurred, but said the conversations were more a product of discussions that emerged from interactions with guest speakers rather than an intentional piece of the curriculum. Martha Stone

said that in her experience in cohort one there were many comments made about the need for institutional change, the need for flexibility and the need for adaptability, as well as remarks made regarding the change that had occurred at the institution in its recent history. She said that the comments were made in the context of informal conversations; however, and were not a structured part of the curriculum. Samantha Simon stated that she felt that change was a secondary theme within the curriculum—not a specific focus, but that everyone understood its importance. She said,

I felt like it was just kind of a known message throughout the whole thing that again that is why we were there. We were there to learn how to be handling things at our level and through our work, through our ideas and through our collaborations...the idea would be that hopefully we would progress in the formal session and continue to do that. That we would continue to work well across the different lines, solve problems and have new ideas. It just felt like an underlying theme to me.

Following the same thought process of Ms. Simon and Ms. Stone, Dr. Faulkner also discussed the idea of change as a topic that was talked about but not in an overt manner. He did, however, think that the topic was addressed more formally than did others, remarking that Dr. Madeline Foster provided a book for the participants to read called *The Innovative University*. Dr. Faulkner said change was addressed through this book in the sense of “bringing innovation to your role”, “thinking about growth of the university” and in terms of “how to move the university forward”. Like Ms. Stone and other participants, Dr. Faulkner also said change was discussed in context of personal flexibility and adaptation.

Aside from Dr. Faulkner, the other participants who gave very detailed accounts of how and when change was discussed referred to a particular CCS course that deals specifically with change. Participants referred very positively to this course and according to their accounts this is the place in the curriculum that participants received practical information about organizational change. This was not a required course and from the responses I received it did not seem as if a

majority of participants enrolled in this particular course. Elizabeth Shoals called the class “interesting” and “very good” and said it focused on how to deal with change and the essential nature of change. Dr. Grace Johnson said that there was a session during university specific workshops for one of the cohorts that focused specifically on change. Dr. Mary-Louise Hightower, also of the advisory committee, spoke about how to handle personnel when going through change. Dr. Johnson said the session was very good. None of the participants recalled this specific session when asked, but it is possible that they reflected on it when making general observations.

Some of the faculty participants were slightly more critical about how *Leadership I* addressed change in its curriculum. Half of the faculty members who commented said the issue of change needed to be addressed in more detail or at least in a different manner. Dr. Peter Battle said that he does not remember change management being addressed. Coming from a background of teaching similar topics in the college of business, he was surprised that a leadership development program did not touch on the topic more than it did. Dr. John Martin said that change was addressed, but only in the manner that the institution wanted to discuss it. He did not feel like any opinion that did not fit in with the status quo was welcome.

In general, participants reported change being discussed in a similar way to how diversity was discussed, with many participants responding immediately to my questions about the topic with “of course change was discussed,” saying that it only made sense that it would be discussed because of the changing face of the campus, but then struggled to recall specific (or even general) ways in which change actually was discussed. Those who talked about specific ideas they learned regarding organizational change or being a change agent talked about these things in terms of the CCS course. Phillip Forrester said that he would like to see more time devoted to

discussions on change in the university specific workshops, but understands that the lack of attention to this topic is probably a result of lack of time not lack of interest.

Leadership as Service

A significant and unexpected finding was the emergence of servant leadership as a subcategory of the theme *leadership as a process*. A servant leader is a servant *first*, then a leader (Greenleaf, 1991). The servant leadership philosophy focuses on shared power and the health of a growing community and is a process-oriented model, whereas other leadership theories that focus on the leader first are more hierarchical and power driven. Transformational leadership theory is most often associated with a servant leadership style (Conger, 1999; Bass & Steindlmeier, 1999). In the interviews I never introduced the term “servant leader” in any of my conversations, but many of the participants did so independently. Other participants who did not use the specific term “servant leader” described themselves as a leader using the characteristics Greenleaf outlined in his original description of a servant leader.

The topic of servant leadership came up most often when I asked participants to define leadership. As they defined leadership and then described their own leadership style, many of them referred to themselves as a servant leader. When I asked Dr. Samuel Faulkner how he defines leadership he responded,

How do I define leadership? I really take the perspective of, I guess, the leader as servant. You're here to serve your unit, to serve the university. There's a quote, actually, from a novel I read, which is, "The privilege of rank is service," and *Leadership I* has helped strengthen that view, because of the fact that it makes me more aware of both that broader mission and, the fact is that an effective leader is someone who is not worried about themselves. Because, ultimately, if all you're doing is pushing your own agenda, you're not advancing the other people you're working with or for, and you're not advancing the institution. So it really has to do with working to ensure that your activities and the people working with you are working towards that institutional goal, that organizational aspect, as opposed to strictly managing by self-interest.

Likewise, David Self said that he has read multiple books on leadership theory and the philosophy with which he aligns most closely is servant leadership. Also similar to Dr. Faulkner, Mr. Self said that although *Leadership I* did not change the way he defined leadership it did reinforce how he thought about leadership. He specifically recalled that many of the speakers and panelists that visited with his cohort during the university specific workshop sessions approached leadership from what he considers a servant leadership model. He said not all of them used this term but he saw elements of this theory in how they talked about their approach to leadership. Other participants noted similar observations.

Phillip Forrester is an example of a participant who did not use the term servant leader but nevertheless defined leadership in terms of service. He also said that *Leadership I* did not change his personal definition of leadership, but it did reinforce his own beliefs. Although the female participants did not always use the term servant leader these individuals most consistently described themselves as a servant first. Laura Jones did call her style of leadership “participatory” and, specifically, “servant” based.

The two participants who did not address any aspects of service in their definitions are Michael Anderson and Dr. Peter Battle. Dr. Battle, in fact, specifically stated that he does not like the servant leadership philosophy because he believes individuals can be a “good servant but not a good leader”. Mr. Anderson was not as direct in his comments, but defined leadership in a similar fashion. Of all of the participants, Dr. Battle and Mr. Anderson indicated getting the least, personally, from the program although they both identified the merit of the program for other participants.

Concluding Remarks about the Theme of Leadership as a Process

Defining leadership as a *process* focuses on behavior that is learned, not inborn and emphasizes the importance of situational context. When defined in this way leadership becomes accessible to a large number of people. Throughout chapter four I addressed the many ways in which participants discussed the *Leadership I* program in terms of legitimate and formal power, which is more restrictive in terms of access; however, the idea of leadership as a *process* is not completely absent from participant reflection about the program. In fact, participants discussed leadership in terms of process-oriented behaviors in a number of ways, specifically in terms of institutional processes, institutional change and servant leadership models.

A process-oriented approach to leadership is a characteristic of twenty-first century leadership; however, leadership development programs in higher education continue to emphasize traits, skills, behaviors and formal authority, which restrict the access of who can practice leadership (Kezar, et al., 2006). Although *Leadership I* participants discussed leadership as a *process* through conversations about collaboration, culture, change and influence, the theme still appears secondary to the theme of legitimate power. Leadership in terms of legitimate power was discussed in relationship to the institution's culture as well as the curriculum with much more frequency than leadership as a *process*, which appears in personal participant definitions of leadership more often than it does in their descriptions of intentional curricular components.

Concluding Remarks Regarding the Analysis of Data

In this chapter I have discussed the six overarching themes that I used to categorize the multiple subthemes that emerged from document review and observation of the *Leadership Institute* program and from the individual interviews of participants and advisory committee members. The following are the six themes that I discussed in chapter four: (1) emphasis on legitimate power; (2) emphasis on traits and behaviors; (3) emphasis on the leader; (4)

significance of context and culture; (5) significance of relationships and influence; and (6) leadership as a process. The first three themes, and subsequently the subthemes under which these fall, are more representative of the industrial paradigm of leadership than the postindustrial paradigm. The remaining three themes reflect a more postindustrial paradigm of leadership, although participant interviews and other data collected suggest that these themes also include many elements that are industrial in nature.

The findings from the individual interviews, especially, indicate tension between the two paradigms that exists within the *Leadership I* program. For example, when asked direct questions regarding leadership philosophies and definitions, most participants and advisory committee members responded with answers that represent a postindustrial perspective of leadership. When talking casually about campus culture and the participants' respective positions, however, as well as when discussing the meaning of leadership from an institutional perspective, there was a strong industrial leadership emphasis. The tension between what participants seemingly want leadership to be about or believe it *should* be about and the shape it takes in the context of their current campus environment created some conflict and discomfort for individuals. This conflict was especially evident when I pressed participants and advisory committee members to provide examples of how postindustrial elements such as change, diversity, and process are included in the *Leadership Institute* curriculum.

To think about it in more simple terms than a conflict between the industrial and postindustrial paradigms, one can think about it as a conflict between *leader* development and *leadership* development. *Leader* development is often thought about in terms of the industrial paradigm because it focuses on the development of human capital, or enhancing individual abilities. Conversely, *leadership* development is typically aligned with the postindustrial

paradigm because it is perceived as the development of social capital, or emphasizing interpersonal competence, relationships and mutual trust (Day, 2001). *Leadership I* participant commentary reflected elements of both *leader* development and *leadership* development. Participant responses represented both the “Lone Ranger”, heroic perspective of leadership that emphasizes power, authority and a set of specific, inborn traits as well as the process-oriented and change-oriented leadership approach. Document review and observation also revealed both types of development taking place, as well as a tension between stated goals and actual outcomes.

Most contemporary leadership literature has discussed postindustrial and industrial leadership practices as mutually exclusive. The outline I discussed in chapter two of the five overlapping elements of the four theoretical approaches demonstrates that it may be possible to create a new leadership perspective and corresponding programming that relies on both industrial and postindustrial paradigms. Such innovative programming might be able to address the current issues with which higher education is faced in the twenty-first century, while still including some traditional, practical aspects of training and development that have produced positive outcomes in the past.

According to Kezar, et al. (2006) leaders, and in turn their organizations, will be best served if they use “as many frameworks as they can to address complex problems” (p. 160). Dr. Grace Johnson of the advisory committee spoke about the dichotomy of management and leadership in her interview with me. She said that *Leadership I* focuses both on management skill (or *leader* development) as well as on the process of leadership, or what Day would refer to as *leadership* development. Dr. Johnson said that both types of training and development are needed in a university setting. Furthermore she said, “That thing between management and

leadership, to me, is really a false dichotomy. They are not opposites on the same continuum. They exist side-by-side.” In chapter five I will examine more closely this struggle between the postindustrial paradigm and the industrial paradigm, as well as the tension between *leadership* development and *leader* development, as I answer the research questions that guided this study. I will also explore the potential positive outcomes of utilizing multiple frameworks when designing leadership development programming in higher education.

CHAPTER FIVE

IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The identity of colleges and universities and their ability to succeed in the twenty-first century have been endangered by what many scholars describe as a *crisis* in higher education. This crisis--caused by economic, social and organizational changes that have occurred over a period of several decades—has resulted in a decrease in those able to and willing to participate in formal and informal leadership on campuses throughout the country (Zusman, 2005; Tierney, 1998; Tierney, 1999; Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Gallant & Getz, 2009). The decrease in leadership at colleges and universities is a result of the overall crisis in higher education, but it also contributes to the crisis.

Given the current challenges facing higher education, the absence of leadership at institutions of higher education is disconcerting. The demand for innovation indicates that today, more than ever, there is an increasing need for faculty and staff members to participate in the leadership process. The dynamic nature of twenty-first century college campuses makes it necessary for individuals to be open to new and different approaches to solve complex issues. Many scholars have agreed that the future of colleges and universities is largely dependent on the leadership ability of their faculty and staff (Kezar, 2009; Christensen & Eyring, 2011).

Using the findings discussed in chapter four, chapter five examines each of the research questions posed in this dissertation. The purpose of this dissertation is to explore how institutions of higher education are cultivating their leaders in the twenty-first century. This dissertation considered the personal experiences of faculty and staff participating in a campus-based

leadership development program at a four-year, public institution and examined the ways in which a four-year institution increases leadership capacity of its employees. This dissertation also explored how a campus-based leadership development program employs elements of the industrial and postindustrial leadership paradigms. In this chapter I reflect on the significance of the influence of each paradigm as I answer the research questions. At the close of this chapter, I will also provide recommendations for future research and considerations for practice, as well as discuss the limitations of the study.

Answering the Research Questions

At the conclusion of chapter two I suggested that the seemingly competing paradigms of industrial and postindustrial leadership might each have significance in terms of faculty and staff leadership development in the twenty-first century. I challenged the long-held belief by many that these paradigms are mutually exclusive. To create the most comprehensive programming possible for leaders, I suggested that these paradigms be used together. Although many scholars have been strong advocates of one framework or the other, Kezar, et al. (2006) and Ensley, et al. (2006) presented the benefits of exploring the use of multiple frameworks when designing faculty and staff leadership development initiatives. To better understand how institutions cultivate their leaders and how individuals experience campus-based leadership programs, I considered the following research questions:

- (1) What leadership philosophies underscore the *Leadership I* curriculum?
- (2) How do the *Leadership I* participants conceptualize leadership?
- (3) What individual policies, practices or behaviors have changed as a result of *Leadership I* participation?

In the following sections, I have used the data collected to answer these questions.

What Leadership Philosophies Underscore the *Leadership I* Curriculum?

The *Leadership Institute* program employs multiple leadership theories and philosophies within its curriculum. These theories reflect both postindustrial and industrial approaches to leadership. Some of the philosophies that are represented are done so in an overt, intentional manner, while others are unintentional but nevertheless evident. Specifically, the *Leadership I* curriculum includes elements of trait-based, behavioral, situational and change-oriented theories.

Influence of trait-based leadership theory on the *Leadership I* curriculum. The influences of trait-based philosophies of leadership are evident in the *Leadership I* curriculum. Some aspects of trait theory are included in an intentional manner whereas other aspects are an unintentional result of the structure of the program. The participants, as well as advisory committee members, agreed that trait-like (inborn characteristics) are not talked about much during the *Leadership I* program; however, state-like (learned characteristics) are deliberately incorporated. Observation of *Leadership I* sessions, individual interviews and a review of agendas and curriculum materials revealed that *Leadership I* emphasizes certain learned qualities that are equated with effective leadership in higher education.

Inclusion of skill development and training. One aspect of the *Leadership I* curriculum where there is evidence of intentional inclusion of the trait-based philosophy is the skill development component—or what some advisory committee members referred to as the “application” portion. The required CCS courses focus on skill development and successful management practices and reflect best the intentional manner in which trait theory is incorporated into the *Leadership I* curriculum. The *Leadership I* website also reflects the curriculum’s intentions in regard to skill development and further demonstrates the emphasis on trait theory in terms of state-like characteristics. The website states that the curriculum is

designed to: (1) develop and enhance participants' abilities for higher-level management/leadership responsibilities; and (2) provide practical skills that may be used to enhance participants' immediate effectiveness as an administrator.

Emergence of the influence of the heroic leadership approach. In addition to the intentional inclusion of skill development within the program, there are other ways in which the trait approach is evident in the curriculum design of *Leadership I*. The university specific sessions include many speakers, facilitators and panelists who represent great positional power, both within the institution and within the larger university system. Although not the intent of the curriculum's design (nor the desired outcome by advisory committee members), this component of the curriculum has resulted in positional leader worship reminiscent of the way in which leadership is reflected in the heroic or "great man" theories. Through comments made in individual interviews, especially, it is evident that participants were not only impressed by the senior-level administrators, but saw them as institutional heroes. They spoke about these administrators as leaders based on their positions, with no flaws and with trait-like and state-like characteristics that they thought few would ever be able to replicate.

Trait theory as reflected in the emphasis on legitimate power. Trait theory typically emphasizes leadership as an individual phenomenon and thus is also closely associated with the use of legitimate power. Although the advisory committee did not specifically design the application materials or recruitment process using a trait theory framework, trait-based philosophies are reflected in the formality of the process—one that uses legitimate power and leader-centered language. Participants' initial exposure to the program is likely to be through one's supervisor or dean. The application and orientation process also involves the candidate and participant's supervisor or dean. The stated goals of the program, which are typically one of the

first introductions candidates have to the program, are largely oriented to individual development, emphasizing skill development and a management philosophy. The statement of purpose, a required portion of the application process, also asks two guiding questions that deal, at least in part, with skill development.

In addition to the recruitment and application portions of the program, the expectations of individuals that participation in *Leadership I* will translate into future advancement--as well as the way in which they discussed positional leadership--indicate a curriculum that is in part guided by a trait-based leadership philosophy. The website and program materials also reflect a leader-centered, trait-based approach in that most of the language in these forums focuses on the development of the individual, rather than widespread institutional leadership development. In most circumstances, trait theory and associated philosophies were not intentionally used to develop the curriculum, but are clearly evident in the implementation of the program.

Influence of behavioral leadership theory on the *Leadership I* curriculum. As compared to trait theory, there is far less emphasis on behavioral theory in the *Leadership I* curriculum. Advisory committee members suggested that leadership behaviors were not focused on in the design of the *Leadership I* curriculum, so unless specific behaviors were addressed in CCS courses in which participants enrolled, individuals were most likely not exposed to these leadership philosophies in a direct manner. I found the advisory committee members' assessment to be accurate.

Participants most commonly cited a focus on leadership behavior and style when discussing the CCS courses. Indirectly, then, by the inclusion of the CCS component, participants receive training and development that uses behavioral theory as a cornerstone. Advisory committee members indicated that behavioral theory is not a philosophy that heavily

influenced the curriculum design; however, the guest speakers and panelists typically incorporate discussions of behavior and style into their conversations about leadership. I would argue that facilitators do draw upon aspects of behavioral theory to some degree; however, based on the fact that participants reported discussions about the task-relationship dichotomy during university specific sessions. The behavioral philosophy has been included in many of the sessions indirectly, but it is not a theory that is used or referenced much, if at all, in the curriculum. Its influence was reported and observed as being minimal to the curriculum design.

Influence of situational leadership theory on *Leadership I* curriculum. Situational leadership theory is reflected in the *Leadership I* curriculum in several different ways. Postindustrial and revolutionary leadership development programming frameworks include an emphasis on culture and context, calling these elements critical to the practice of leadership (Kezar & Carducci, 2009). Seemingly, there is greater intentionality about the inclusion of a situational leadership approach as compared to the inclusion of trait and behavioral leadership philosophies. One aspect of situational theory that is especially evident in the *Leadership I* program is the training and development exercises that are included as a part of the CCS courses and as a part of the university specific sessions.

Situational theory and the evolving nature of the Leadership I curriculum. According to program participants, the CCS courses are more about practical leadership and management strategies than they are about leadership philosophy or theory. Participants reported that the exercises, activities and case studies that were incorporated into the CCS courses in which they were enrolled gave them an opportunity to see how their peers and instructors would approach various situations. Many participants cited the use of such exercises as one of the most meaningful aspects of the program for them personally. Some participants, however, expressed

disappointment with what they saw as an underutilization of situational theory. This criticism especially emerged from participants from the first cohort regarding the university specific sessions. Several participants expressed their desire for greater interaction with senior-level panelists and speakers when discussing specific situations or problems common to the institution.

Advisory committee members disclosed in their interviews that there was a fairly significant shift in the design of the university specific sessions starting with the second year of the program. It was at this time that the advisory committee members changed the curriculum to make the university specific sessions less lecture-oriented and more interactive. It was also at this time that advisory committee members developing the curriculum made a deliberate effort to focus even greater attention to context within the university specific sessions. Participants began physically touring, visiting and interacting with departments and divisions being discussed, as well as interacting with visiting guests on a more personal level.

During my observation of university specific workshop sessions, I engaged in the session about culture. According to advisory committee members, this particular session has changed over the course of the program. This session is a good example of the way in which situational theory is now used to design specific sessions to make them more context-oriented. Participants from the second cohort, especially, also talked about the importance of panelists and speakers incorporating stories about situations that required leadership strategies into their messages. Participants stated that such conversations were significant to their leadership growth.

Institutional culture and personal reflection. Kezar and Carducci (2009) suggested that faculty and staff who participate in leadership development programs should be reflecting on their own behaviors and skills in context of the institutional culture. I saw a significant amount of

this type of reflection taking place during the workshop session about culture. I did not hear campus culture spoken about or reflected upon in individual interviews as frequently as I saw participants thinking about it when prompted in university specific sessions. Surprisingly, diversity in the context of campus culture is something most participants did not feel was emphasized during the program.

I received examples of the way in which situational theory of leadership has been used through case studies, exercises and activities during the CCS courses, especially, to discuss general issues of diversity--but not necessarily as it applies specifically to the university or its campus culture. Due to the age of the program, the advisory committee is continually reviewing and making changes to the curriculum. During this development process the advisory committee has had intentional conversations about the importance of focusing on institutional context and the importance of selecting speakers for a specific purpose beyond just their title or position. For these reasons I assert that program administrators have used situational leadership theory (even if the theory was not referenced by name) as they continue to transform the curriculum.

Influence of change-oriented leadership theory on *Leadership I* curriculum. Change-oriented leadership theory is evident in the curriculum and design of the *Leadership I* program. The two themes that emerged during the data collection process that relate to change-oriented theories are the significance of (1) relationships and influence and (2) leadership as a *process*. Some of the relational and process-oriented elements of the program are unintentional results of the program's design and do not reflect a purposeful effort; however, other elements are the result of deliberate planning and of the structure of the curriculum.

Relationships and influence. The focus on leadership in terms of relationships and influence in the curriculum reflects key advisory committee members' personal definitions of

leadership, as well as the culture of the institution (which is highly relational). The program's focus on relationships and influence--and thus the underlying influence of change-oriented leadership theories--can be seen in almost every aspect of the program, including its marketing, application process, university specific workshop design and even in the CCS courses. One of the criteria listed for potential members on the program's website is the "capacity for positive influence". The required essay for the application process focuses on the idea of individual influence. According to advisory committee members, they designed the CCS courses and university specific sessions to foster relationship building and networking between participants and guest speakers, as well as among peer participants.

The intentionality on relationship building is especially evident in the documents and from advisory committee member comments. Advisory committee members discussed at length the changes that were implemented following the first year to ensure greater interaction between guest speakers and participants. These changes also helped participants engage on a deeper level with session topics. Document review, observation and participant responses also showed that the *Leadership I* curriculum emphasizes professional collaboration between departments and divisions. Participants discussed the collaboration that was modeled for them by speakers and panelists in the university specific sessions, as well as within the CCS courses. Some participants viewed the inclusion of collaboration as an intentional curricular component, whereas others saw it as an unintentional result stemming from other discussion topics. Almost all participants addressed it in some fashion as an outcome of the program.

Leadership as a process. In chapter four, I discussed the theme of *leadership as a process* from the perspective of the institution, in regard to informal leadership practices and in association with leadership defined as *change* and leadership defined as *service*. In traditional,

change-oriented leadership theories, leadership is expressed as a process rather than as something enacted by one, individual person. Although the curriculum focuses heavily on leadership as an individual *position*, it does not disregard the perspective of *leadership as a process*. Many participants said that initially one of their personal goals for the program was to understand the process of the institution better so that they could emerge as more effective leaders—and many agreed that this goal was met. Advisory committee members also articulated that a purpose of the *Leadership I* program is to help those poised for higher positions gain a greater understanding of the leadership process in higher education.

The deliberate inclusion of the perspective of leadership as a *process* was most evident in discussions during the university specific sessions. Guest speakers, facilitators and program administrators initiated process-oriented conversations. Some participants also reported that elements of informal leadership were discussed during the program, but this does not seem to be a deliberate focus, rather a topic that emerged from participant conversation and inquiry. Multiple advisory committee members also addressed the process-oriented nature of leadership when discussing the application and selection process. They reported making an effort to create cohorts representative of multiple divisions and a diversity of positions to best facilitate collaboration and learning.

Elements of change and service. The topics of change and service are traditionally related to change-oriented models of leadership as well as revolutionary leadership development programming. In the case of the *Leadership I* curriculum, these two topics emerged in some unique ways. Change is addressed in the *Leadership I* program beginning with the application process that indirectly prompts applicants to think about the initiatives in which they have taken part or wish to take part to improve their own departments or divisions. Likewise, a stated

purpose of the curriculum design is to “enhance participants' abilities to think critically about higher education in a dynamic environment,” again acknowledging the quickly changing nature of institutions.

Advisory committee members spoke about the importance of change as a desired outcome of the program. Specifically, several of them articulated the hope that participants will be empowered to create the change necessary to help their areas meet the demands based on the broader shifts of the institution as a whole. Participants also discussed the importance of change as an idea, but neither they nor advisory committee members could articulate specific curricular components that focus on what it means to be a change-agent or create sustainable change. I heard change discussed in context of the senior-level administrators and most often in relationship to a heroic leadership philosophy. Much like diversity, participants had a difficult time articulating how change was practically integrated into the program. Although change was discussed in a number of ways, it was not a focus of the curriculum or reflective of revolutionary leadership development approaches.

Whereas leadership as change is specifically mentioned in the desired outcomes of the program (although perhaps not seen in implementation), leadership defined as service is not stated as a desired learning outcome. The subtheme of leadership as service (*servant leadership*) emerged very specifically as a philosophy shared by many of the participants as well as advisory committee members. Although not a theory that was used intentionally in the design of the curriculum, the change-oriented leadership element of service has been integrated into the program both through personal philosophies of advisory committee members as well as from the participants themselves.

Postindustrial and industrial leadership paradigms. According to program participants and advisory committee members, there is no one specific leadership philosophy promoted through the *Leadership I* curriculum, but rather the curriculum was designed for cohort members to explore and experience various leadership styles, theories and practices. The philosophies that underscore the curriculum of *Leadership I* reflect both postindustrial and industrial paradigms. I have summarized in the following paragraphs how the aforementioned theories represent both industrial and postindustrial elements.

Leadership I curriculum as a reflection of the industrial paradigm. Data from observation, document review and individual interviews support the fact that the *Leadership I* program did not qualify specific traits or inborn characteristics as essential for effective leadership. Data reveal, however, that the *Leadership I* program curriculum does reflect the industrial leadership paradigm specifically through its emphasis on legitimate power that invokes a participant focus on leadership from a heroic/trait-based perspective. When discussing panelist and speakers, participants were more likely to express excitement and awe of the titles of the individuals involved, rather than reflect on the message they delivered. The intentional focus on skill development within the curriculum also represents trait theory. Sometimes skill-based development is identified with postindustrial characteristics, specifically when it focuses on collaborative strategies. The skill development focused on in the *Leadership I* curriculum, however, is more management-oriented in nature, evidenced by the titles and descriptions of CCS courses that use leader-centered, industrial, and management language and concepts.

I did not find that behavioral leadership theory was used widely in the design of the curriculum. Individual speakers and panelists did incorporate it into their specific sessions. Again, I typically found these uses to be more reflective of the industrial rather than the

postindustrial paradigm. Unlike behavioral theory, situational leadership approaches have been intentionally discussed during the ongoing process of curriculum development. Although situational theories reflect many postindustrial paradigm elements, when discussed in the context of the curriculum the focus is generally leader-centered with an emphasis on management strategies--also reflective of the industrial paradigm.

Leadership I curriculum as a reflection of the postindustrial paradigm. The three advisory committee members who have had the most influence over the curriculum and who have been engaged for the longest period of time described personal philosophies of leadership that reflect a postindustrial paradigm perspective. Dr. Grace Johnson described leadership as a relationship that occurs in a group context and has a purpose of change, while Dr. Madeline Foster described leadership as vision within the context of application. Victoria Thompson focused on the servant leader philosophy, also a postindustrial, change-oriented concept. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that many of the elements that seem most intentional in the curriculum reflect a postindustrial philosophy. The change-oriented leadership theory emphasis on relationships and influence can be seen throughout the university specific sessions as well as the CCS courses, although to a lesser degree in some of the CCS courses. The emphasis on collaboration, networking, influence and professional and personal relationship building is reflected in the session descriptions. There are several stated goals regarding diversity and change that represent a postindustrial perspective, also, but in practice these elements did not appear to be substantial or meaningful parts of the curriculum for participants.

The emergence and use of multiple frameworks. The three advisory committee members who have been integral in developing the *Leadership Institute* curriculum use postindustrial paradigm language when describing how they personally conceptualize leadership.

Although they maintain these postindustrial perspectives of leadership, each of these three individuals also stresses the importance of application, training and management emphasis within the context of broader leadership development. Dr. Grace Johnson described management and leadership as existing side by side rather than at opposite ends of the same continuum, the way much of the literature about postindustrial and industrial paradigms described these two entities. Given the personal perspectives of these advisory committee members and their own leadership development philosophies (which seem to incorporate elements of both the industrial and postindustrial paradigms) it makes sense that a curriculum that is guided by multiple frameworks would emerge.

How Do the *Leadership I* Participants Conceptualize Leadership?

Indications about how *Leadership I* program participants conceptualize leadership emerged during examination of each of the six overarching themes. I learned significant information about how participants view leadership through responses given to an inquiry in which I asked them to share with me how they conceptualize or think about leadership. I received equally significant information about participants' perceptions of leadership through their descriptions of the campus culture and current campus leaders, as well as through their responses to other questions, which often focused on traits, skills, power dynamics, and relational processes.

How participants conceptualize leadership as reflected through personal statements.

When asked directly to describe how they conceptualize leadership, overwhelmingly participants presented a postindustrial perspective. Without prompting or prior discussion (as this was one of the first questions I asked participants), the majority of participants discussed meaningful relationships, vision, collaboration and change-oriented behaviors as critical elements of

effective leadership. The majority of participants also independently asserted that leadership is not about position—or at least not exclusively about position—but rather about the ability of a person to exert influence and create change. When asked a follow-up question regarding *whom* they saw as leaders, the majority of participants once again asserted that anyone can be a leader and that titles do not matter (meaning that even a person without a prestigious position at the institution might in fact be an excellent leader). When participants did discuss traits and skills within the context of explaining how they view leadership, they most often talked about state-like characteristics and skills in their descriptions rather than inborn traits.

Most notable, as well as most surprising, was the frequency with which individual participants described their leadership perspective as one that follows a servant leadership philosophy. A large number of participants used the term *servant leadership*. While others may not have used the specific term *servant leader/leadership*, they still equated leadership with service. They described effective leadership as structurally flat, process-oriented, transformational and centered on service to others, rather than leadership that is focused on the elevation of one, specific person. Only two participants rejected the idea of service as a critical component of leadership. These are the same two individuals who described leadership from an almost exclusively industrial perspective, who asserted that not everyone had the capacity to be a leader and who suggested that effective leaders possess inborn traits and characteristics that cause their success.

How participants conceptualize leadership as reflected through discussion of campus culture and personal experiences. When asked about how they conceptualize leadership, a large majority of program participants described eloquently and without hesitation a view of leadership that celebrates a postindustrial leadership framework. The participants’

perspectives of leadership as one of change, process, service and relational influence follow with precision most contemporary scholars' descriptions of postindustrial leadership. It is significant, then, that through discussion and casual conversation during individual interviews (with the exception of when I posed the specific question about individual concepts of leadership) the participants emphasized a leader-centered perspective focusing on power and position. The emphasis on industrial framework concepts such as position, power and the individual-as-leader were especially evident during discussions about campus culture, current employee positions and the perceived institutional approach to leadership.

When specifically asked about their own view of leadership, participants articulated a postindustrial perspective, but in casual conversation about the campus and about daily interactions and leadership styles relating to their specific positions participants most frequently used a postindustrial paradigm lens. The emphasis on hierarchy, legitimate power, management and achieving the leader's goals is reflective of a campus culture at the university that is oriented toward positional authority, tradition, and top-down management. Given the nature of higher education and the educational background of the participants, it makes sense that when asked directly most participants asserted that anyone can be a leader and that title and position do not matter. Participants disclosed that this assessment is largely based on their own research and reflection of contemporary leadership literature.

Considering the institutional perspective of leadership, it also is understandable that in practice the participants are more likely to represent a positional, power-driven, individual approach to leadership. When I asked participants to identify the most significant elements of the program, a majority responded that interacting with "leaders" on campus was one the most significant parts of the program because they were able to learn about effective and successful

leadership practices. When I asked them how they identify individuals as leaders, most responded that it is due to a person's position. Likewise, participants deemed specific leadership practices as successful more because of the individual position of the person presenting the idea rather than the outcome of the practice itself.

In addition to the contradiction between participants' stated philosophies and their practices regarding legitimate power, tension emerged between participants' stated ideas and practices relating to trait-based philosophies. In their personal definitions of leadership, most participants rejected the idea of inborn characteristics and other trait-based philosophies. During general conversation about the program and the campus, however, many participants represented a heroic leadership perspective with their comments, as they exclaimed about the involvement of the president and other senior-level administrators. Numerous participants called it "very significant" to the value of the program to have such high caliber individuals involved, commenting that few men and women possess the characteristics necessary to achieve the success that those few "great men" and "great women" have achieved. When asked how they classify "success," the participants again responded that success is indicated by the position that individuals have achieved and maintained. Participants emphasized the importance of legitimate power through their quest for advancement, which many of them stated as an expected outcome of the program. They also used leader-centered language throughout the process of the interviews, which some suggested mirrored the language of the institution. I noted leader-centered language used during the *Leadership I* sessions that I observed, especially by participants but also at times by presenters.

***Leadership I's* influence on how participants conceptualize leadership.** When asked directly about how they conceptualize leadership, the majority of participants described it from a

postindustrial perspective with some industrial elements focusing on skill and the use of legitimate power. A small minority of participants described their views of leadership from a strictly industrial perspective with little postindustrial influence. Regardless of how they conceptualize leadership; however, the participants were in agreement that their personal philosophies about leadership did not change as a result of the *Leadership I* program. The majority of participants said that the way in which the program presents leadership aligns with their personal belief system and thus their previously held notions have been strengthened and broadened as a result of the program's curriculum--but not changed. The two participants who reported feeling tension between their own leadership philosophies and those of the program are the two participants who described leadership from a strictly industrial perspective focusing on top-down management and inborn characteristics.

Throughout the interviews, observation and document review, it became evident that the *Leadership I* program does not suggest one specific leadership philosophy or theory for participants to adopt. Participants agreed that the program effectively introduced them to many different styles and philosophies through presentations and personal accounts and allowed them to explore what might work best on an individual basis. Participants generally identified with speakers or philosophies that best aligned with their own personal style of leadership and where they were in their career path at the time of the program. The career experience of participants is another reason individuals reported no great change in their personal leadership styles or philosophies, but rather a strengthening of their current practices. Participants also agreed that there are certain qualities or state-like attributes that the program's curriculum highlights as critical elements to successful leadership in higher education, but the focus is not on inborn traits or characteristics that are more often seen in industrial leadership frameworks.

The curriculum did not have a major influence on the way participants defined their personal conceptions of leadership. The curriculum, along with advisory committee member approaches to leadership, did however seem to play somewhat of a role in how participants discussed leadership during casual conversations (I experienced this both during the interview process as well as during observation of *Leadership I* sessions), but still less of an influence overall than campus culture and personal experiences. The advisory committee members who designed or influenced the design of the curriculum and agendas for the *Leadership I* sessions, along with the instructors of the CCS courses, may have indirectly impacted how the participants conceptualize leadership, although participants themselves did not acknowledge this fact.

As articulated in the previous section, advisory committee member perceptions about leadership vary widely and represent both postindustrial and industrial paradigms. Likewise, the program's curriculum seems to encourage participants to look at multiple leadership models. It regularly emphasizes postindustrial paradigm characteristics such as relationships of influence, collaboration and process; however, it also focuses on industrial paradigm elements such as specific skill development, management strategies that invoke legitimate power and leadership within a hierarchical structure. Utilizing multiple frameworks—in this case, the postindustrial and industrial framework—the curriculum combines twenty-first century leadership ideas with management-centered application. The overall participant descriptions of leadership most directly reflect the philosophies of those who designed the curriculum. During interviews and observation, participants used the language and repeated messages that I heard within *Leadership I* sessions and during individual interviews with key advisory committee members. I argue that personal experiences and the campus culture may have influenced the way participants perceived effective leadership from both a postindustrial and industrial lens early on in the program, but the

Leadership I curriculum helped shape the message that participants now relay about leadership within the context of higher education.

Conceptualizing leadership using multiple frameworks. The way in which program participants conceptualize leadership is influenced by the personal leadership philosophies that they held prior to entering *Leadership I*, the campus culture and environment within which they work as well as the *Leadership I* curriculum and personal philosophies of individual advisory committee members. The curriculum and advisory committee members' personal perspectives appear to have far less of an influence than did the participants' personal philosophies and the campus culture. Surprisingly, the tension that existed in terms of approaches to leadership did not exist between program participants, with few exceptions, but rather between the way in which participants described how they conceptualize leadership and the way in which they practice leadership within the context of the institution.

Participants' personal conceptions of leadership and the way the large majority of participants described leadership is reflective of the postindustrial paradigm that focuses on collaborative relationships, change, influence behaviors, management-as-distinct-from-leadership and that which deemphasizes position, power and rank. The discrepancies and tension arise, then, in comparison to how the participants described the practice of leadership within their individual jobs and within the campus as a whole--which is far more reflective of the industrial paradigm. Participants revealed that the leadership as practiced within their offices, departments and divisions (including the practices in which they personally engage) endorses an industrial paradigm, focusing on a leader-centered model emphasizing management, legitimate power, specific leadership characteristics and advancement. The personal philosophies of key advisory committee members--who see management and leadership as existing side-by-side--reflect an

integration of multiple frameworks, as does the curriculum they designed. Given the desire of participants to lead in a postindustrial manner and the demand for industrial approaches in context of the institutional culture, it seems important—and necessary—to have a leadership development program that employs multiple frameworks.

What Individual Policies, Practices or Behaviors have Changed as a Result of *Leadership I* Participation?

The influence of the *Leadership Institute* program at an individual level is most evident through the data collected during one-on-one interviews. I directly asked participants how the *Leadership I* program changed the way they approach their roles at the institution, as well as how it has altered their general leadership philosophies. I found that participants have not significantly changed their personal philosophies of leadership as a result of their involvement in *Leadership I*; however, they have adopted new professional practices, behaviors and in some instances policies due to their involvement. There are three primary ways in which individual participants have changed how they approach their professional and personal leadership practices as a result of the *Leadership I* program. These three areas of change focus on (1) collaboration; (2) management practices and policies; and (3) student services.

Collaboration. Participants overwhelmingly reported that the *Leadership I* program has changed the way in which they approach collaboration between departments within their own division, as well as between different divisions at the institution. The “bigger picture” of the institution that many individuals described seeing as a result of participating in *Leadership I* gave them a better perspective about the needs of the growing campus and helped them understand the difficulty of meeting such needs while working within individual silos. Participants frequently used the term “silo” when explaining the way in which they functioned professionally prior to

their involvement in the *Leadership I* program. The relational leadership approaches that are a focus in the curriculum has changed the way in which many participants view their work at the institution and has prompted many of them to increase their efforts to engage others outside of their own areas.

As a result of the program, participants reported that they communicate more frequently with people outside of their own departments and divisions, work with people from other divisions on projects, invite departments outside of their own divisions to partner with them on events and feel more comfortable asking colleagues from other areas to assist them or their students (both peers they met in the program as well as other faculty and staff). Advisory committee members also reported a noticeable increase in the personal and professional networks of participants from the beginning of the program to the end, which they said they believe leads to greater collaboration following the program. Participants reported that the university specific sessions foster collaboration the most, followed by certain CCS courses that also emphasize relational and influential aspects of leadership

Management practices and policies. Collaboration may have been the behavioral change most cited by participants, but a close second is the changes the participants made in their management behaviors. Many of the participants, both faculty and staff, asserted that they made changes in their daily management practices as a result of what they learned, especially as a result of what they gleaned through the CCS courses. A few individuals mentioned that they formally implemented new management policies because of what they learned through *Leadership I*, but mostly participants stated that they informally changed the way they approach management and leadership in their offices and in their roles as supervisors.

Specifically, participants stated making changes in the way they communicate with peers, supervisors and those whom they supervise; the way they manage their time; the way in which they approach conflict/resolution; the way in which they motivate people and garner support; and the way in which they craft messages that promote unity and support the institution's goals. Participants also spoke about ways in which they made changes based on information learned in university specific sessions about practical tasks associated with job responsibilities such as dealing with reports, evaluations and other paperwork. Although some participants said that the management-oriented lessons did not include new information for them, they admitted that the lessons were still good reminders of best practices that they needed to revisit.

Student services. Participants discussed changes they made either in their behavior in regard to working with others across campus or in management practices within their own offices. Fewer participants commented on the influence the *Leadership I* program has had on how they directly serve students, but those who did reference this effect feel strongly about the outcome. Participants reported being more likely to call on colleagues for assistance, more likely to think about student services from a larger campus perspective and more likely to directly teach students about leadership and management skills as compared with their practices prior to entering the *Leadership I* program.

Some participants responded that gaining a better understanding of the institution and the changes taking place in areas other than their own helps them answer student questions more effectively and helps them better manage student expectations. Other participants, who dealt less-directly with students on a daily basis, said that understanding the bigger institutional picture helps them make small adjustments in their areas that result in the needs of the overall student population being met in a more efficient manner (for example, in transportation and dining

services). Several participants also cited examples of referring a student to another *Leadership I* colleague for assistance or calling on that colleague themselves to gain expertise to more effectively serve a student in need. Almost all participants who commented that the *Leadership I* program experience increased their effectiveness with students cited as the reason their increased professional network on campus. A few participants also said that they took specific leadership and management skills learned in the program and incorporated them into their syllabus when teaching courses or facilitating programs for graduate and undergraduate students.

Concluding Remarks Regarding Research Questions

When answering the research questions it became even more evident that the *Leadership Institute* program relies on multiple frameworks in the design and implementation of its curriculum. The use of multiple leadership philosophies were discussed by participants and can be found upon review of *Leadership Institute* documents as well as seen in practice during observation of university specific sessions. Through analysis of the data, evidence of the four overarching leadership theories that I reviewed in chapter two of this dissertation emerged. These theories reflect elements of both the industrial and postindustrial leadership paradigms.

In specifically answering the research questions regarding the guiding philosophies of the *Leadership I* curriculum, participant conceptions of leadership and the resulting individual changes from involvement in the program, I illustrated how an institution cultivates its leaders. The philosophies that underscore the curriculum and the way in which participants conceptualize leadership draw heavily from both the industrial and postindustrial paradigms. In theory, participants and advisory committee members share personal and programmatic approaches that are more postindustrial in nature. In practice, there is a far greater industrial influence that exists. The responses to the third research question that addresses the changes in policies, practices and

behaviors that result from participation in the program indicates that there are individual or *leader* benefits as well as institutional or *leadership* benefits of the way the curriculum is structured. The responses to the research questions provide evidence that *Leadership Institute* is not exclusively about *leadership* development or *leader* development nor is the program guided exclusively by an industrial or postindustrial paradigm. Rather, *Leadership Institute* seems to cultivate its leaders using multiple frameworks and using several different guiding philosophies.

Differing Perceptions of the *Leadership Institute* Program Based on Self-Identification

I discovered certain themes and subthemes during data collection and the analysis process for which groups of individuals are aligned depending on personal identification regarding race, gender or university classification. Overall, however, I found very few significant differences in terms of faculty and staff classification, gender and race identification. Those differences that I did discover are significant enough to include, as I found them meaningful to the overall conversation about revolutionary leadership development.

Faculty and Staff

Several of the advisory committee members stated that they were surprised that the program assessment from the faculty and staff did not vary more widely than it did. There are only a few areas in which faculty and staff differed greatly in their perspectives. Analysis of data revealed that faculty members diverged from staff significantly in their thoughts about skill development and how the program defines change, as well as how it addresses informal leadership. Faculty members were less likely to find as great of value in the skill development aspect of *Leadership I*. In general, faculty and staff participants who have been at the institution the longest reported the least enthusiasm about this part of the program. Seemingly, one's faculty or staff status did not have as much to do with his or her indifference or dislike of the CCS

course requirements as did the person's length of service to the university. Likewise, staff participants were more likely to discuss confidence as an outcome of the program than were faculty participants.

Faculty member participants were also comparatively more critical of the way the program addresses change, saying that it is not directly discussed. Many thought that it should be talked about in greater depth given the climate of the institution. Faculty members said they perceived the program and the institution, overall, as having a positive approach to informal leadership processes. This is not true for staff members, who typically stated that they do not think the university embraces flat leadership structures or that it does so minimally. It is difficult to evaluate the differences between how faculty and staff perceive the program using data exclusively from this study because faculty were only included starting from the second cohort. The third cohort has several participants who identify as faculty, but I did not conduct individual interviews with these members as they were just beginning their program sessions at the time of the study. The small number of faculty available for interview limits this analysis. Also, it is important to note that many participants who are classified by the institution as "faculty" also maintain administrative positions and thus function in traditional faculty roles as well as in administrator roles.

Gender and Race

Like the differences between faculty and staff perspective, the differences along gender and race lines are also few, although those that exist introduce critical insight. The individual cohorts are not balanced as far as gender is concerned; however, the overall make-up of all three cohorts represents a balance in terms of gender with men only slightly out-numbering women. There was only one difference that was consistently noticeable between men and women in

individual interviews, as well as during observation sessions: Female participants were more likely than male participants to speak about leadership from a transformational, change-oriented perspective. Women were also more likely to use inclusive, team-oriented language whereas male participants spoke more frequently about advancement in relationship to leadership. Both men and women spoke about leadership from a transformational and transactional perspective; however women were more likely to discuss it in terms of the former and men in terms of the latter. Given the research discussed in the literature review that revealed more women than men take a transformational approach to leadership, this conclusion is not an unusual finding associated with leadership development programming.

One of the most evident differences between populations emerged between those who identify as a racial minority, ethnic minority, or as part of a marginalized population due to country of origin and those who identify as Caucasian and born in the United States. The ways in which individuals in each group discussed how the program addresses race differed significantly. Those who identify as a minority did not think the sessions in which they were involved addressed diversity in a notable manner, which most of them thought was reflective of how the institution also deals with issues of race and difference. Comparatively, most of the participants who identify as Caucasian either said that the program addresses race and diversity adequately or could not recall specific instances of how it was addressed, but assumed that it was done in an appropriate manner. Overall, I found few significant differences based on personal identifiers, but the aforementioned emerged and are noteworthy because of the importance of race, gender and faculty/staff status in terms of revolutionary leadership development research.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

As the researcher, I made every effort to reduce effects of the limitations and delimitations of the study. In the following sections, I will discuss further the possible limitations and delimitations that I introduced in chapter three in an attempt to alleviate any questions about the validity of the research. I will address the issues of a small sample population, single-site study and questions regarding the researcher's lens that were discussed in chapter three as well as concerns about political limitations that emerged during the study.

Single Research Site

In chapter three I discussed a single research site as a delimitations of the study. Most notably, the concern of a single site study is that the findings may not be able to be generalized to other institutions with similar programs. The accessibility I was given to *Leadership Institute* participants, as well as to advisory committee members and workshop presenters, allowed me to collect a wealth of information from varying perspectives that resulted in transferable conclusions.

For the majority of the data collection process I was able to live near the university. The institution was welcoming to me as a researcher. The program administrators freely shared documents and allowed me to participate in program activities with the only requests being that I respect the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. The access that I was granted gave me the opportunity to increase the breadth of a study with a fairly small sample population.

The depth that I was able to pursue with each participant and through document review and observation came in part from my ability to live near campus for the duration of the data collection phase and in part from the willingness of the institution to welcome me as a researcher to study the *Leadership I* program. During the data collection process I learned about additional institutions that have leadership development programs that share similar curricular elements

with the *Leadership I* program. That newly discovered information, in addition to the information I had learned from the literature regarding faculty and staff leadership programming across the United States, increases my confidence as the researcher that the findings of my study will be both transferable and valuable.

Small Sample Population

In addition to the concerns regarding the single site study, I also addressed in chapter three the limiting factors of a small sample population. The *Leadership I* program is still in its infancy, with only two cohorts of participants having completed the program and a third cohort currently enrolled. With 10 to 15 participants per cohort, the population available for individual interviews was small. Likewise, the advisory committee is not large and thus the number of persons available to engage in individual interviews from this group was also limited. Although the limitation of the small sample size discussed in chapter three still exists, the concern was diminished some due to the overwhelming response from program graduates willing to participate in the study. The fact that so many program graduates agreed to engage in individual interviews helped facilitate the best outcome possible.

Perhaps the biggest limitation I encountered regarding population was the lack of participation in individual interviews by persons of color. As stated in chapter three, there are few persons of color who have been involved in the program as participants. Of the four persons of color involved in cohorts one and two, only two responded to my request for an interview. I received valuable information from the two individuals I interviewed who identified as racial minorities, but the small number did limit my understanding of the lived experiences of faculty and staff of color in the context of campus-based leadership development programming. The group I interviewed is representative in most other ways, however, including a fairly equal

number of men and women, faculty and staff, as well as individuals who identify with other marginalized or minority groups.

Researcher Lens and Political Influences

My desire to understand the way in which institutions are fostering leadership development in faculty and staff in the twenty-first century comes from a genuine interest in the topic of leadership development, as well as from curiosity given the gap I discovered in the literature on this topic during my initial phases of research. I recognize that the lens through which I see information is influenced by my lived experiences, including my experiences as a past administrative staff member at SWSU, as well as the work I have done at other institutions. I mitigated any existing bias to the extent possible with the use of triangulation, member checks and identification of personal biases. I also utilized multiple sources of data and methods (one-on-one interviews, document analysis and observation) to confirm the findings and sent completed transcripts back to participants for verification.

Due to the nature of my positions at the university, which were either categorized as entry-level or mid-management positions, and due to the amount of time I have been removed from the institution--now living in another geographic region--my affiliation in this way did not seemingly have an impact on the participants. What I did find, however, is that the political environment of the campus was somewhat limiting on a few occasions. I recall that two participants were reluctant to fully disclose information and when asked about difficult issues repeatedly used specific (seemingly rehearsed) responses that fell in line with the perceived university stance. A few other participants also began the interview responding in this fashion, but only two participants continued with these types of responses throughout the duration of the interview. Most participants were extremely candid with their responses.

Both advisory committee members and program participants identified concerns that due to the political pressures at the university some participants might not respond honestly to questions that could be perceived as controversial for fear of retribution. During the observation process one of the faculty participants was reluctant to comment during the session about campus culture, stating that he had additional things to say but felt it was best to “keep quiet” as he knew his comments would not be in line with the institution’s message on the subject. Although the political environment of the campus did limit me in gathering some desired pieces of information from two or three participants, in general I did not perceive the political pressure to be problematic.

Concluding Remarks about Delimitations/Limitations of the Study

Through careful examination of personal bias, cooperation on the part of participants, advisory committee members and the institution--as well as due to my ability to relocate during the data collection process--I was able to largely mitigate the effects of the limitations and delimitations discussed in chapter three. The only additional potential limitation that I did not discuss in chapter three, that emerged during the individual interview portion, was that of participant memory. I acknowledge that whereas most variation in participant responses reflects the lens through which individuals see and experience the program, different responses may at times also reflect a lack of the ability of a participant to recall specific information. Although none of the participants had been more than one year removed from the program, there is still the possibility that a participant or advisory committee member may not have been able to recall details regarding specific information I requested. Overall, however, this did not appear to be a problem and did not seemingly impact the findings of the study.

Recommendations for Future Research

The lack of current research available on the topic of faculty and staff leadership development in higher education provides ample opportunity for future studies. There is also opportunity for further research on faculty and staff leadership development at Southwest State University, specifically, regarding the *Leadership Institute* program. In the following paragraphs I will outline some specific recommendations for future research in regard to faculty and staff leadership development in general as well as future research as it relates to the *Leadership Institute* program.

Recommendations Regarding Sample Population and Timeline

My first recommendation for future research is additional data collection. I recommend this data collection come in the form of additional case study sites with larger participant populations as well as an on-going investigation at Southwest State University. As the *Leadership I* program grows in the number of cohorts and increases in the number of individuals who have completed the program, there will be a larger pool of past participants from which to collect data. This is significant given the small size of the sample population is somewhat of a limiting factor for this study. Increasing the sample size will also hopefully increase the diversity of the candidates interviewed. As the program grows, it is likely that more persons of color will be included in the program, so additional interviews will allow for a better view about how minority and marginalized populations perceive the program. By broadening the study to include programs at other institutions, this will also allow for an increased perspective about how a diverse sample of faculty and staff at different institution types engage in and respond to campus-based leadership development initiatives.

In addition to including other institutions and replicating the current study at SWSU, I also recommend interviewing participants after they are selected for a leadership program but

prior to the program's orientation. I recommend interviewing the same participants again following their graduation from a program. I recommend this approach be used at SWSU for additional data collection focused on *Leadership I*, as well as at other institutions where a researcher would conduct a study on a similarly structured campus-based program. Although I asked *Leadership I* participants who had already graduated to reflect upon what they recalled regarding their thoughts about the program prior to their orientation and first structured sessions, their answers were influenced from having already participated in the program. Their answers were also impacted by their ability to recall details.

In the current study, I interviewed participants who had completed the program within the past year. This is also due to the age of the program. In the future, I recommend that researchers also interview participants of a campus-based leadership program three to five years removed from the program to collect data about how participants have sustained the changes they implemented as a result of what they learned, as well as provide information about the positional advancement of participants at their institution or in higher education in general.

Recommendations Regarding *Leadership Fellows* Research

The second recommendation for future direction of research pertains specifically to the *Leadership I* program and is in relationship to the *Leadership Fellows* program. Both advisory committee members and participants referenced the *Leadership Fellows* program, a previous leadership development program for higher-level faculty and administrators at the university. In a future study of faculty and staff leadership development programming at Southwest State University, I would include individual interviews with participants from the *Leadership Fellows* program. Multiple advisory committee members, as well as *Leadership I* participants, indicated

that the *Leadership Fellows* program included elements that are absent from the *Leadership I* program that would be beneficial to certain participants.

Recommendations Regarding Benchmarking

The third recommendation I suggest is in relationship to benchmarking. Campus-based leadership development programs for faculty and staff have become more prevalent in recent years. To assist the institutions in their efforts to create sustainable programming that makes a meaningful impact, I recommend engaging in research that looks at what comparable institutions are doing in terms of leadership development. In the case of *Leadership I*, some of the advisory committee members have reviewed other leadership development programs but it is my understanding that benchmarking results have not been shared with the advisory committee as a whole or with university administrators.

Recommendations Regarding Revolutionary Leadership Development Framework

My final recommendation is one that pertains to the study of a campus-based program at any institution of higher education. Several leadership scholars suggested that the curricula of leadership development programs in higher education should reflect revolutionary leadership development concepts, although few do this in practice. I recommend using the Kezar and Carducci (2009) tenets of revolutionary leadership development as a framework to assess the emphasis programs place on revolutionary/postindustrial paradigm aspects of leadership.

Examining leadership development from a revolutionary leadership perspective is relevant because although multiple frameworks are useful, it seems that the postindustrial paradigm concepts are more difficult to implement in practice, even when established as part of a program's framework. When looking at programs from this perspective, I recommend interviewing individuals who are in "subordinate" positions to those participating in the

leadership development programs. I also recommend following a group of participants after completion of a program to determine what sustainable changes, if any, are made in their leadership approaches, in their practices and in their philosophies. In a short-term study it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of a program in terms of revolutionary leadership development tenets because many of them deal with widespread change that cannot and does not happen overnight.

Considerations for Practice

There are several considerations for practice and implications that emerged throughout the course of this study. The recommendations I will make are not only specific to SWSU. Given the way in which the data collected supports the literature reviewed, these are recommendations that can be applied more broadly. I acknowledge, however, that although other institutions have similar leadership development programs, every campus has a unique culture and set of needs. The considerations for practice that I have outlined focus on the following four, main areas: (1) continuing engagement and long-term program impact; (2) diversity; (3) program marketing; and (4) needs of faculty/staff participants based on years in the field.

Long-Term Program Impact

Leadership I participants articulated their desire to continue engaging with the *Leadership I* program in a meaningful way after completion of the two-year curriculum. Participants also expressed confusion about their role as an alumnus/a of the program and expressed a desire for additional opportunities and further direction about how to interact with members of new cohorts. I did not find participant comments to be in the form of complaints, rather they had genuinely felt challenged and supported by both their peers and the administrators of the program and want to continue those relationships in a more structured

fashion. Advisory committee members disclosed that one of the most difficult aspects of the program for them is determining an effective way to continue to foster relationships and engage the participants once the curriculum is complete.

Members of the first cohort reported meeting informally several times in the first year after completion of the program and a few participants reported attending orientation and graduation events to which they were invited. The majority of participants said that they desire a more structured way of continuing their conversations about leadership. Participants also expressed a desire to continue growing in their knowledge about leadership. Several participants disclosed that they struggle with how to implement some of the strategies learned through *Leadership I* and want to create change but need additional support to do so.

The literature discussed in chapter one indicated that the most effective leadership development programs make long-term commitments to individuals, engaging faculty and staff members beyond the mandated workshops and courses. Postindustrial leadership is about change—but not change for the sake of change—rather sustainable change that can make a meaningful difference in the life of an organization and its members. The tenets of revolutionary leadership development therefore also are geared toward preparing individuals to lead in an ever-changing environment of the twenty-first century. Dr. Grace Johnson, one of the advisory committee members integral in the creation of the curriculum, said that it is not enough that participants are impressed by aspects of the program if they make no changes in the way they approach their positions or how they lead then she feels the program has failed.

Recommendations. Given the revolutionary leadership development emphasis on meaningful, sustainable change and the desire stated by advisory committee members and participants in this study to be a part of ongoing organizational change and personal growth,

there are several recommendations that are appropriate for campus-based leadership programs. I recommend that those in advisory and administrative capacities invite past participants of campus-based programs (only those who have completed a program's requirements) to engage in occasional lectures, roundtable discussions or other forums where they can continue to hone their leadership skills as well as engage with colleagues, program administrators and senior-level administrators. These meetings do not have to be frequent to achieve the purpose of on-going engagement. I also recommend that campus-based programs invite past participants to receptions and graduations for future cohorts. *Leadership I* does this and, although several participants said they have been unable to attend (mostly due to professional engagements), they appreciate being asked. It makes them feel as if they are still a part of the program.

A 2.0 curriculum. As discussed previously, research indicates that experience, inquiry and reflection on action are critical to leadership development (Gram, 2010). Given the research, along with the revolutionary leadership development emphasis on meaningful, sustainable change, I recommend incorporating web 2.0 learning into campus-based leadership programming for faculty and staff. I recommend using a 2.0 curriculum as a part of the *Leadership Institute* curriculum, specifically, to foster continued participant engagement. Gram (2010) described *Learning 2.0* as "using the collaboration, communication and user-generated content features of web 2.0 technologies to facilitate learning from work experience." Likewise, Grosbeck (2008) defined web 2.0 as "the social use of the web which allow people to collaborate, to get actively involved in creating content, to generate knowledge and to share information (p. 478). I recommend that administrators of leadership development programs utilize forums such as social networking sites, blogs, media sharing sites or other similar online venues to facilitate continued training after the required courses are completed. A 2.0 curriculum can facilitate interactive and

collaborative projects centered on topics that could not be fit into the limited timeframe of a campus-based program's curriculum (e.g. fundraising and development) or for those topics in which participants desire more hands-on experience. Such projects can be used as a way for participants to develop distinct skill sets while also potentially benefitting the institution.

Innovative and thoughtful use of technology is critical to achieving objectives of campus-based programs and necessary for providing opportunities for participants to continue to learn and foster relationships following graduation. In addition to web 2.0 project-based continuation of the curriculum, I recommend that administrators of campus-based programs create a private section on their websites accessible only to current and past program participants. These areas of program websites are places where administrators, guest speakers and participants can post resources, handouts, articles, book recommendations and the like. These types of areas can also include a discussion board where participants share items from their own departments or information from conferences that they attend in their specific areas.

Diversity

Overall, *Leadership I* participants perceived diversity as a topic that was not discussed in an intentional, meaningful way, either by speakers or as a planned part of the curriculum. Participants who represent marginalized or racial/ethnic minority groups, especially, reported that discussions about diversity were lacking. These same individuals indicated the need for greater diversity, specifically in terms of race, within the make-up of the program. It is my understanding from advisory committee members that the curriculum has undergone some significant changes since the first cohort in how some of the topics are addressed--culture (including "diversity") being one of them. Regarding the curriculum, I observed one session

during which I did hear conversations that dealt with the history and culture of the campus that touched on issues of race as well as other forms of diversity.

Recommendations. The literature indicated that diversity is a critical part of revolutionary leadership development; but also noted that it can be a difficult issue to approach within campus-based programs. Knowing that diversity can be a challenging topic to address within the context of leadership development, administrators must be intentional in their efforts to include it in the curriculum as well as in the admissions process. In terms of the *Leadership Institute*, specifically, multiple advisory committee members have suggested that as a committee it must continue to review how the program presents and approaches issues of diversity. Given the literature, as well as the data collected from this study, I recommend that all campus-based leadership programs take steps to ensure they are addressing the idea of difference within their curricular components as well as within their recruitment plans.

Diversity addressed within the curriculum. There are several ways that a program can address the topic of diversity within its curriculum. In the following section I provide some specific recommendations based on best practices and research regarding leadership development taken from the higher education community as well as from the business community. To achieve success in developing leaders who embrace and celebrate diversity an organization must be authentic as well as intentional (Llopis, 2011). To achieve such authenticity, administrators of a campus-based leadership development program should consider including the following elements in their initiatives: (1) readings by a diverse set of scholars and practitioners (Harper & Hurtado, 2007); (2) a format in which to discuss the institution's history as it relates to issues of diversity and inclusion (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen & Allen, 1998); (3) an opportunity for open discussion about the current state of the institution as it relates

to issues of diversity and inclusion (Hurtado, et al., 1998); (4) an opportunity for participants to reflect on how different parts of their identity (race, sexual orientation, ability, gender, etc.) constrain or enable their leadership (Ospina, El Hadidy, Caicedo & Jones, 2011); (5) strategic partnerships with individuals and organizations on campus who can facilitate the design of curricular components that help look at issues from multiple perspectives; (6) assessment in the form of evaluations for each workshop session and course (McDowell, Fang, Brownlee, Young & Khanna, 2002); (7) a format in which to receive feedback from past and current participants regarding what they would like to see addressed in terms of leadership in a diverse campus climate in the twenty-first century; and (8) a representation of multiple perspectives (Hurtado, et al., 1998; Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

The aforementioned recommendations are largely based on postindustrial paradigm and revolutionary leadership tenets of context and culture. Diversity and understanding of difference can only be achieved if approached in an authentic manner (Llopis, 2011). If an institution is promoting diversity within leadership for the purpose of image or public relations, it will be evident and their objectives will likely fail. Campus-based leadership development programs must make a commitment to include the idea of difference into all aspects of a curriculum. Readings, as well as speakers, should be diverse and include individuals who represent different minority and marginalized populations as well as individuals who discuss a wide range of ideas.

In addition to including a more diverse group of speakers and topics (or different perspectives on traditional topics), campus-based programs must deal with their institution's history as it relates to behaviors of inclusion and exclusion. According to Hurtado, et al. (1998) organizations must directly address their history regarding diversity, even when it is less than favorable. They must do this in an honest and open format and allow people to discuss their

feelings about the past as well as address their concerns about the current culture as it relates to diversity initiatives. This type of examination of the past and present is particularly important to ensure that individuals feel comfortable stating opinions that go against what may be perceived as the “status quo”. In the absence of such a comfort level the ability to create change is difficult. Studies have shown that reflection about leadership in context of a person’s identity and the institution’s culture is significant to an individual understanding various issues dealing with difference (Ospina, et al., 2011).

Along with the aforementioned recommendations, assessment is key to ensuring that the curriculum is fostering an environment of learning that is inclusive. It is important to assess individual sessions as well as design a way in which to receive feedback from past and current participants regarding what is lacking in the institution’s leadership training in relationship to diversity and cultural awareness. Assessment can be done in a number of ways including using online tools, through in-person evaluations or through one-on-one interviews. In addition to assessment of the curricular components, administrators must also look at the membership of the program. Who is in the room or “at the table” matters when looking at what kind of learning takes place in individual sessions. Participants will learn from their peers as much as they will learn from facilitators and guest lecturers.

Diversity in recruitment. According to Kezar and Carducci (2009) one of the goals of revolutionary leadership development programming is to empower historically marginalized individuals and foster social change. Although the *Leadership Institute* is a diverse and extremely representative program in some ways, in other ways, such as racial and ethnic diversity, it is lacking. The literature indicated that this is common in campus-based programs. Given what revolutionary leadership development theory conveys about empowering

marginalized individuals and given the issues of racial and ethnic diversity that emerged in this case study, I make the following recommendations for campus-based programs: (1) establish strategic partnerships with individuals who can help advertise leadership training opportunities to campus organizations; (2) establish partnerships with campus publications and organizations that focus on minority and marginalized populations (McDowell, et al., 2002; Hurtado, et al., 1998); (3) provide diversity-in-leadership training for advisory board/committee members and/or administrators overseeing the program (McDowell, et al., 2002; (4) establish a continuous review of the recruitment processes of potential candidates; and (5) focus recruitment on all areas of the institution, regardless of size or political power of the department.

In the case of *Leadership I* it is evident that the lack of racial diversity is not a result of the selection process, but a result of the recruitment process. Those in key positions on the advisory committee have demonstrated a commitment to reaching all populations on campus and to creating diverse cohorts. Each advisory committee member I interviewed articulated the value—and necessity—of diversity within any institutional leadership development program. They also spoke about diversity as important from a higher education perspective.

To combat the recruitment issues reported in literature and reflected in the case study of *Leadership I*, I recommend establishing strategic partnerships that will enable program administrators to reach a wider audience when marketing the program. These partnerships can be with organizations and publications that focus on marginalized and minority populations and differing perspectives in higher education. Partnering with key leaders of different subgroups at an institution may also help educate less represented groups about the existence of leadership development opportunities. Additionally, I recommend that campus-based program administrators consider the value of intentionally engaging supervisors from all areas to

participate in the nomination process. These recommendations do not negate the time that I understand many individuals have already invested in this issue in the case of *Leadership I*, but rather serve to encourage a recognition of the significance of continuing efforts to engage more individuals and advocate for a wider commitment in terms of recruitment by *all* involved with any similar campus-based program.

In regard to membership recruitment, it is also my recommendation that all of those involved in an advisory capacity to campus-based programs be engaged in ongoing discussions about the philosophy of the recruitment process. Along with such dialogue, I recommend that those who oversee campus-based programs receive some group training, even if minimal, regarding how to seek diversity in membership and how to implement a curriculum that celebrates difference. The additional training and conversations surrounding what diversity looks like for a campus-based program will likely bring the issue to the forefront and make it a topic that is more comfortably embraced.

My final recommendation regarding inclusion of participants from all areas of campus is related to a need for continuous dialogue. From the interviews I conducted with *Leadership I* advisory committee members, it is evident that multiple opinions exist about the target population for the program. Some advisory committee members see the *Leadership Institute* program as geared toward individuals in large departments of the university, who are more likely to advance and who currently have political influence, or who are likely to have such influence in the near future. Other advisory committee members see the program's target population much more broadly and less in terms of advancement and political power. Using a revolutionary leadership development model, the concern that emerges in relationship to the first perspective is

that some of the less influential areas on campus serve marginalized populations and have administrators who identify as minorities.

Excluding individuals representing smaller departments from participating in a campus-based leadership program because of their lack of power, probable advancement or personal influence not only potentially limits the diversity of the program's candidate pool, but also limits conversation within the group about important campus issues, student populations and contextual topics. Individuals from smaller, less notable departments may lack institutional power but often serve marginalized populations and bring valuable perspectives about diversity, as well as culture, to the discussion. If potential participants from smaller, less influential areas are not *excluded*, but are still given less preference, this may also hurt the overall diversity competency goals of the program. Continual conversations about the recruitment philosophy may help draw a consensus between administrators and advisors as well as foster a more inclusive environment for potential and current participants. Although the final recommendation emerged specifically from the data collected in the case study of *Leadership I*, it is a recommendation I would encourage any campus-based leadership program to consider.

Needs of Faculty/Staff Participants Based on Years in the Field

Leadership Fellows was a leadership development program at Southwest State University that was dissolved in an effort to create one, overarching program designed for faculty and staff at all levels of their careers. This consolidation was seemingly a unanimous decision at the time, with only one or two dissenters; however, many of the advisory committee members I interviewed (several of whom are graduates of the *Leadership Fellows* program) stated that they believe there is value in having two separate programs. Those who advocated this position said that it has become evident that the goals of the *Leadership Institute* and the *Leadership Fellows*

are different enough that it is unrealistic to expect the original target populations of both to achieve as positive of outcomes in one, combined program.

The *Leadership Fellows* program specifically targeted a small group of faculty and staff who were already poised for *top-level* positions as provosts, deans, vice or associate/assistant provosts or vice presidents. *Leadership I* does focus on developing participants for *higher-level management/leadership responsibilities* but the program is much more geared toward skill development of mid-management employees and engaging participants on issues affecting the university and its mission. Some participants who had entered the *Leadership I* program expecting it to be similar to what they knew about the *Leadership Fellows* program were disappointed with what they described as the lack of disclosure between participants and senior-level administrators, the focus on elementary skill development and the absence of engagement with leaders from other campuses.

Other participants who were not as familiar with the *Leadership Fellows* program also had similar criticisms of the *Leadership I* program when asked what they would change about the program. The participants who shared the aforementioned perspectives identify both as faculty and as staff, but they all have been in their career paths longer than seven years, with most of them working in higher education for 15 to 20 years. This demonstrates one of the more difficult aspects of the *Leadership I* program: developing a curriculum that meets the needs of faculty and staff participants who are at different places in their careers and/or poised for different types of advancement opportunities.

Recommendations. For future research, I recommended collecting data through personal interviews of those who participated in the *Leadership Fellows* program. To address considerations in practice, I recommend that those in advisory capacities of any campus-based

program continue discussions about the way in which the curriculum is meeting the needs of faculty and staff participants with multiple decades of higher education experience. I recognize that creating different programs that are geared toward faculty and staff at different stages of their career may be a controversial recommendation on many campuses due to lack of resources. I advocate, however, that administrators and those in advisory capacities review the aspects of programs (such as *Leadership Fellows*) that are geared toward those who have been in the field longer and determine which of those programs' elements may be missing from other campus-based programs that include a broader spectrum of participants. Creating a separate program altogether may not be necessary to meet the needs of those further along in their careers, nor feasible, but making changes to current curriculum components to meet such needs might be possible.

Mentoring. Those who are new to the higher education field, as well as those who are seasoned professionals, shared their desires for a mentoring component to the *Leadership I* program. Those persons who represent the more seasoned professionals especially expressed a desire for a mentoring piece. The *Leadership Fellows* program had a formal mentoring component, whereas any mentoring experienced through *Leadership I* is informal and not coordinated as a part of the program. Advisory committee members who have been a part of curriculum development for both the *Leadership Fellows* and *Leadership Institute* programs stated the difficulty of coordinating formal mentoring for such a large group.

Given the individual participant comments regarding mentoring, as well as the emphasis on it in the literature for campus-based leadership development programs, I recommend that those in advisory capacities of campus-based programs discuss possible ways to meet the mentoring need. I acknowledge that including a mentoring component necessitates a practical

strategy. For the *Leadership I* program and other similar campus-based programs mentoring most likely needs to be done in a manner that can address the need in a less formal way than in *Leadership Fellows* (but in a more structured format than it is currently occurring in *Leadership I*). Given the findings that emerged in this study, I recommend that an advisor who is less involved in the curriculum writing and instruction portions of a campus-based program assume the responsibility for the coordination of a mentoring component. Seemingly this will only work if the guiding committee of said campus-based program is functioning as a working board, rather than just an advising board.

Program Marketing

My final recommendation for practice deals with the marketing of campus-based programs. Based on participant and advisory committee member comments, the marketing of *Leadership I* seems incongruent with the spoken intentions of the program. *Leadership I* advisory committee members, particularly those most integral in creating the curriculum, stated that advancement is not the main focus of the program and should not be an expectation of participants; however, advancement is communicated through the language used to market the program and to recruit participants. The *Leadership I* advisory committee members spoke about leadership development using multiple frameworks and they emphasized postindustrial paradigm outcomes of widespread leadership and change. The written materials on the website and in the application materials are much more focused on *leader* development, however, emphasizing an industrial paradigm leader-centered perspective.

Recommendations. In regard to the *Leadership I* program, the contradiction between the stated beliefs of those designing and coordinating the curriculum and the written purposes of the program have resulted in confusion among participants regarding the purpose of the program and

the expectations of them as graduates of the program. For this reason, I recommend that campus-based leadership program administrators and advisors have regular conversations that address the needs of their institutions as they relate to leadership, as well as hold discussions that focus on the desired long-term outcomes of leadership programming. I recognize that many similar conversations have occurred throughout the years by those involved with the *Leadership I* program. As the program has grown in age the curriculum has changed in design to reflect a changing institution. With members of two cohorts graduated and data collected on their perceptions of the program, this is an appropriate time to revisit the stated goals of the program and evaluate them in terms of what is practiced and in terms of the values integrated into the curriculum based on advisory committee member philosophies and the institutional message. Based on the literature this seems to be a model of practice that would benefit most campus-based programs.

I also recommend campus-based programs incorporate assessment tools designed to evaluate the objectives and critical competencies of their curriculum. *Leadership I* participants and advisory committee members spoke about several objectives and competencies during their individual interviews and while some of them were evident during observation and document review, others were not as clearly represented. I recommend that advisors of all campus-based programs use evaluation tools that assess the objectives, as well as any other learning outcomes, and discuss their relevance to their institution.

I recommend making adjustments to the curriculum and stated objectives given what is learned through the assessment procedures. I recommend making changes based on a determination of what particular objectives are most relevant to the program or overall leadership development at an institution. This process will allow a program to focus on the competencies

and/or objectives that matter most while at the same time reducing current contradictions between stated goals and the practices of the program, as guided by the content of the curriculum. This process would also help with recruitment and marketing issues by decreasing confusion of candidates and participants entering the program as to the goals and objectives of the program. A clear alignment of stated and practiced values should help guide the expectations of potential candidates and participants of any campus-based program.

The Use of Multiple Frameworks in Revolutionary Leadership Development

Through a case study format, this dissertation explored how institutions of higher education are cultivating their leaders in the twenty-first century. This study focused on a single campus-based leadership development program for faculty and staff. I have included recommendations for practice that are specific to this program as well as ones that are generalizable to other campus-based programs. Although the data collected and subsequent recommendations may not be able to be generalized for all campus-based leadership programs, the information is transferable and thus significant to the body of research on the topic.

The topic of faculty and staff leadership development is significant because of the leadership crisis that currently exists in higher education. Ensuring that there is not only availability of individuals willing to assume leadership roles in the coming decades, but also that the leaders have the appropriate training and development to guide twenty-first century organizations, is critical. The literature suggested that to meet the needs of dynamic environments of current and future college campuses, a different type of leadership is necessary.

A New Definition of Revolutionary Leadership Development

To achieve the innovative leadership necessary, Kezar and Carducci (2009) suggested that leadership development programs should place a greater emphasis on what they refer to as

“revolutionary leadership development principles”. These principles reflect the postindustrial paradigm and are aligned with Rost’s (1993) definition of twenty-first century leadership that described leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes” (p. 99). Similar to Rost’s definition, the tenets of revolutionary leadership that Kezar and Carducci described focus on individual and organizational learning, complexity and chaos, collaboration, culture and context as well as recognize the importance of emotions, empowerment of historically marginalized individuals, social change and globalization. Both Rost’s definition and Kezar and Carducci’s tenets of revolutionary leadership are reflective of the postindustrial paradigm, which calls for the use of influence behaviors that are multi-directional; a focus on collaborative relationships; a concentration on purposeful, meaningful change; and an emphasis on process-oriented leadership.

Many contemporary scholars have asserted either a postindustrial or industrial leadership perspective and are skeptical about the ability to combine elements of each, arguing that industrial management and postindustrial leadership exist on opposite ends of a spectrum and thus require two different types of development programs. Kezar, et al. (2006) and Ensley, et al. (2006), however, suggested that it is beneficial to implement the use of multiple frameworks when designing faculty and staff leadership development for the twenty-first century. Likewise, I argue that the leadership development programs most likely to result in widespread, sustainable change in higher education incorporate elements of both industrial and postindustrial paradigms. I refer to such programs as “revolutionary” in their own right. *Leadership Institute* is an example of a program that uses both industrial and postindustrial paradigms to underscore its curriculum.

Integration of elements from the postindustrial leadership paradigm. There are several ways in which the *Leadership Institute* curriculum reflects a postindustrial paradigm philosophy. The curriculum's focus on learning, collaboration, relationships and influence reflect the postindustrial teachings of Rost as well as the teachings of Kezar and Carducci. Context, culture and organizational change are emphasized but in a less direct manner than the aforementioned elements. Empowerment of marginalized individuals, social change and multidirectional leadership are the elements least discussed according to curriculum materials and information provided by individual participants and advisory committee members. It is significant to note that many of the advisory committee members most integral in the creation of the *Leadership I* program spoke about leadership most frequently from a postindustrial leadership perspective, especially emphasizing meaningful change as an important outcome of leadership and leadership development.

Integration of elements from the industrial leadership paradigm. Differing widely from postindustrial leadership, the industrial leadership paradigm focuses on individual traits; leader-centered, legitimate behaviors; and emphasizes "doing the leader's wishes," along with pursuing all organizational goals even if not related to change. *Leadership Institute's* curriculum includes several elements of the industrial paradigm. The curriculum most directly incorporates elements of the industrial paradigm by its focus on leadership traits and skill development, through its emphasis on legitimate power and subsequently leader-centered behavior, and with its representation of leadership as a position. Industrial leadership focuses on management whereas the postindustrial paradigm distinguishes the process of leadership from management behaviors.

A merging of paradigms. In many ways, *Leadership Institute* has been successful at incorporating both industrial and postindustrial philosophies into its curriculum. Like most institutions of higher education today, there is a noticeable tension at SWSU between the hierarchical, leader-centered, position-oriented, management-driven approaches that have existed for centuries and the emerging leadership approaches that are collaborative, process-driven, change-oriented and inclusive. Tension often arises as institutions strive to incorporate innovative, twenty-first century strategies to address the emerging issues in higher education, but must continue to navigate traditional thoughts, structures and rituals that have been in place for multiple decades. It is logical that the tension between industrial and postindustrial leadership paradigms emerged in the *Leadership Institute* program most clearly between stated leadership perspectives that reflect a postindustrial approach to leadership and a curriculum that, in practice, emphasizes a slightly more management-oriented, industrial approach to leadership. This also explains why that in practice the curriculum sometimes contradicts what administrators suggest are the desired outcomes for the program.

Leadership Institute as a program struggles with what most leadership development programs, as well as institutions of higher education in general, struggle: how to balance training individuals in a practical manner to lead within the hierarchical, industrial structures that currently exist at colleges and universities while encouraging innovative approaches to leadership that will better address the crisis that is emerging in higher education. In many instances, the *Leadership Institute* curriculum facilitates such a balance. At other times, the curriculum lends itself more toward *leader* development, rather than *leadership* development, focusing on skill development, individual advancement and power. The struggle seen in the

Leadership Institute program to achieve a desired balance is reflective of what is happening at many institutions in regard to faculty and staff leadership development.

Concluding Remarks

The purpose of campus-based leadership programs is to ensure that there is a pool of individuals available to lead colleges and universities into the twenty-first century. This does not necessarily mean the function of these programs is solely personal advancement or to ensure the availability of future positional leaders. The purpose is also to ensure that individuals exist who possess the skills and knowledge to ensure the success of institutions in a changing climate. For a long time in higher education the concept of change-oriented, postindustrial, revolutionary leadership tenets have been discussed as innovative ideas that represent a more inclusive leadership approach; however, institutions have continued to train individuals largely using industrial and management models of leadership that focus almost exclusively on the use of legitimate behaviors, traits, skills and how to harness power.

Historically, institutions of higher education have placed a higher value and reward on leadership initiatives associated with the industrial leadership paradigm. As leadership development programs slowly change how they train leaders in higher education for the future, however, the increased value once placed on industrial leadership is diminishing somewhat. *Leadership Institute* is a good example of the changing face of faculty and staff leadership development. Rather than building a curriculum that solely emphasizes industrial paradigm elements of leadership such as skill development and individual advancement, program administrators are also using postindustrial, change-oriented philosophies to design curricular components. It is not surprising that the elements about which the participants and advisory committee members were most ambiguous in their responses surrounded some of the core

principles of postindustrial leadership and revolutionary leadership development, such as change, empowerment and diversity. The intent to include these elements is evident both in the curriculum and by the stated objectives and personal desires of those integral in creating the curriculum. It will likely take many years, however, to successfully integrate some of the postindustrial paradigm elements of leadership into a campus culture that adheres so strongly to traditional, industrial, hierarchical approaches to leadership.

Given the culture of the institution it is significant that almost all faculty and staff participants, as well as advisory committee members, described a personal and professional philosophy that reflects the postindustrial paradigm. The fact that many of the participants also incorporate some practices that reflect a more postindustrial approach is notable as well. The conflict between paradigms evident in the *Leadership Institute* program is an indicator of the real change that is taking place in how institutions develop their leaders. As a shift occurs between how leadership development had been approached in the past to how it will be approached in the future--to meet the changing needs of higher education—there will likely continue to be a degree of tension and disagreement among individuals designing the curriculum of leadership development programs.

The shift that is taking place in higher education broadly has been happening over many years and multiple leadership development programs at SWSU. Given the history of the institution's faculty and staff leadership development programming as well as the culture of SWSU, it seems appropriate that there would exist some contradiction between how the program and individuals describe leadership and what happens in practice, both within the *Leadership I* program and at the institution in general. This is indicative of a changing culture and a changing climate in higher education.

A Move Toward Using Multiple Frameworks in Leadership Development

The data collected indicate that professionals at this institution rely most frequently on industrial forms of leadership in their institutional roles. The data also suggest that there is a slightly greater emphasis on industrial as compared to postindustrial leadership philosophies in the curriculum of the *Leadership Institute* program, even though there is greater intentionality about the incorporation of postindustrial elements. The limited literature that does exist about faculty and staff leadership development reflects that the reliance on industrial leadership concepts is common at institutions of higher education and should be examined when discussing the leadership crisis that currently exists.

Upon the realization that there is a lack of individuals interested, willing and able to assume leadership roles in higher education, either formally or informally, institutions began developing campus-based programs to address the problem. Part of the issue exists due to the nature of institutions in the twenty-first century and the leadership required for the necessary changes to be implemented. *Leadership Institute* is a good example of a program that is integral in shaping individuals for the future leadership needed in higher education. Like any program, *Leadership Institute* is imperfect but its curriculum reflects an intentional effort to look at leadership development from an innovative lens. Administrators continually revise and rework curricular elements as they discover what will best serve the participants and in turn the entire campus community. Through this process, they are achieving many of the program objectives as well as making an imprint on the leadership culture of the campus.

As a fairly new entity to the higher education horizon I believe that, like *Leadership I*, most campus-based programs will continue to grow, change, expand and redefine their goals, objectives, and missions. As institutions learn more about what is needed to produce successful

leaders for the future of higher education, administrators will alter campus-based programs to meet those needs. What seems fairly evident from the literature, and from this study, is that leadership development should be looked at using multiple frameworks. To successfully navigate as a formal or informal leader in the realm of higher education individuals must be able to understand leadership from a process-oriented perspective as well as from a management perspective. Institutions and administrators must shape programs to emphasize *leader* development as well as *leadership* development. Creating a program that overlooks one or the other is inadequate when preparing individuals to serve within traditionally structured organizations that are demanding innovative leadership solutions for a twenty-first century climate. Programs must also be designed to give individuals the tools to turn theory into practice.

Leadership Institute is an example of a young program that, with each cohort of faculty and staff, is steadily achieving milestones in its efforts to bring together industrial and postindustrial philosophies to develop leadership among faculty and staff. Advisory committee member Dr. Grace Johnson describes it best. When asked about leadership and management in the context of industrial and postindustrial paradigms, she said, “That thing between management and leadership, to me, is really a false dichotomy...they are not opposites on the same continuum. They exist side-by-side. They are very different skills. But at the university level, you really need both. You can't just have one.”

REFERENCES

- Advanced leadership for academic professionals (n.d.). *Leadership Development at the University of Florida*. Retrieved from <http://www.hr.ufl.edu/training/leadership/alap.asp>.
- Altbach, P.G. & Finkelstein, M.J. (1997). *The academic profession: The professoriate in crisis*. New York: NY: Garland Publishing, INC.
- Amey, M.J. (2006). Leadership in higher education. *Change*, 38(6), 55-58.
- Anderson, M. (2001). The complex relations between the academy and industry: Views from the literature. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 226-246.
- Appadurai, A. (2009, April 10). Higher education's coming leadership crisis. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A19.
- Astin, A.W. & Astin, H.S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. W.K Kellogg Foundation Report, Battle Creek, MI.
- Ayman, R., Chemers, M.M., & Fiedler, F. (1995). The contingency model of leadership effectiveness: Its levels of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 147-167.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications, third edition*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bass, B.M. & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181-217.
- Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., and Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Bess, J.L., & Goldman, P. (2001). Leadership ambiguity in universities and K-12 schools and the limits of contemporary leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 419-450.

- Birnbaum, M.H. (1992). *How academic leadership works*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J.S. (1967). The managerial grid in three dimensions: Additional attribute is depth of managerial style. *Training and Development Journal*, 21(1), 2-5.
- Blanchard, K.H., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. Situational leadership after 25 years: A retrospective. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1993, 1(1), 22-36.
- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (2003). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bonner, J. (2011, September 6). Growth in numbers and quality. *The Crimson White*. Retrieved from <http://cw.ua.edu/2011/09/06/growth-in-numbers-and-quality>.
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 693-710.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. NY: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Cannon, J. (2010, October 25). Graduate program sees expansion. Retrieved from <http://changingtides.ua.edu/?tag=graduate-school>.
- Carr, S. (1999, July 16). Training programs help professors prepare for posts as administrators. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A37-38.
- Chaffee, E.E. (1998). Listening to the people we serve. In W. Tierney (Ed.), *The responsive university* (pp. 13-37). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Christensen, C.M. & Eyring, H.J. (2011). *The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Christensen, C.M. & Horn, M.B. (2011, July/August). Colleges in crisis. *Harvard Magazine*, pp. 40-43.
- Conger, J.A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 145-179.
- Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- Conger, J.A., Kanungo, R.N. & Menon, S.T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(7), 747-767.

- Davis, G.P. (n.d). On-campus leadership development programs: A sampling of approaches. *American Council on Education*. Retrieved from <http://acenet.edu>.
- Day, D.V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.
- Derue, D.S., Nahrgang, J.D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S.E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 7-52.
- Doyle, W.R. (2008). The baby boomers as faculty: What will they leave behind? *Change*, 40(6), 56-59.
- Dugan, J.P. (2006). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47, 335-343.
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B.J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744.
- Eatwell, R. (2006). The concept and theory of charismatic leadership. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 7(2), 141-156.
- Editorial: SWSU didn't lower standards to increase enrollment. *The Tuscaloosa News*. Retrieved from <http://www.tuscaloosaneews.com/article/20120422/NEWS/120429978?p=1&tc=pg>
- Eisenbach, R. Watson, K., & Pillai, R. (1999). Transformational leadership in the context of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(2), 80-89.
- Ekman, R (2010, September 24). The imminent crisis in college leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A88.
- Ekvall, G & Arvonen, J. (1991). Change-centered leadership: An extension of the two-dimensional model. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 7(1), 17-26.
- Ensley, M.D., Hmieleski, K.M. & Pearce, C.L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly* 17, 217-231.
- Faculty Senate Financial Affairs Committee Meeting. (2003, November 21). Retrieved from <http://facultysenate.ua.edu/03-04/FinancialAffairs/FACmn112103.html>.
- Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. (2003, January 21). *Southwest State University*. Retrieved from <http://facultysenate.ua.edu/02-03/mn012103.html>.
- Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. (2008, August 26). *Southwest State University*.

- Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes. (2011, September 20). *Southwest State University*. Retrieved from <http://facultysenate.ua.edu/11-12/minutes%2011-12/FACULTY%20SENATE%20MEETING%2009-20-11.pdf>.
- Fain, P. (2009, May 1). Trustee surveys paints grim budget picture over next year for public universities. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A13-A13.
- Fast facts (Fall 2011). *Southwest State University System*. Retrieved from <http://www.uasystem.ua.edu/IR%20Data/Fast%20Facts-current.pdf>.
- Fathe, L. (2008, September 5). Leadership in academe and industry. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A79.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1970). The contingency model: A theory of leadership effectiveness. In J.S. Ott, S.J. Parkes & R.B. Simpson (Eds.), *Classic readings in organizational behavior* (pp. 55-64). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Fincher, C. (2003). *Administrative Leadership: In academic governance and management*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Fisher, J.L. (1984). The charismatic presidency. In *Power of the presidency* (pp. 57-71). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company and American Council on Education.
- Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37(1), 1-6.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Gallant, T.B. & Getz, C. (2009). Facing organizational complexity and change: A case-in-point approach to leadership development. In A.J. Kezar (Ed.), *Rethinking leadership practices in a complex, multicultural, and global environment* (pp. 93-116). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Gil, F., Rico, R., Alcover, C.M., & Barrasa, A. (2005). Change-oriented leadership, satisfaction and performance in work groups: Effects of team climate and group potency. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(3/4), 312-328.
- Gmelch, W.H. & Wolverton, M (2002). An investigation of dean leadership. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1990). An alternative “description of personality”: The big-five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216-1229.
- Goleman, D. (1998/2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 82-91.

- Gortner, H.F., Nichols, K.L. & Ball, C. (2007). *Organization theory: A public and nonprofit perspective*. Belmont, CA: Thomas Wadsworth.
- Graeff, C.L. (1997). Evolution of situational leadership theory: A critical review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(2), 153-170.
- Gram, T. (2010). Leadership development in a learning 2.0 world [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/tomgram/cstd-calgary-symposium>.
- Grayson, W. (2012, May 21). University faculty delaying retirement. *The Tuscaloosa News*. Retrieved from <http://www.tuscaloosaneews.com/article/20120521/NEWS/120529978?p=3&tc=pg>
- Grosseck, G. (2009). To use or not to use web 2.0 in higher education? *Procedia social and behavioral sciences*, 1, 478-482.
- Harper, S.R. & Hurtatdo, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 120, 7-18.
- Hernandez, M., Eberly, M.B., Avolio, B.J., & Johnson, M.D. (2011). The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1165-1185.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1982). Leadership style: Attitudes and behaviors. *Training and Development Manual*, 36(5), 50-52.
- Hicks, C. (2011, February 2). Number of tenured faculty has increased over years; Part-time professor numbers fluctuate. *The Red & Black*. Retrieved from http://www.redandblack.com/news/number-of-tenured-faculty-has-increased-over-years-part-time/article_218d731e-633e-5c3f-b00d-5b5c398c85f1.html.
- Hoffman, B.J., Woehr, D.J., Maldagen-Youngjohn, R. & Lyons, B.D. (2010). Great man or great myth? A quantitative review of the relationship between individual differences and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(2), 347-381.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G.J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49(6), 493-504.
- House, R.J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- House, R.J. & Baetz, M.L. (1979). Leadership some empirical generalizations and new research directions. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 341-423.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., & Walter, R. (1998). Enhancing campus

- climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279-302.
- Hutt, J.C. & Andreen, C. (2003, February 3). Dr. Robert Witt named SWSU president. *Dialog*. Retrieved from <http://dialog.ua.edu/2003/02/dr-robert-witt-named-ua-president/>.
- Inaugural leadership I class praises program's rewards, insights (2010, March 10). *Dialog*. Retrieved from <http://dialog.ua.edu/2010/05/inaugural-leadership-u-class-praises-programs-rewards-insights/>.
- Jones, A. (2005, August 22). SWSU student to faculty ratio grows. *The Tuscaloosa News*. Retrieved from <http://txstage.ny.atl.publicus.com/article/20050822/NEWS/508220344?Title=UA-student-to-faculty-ratio-grows>.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E, Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780.
- Judge, T.A., Woolf, E.F., Hurst, C. & Livingston, B. (2006). Charismatic and transformational leadership. A review and agenda for future research. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*, 50(4), 203–214.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 246-255.
- Katz, R.L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 33-42.
- Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C.A., Murphy, C.J., & Stogdill, R.M. (1974). Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12, 62-68.
- Kezar, A. (2012). Bottom-up/top-down leadership: Contradiction or hidden phenomenon. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(5), 725-758.
- Kezar, A.J. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(4), 429-459.
- Kezar, A.J. (2009). Preface. In A.J. Kezar (Ed.), *Rethinking leadership practices in a complex, multicultural, and global environment (ix-xx)*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Kezar, A.J. (2006). Redesigning for collaboration in learning initiatives: An examination of four highly collaborative campuses. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 804-838.
- Kezar, A. & Carducci, R (2009). Revolutionizing leadership development. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Rethinking leadership in a complex, multicultural and global environment: New concepts and models for higher education* (pp. 1-38). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

- Kezar, A.J & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, 715-740.
- Kezar, A.J., Carducci, R., & Contreras-McGavin, M. (2006). Rethinking the “L” word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 31*(6). New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A., & Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management, 5*(2), 48-60.
- Komives, S.R., Owen, J.E., Longenecker, S.D., Mainella, F.C., & Osteen, L (2006). A leadership identity: Applications from a grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*, 401-418.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (2008). *The student leadership challenge: Five practices for exemplary leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lafreniere, S.L. & Longman, K.A. (2008). Gendered realities and women’s leadership development: Participant voices from faith-based higher education. *Christian Higher Education, 7*(5), 388-404.
- Leadership Fellows description and expectations (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ua.edu/advancement/cqi/description.html>.
- Leadership I fosters professional development (2009, September 29). *Dialog*. Retrieved from <http://dialog.ua.edu/2009/09/leadership-u-fosters-professional-development/>.
- Leadership Institute advisory committee (2012). *Leadership I*. Retrieved from <http://training.ua.edu/leadershipu/advisory-committee.html>.
- Leadership Institute application (2012). *Leadership I*. Retrieved from <http://training.ua.edu/leadershipu/application.html>.
- Leadership Institute curriculum. (2012). *Leadership I*. Retrieved from <http://training.ua.edu/leadershipu/curriculum.html>.
- Leadership Institute home. (2012). *Leadership I*. Retrieved from <http://training.ua.edu//leadershipu/>.
- Leadership Institute requirements. (2012). *Leadership I*. Retrieved from <http://training.ua.edu/leadershipu/requirements.html>.
- Leadership Institute resources. (2012). *Leadership I*. Retrieved from <http://training.ua.edu/leadershipu/resources.html>.

- Levine, K.J., Muenchen, R.A., & Brooks, A.M. (2010). Measuring transformational and charismatic leadership: Why isn't charisma measured? *Communication Monographs*, 77(4), 576-591.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology, S.P.S.S.I. Bulletin*, 10, 271-299.
- Lord, R.G., De Vader, C.L., & Alliger, G.M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 402-410.
- Llopis, G. (2011). Diversity management is the key to growth: Make it authentic. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/glennllopis/2011/06/13/diversity-management-is-the-key-to-growth-make-it-authentic/3/>.
- M. King, personal communication, April 10, 2012.
- Mann, R.D. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(4), 241-270.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Maxwell, J.C. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership: Follow them and people will follow you*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- McDowell, T., Fang, S., Brownlee, K, Young, C. & Khanna, A. (2002). Transforming an MFT program: A model for enhancing diversity. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 28(2), 179-191.
- Mead-Fox, D. (2010, January 8). It's getting harder to find superior leaders. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. D.25-D.26.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and Expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Connelly, M.S. & Marks, M.A. (2000). Leadership skills: Conclusions and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 155-170.
- Nandal, V. & Krishnan, V.R. (2000). Charismatic leadership and self-efficacy: Importance of role clarity. *Management and Labour Studies*, 25(4), 231-243.
- Neumann, Y., & Neumann, E.F. (1999). The president and the college bottom line: The role of strategic leadership styles. *The International Journal of Education Management*, 13(2), 73-79.

- Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ospina, S., El Hadidy, W. & Caicedo, G. (2011, March). *Leadership, Diversity and Inclusion: Insights from Scholarship*. New York, NY: Research Center for Leadership in Action, NYU Wagner. Retrieved from <http://wagner.nyu.edu/files/leadership/LeadershipDiversityInclusionScholarship.pdf>
- Ott, J.S., Parkes, S.J, & Simpson, R.B. (2008). *Classic readings in organizational behavior*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Popper, M. & Lipshitz, R. (1993). Putting leadership theory to work: A conceptual framework for theory-based leadership development. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 14(7), 23-27.
- Quickfacts (2012). *SWSU View book*. Retrieved from <http://viewbook.ua.edu/quick-facts/>.
- Rice, R.W., & Kastenbaum, D.R. (1983). The contingency model of leadership: Some current issues. *Basic and Applied Psychology*, 4(4), 373-392.
- Romano, C.R., Hanish, J, Phillips, C. & Waggoner, M.D. (2010). The new normal: Senior student affairs officers speak out about budget cutting. *New Directions for Student Services*, 129, 59-70.
- Rosener, J.B. (1990). Ways Women Lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 69, 119-125.
- Rosser, V.J., Johnsrud, L.K. & Heck, R.H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(1), 1-25.
- Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.
- Rost, J.C. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1) 92-110.
- Rost, J.C. (1997). Moving from individual to relationship: A postindustrial paradigm of leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(4), 3-16.
- Rost, J.C. & Smith, A. (1992). Leadership: A postindustrial approach. *European Management Journal*, 10(2), 193-201.
- Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rudolph, F (1991). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

- Sadler, P. (1997). *Leadership*. London: Kogan Page in association with Coopers & Lybrand.
- Schein, E.H. (1991). *Organizational culture and leadership, 2nd edition*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Schmidtlein, F.A. & Berdahl, R.O. (2005). Autonomy and accountability: Who controls academe?. In P.G Altbach, R.O. Berdahl & P.J. Gumpert (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political and economic challenges* (pp. 91-114). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L.L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L.L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization, 8*(2), 154-161.
- Smith, T. (2012, April 11). Witt oversaw era of unprecedented growth. *The Crimson White*. Retrieved from <http://cw.ua.edu/2012/04/11/witt-oversaw-era-of-unprecedented-growth/>
- Southwest State University 2007 minority participation report (2007, September 14). Retrieved from <http://www.uasystem.ua.edu/IR%20Data/MinorityParticipationReport2007.pdf>.
- Southwest State University 2009 minority participation report (2009, November 9). Retrieved from <http://www.uasystem.ua.edu/IR%20Data/MinorityParticipationReport2007.pdf>.
- Southwest State University system data summary report (2011, August). Retrieved from <http://www.uasystem.ua.edu/IR%20Data/datasum-current.pdf>.
- Stogdill, (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*: 35-71.
- SWSU enrollment at record high. (2012, September 12). *UA NEWS*. Retrieved from <http://uanews.ua.edu/2012/09/ua-enrollment-at-record-high/>.
- SWSU ranked one of America's best colleges (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.ua.edu/features/usnews.html>.
- Tannenbaum, A.S. and Schmitt, W.H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review, 36*(2), 95-101.
- Tierney, W. G. (1998). On the road to recovery and renewal: Reinventing academe. In W.G. Tierney (Ed.), *The responsive university* (pp. 1-12). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tierney, W.G. (1999). *Building the responsive campus: Creating high performance colleges and*

- universities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tierney, W. G. (2008). *The impact of culture on organizational decision-making: Theory and practice in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Tierney, W.G. & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tierney, W.G., & Rhoads, R.A. (1993). Faculty socialization as a cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Vaillancourt, A.M. (2011). The academic administrators professors love to hate. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A29.
- Vivian H. Fisher PSO Leadership Academy (n.d.). *UGA Faculty Programs*. Retrieved from http://outreach.uga.edu/index.php/programs/faculty_programs/psa_leadership_academy/
- Vroom, V.H (1983). Leaders and leadership in academe. *Review of Higher Education*, 6, 367-386.
- Vroom, V.H., & Jago, A.G. (2007). The role of situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17-24.
- Wisniewski, M.A. (2004). Leadership in higher education: Implications for leadership development programs. *Academic Leadership Live, the Online Journal*, 2(1).
- Wolfson, H. (2010, February 16). Tenured professor numbers decline in Alabama. *The Birmingham News*. Retrieved from http://blog.al.com/spotnews/2010/02/tenured_professor_numbers_decl.html
- Ylijoki, O. (2003). Entangled in academic capitalism? A case study on changing ideals and practices of university research. *Higher Education*, 45(3), 307-335.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A, & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 15-32.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 6-16.
- Zaccaro, S.J., Foti, R.J., & Kenny, D.A. (1993). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2), 308-315.

Zaccaro, S.J, Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A.T. Cianciolo, & R.J. Sternberg (Eds.). *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101-124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zaleznik, A (1977/2004). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, 4-81.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In. P.G Altbach, R.O. Berdahl & P.J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political and economic challenges* (pp. 115-162). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

APPENDIX A
Comparative Leadership Theory Table

	Key Authors	Industrial Leadership Characteristics	Postindustrial Leadership Characteristics	Examples in Practice
Trait Theory	Katz; Stogdill, 1940; Mann, 1959; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Zaccaro, 2007	Leader-centered; Formal, hierarchical approach; Focus on individual, inborn leader characteristics that transcend context and relate to authority and dominance; Equates “good” leadership with specific management skills/traits (“great men”= great managers = great leaders); Focus on leader’s goals; Uses traditional management terminology	Skill-based versions focus on leadership as a learned concept; Some contemporary leadership theories include a focus on individual traits that are described as significant to ensure success of the collaborative leadership process	Focus on <i>leader</i> development; Used most often for job training and for employee evaluation and selection; Skill-based programs focus on competencies and are used widely as the foundation for training and development in higher education Examples of Models & Instruments: <i>Three-Skill</i> approach; <i>Skills Model</i> ; <i>Leadership Trait Questionnaire</i> ; <i>Myers-Briggs Type Indicator</i> ; <i>Strengthsquest</i> ; <i>True-colors</i>
Behavioral Theory	Blake & Mouton; Lewin, Lippitt & White	Leader-centered; Formal, hierarchical approach; Focus on individual behavior; Focus more on leader behavior than context; Emphasize managerial styles (i.e. task v. relational); Focus on legitimate leadership behaviors; Focus on a leader’s goals; Use traditional management terminology	Recognize leadership as a learned concept; Identify the possible significance of context; Acknowledge that relational, influential, aspects of leadership exist; Foreshadow horizontal/process-oriented leadership; Some models include shared-power elements	Focus on <i>leader</i> development; Used most often for employee training and development programs; Behavioral approaches are utilized most often in self-assessment of leadership style and effectiveness; Higher education programs emphasize a balance between task and relationship behaviors Examples of Models & Instruments: <i>Blake & Mouton Managerial/Leadership Grid</i> ; <i>The Ohio State and Michigan Studies</i> ; Lewin, Lippitt & White <i>authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire leadership</i>
Situational Theory	Hersey & Blanchard; Tannenbaum & Schmidt; Fiedler; House; Vroom; Yetton; Jago	Largely leader-centered; Formal, hierarchical approach; Focus on a leader’s goals; Ultimate focus still on individual traits, behaviors and managerial styles; Some models depict leaders as having inborn traits and behavioral styles that cannot be altered; Some models promote legitimate behaviors only; Use traditional management terminology	Most models recognize leadership as a learned concept; Emphasize the significance of culture and context; Acknowledge that relational, influential, aspects of leadership exist; Acknowledge that influence can be multidirectional; Acknowledge the need for multiple leaders; some models promote influence behaviors	Focus on <i>leader</i> development; Used most often for employee training and placement; Significant method for higher education because of emphasis on culture Examples of Models & Instruments: <i>The continuum of leadership behavior model</i> ; <i>Situational leadership model</i> ; <i>Contingency model</i> ; <i>Path-goal theory model</i> ; <i>Decision-making model</i> ; <i>Least Preferred Coworker Instrument</i>
Change-Oriented Theory	Conger and Kanungo; House and Shamir; Bass and Avolio; Burns	Focus on traits and behaviors; Resemble “heroic” leadership theory; Focus on leader domination; Leader’s goals sometimes dictate the organization; Largely a formal, hierarchical approach	Greater focus on leadership as a process; Emphasize collaborative, relational, influential aspects of leadership; Emphasize the significance of culture; Emphasize change; Promote influence behaviors; Emphasize that influence can be multidirectional; Emphasize the need for multiple leaders; Emphasize leadership as distinct concept from management; Include flat models that focus on informal, grassroots leadership; Focus on values; Use process-oriented leadership terminology	Focus on <i>leader</i> development and <i>leadership</i> development; Used most often for training and development and organizational change; Easiest for higher education to engage in change-oriented leadership at small institutions, during a crisis or when an institution seeks to move to a higher tier; Examples of Models & Instruments: <i>Integrative theory of charismatic leadership</i> ; <i>Behavioral model of charismatic leadership</i> ; Bass and Avolio <i>model of transformational leadership</i> ; <i>MLQ</i>

APPENDIX B
Protocol

Protocol for *Leadership Institute* Participants

1. Describe your current position at Southwest State University.
 - a. What is your title?
 - b. When did you begin in your current role?
 - c. What are the responsibilities of your position?
2. What roles have you held prior to this position in higher education?
 - a. How long have you worked at Southwest State University specifically?
3. What led you to participate in the *Leadership Institute* program?
 - a. How did you learn about the program?
4. What were your personal goals for participating in this program?
 - a. How has participating in *Leadership I* impacted your job performance?
5. How do you conceptualize leadership? How has this definition changed since participating in the *Leadership I* program?
6. After going through this program, how do you believe the institution defines leadership?
 - a. Who does the institution see as leaders?
7. How has participating in *Leadership I* changed the way in which you think about leadership?
8. What is your approach to leadership on campus? Has this changed since your participation in the *Leadership I* program?
9. What were the three main outcomes of the *Leadership I* program for you, personally?
10. Tell me about the courses you took to fulfill the requirements of the program. What was emphasized in these courses and what did you learn from them?
11. What elements of the program were the most significant and valuable to enhancing your leadership capacity? Why?

- a. How did training and development in these key areas help you in your role at Southwest State University and in higher education?
12. In what ways did the program include development in terms of skill building? Cultural awareness? Leadership behavior?
13. In what ways did the program include development in terms of collaborative and grassroots leadership?
14. Does the program indicate specific leadership behaviors and characteristics linked to effective leadership practices? If so, what are those?
15. In what ways does the curriculum discuss the role of those in the position of a follower or collaborator? How does the curriculum instruct participants to manage power to achieve desired results?
16. How does the program's curriculum address institutional change and faculty and staff's role within that change?
17. From your perspective as a graduate of the *Leadership I* program, is there a difference between those staff and faculty who have participated in the *Leadership I* program and those who have not? If so, please describe the difference.
 - a. How is leadership development provided to all staff and faculty at SWSU?
18. Prior to participating in the program, what were your expectations? Were these expectations met? If so, how? If not, why were they not?
 - a. What would have been helpful to have as a part of the curriculum that was not included?
19. How do you believe *Leadership I* is accomplishing its mission and goals?
20. Do you have any additional thoughts to share with me about *Leadership I* or your role as a participant?

Protocol for *Leadership Institute* Advisory Committee Members

1. Describe your current position at Southwest State University.
 - a. What is your title?
 - b. When did you begin in your current role?
 - c. What are the responsibilities of your position?
2. How did you become involved in the *Leadership Institute* advisory committee? What is your role within the program and on the advisory committee?
 - a. How long have you been involved with the advisory committee/with *Leadership I*?
3. How did the concept of *Leadership I* begin?
 - a. What was it that created a need for the program?
 - b. What were the motivating factors for starting the program?
4. What do you see as the main purpose/principles/goals/desired outcomes of the *Leadership I* program?
 - a. Has the purpose of the program changed at all since its inception?
 - b. In your opinion is the program's purpose more linked to individual development or institutional change?
5. Who designed the curriculum of *Leadership I*? How was it created?
 - a. Is the program's curriculum (or parts of it) modeled after another leadership program?
 - b. Is there a particular leadership theory (or theories) that the curriculum uses as its framework?
6. What impact do you think *Leadership I* has on professional staff and faculty who participate in the program? What impact do you think *Leadership I* has on all faculty and staff as well as the institution as a whole?
7. What elements of the program do you think are the most significant and valuable to enhancing the participants' leadership capacity? Why?
 - a. What elements of the program are most likely to lead to organizational change?
8. In what ways does the curriculum include development in terms of the following: (1) individual skill-building; (2) management behaviors; (3) culture and context of higher education; (4) leadership behaviors; (5) collaboration; (6) grass-roots leadership?

- a. Which of the aforementioned are focused on the most in the curriculum? The least? Why?
9. How does the program's curriculum address institutional change and faculty and staff's role within that change?
10. In what ways does the curriculum discuss the role of those in the position of a follower or collaborator? How does the curriculum instruct participants to manage power to achieve desired results?
11. Does the program indicate specific leadership behaviors and characteristics linked to effective leadership practices? If so, what are those?
12. How do you personally conceptualize leadership? Has your definition changed since being involved with *Leadership I*?
13. What do you think other's who are not involved with *Leadership I* think about the program?
14. What would you like changed about the curriculum or structure of the *Leadership I* program? For what reasons?
15. Do you have any additional thoughts to share with me about *Leadership I* or you role as an advisory committee member?

APPENDIX C

Office for Research

February 8, 2013

Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects



Holly Luther
Dept of Higher Education Admin.
College of Education
Box 870302

Re: IRB#: 13-OR-046 "Leadership Development in Higher Education: A Case Study of the Experiences of Faculty and Staff in a Leadership Development Program at a Public, Four-Year Research Institution"

Dear Ms. Luther:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

Your application will expire on February 7, 2014. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent forms to obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office of Research Compliance
The University of Alabama



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM

Consent Form for Nonmedical Human Subjects

CONSENT FORM

FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY, CONTACT: Holly Luther, Ph.D student, Higher Education Administration, The University of Alabama at 616-648-1603 or hmluther@gmail.com or Dr. Karri Holley, Associate Professor Higher Education Administration, The University of Alabama, Box 870302, 205-348-7825.

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study about the leadership development experiences of faculty and staff who have participated in the [REDACTED] program at [REDACTED]. The questions examine the experiences of faculty and staff both during and after their participation in the [REDACTED] program as well as examine the influence of the [REDACTED] program on the broader organization. The purpose of the research is to explore the personal experiences of faculty and staff in a campus-based leadership development program as well as examine the ways in which a four-year institution increases leadership capacity of its employees. You will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview lasting approximately one-hour. The interview will be audiotaped. The audio will be transferred to a electronic file on the computer following the interview and used for transcription purposes only. All electronic files will be password-protected. The files will be deleted after the study is complete.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no risks involved in this study. Your identity will remain confidential and you may decide to discontinue your participation at any time. There are no direct benefits to be gained by participants in this study. Results from the study will be used to gain a better understanding of the experiences of faculty and staff engaging in leadership development programming.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation in this experiment will take approximately one hour.

PAYMENTS: You will not receive a payment for your participation.

SUBJECT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study. Names will be known only to the principal investigator. The names will not be used as identifiers in the research to ensure confidentiality of the participants and the institution.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 2/8/13
EXPIRATION DATE: 2/7/2014

If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205)-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

I give consent to be audiotaped during this study. The audio tapes will be used to create accurate transcripts of the interview for purposes of coding the collected data:

please initial: Yes No

The extra copy of this consent form is for you to keep.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

Protocol Approval Date: _____

Protocol Expiration Date: _____

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 2/8/13
EXPIRATION DATE: 2/7/2014